



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



P

A. T.

COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA.

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES.

SESSION 1907-8.

(SECOND SESSION OF THE THIRD PARLIAMENT.)

VOL. XLII.

(Comprising the period from 22nd November to 13th December, 1907.)

SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

*Printed and Published for the GOVERNMENT of the COMMONWEALTH of AUSTRALIA by
J. KEMP, Government Printer for the State of Victoria.*

Digitized by Google

1908.

F.7128.

J
905
H2-
v. 42

the combustion of coal. Under existing conditions we secure only a modicum of that power. Should they succeed in getting from coal four or five times the heating power at present obtained from it, they might easily double the speed of vessels without seriously adding to the cost of running them. What an enormous advantage that would be to a country like Australia, isolated as it is from the great bodies of people who wish to have intercourse with us, and to exchange goods with us. If such a state of things were brought about, we should occupy a very happy position, and the Government would undoubtedly appeal to the company to which we were paying a subsidy to bring their ships up to date. Of course, we all hope that the same rate of progress which has characterized mechanical science in the past will continue. If it does, we shall have reason to congratulate ourselves. I think that the Government, having decided to include the whole of the Commonwealth in this new mail contract, should also see that no State is asked to pay a special subsidy to the mail steamers for calling at its chief port. Concerning the practicability of the Commonwealth successfully conducting a line of steamers of its own for the purpose of carrying produce and passengers between Australia and other parts of the world, I have no doubt whatever. I wish to set aside at once the mistaken idea which is entertained outside—an idea which has been propagated by honorable members opposite—that the Labour Party seek to introduce a white ocean policy. All that we have ever claimed is that if we pay a subsidy to any line of ships, we have a right to prescribe the class of labour which should be employed upon them. If these vessels want our money, they may have it subject to that condition; but if they do not want it, they may carry out their own conditions. That is a very different matter from having a white ocean policy.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—The members of the Labour Party travel by vessels which employ coloured labour.

Mr. FISHER.—Why should not we do so? Does the right honorable member suggest that I should not associate with a coloured man because I do not desire to have him in my home?

Sir JOHN FORREST.—My point is that we send our goods by vessels which employ coloured labour.

Mr. FISHER.—I treat a coloured man just as I would treat any other. In this connexion I am reminded of a celebrated individual in America who in the north during the excitement of rebellion lifted his hat to a coloured man, and was upbraided for so doing. His reply was that he would not be outdone in courtesy by any man.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—We send our goods by steamers carrying black labour, and yet the party to which the honorable member belongs draws the line at the carriage of mails by such vessels.

Mr. FISHER.—The honorable member seems exceedingly dense.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—That is bluster. I am not more dense than is the honorable member.

Mr. FISHER.—I will withdraw the word "dense," and say that the honorable member does not exhibit his usual aptitude in grasping my statement. What I said was that the Labour Party had never claimed that we should have a white ocean policy. All that we claim is that if we pay a subsidy to a certain line of steamers, we have a right to say under what conditions it shall be paid.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—A man who sends freight by any vessel pays a subsidy.

Mr. FISHER.—The members of the party which I have the honour to lead have two things to guard against. We are the political pioneers in these matters, and we are subjected to more misrepresentation than is any other party. Moreover, it is misrepresentation of a kind that we cannot catch up to. It is just as well, therefore, that our position should be clearly stated, so that every honest man who wishes to do justice to a political opponent will know exactly what it is. We say that white labour should be employed only under certain conditions.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—We pay poundage charges to vessels upon which coloured labour is employed.

Mr. FISHER.—Under the Postal Union Convention we have no power to do anything else. Are we not a party to that Convention? It is astonishing to me that the honorable member for Swan, who has been a Minister of the Crown, should not know the facts. The civilized nations of the world have agreed to certain combined action in order to accelerate the transmission of mails; and that is quite apart from the payment of any

subsidy. But the honorable member for Swan does not seem able to comprehend these simple matters this morning.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—The truth is that the honorable member for Wide Bay is "on a bad wicket."

Mr. FISHER.—I am afraid that it is labour in vain to endeavour to enlighten the honorable member.

Sir JOHN FORREST. — The honorable member and his party change their ground so often that we do not know where they are.

Mr. FISHER.—I accept that challenge, and ask the honorable member to show when or where we have changed our ground on a question of principle. Our policy, part of which is embodied in the amendment of the honorable member for Barrier, is published to the world—we have nothing to conceal. There is every opportunity for successful attack if we change our principles. The fact is that we are criticised and opposed, not because we change our principles, but because we are convincing the people as to the truth of our principles.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I find it almost impossible to follow the honorable member, owing to the numerous conversations which are being carried on, and to the frequent interjections. I must ask honorable members to observe the ordinary rules of debate.

Mr. FISHER.—In my opinion, many great advantages would follow from the establishment of a Commonwealth line of mail steamers. The proposed mail contract, excellent as it is in the way of providing cool storage, and for the calling of the mail steamers at all the principal ports from Fremantle to Brisbane, will not accomplish all that could be accomplished by a Commonwealth line of steamers. If it be our object, by means of a mail subsidy, to assist the primary producers, then the contract goes too far, or does not go far enough. It is not sufficient that the steamers should call at the principal ports. One might imagine that the larger centres of population would be well able to look after themselves in this connexion, and that our attention and assistance would be devoted to smaller centres which are more difficult of access. That assistance is withheld, not because the claims are not just, but because the political influence exercised by such places is not equal to moving Parliament. For a Commonwealth line of steamers

there might be subsidiary lines to convey produce from small ports to the large ports.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Is not that done now?

Mr. FISHER.—That may be, but producers at the smaller ports have in the past been seriously penalized. Under such a scheme as I have indicated, the cost to the producers would be reduced, and the protection of the produce would be assured. The small producers would be able to consign their goods practically from their farm. The Commonwealth has control of the Customs and the Post Office; and there are officials of both Departments in every port and every little village. It would be possible to post up at every post-office each day, or, at least, each week, the ruling prices of goods in the various parts of the world, and the consignments could be sent on with the aid of the Government officials, thus saving the high commission charges which are at present made.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—What an army of public servants would be required.

Mr. FISHER.—That is an old cry. If a public servant is doing more efficiently work usually done by private individuals, what harm is there?

Mr. HARPER.—There is a big "if."

Mr. FISHER.—In every reform there is a big "if." We have heard the honorable member for Flinders say that rates on State-owned railways are 20 per cent. cheaper than they are on privately-owned lines; and if we extend the principle we shall greatly help those people who have to make their living on the land. We know how producers are overcharged by commission agents, and how very often it is uncertain whether there will be any return. If Government officials do not carry out their duties properly, complaint is made in this House immediately, and injustice can be remedied. A Commonwealth line of steamers is not only possible, but would be profitable and beneficial, more especially to those who toil on the land. I have often expressed these ideals both in this House and outside.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Why do not the Government officials do that work now? There is nothing to prevent them.

Mr. FISHER.—Government officials are doing that work in a lesser degree, and I am glad to say they are doing it very well—better than in any other country in the world. The railways in Australia are

safer and better in every respect than privately-owned railways elsewhere; and we ought to be proud of the fact, which only bears out my contention that State control is better than private control. I hope the time is not far distant when the Commonwealth will undertake to furnish everybody in the community with information regarding trade and commerce, and will do everything possible to assist in the transportation of produce, with a view to reducing the present commission charges.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [12.31].—I intend to be as brief as possible, because at this stage of the session we cannot discuss any question so lengthily as we would at another time. My principal reason for rising is to reply to some remarks made by the honorable member for Barrier last night when he submitted his amendment. I cannot complain of the honorable member's criticism of myself; in fact, I think he gave me undue credit. I can only say that if there was any merit in the speech in which I replied to the honorable member on a previous occasion, it was due to the strength of his own address, on the good tone of which I can also congratulate him. I shall not press the line of compliment further, or we may deteriorate into a mutual admiration society. If I understood the honorable member aright—I may perhaps have been mistaken, because my attention was distracted a little at the time—his later speech, while it had all the ability of his previous speech to which I have referred, was certainly not so desirable in its tone. I understood the honorable member to say that capitalism has been guilty of every crime in the Decalogue—that it is heartless, treacherous, deceitful, and so forth. Perhaps the honorable member was quoting somebody else; but I understood him to say that Chambers of Commerce would sell Jesus Christ for thirty pieces of silver.

Mr. THOMAS.—I said that Chambers of Commerce would crucify Christ for thirty pieces of silver.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON. — The honorable member for Wide Bay objects to the criticism that has been directed to the members of his party, whom he described as misrepresented pioneers. He objects to the criticism directed against them as Socialists—to the charge that they are in favour of laxity of the marriage tie, against religion, and in favour of depriving parents of the custody

of their own children. To that criticism the honorable member objects, and he rightly objects so long as these ideas are not advocated by his party. But is it right for them, although objecting to the criticism of opponents as dishonorable and unfair who refer to the views of some Socialists as the opinions of all, to overlook all that is good that is associated with capitalism, and picking out instances of evil, to declare that these exceptional cases apply to all Chambers of Commerce and to capitalism. Those associated with Chambers of Commerce and capitalists have as much right to object to criticism such as we have heard as have the Socialists in this House to object to being criticised because of views held by other Socialists which they do not themselves accept. The criticism of which I am complaining is cheap and easy, but it is unworthy of any honorable member. There are evils connected with capitalism, and there are undesirable persons connected with Chambers of Commerce; but if those persons are no better, they are no worse than the people with whom the honorable member associates, and whom he represents.

Mr. FISHER.—That is fair.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—It is not right to use particular instances as if they were of general application. Coming to the amendment, I shall not occupy much time in dealing with the financial question which it raises, because the honorable member for Barrier did not deal with it at length. He was right in saying that when I criticised his proposals on a former occasion there was a great difference between my results and those at which he had arrived. He has acknowledged, however, that I did not take the extreme figures put forward by steamship owners. The Orient Company claimed that on each round trip the extra expense of running the larger boats is £10,000. I took only half of that amount, but I showed a considerable loss where the honorable member for Barrier showed a profit. The Commission of which he was chairman obtained from Mr. Coghlan a price for steamers of the class which they recommended—£375,000 each. But I pointed out that that is what one of those vessels would cost delivered from the builder's hands, and that there would still be the furnishings to pay for. The providing of linen, cutlery; plate, bedding, and other furnishings for a big steamer costs

probably £25,000. Therefore, I put the cost of each vessel at £400,000, and the rate at which the Commonwealth could borrow at $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., instead of at 3 per cent., which was the estimate of the honorable member. I also argued that nine boats would be required to provide a regular service. I do not mean that it would be absolutely necessary for the Government to own nine vessels; but provision would have to be made for the occasional chartering of a ninth to prevent interruption to the service from break-downs, or docking for large repairs. As a matter of fact, there are nine vessels now in the Australian sailing lists of the Orient and Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Companies. However, in one of my calculations I allowed for eight boats only, and, accepting the estimate of cost furnished by Mr. Coghlan—£375,000—showed that there would be a loss of £336,000. Of course, there must be differences of opinion as to the correctness of that result. I cannot claim infallibility, any more than the honorable member can. But as he has not gone into the matter again to substantiate his estimates, I shall not do so. He asks how is it, if such a loss would be incurred, that a private company, which must make profits, is willing to enter into the proposed contract, and to provide vessels similar to those suggested for the Commonwealth fleet. My first answer to the honorable member is that I am not concerned whether the Orient Steam Navigation Company loses money or not, but that it is my duty to see that the Commonwealth does not lose money. In the second place, the circumstances now are different from what they were when the calculation was made. The cost of metal has declined considerably, so that the cost of building steamers is probably lower than it was. Then freights have been increased. Under this contract the butter freight will be £1 3s. 6d. per ton higher than it was, and other freights have risen because the extreme cutting of freights to and from the East has practically ceased. Then passage rates have increased by 10 per cent.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—And the subsidy has increased.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The proposed subsidy is £20,000 more than was calculated for by the honorable member for Barrier. He put it at £150,000, making Brisbane a port of call; but it is to be

£170,000. Therefore, my estimate may have been substantially correct, and yet under present conditions the company may be able to make a profit.

Mr. THOMAS.—Might not a Commonwealth service also be able to make a profit now?

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—A Commonwealth service would have a better chance of making ends meet now than existed previously; but a Government line of steamers which had to compete with other lines would not be likely to do nearly as well as a line privately owned and managed by experienced directors. I could give my reason for that statement, but, as time is pressing, I shall not do so. I admit that when a franchise or a practical monopoly is concerned, the question must always arise, is it better to give it to private persons or to allow the Government to exercise it? But in this case there is no monopoly. As the honorable member for Parramatta has pointed out, the sea is not like the earth, on which you put down two lines of rails or under which you place a line of pipes. It provides facilities for any amount of competition.

Mr. THOMAS.—Is there not something in the argument that a subsidized mail company is removed from ordinary competition?

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—It must, in the first instance, compete with other companies to obtain the subsidy, and after it is subsidized, it must compete with other lines for passengers and freight.

Mr. CARR.—How many companies were in a position to tender for this contract?

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Besides the mail companies, some of the biggest shipping companies in the world run steamers to Australia, and they were in a position to tender. So, too, were other British companies.

Mr. CARR.—The fact that they did not tender shows that they were not in a position to do so.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The fact that other tenders were above that of the Orient Company, and that some lines did not tender at all, only shows that those concerned did not think it worth while to make a greater effort to obtain the contract.

Mr. HUGHES.—Competition can never be keener than it is now. The Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Company says that its Australian traffic is not profitable, and the Orient Company does not pay.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—There is good evidence that the Orient Company has not paid in the past. It has paid those who have handled the business, but it has not returned interest on capital. In this case there is no monopoly. Of course, anything may by combination be made a monopoly; but we can deal with shipping combinations more easily than with any others, and from time to time, when we on this side have spoken of monopolies, the members of the Labour Party have replied, "We can deal with monopolies."

Mr. HUGHES.—We do not say that.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Had the honorable member been here more frequently, he would have heard that statement from members of his party. If there were such a strong combination working against Australia so that its interests were likely to be injured, I should not stand in the way of a Commonwealth mail service. But no such danger exists. We are being asked to enter upon a new and untried experiment, which is not likely to prove successful. I admit that Government institutions have proved more or less successful; but their success has depended upon commercial management.

Mr. ARCHER.—Besides, they have been monopolies.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Yes; and it has been possible to conceal large losses in the general accounts of the Government. What instance of success can be pointed to where a Government concern has had to compete against private concerns?

Mr. HALL.—The State clothing factory of New South Wales.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—That is a small concern, and inquiry has shown that at one time, at all events, it was not a success. Reference has been made to the Fitzroy Dock; that again was condemned by an inquiry.

Mr. HALL.—The inquiry upheld it.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—It condemned the management and the results.

Mr. HUGHES.—Take the State clothing factory of Great Britain.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—It is not competitive.

Mr. HUGHES.—In its results it undoubtedly is.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—When the State takes its own manufactures and shuts out others competition ceases. I fail to see in competitive Government management anything that would justify us in

entering upon such an experiment. I desire now to point out how far it is proposed to carry the principle of nationalization. Some honorable members of the Labour Party will not admit that they are committed to complete nationalization, but in this Parliament we have already had proposals for the nationalization of the iron industry, the mail steam-ship service, the tobacco industry, the sugar industry, and the coal-mining industry. The programme of the States Labour Party also includes a proposal for the nationalization of land. That surely is a wide movement.

Mr. THOMAS.—It is a very fair programme.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—It is.

Mr. HUGHES.—One section of the honorable member's party is in favour of the nationalization of rents.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—It can be claimed that Government institutions having at their head men who are prepared to manage them on commercial lines have been more or less successful. I admit that in one or two cases such institutions have been eminently successful, but what would happen if for instance the State-owned railways were managed, not by men appointed by the State to control them, but by the votes of the men within the Department.

Mr. HALL.—Who advocates that?

Mr. HUGHES.—If the honorable member ran a private enterprise on such lines we know what would happen.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—What would happen if the Railway Department of a State were managed by the votes of its employés?

Mr. HALL.—No one believes in that.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—When more than half of the industries of a State are made Government monopolies the votes of those employed in them will control the management.

Mr. HUGHES.—Not all the votes within each industry.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—That is immaterial. The ex-leader of the Labour Party has put before us a beautiful scheme. He has said that the Labour Party do not believe in the principle of "share and share alike"; that such a system would shatter society and would be really impossible. I accept that statement, but is the honorable member prepared to say that when all our industries become Government monopolies, and are consequently managed by the votes of the

engaged in them, the employés will be satisfied with varying rates of wages—that one man will be content to work for a wage of £2 a week whilst another is receiving £3,000 a year?

Mr. HUGHES.—Does the honorable member mean to say—

Mr. SPEAKER. — The honorable member for West Sydney, if he pleases, may speak presently. I ask him not to interrupt the honorable member who is addressing the Chair.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON. — The statement has been made that in Government monopolies men would be paid according to the services they rendered. I fully recognise the clearheadedness of the honorable member for South Sydney, but how could he hope to resist a demand for an equal division of wages in nationalized industries when over 50 per cent. or the whole of the voters of Australia were employed in them? The larger number of those employés would be receiving comparatively small remuneration, and their votes would be cast every time in the direction of reducing the salaries of the higher paid officers, and approaching an equal division.

Mr. HUGHES.—What prevents equal division at the present time? Could we not, to-morrow, pass a law, if we liked, providing for an equal division?

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON. — No; that could not be done in connexion with private enterprise. Industries would have to be nationalized.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—What! does the honorable member for West Sydney say—

Mr. SPEAKER.—Order! Not only are interjections again becoming too frequent, but remarks are being made across the chamber. I ask the House not to force me to use those powers with which I am vested, and which I recognise should be used only in extreme cases. It would be unpleasant to have to resort to them, but I shall certainly do so if honorable members will not place some restraint upon themselves.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON. — An equal division could be secured only by nationalization. It could not be brought about in connexion with independent individualistic enterprises. I shall not, however, deal further with that phase of the question. Coming to the contract itself, I think that the Postmaster-General should have given the House a fuller

explanation than he did of the proceedings which have taken place in connexion with the mail contract since we were last asked to deal with the matter.

Mr. MAUGER.—I could have spoken for two hours, but having regard to the importance of saving time, and knowing that nothing would be gained by making a lengthy explanation, I refrained from doing so.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON. — The honorable member might have given the House a satisfactory explanation without speaking for two hours. He could have condensed his remarks, as I am endeavouring to do. Parliament should have had from the Minister some explanation of the failure of the Laing contract, which was spoken of so highly by the Prime Minister, who had such great expectations of it. I do not think that that failure has been sufficiently explained. It was not without warning that the Government took the course that they did. They were told that they ought to insist upon a more substantial security. As it was they allowed certain persons to obtain a concession to be "hawked" through the money markets of Great Britain. To the evident astonishment of the Prime Minister, who had alluded to the strength of the contracting parties, I said when the contract was before us that the firm he mentioned was really not behind it. I pointed out that it was merely a proposal to deposit £25,000 in order to obtain a certain option, and that there was even no certainty of our securing that £25,000 in the event of the contract not being fulfilled. We have had from the Government no explanation of the cause of the failure, or of the reasons why the Government have not enforced the bond.

Mr. KING O'MALLEY.—I think Croker "cooked" them.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON. — The Government were told that the contract merely represented an attempt on the part of certain persons to secure a concession in the hope of floating a company; that if it could be floated the contract would be fulfilled, but that otherwise it would not. I ventured to say then that while I thought that the contract would be a good one if it were fulfilled, I did not think that it would be. The Government should have taken greater precautions than they did to prevent the Commonwealth being placed in the unfortunate position of having the

option which it gave "hawked" through the money markets of Great Britain.

Sitting suspended from 1.3 to 2.15 p.m.

Mr. DEAKIN (Ballarat—Minister of External Affairs) [2.15].—With the permission of the honorable member for North Sydney I should like to move the adjournment of the debate for a few minutes in order that we may receive messages from the Senate in relation to two Bills which have been returned from that Chamber.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I have no objection.

Debate (on motion by Mr. DEAKIN) adjourned.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 4).

Bill returned from the Senate without request.

BOUNTIES BILL.

Mr. SPEAKER announced the receipt of the following message from the Senate—

The Senate returns to the House of Representatives the Bill for "An Act to provide for the payment of bounties on the production of certain goods," and acquaints the House of Representatives that the Senate does not insist upon its amendment No. 9, disagreed to by the House of Representatives. The Senate agrees to the amendment of the House of Representatives upon its amendment No. 11, and to consequential amendment in amendment No. 2. The Senate insists upon its amendment No. 7, disagreed to by the House of Representatives, as shown in the annexed schedule, and requests the reconsideration of the Bill in respect to that amendment and to amendments Nos. 2 and 12, in which the Senate has made consequential amendments, as shown in the annexed schedule.

A. J. GOULD, President.

The Senate, Melbourne, 22nd November, 1907.

Ordered—

That the message be taken into consideration forthwith.

Motion (by Mr. GROOM) proposed—

That the House does not insist upon disagreeing with the Senate's amendment, omitting from the first schedule the item "copra," and agrees with the consequential amendments made in other clauses.

Mr. FRAZER (Kalgoorlie) [2.19].—In view of the statement which he made last evening, does not the Attorney-General think that we are justified in making still another attempt to induce the Senate to agree to our proposal in regard to copra?

Mr. SALMON.—Does the honorable member know what were the numbers upon the

division which took place in the other Chamber?

Mr. FRAZER.—No. Does the honorable member know?

Mr. SALMON.—Yes. There was rather a large majority against our proposal.

Mr. FRAZER.—That fact ought not to be sufficient to induce the Government to abandon the industry which only last night they claimed would be of immense value to the Commonwealth.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Did the honorable member vote for the proposal?

Mr. FRAZER.—That is another question. The Government certainly attached great importance to their proposal to extend a bounty to the production of copra. Simply because another place, upon the eve of a prolonged adjournment, has seen fit to take up a different attitude, we are not warranted in abandoning our position.

Mr. STORRER.—Is it not better to agree to the amendment of the Senate than to sacrifice the Bill?

Mr. FRAZER.—I do not agree with the honorable member. I have always maintained that the consideration of this measure might, with advantage, have been postponed until our future financial relations with the States had been determined.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I would point out to the honorable member that the only matter at present open to discussion is whether or not we shall insist upon disagreeing with the amendment made by the Senate.

Mr. FRAZER.—I am aware that I was transgressing the rules of debate. The Government ought to say that they will have the schedule, which was approved by this House, or that they will not have the Bill at all.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Oh!

Mr. FRAZER.—The Treasurer signifies his disapproval of my statement, but, in respect of another measure, I have heard him say that the Government will have their way, or it will be sacrificed. That attitude, however, seems to be adopted only when he is sure that he has the requisite numbers. I am in favour of insisting upon the proposal which was agreed to by this House.

Question put. The House divided.

Ayes	39
Noes	16

Majority ... 23

AYES.

Archer, E. W.
Carr, E. S.
Chanter, J. M.
Chapman, Austin
Cook, Joseph
Coon, J.
Deakin, A.
Ewing, T. T.
Fairbairn, G.
Forrest, Sir John
Foster, F. J.
Fuller, G. W.
Glynn, P. McM.
Groom, L. E.
Harper, R.
Hedges, W. N.
Irvine, W. H.
Johnson, W. E.
Knox, W.
Livingston, J.

Lyne, Sir William
Mauger, S.
McWilliams, W. J.
O'Malley, King
Palmer, A. C.
Poynton, A.
Quick, Sir John
Salmon, C. C.
Sampson, S.
Storror, D.
Thomson, Dugald
Thomson, John
Tudor, F. G.
Watson, J. C.
Wilks, W. H.
Willis, Henry
Wise, G. H.
Tellers:
Cook, Hume
Crouch, R. A.

NOES.

Batchelor, E. L.
Brown, Thomas
Edwards, R.
Fisher, A.
Frazer, C. E.
Hughes, W. M.
Hutchison, J.
Irvine, Hans
Mahon, H.

Maloney, W. R. N.
Mathews, J.
McDonald, C.
Page, J.
Spence, W. G.
Tellers:
Hall, D. R.
Thomas, J.

Question so resolved in the affirmative.

DISPUTED ELECTIONS AND
QUALIFICATIONS BILL.

Assent reported.

MAIL SERVICE TO EUROPE.

Debate resumed (*vide* page 6439).

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [2.33].—It is rather dangerous to give any honorable member such an interval as has been provided on this occasion, because so many new ideas come into his head, that he may be tempted to waste the valuable time of Parliament. However, there is only one point to which I desire to call attention, to which I would not otherwise have referred. An interjection, which was made before the adjournment for luncheon, seemed to show that possibly I had not made clear enough one position I am maintaining; and I shall refer to that in a few words before dealing with the contract itself. I stated that when the industries of the community became one vast Commonwealth industry, the Government of the industry will be from within. When I previously asked honorable members in the Labour corner, whether the railways could be managed by a vote of those employed on the railways, I was told by those honorable members that they would not dream of anything of the sort. I then went on to show that, if the policy of universal nationalization were carried out,

or even if the majority of the industries of the community were nationalized, then the management would be by the votes of those within the vast State industry, and the position would be reached which honorable members in the Labour corner admitted is impossible.

Mr. FISHER.—We did not admit that at all.

Mr. CARR.—The State industries are controlled by the votes of the people now.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—That is the interjection to which I refer. But the majority of the people of to-day are not Socialists—they are not for nationalization of all the industries, or any large portion of them. They have declared themselves, at every election so far, by large majorities, in favour of private enterprise and individual effort and reward.

Mr. FISHER.—Might I say that we have never contended that the State's industries could be controlled by the votes of the people; we propose to delegate to a properly constituted tribunal, the duty of dealing with the wages and conditions of the workmen.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I am aware of that, but I point out that the people of the Commonwealth, so far as their decision has been made known, have declared against nationalization.

Mr. WATSON.—They have never been asked to declare for it.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—They have not declared for it, whether they have been asked to do so or not.

Mr. WATSON.—The people have not declared against extensions of nationalization.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—They have been asked to declare for approaching universal nationalization step by step.

Mr. WATSON.—Nothing of the sort.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—At any rate, so far as they have indicated, whether they have been asked or not—so far as they have made their wishes and desires known—the people are against any large nationalization of the industries of Australia. The present national industries or departments are managed not from within, but from without—they are managed by the bulk of the people of Australia, who are not employed in them, and who appoint, not political managers, but commercial managers—managers for the commercial and trading concerns, such as the railways or the Post Office. It will be a

different matter altogether when all industries become one vast Commonwealth department, and when the management must be entirely from within. Under such circumstances, the position taken up by the honorable member for South Sydney, that, however many industries are nationalized, we shall still continue to pay according to the work done, absolutely breaks down. When all industries are one vast Commonwealth department, men will not be elected to Parliament unless they agree to remove, gradually at any rate, the differences between high salaries and low salaries, and in the end, in my opinion nationalization must be communism.

Mr. MAHON.—The honorable member takes rather a low view of human nature.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I am taking a very natural view of human nature.

Mr. MAHON.—Surely a public conscience will have arisen in the meantime to prevent a result like that suggested by the honorable member.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—There is no occasion for any conscience. It is very hard to convince men that they are not worth as much as other men to whom superior appointments and superior pay are given.

Mr. POYNTON.—Do I understand the honorable member to mean that a messenger in the telegraph office will be paid the same salary as is the head of the Department?

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I am not saying that at all—I am not individualizing cases; but I do say the tendency will be to bring the remuneration as nearly as possible to one level, and eventually to one level.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—If the honorable member is right, surely that tendency should be shown now?

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I have already explained that the nationalization of industries to any large degree is not supported by the people of Australia, who are in favour of individualism, and of individual effort being rewarded according to merit. At present the management of the nationalized industries is from the outside.

Mr. CARR.—And always will be.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—How can it always be so if everybody is brought within and employed in one vast State Department?

Mr. BATCHELOR.—The people will not be all in one Department.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The people will all be in one great Department, though not in one branch; and the condition of affairs will be very different from what it is to-day.

Mr. CARR.—The State Departments might be managed by deputy.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Quite so; but who would be appointed as managers if they did not promise to do what was desired by those within the Department? If it is impossible to properly manage our railways by the votes of those within the Department, so it will be impossible to effectively manage the industries of the Commonwealth by the votes of those within if they are made one great national institution.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—The honorable member assumes that the people "is an ass."

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I do not assume anything of the sort. I only assume that what has taken place in other places, amongst intelligent peoples, will take place in our own case—that the drift will be from nationalization of industries on the basis of reward according to assumed merit to nationalization on the basis of communism.

Mr. CARR.—The honorable member questions the ability of the people to govern themselves.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Under such circumstances as I sketched the people would govern themselves; and that would be the result. However, I cannot expect honorable members in the Labour corner to agree with me, and I think I shall now turn my attention to the contract itself. I merely desired to explain what I do not seem to have made clear previously. I do not propose to deal at any length with the contract; the honorable member for Parramatta and others have already devoted some time to it. As to the amount of the subsidy, I admit that it is a considerable increase on any we have recently paid. The only justification for the payment of this amount is that we have asked for certain services and demanded certain conditions, and that, after presenting an opportunity to the world to tender, no lower or as low a tender has been received. Consequently, if the conditions are of importance, as most honorable members seem to think they are, we have adopted the only method to test at what rate the shipping companies are prepared to provide

the service. This being the lowest tender, I am willing to accept it, though, as I say, it represents a very considerable increase on what we previously paid to the same company, and what the Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Company are supposed to be receiving, though not for exactly the same service, or under the same conditions. There are one or two matters in connexion with the contract which deserve some consideration. First, there is the looseness of the provision regarding the calling of the boats at Hobart. There is the other peculiarity, that, during the negotiations for this contract, the Minister of Agriculture for one of the States was in consultation. Perhaps the Minister of Trade and Customs can inform me whether there was any consultation with the representatives of any of the other States.

Mr. MAUGER.—I think not; but the interests for which the Minister referred to was working, were interests pertaining to all the States.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I think it is desirable, when there is consultation with one State, that there should be consultation with all.

Mr. MAUGER.—There was no consultation; there were certain representations urged by the State Minister in the interests of producers and exporters.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—He was not called in.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—But he was admitted to consultation.

Mr. MAUGER.—He was allowed to make certain representations. It depends on what the honorable member means by "consultation."

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—He was in consultation; and he may have assisted very materially in the framing of the contract. In dealing with a subject like the conveyance of produce, and especially the conveyance of perishable produce, if there is consultation with one State representative there should be consultation with the representatives of the others. There are one or two things in the proposed contract which might, perhaps, have been different had there been such consultation—for instance, the vagueness of the provision relating to the calling of the mail steamers at Hobart, and the provision against differentiation of freights, which I think will operate unjustly to one or more ports. I am opposed to unreasonable and improper differentiation; but the shippers

from a port which vessels can enter and leave cheaply, and at the wharfs of which they can discharge and load cheaply, or which has other natural advantages, ought not to be made to pay for the higher charges incurred or for the fewer advantages in other ports. Rates of freight, if there is to be equality, should be in proportion to the cost to which vessels are put in connexion with the ports to which they trade.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—At the present time the freight to Fremantle is higher than that to Sydney.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I do not say that that is right. But where a shipping company has to make a larger outlay or has less advantage in respect to one port than in respect to another, it is not just to insist that there shall be no differentiation of freights.

Mr. FRAZER.—Does not the honorable member think that the freight to Fremantle should be less instead of more?

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I agree that in this contract it should not be more. I do not allude to this matter merely because it concerns Sydney—honorable members will admit that I have always endeavoured to be fair to all the States. I have a copy of the freight rates of the German-Australian line, which I propose to quote, because this is the only list that I have been able to get in print, though similar differences to those I am about to disclose exist in the freights of other lines. The freight from Europe to Fremantle is 47s. 6d., to Port Adelaide 42s. 6d., to the Semaphore 40s., to Melbourne 42s. 6d., and to Sydney 40s. There is no apparent reason why Fremantle should pay so high a freight. The Sydney freight is low because of the lowness of the port dues there, and because of certain freight facilities.

Mr. FOWLER.—There is no local disability at Fremantle to justify the charging of high freights to that port.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Where there are no local charges or advantages making one port less costly to a company than another, there should not be differentiation in freights. But where local charges or circumstances make some port particularly costly, it is not fair that that port should get an advantage by being treated on the same terms as all other ports.

Mr. FRAZER.—If an advantage is to be given, it should be given to the nearest port.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I admit that Fremantle has that advantage over other Australian ports, that it is nearer to Europe, and that that fact is not considered in the fixing of the freights; but possibly the fact that shipments to other ports are larger may enable the companies to charge less to those ports. There is the proviso that lighterage shall not be taken into account in connexion with the provision that there shall be no differentiation in freights, and I think that port charges, too, should be excepted. Where port and other charges are very heavy, shippers from other ports should not, under a system of non-differentiation, be made to pay for them. I think that an amendment should be moved dealing with this matter. Explanations will also be needed as to the effect of the provisions relating to passage freights from port to port in Australian waters, and as to the period for which vessels may remain in the various ports. Brisbane is to be considered the port from which the voyage to England will commence. I have no objection to the steamers visiting Brisbane, though, had this been merely a mail contract, I should have objected to any stipulation requiring them to visit other ports than Adelaide and Brindisi. But as this is not a mail contract, I have no objection to urge against the provision which makes Brisbane a port of call. Seeing, however, that Brisbane is taken as the starting point of each voyage, and that it is provided that after a voyage has commenced there shall be no delay, steamers may be prevented from remaining in Sydney as they have done hitherto, which, in my opinion, is not a desirable provision, unless it can be shown that it is necessary to enforce it in the interests of the other ports.

Mr. WILKS. — The honorable member says that this is more than a mail contract.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Yes.

Mr. WILKS.—Then we are entering on dangerous ground.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—We are entering into all sorts of difficulties in providing for more than the carriage of mails, though I am not going to object to the course which is now being taken. Still, when other mail contracts come under consideration, the point will probably be made that terms similar to those insisted on in this must be inserted, and that the vessels performing the service must call at every port in Australia right round to Fremantle.

Mr. WILKS.—This is more than the half-way house to nationalization.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I do not say that. There are dangers in regard to the fixing of freights.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—Merely a maximum is fixed.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON. — Yes; but there will be an attempt to make the maximum a minimum. At the present time we have the extraordinary spectacle of negotiations with a view to getting steamship companies to raise the butter freights by 2d. per box, with the object of throwing all the business into the hands of one great combination. Yet we hear complaints about combination. In some directions too much has been attempted by the contract. It may be well enough to arrange for the shipment of goods by vessels of a certain size, and affording certain cool storage accommodation, and to require that the journey shall be performed at certain rates of speed, and that preference shall not be given to any State. But when it is attempted to fix maximum freights, and to get other companies to come in so that those freights may be observed generally, and other conditions are introduced, you get on dangerous ground, and may find it troublesome to insist on the complete observance of the terms of the contract. Although the subsidy provided for is higher than has previously been paid, conditions have been insisted on which make a higher subsidy necessary. I prefer the contract to a State service, which would force us to experiment on lines in regard to which we have had no experience, and to undertake an enterprise which I think we could not manage as effectively as a private concern could be managed. One of the great reasons given for establishing a Commonwealth service is that it would give greater opportunities for encouraging immigration; but while we have been talking, the Orient Steam Navigation Company has done a great deal more for immigration than has been done by all the Governments of Australia.

Mr. WILKS.—Would it not be better to have immigrants brought round by the Cape? That is a cheaper route than the Canal route.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Seeing that certain steamers must come through the Canal in any case, I do not know that it is any more expensive to bring immigrants that way than round the Cape.

Mr. MAHON.—The inference to be drawn from the honorable member's remarks is that the motive of the Orient Steam Navigation Company in promoting immigration has been the welfare of Australia.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Of course, what they have done has been done for their own advantage, and one reason why I favour individualistic enterprise is that the motive of personal interest induces greater effort. The Orient Steam Navigation Company has not made a great deal of profit from its Australian trade; but, of course, the object of its existence is to make profits. I would not give a great deal for the chances of profit in the present undertaking. That is the look-out of those engaged in it. Difficulties will arise because the contract has been made too minute in its particulars; but I am willing to accept it as the best the Government can do, reserving anything else I have to say until we come to discuss the clauses in detail.

Mr. WATSON (South Sydney) [2.58].—This seems a very good contract for the Orient Steam Navigation Company. I think it rather unwise for us to bind ourselves for practically twelve years—because although this contract is for ten years only, it and an interim contract engage the Commonwealth until the beginning of 1920. It contains provisions fixing maximum rates of freight for the carriage of butter and other commodities. But no one knows what the scientific achievements of the next five or six or ten years will be. New methods may be invented for the conveyance of perishable produce which will make quite unreasonable rates which to-day seem reasonable.

Mr. MCWILLIAMS.—The rates for the carriage of fruit have been reduced by one-half during the last fifteen years.

Mr. WATSON.—Yes. Therefore I am disinclined to bind the people of Australia to pay certain rates of freight for a period of twelve years. I see no reason why, in making a postal contract, we should not arrange for the carriage of produce at reasonable rates; but it should be emphasized that many of those who cry out against Socialism, and pose as anti-Socialists of the purest type, are desirous of securing assistance from the Government to get cheap freights for butter, fruit, meat, and other products of Australia.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—At the cost of the whole community!

Mr. WATSON.—Quite so. This contract appeals to me in a large measure as

a bonus on the export of butter. From a postal stand-point there is no need whatever to subsidize the Orient Steam Navigation Company to do more than to deliver the mails from England at Adelaide, and to take delivery, at the same port, of the Australian mails for England.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—They do not carry the mails beyond Adelaide.

Mr. WATSON.—They carry postal parcels beyond that port. It would conduce to a better understanding if the Postal Department made a contract providing only for the conveyance of mails, whilst the Department charged with the overlooking of exports simultaneously entered into a contract for the carriage of exportable products. We should then know exactly where we stood. The people would be able to appreciate what proportion of this very large expenditure was to be debited to a purely mail service and what proportion of it represented the encouragement of exports.

Mr. WILKS.—We should have separate accounts.

Mr. WATSON.—I think so. I have absolutely no objection to the encouragement of exports under favorable conditions, but I think that we ought to be able to point to the exact cost of, or the degree of encouragement that is given to, the export of any particular commodity. The Postal Department should not be asked to bear the loss represented by the proportion of subsidy paid for the carriage of perishable produce. I trust that, even at this stage, an attempt will be made by the Postmaster-General in the interests of his own Department to discover what payment ought to be made in respect of the postal services rendered by the company, and what proportion of the subsidy should be debited to the Department charged with the work of overseeing the export of butter and other perishable products.

Mr. MAHON.—The Department ought not to have to pay more than £60,000 per annum for the postal services.

Mr. WATSON.—That is one aspect of the matter to which attention should be devoted. The honorable member for Parramatta, in discussing the terms of this contract, said that, although it involved an increased expenditure—and as a matter of fact, after making all allowances, it involves nearly double what we had to pay a little while ago for a similar service—we should remember that the

contract entailed a large increase of expenditure on the part of the Orient Steam Navigation Company. He should recollect that the company was faced with two alternatives; it had either to go out of the Australian trade or to build new steamers to keep in line with the other companies running high-class vessels in the trade.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I meant that to apply in both ways. This contract takes from the company certain privileges which it has enjoyed. The stipulations as to freight and other matters will diminish its earnings.

Mr. WATSON.—It is evident that it would be most unfair to debit the Commonwealth, as I understood the honorable member to suggest, with the whole of the expenditure, which the Orient Steam Navigation Company proposes to incur in connexion with the construction of new steamers. In any case such an expenditure would have been necessitated by the requirements of the trade and by the keenness of competition, so far as equipment and accommodation are concerned. It seems to me, therefore, that this expenditure on the part of the company would have been inevitable, even if a new contract had not been entered into. The representatives of the company have practically admitted that the majority of their vessels are behind the times.

Mr. WILKS.—They have admitted that if all their vessels were up to the standard of the *Oromes*, they would be able to make the line pay.

Mr. WATSON.—They have a number of steamers that are reasonably good, but most of the vessels of their fleet are as the lives of mail steam-ships go, comparatively old, and their accommodation is not nearly equal to that provided by other lines. On these grounds, I do not think that the contract represents the best that could be done for the Commonwealth, even assuming that we must rely on private enterprise to provide the service. Coming to the amendment moved by the honorable member for Barrier, I may say at once that I was one of those who a little time ago voted against a similar amendment. I did so upon grounds which at the time seemed to me to be absolutely adequate. We had then been offered a contract that was much cheaper than is the present one, and promised at least all the facilities provided for in this agreement.

Mr. BATCHELOR. — On paper, it was a far better contract.

Mr. WATSON.—Very much better. As to the suggestion of the Opposition that the Laing contract never had any substantial backing, we ought to remember that as soon as the names of the firms concerned in that contract were announced, honorable members of that party absolutely withdrew their opposition to the contract.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—That is absolutely incorrect.

Mr. WATSON.—It is absolutely correct.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—It is not; the honorable member has no right to make such a statement.

Mr. WATSON.—I should like the honorable member to point to one statement in *Hansard* showing that the Opposition protested against the contract after the announcement that Vickars, Son, and Maxim, Sir James Laing and Company, and others were parties to it.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I said that those firms were not behind it. In reply to the Prime Minister, I stated that all that was behind the contract was the bond of £25,000.

Mr. KNOX.—We had an assurance that those firms would carry the proposal through.

Mr. WATSON.—And on that assurance, the contract appeared to be a very favorable one. Whether the Government took adequate steps to insure that they would be penalized for failure to carry out the contract, is another matter; but, on the face of it, the agreement was a very fair one. We have also to remember that a combination of shipping companies engaged in the carriage of perishable products had not at that time been brought about. Those shipping companies had not combined in order to force the producers of Australia to come to their terms, so that the circumstances were very different from those that have since arisen. To-day, we find that the Orient Steam Navigation Company, notwithstanding the philanthropy that has been so freely attributed to it, has shown itself willing to join in a combination to fleece the exporters of Australia—a combination to exact from them unfair freights for the carriage of perishable products.

Mr. McDUGALL.—Is not that the privilege of private enterprise?

Mr. WATSON.—That is a point with which I intend to deal later on. The Orient Steam Navigation Company, which has so many friends in this Chamber, and has had

passed upon it so many encomiums in respect of the good services that it has rendered to Australia, has shown itself willing to cast aside any consideration for the producers, the farmers and others concerned in the export of perishable products from this continent. It has demonstrated, during the last few months, its willingness to join in a combine to fleece exporters of another £50,000 per year in respect of freights.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—But was it unfair for such an arrangement to be made?

Mr. WATSON.—If we are looking for excuses for such a proceeding, it is easy to find them.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—The representatives of the company said that before that arrangement was made the business was unprofitable.

Mr. WATSON.—It is very difficult for us to estimate what would pay them; but a significant fact is that another set of shipping people were willing to carry our butter at a very much reduced freight. The Five Lines Combine, to which the Orient Steam Navigation Company belonged, decided to penalize the butter producers of Australia to the extent of 1s. 8d. per box, unless they were given the carriage of the whole of their exportable produce. All these considerations demonstrate that the Australian producers are at the mercy of a ring, or combination, or monopoly, so far as perishable products are concerned. One cannot help being amused at the attitude assumed by the honorable member for Parramatta in this regard. He told us this morning that his strongest objection to the extension of State enterprise was that it would subject our people to compulsion and tyranny. I do not know whether it is because he has been overwhelmed by the talk upon the Tariff, and is consequently unable to judge things with his accustomed clearness, but he seems to be absolutely blind to the compulsion and tyranny that has been exercised by private syndicates and companies.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I can assure the honorable member that I am not blind to it.

Mr. WATSON.—Then why was the honorable member, when he alluded to the compulsion and tyranny which follow the extension of State enterprise in this direction, absolutely silent upon the compulsion and tyranny under which our producers

per to-day by reason of the exactions

of the shipping ring both around the Australian coast and oversea?

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—What I did say was that I feared we should escape from the troubles that we had, only to experience greater troubles.

Mr. WATSON.—The honorable member may have intended to say that, but I certainly did not hear him say it. I heard no denunciation from him of the compulsion and tyranny with which our producers are confronted to-day. Under private enterprise, which the honorable member is pledged to uphold, they are subjected to compulsion and tyranny, and yet we hear no protest from the honorable member's side of the House.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The argument of the honorable member for Barrier was that outside persons were under duress and compulsion, and I merely attempted to show that similar conditions operated in our State Departments as well.

Mr. WATSON.—The imposition of a penalty of 1s. 8d. per box upon butter exporters who did not ship all their butter by the five-line combination was an attempt to exercise compulsion and tyranny. Further, the honorable member should know that it is impossible for a shipper who desires to send goods around the coast of Australia to escape from the compulsion and tyranny of the local shipping ring even if lower freights are offered to him. He is bound hand and foot to the shipping combination. If another exponent of private enterprise were to say to him, "I will give you a reduction of 50 per cent. in the freight which obtains to-day," he could not take advantage of the offer, simply because of the system of rebates, which places every merchant in the hands of the shipping ring. The honorable member for Parramatta has said that there are a multitude of steam-ships, and that consequently there can be no monopoly of the ocean. How childlike the honorable member must be if he really believes that.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Childlike and bland. The honorable member is very strong.

Mr. WATSON.—The honorable member must be childlike if he believes that no monopoly of the ocean is possible. Theoretically, the ocean is open to all who care to sail upon it, but, in reality, if a new line of steamers start operations, and is prepared to charge less freights than those charged by the shipping ring, all the resources of the ring are invoked for the

purpose of freezing it out. Such tactics have been successful, notably in the case of the Aberdeen line. For a considerable time that line admitted that they dared not take cargo to Brisbane from the Old Country, although their ships were under contract with the Queensland Government to load butter at that port. Notwithstanding this, however, they had to discharge any cargo intended for Brisbane at Sydney, and take their vessels on to Brisbane empty. It will thus be seen that the honorable member is entirely mistaken when he affirms that there can be no monopoly of the ocean.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—The Australian shipping ring is one of the strongest combinations in the world.

Mr. WATSON.—It is one of the strongest combinations in the world, and not merely in a narrow and local sense. The ring of shipping people who deal with Australian freights is to-day at once both the wonder and the envy of persons engaged in shipping in other parts of the world. In the *Shipping Journal* persons who deal in freights elsewhere have marvelled that the oversea Australian shipping ring has been able for so many years to maintain such a close corporation, and to keep freights at such a very high level. This is a matter of common knowledge amongst those who are engaged in shipping. In view of the evidence given by Walker Brothers, of Marvborough, regarding the treatment meted out to them when they attempted to send freights around the Australian coast, I say that to pretend that there is no monopoly of the ocean possible is to fly in the face of accepted facts—facts which should be recognised by legislators, as well as by the people generally.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—What I meant to say was that there could be no permanent monopoly of the ocean. I am quite aware that these temporary troubles are experienced all over the world. But the honorable member seems to assume that, when once a monopoly has been set up, it will continue for all time, whereas the experience of the world proves the contrary.

Mr. WATSON.—Unfortunately, we are not here for all time, and I am afraid that the shipping monopoly, having lasted for twenty years, is likely to endure throughout our lives unless action be taken to check it. The question which faces us is whether we are going to relieve our-

selves, or whether we are to depend upon posterity to extricate itself from the difficult position in which it will be placed. The honorable member for Parramatta stated that he could not consider the amendment of the honorable member for Wide Bay by itself—that he had to look beyond it to the consequences which were involved. He then proceeded to argue that we should not establish a mail line for fear that it might commit us to a whole series of experiments in the nationalization of industries. Well, it seems to me that the House and the country ought to be quite capable of judging each proposal on its merits. Whether any particular proposition is right or wrong can surely be demonstrated, or ought, at any rate, to admit of decisive argument one way or the other. But I must dissent altogether from the general proposition that because the country is prepared to take a certain step in the direction of nationalization we are, therefore, committed to go to any degree suggested.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—But the honorable member for Parramatta gave a list of nationalization proposals.

Mr. WATSON.—Just so, and each particular proposal would have to rest on its own merits. It would have to be determined whether it was justified or not by the circumstances. But I do not remember that the honorable member for Wide Bay, the leader of the Labour Party, expressed any sentiments such as those attributed to him by the honorable member for Parramatta.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I read from *Hansard* what he said.

Mr. WATSON.—I heard what he said, but I do not remember him saying that he was in favour of all-round nationalization.

Mr. FOWLER.—Very few Socialists are.

Mr. WATSON.—I should say that very few would be.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I quoted what the honorable member for Wide Bay said.

Mr. WATSON.—But I do not think that it was fair to attribute to him sentiments which may have been uttered by the honorable member for Barrier. One occupies a responsible position, and the other is a private member of his party, who is free to hold any view he likes apart from those embodied in the platform of the party.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I see. One member of the party may hold different views from another.

Mr. WATSON.—Oh, quite. The party is pledged to the nationalization of monopolies, but any individual member of the party may propose to go further than the nationalization of monopolies if he so desires, and if he believes that it is a proper thing to do; just as the honorable member for Parramatta, though he is pledged to the programme of his leader, is not precluded from going beyond that programme in any direction he thinks fit. He is entitled to have his own opinion as to the desirableness of taking action in any given direction, so long as he agrees with his leader and with the rest of his party upon the programme which they have formulated.

Mr. HUGHES.—We have absolute freedom outside our programme.

Mr. WATSON.—Quite so, but I never heard the honorable member for Wide Bay express any opinion involving nationalization beyond that embodied in the party's programme. Being in a responsible position, he would not be entitled to do so except he prefaced his remarks by saying that he was merely expressing his own view. But to the nationalization of monopolies there is no doubt that the Labour Party are bound in the most emphatic fashion. We believe, Mr. Speaker, that the existence of these industrial monopolies is inimical to the interests of the general community, and that it is only by their nationalization—by their being governed and controlled and worked on behalf of the community generally—that you can relieve the people from the incubus that at present sits upon them. That is the view which I hold. But beyond that—

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—There is no mention of monopolies in the passage which I read from the speech of the honorable member for Wide Bay.

Mr. WATSON.—The honorable member, so far as my memory goes, did not indicate that he meant anything beyond monopolies. He said that the party was not afraid of nationalization; but to pretend to believe that that meant the nationalization of everything is a deliberate twisting of words—nothing more nor less. The remark was made in reply to an inquiry from the other side—"If we nationalize in this particular instance, where are we going to stop?" and other silly questions of that sort. It might as well be said that we should starve ourselves because of the danger of one or two over-eating.

Mr. JOHNSON.—If it is good in one instance it is good in all.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The honorable member's argument is that we should not eat at all because one or two suffer from indigestion.

Mr. WATSON.—We do not expect consistency from honorable members opposite, but really, to be consistent, they ought to be prepared to sell our railways at once—

Mr. SINCLAIR.—So we are.

Mr. WATSON.—And to get rid of the Government tramways. I am glad to hear the honorable member for Moreton say that they want to sell the Government railways. I did not know that the honorable member for Parkes had a supporter on the Opposition side. As the only logical and consistent anti-Socialist in Parliament, I have always entertained a certain degree of admiration for him; and to find at this late hour that he has support from the honorable member for Moreton—who the other day was invoking all the forces of Socialism on behalf of the butter producers—is rather amusing. The honorable member has evinced in another direction—the Tariff—that his views on protection are of a geographical character. Similarly we find in regard to his anti-Socialism that he is apparently bounded by the limits of his own electorate. Whatever his electors desire should be done even if it means Socialism.

Mr. SINCLAIR.—We have to adapt ourselves to circumstances.

Mr. WATSON.—That is a form of selfishness of which the honorable member is a very efficient exponent I will admit. He is here to look after electorate No. 1, and all the others can go hang so far as public affairs are concerned.

Mr. JOHNSON.—The Treasurer was agreeable to selling the railways and tramways of New South Wales at one time.

Mr. WATSON.—If that be so, it was, I suppose, in the Treasurer's very callow days. I have not observed any indication of an obsession of that kind in him lately. Evidently he has gained wisdom with years.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Does the honorable member agree with his leader's statement that he has "too long shrunk" from expressing certain opinions?

Mr. WATSON.—I do not know that that justifies the honorable member's statements.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—It was rough on the honorable member.

Mr. WATSON.—I am quite prepared to accept any criticism that the honorable member for Parramatta, or the honorable

member for Wide Bay may pass upon me. I do not profess to be perfect any more than is any other member of the community. But I should like to see any quotation which bears out the statement that the honorable member for Wide Bay a couple of nights ago expressed approval of the general nationalization of the means of production, distribution, and exchange. Those words were used by the honorable member for Parramatta, but I have no recollection of any such thing being said.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I explained that I was referring to both the honorable member for Wide Bay and the honorable member for Barrier; and so far as the honorable member for Wide Bay was concerned, I quoted *Hansard* to show what I attributed to him.

Mr. KING O'MALLEY.—I am in favour of the whole business myself.

Mr. WATSON.—The honorable member for North Sydney said that the country had declared against universal nationalization as a principle. I contend that no such proposition was placed before the country except by three gentlemen in New South Wales who stood for the Senate on the platform of international Socialism.

Mr. WILKS.—Pathos and Bathos!

Mr. WATSON.—Those were the only people, so far as I am aware, who put before the electors a programme of universal nationalization.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Not at all.

Mr. WATSON.—I have not heard of any one else.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Ask the honorable member for Barrier what he put before the electors of Broken Hill.

Mr. WATSON.—I have not heard of his putting anything like universal nationalization before them.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Has not the honorable member?

Mr. WATSON.—No; I have not. I read the reports of the speeches of the honorable member for Barrier, but I did not see any statement of that character. I remind the honorable member for North Sydney that no proposal for universal nationalization was put before the people by a responsible party, and that, therefore, they were not asked to express an opinion upon that question. But the proposal, that we should refrain from any socialistic experiments, which was embodied in the platform—if it can be so described—of his leader, met with complete defeat at their hands. The honorable member

ought to remember, as it is less than twelve months since it occurred, that the whole reason for the existence of his party, as expressed by its leader, was that they were going to combat Socialism, to prevent insidious extensions of governmental functions, and that, after a pathetic appeal to the electors, they were defeated by an overwhelming majority. We are in this position: that the people have declared against anti-Socialism, and have not been asked to declare for complete Socialism. Therefore we have had no answer from them on the latter head, either one way or the other. I hold that by their defeat of the party led by the honorable member for East Sydney, the people have indicated that they have no objection to reasonable extensions of governmental functions.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The honorable member forgets that they sent in more holders of the opposite view.

Mr. WATSON.—On that question the electors returned a minority of anti-Socialists to this House and to the Senate.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—No. The Government declared against nationalization.

Mr. WATSON.—If I remember aright the speech of the honorable member for Ballarat, the Government declared that they would hold themselves free to take any steps towards a reasonable extension of governmental functions, and would nationalize wherever it was necessary, and that after all is a common-sense view. But the members of the Opposition Party, through their leader, declared that they were going to strike Socialism out of the political arena. So far as they are concerned, Socialism seems to have escaped scotching, and on that subject they are in a minority here, as well as in another place. If I interpret aright the attitude of the people it is that we should continue on the lines hitherto adopted in Australia so far as principles are concerned, that if the nationalization of a particular industry or function is justified by the circumstances, it should be done at once.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—It depends upon what is called nationalization.

Mr. WATSON.—Quite so. Occasionally the honorable member indicates that he is against Socialism.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—I do not believe in collectivism.

Mr. WATSON.—The honorable gentleman says that he does not agree with those who want to share and share alike.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—I do not believe in the beacon light of the honorable member.

Mr. WATSON.—Like the honorable gentleman, I do not agree with those who want to share and share alike, nor do the members of the Labour Party believe in that doctrine.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—They believe in collectivism.

Mr. WATSON.—The honorable gentleman does not believe in the principle of share and share alike, nor do I, although I have a lot less to lose by that process than he has. At the same time, he has proved himself to be quite as good a Socialist in some respects as has any member of the Labour Party. When he was in power in Western Australia, he carried out Government schemes of all kinds by means of day labour, and without the intervention of the middleman, but he does not call that Socialism.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—No.

Mr. WATSON.—The same thing, if done by the Labour Party, would no doubt be denounced by him as Socialism.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—Not at all.

Mr. HUGHES.—There is really only one remedy, and that is to make him leader of the Labour Party.

Mr. WATSON.—As Shakespeare says—

That in the captain's but a choleric word,
Which in the soldier is flat blasphemy.

I believe that the people are quite agreeable to all reasonable and common-sense extensions of governmental functions which may be proved to be desirable. It has been said that the Labour Party's proposals involve an equality of remuneration all round, irrespective of the degree of service which may be performed. I do not think that we need bother about that during our generation or the next.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—If remuneration is not equal there will soon be rich and poor again.

Mr. WATSON.—I have no doubt that there will be rich and poor for a very considerable period after we have passed away. However ideal it may be to secure an equal reward for services rendered, I do not think that we have by any means approached that stage. The most that we can expect to do in the present development of society is, I think, to cut off excrescences wherever they appear, and to relieve the people from the incubus of monopolies, rings, and combines such as we find on every side to-day.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—We are all agreed there.

Mr. WATSON.—But the honorable member has not yet arrived at the stage, though I dare say he is approaching it, when he recognises that there are no means of successfully combating rings and monopolies, and that the nationalization of the industries is the only remedy. When we remove the incentive to rob the people robbery will cease. Because the State has no incentive to rob the people, it will give them a reasonably efficient service. But once the private individual has got to a certain stage he has always alluringly before him the prospect of removing all competitors from his path, and without restriction being able to exact any terms he likes from those who must buy his goods.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—Yes, but he is not the only man in the world.

Mr. WATSON.—So far as the ordinary consumer is concerned, he is too often the only man in the world.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—“Rob” is too hard a term for the honorable member to use.

Mr. WATSON.—I do not think that any other term can be applied to the exactions of some of the rings that now exist. Take, for instance, the coal ring which the mine-owners have arranged with the shipping companies engaged in our coastal trade. In regard to coal, Western Australia is now under the thumb of the Shipping Combine.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—We have some collieries.

Mr. WATSON.—I am aware of that; but the price of coal in Western Australia generally is governed by the amount at which Newcastle coal can be landed there, and the Newcastle coal is supplied only to a shipping ring, who can charge what price they like for it to the consumers in Western Australia, as well as in South Australia and Victoria.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—And the honorable member's party proposes, by means of the Navigation Bill, to give the Shipping Combine more facilities than they have now. That will make them a closer Combine than they are at present.

Mr. WATSON.—We are not proposing to do that. I would give them less facilities. Personally, I have no objection to the mine-owners getting a fair price for their coal at Newcastle; but when they insure that only three or four companies shall

be able to get coal there at any price they are combining to rob the consumers.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—The honorable member does not think that I have any sympathy with that sort of thing, surely?

Mr. WATSON.—The right honorable gentleman is typical of a great number of other honorable members. He disclaims sympathy with tactics of that sort, and one must at once give him credit for being honest in his statement.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Just as the honorable member disclaims any relation to the extreme Socialists.

Mr. WATSON.—Just so. But surely there is a happy mean in these cases.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—We must try to control them first.

Mr. WATSON.—For the right honorable gentleman merely to state that he has no sympathy with that practice does not advance matters one iota. The evil effect upon the consumer still continues. If the right honorable gentleman can prove that successful efforts can be made in the interests of the consumers to control these monopolies, he will have achieved a very great deal. But I contend that nothing short of nationalization of the shipping will allow the people of certain States to get their coal at reasonable prices.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—Would the honorable member have every ship trading on the coast to belong to the State?

Mr. WATSON.—I would have a sufficient number at least to regulate freights, and to insure that people would get coal carried to them at a reasonable cost. I do not say that it will be necessary to resume and control all the shipping, but at least enough to govern the rates of freight ought to be owned and controlled by the Government, in order to insure that the people get a fair deal at the hands of those shipping the coal. I am afraid that this debate has gone considerably beyond the mere question of a mail contract; but I think that the Commonwealth will run no material risk in establishing a line of mail steamers between Australia and the Old Country. That line would not be able by any means to convey all the perishable produce sent abroad, but by means of it the Government would be able to exercise a restraining influence upon freights charged upon produce generally. That is the most that such a line could expect to do. While the Government line charged a reasonable freight, there would be much less likelihood of

private companies being able successfully to combine in order to exact unfair freights from the exporters. Even if some direct loss were shown, the indirect benefits accruing from reductions of freights ought to be more than sufficient to compensate the people of Australia for the venture upon which we ask them to enter.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I wish to explain that, when I referred in my speech to the statement of the honorable member for Wide Bay, I quoted his own words—and I said then that that was the extent of my allegations concerning him—as follow—

Whether it be popular or not, it would be cowardly for the man who believes that nationalization is a proper principle not to express his views in this House. We have too long shrunk from maintaining propositions which we clearly believe in—far too long.

That is all that I said with regard to the honorable member for Wide Bay.

Mr. WATSON.—The honorable member may have relied on that quotation, but he said more than that.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Not at the time. I went on to say that my remarks had reference to the honorable member for Barrier, who moved the amendment. There could be no doubt as to that honorable member's position, I said, in view of his platform utterances at the recent elections. Nor can there be any such doubt, for the honorable member himself will not deny that upon the platform he did say that he was an out-and-out Socialist in every way.

Mr. WATSON.—That does not bind the party.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I never said that it did.

Mr. KNOX (Kooyong) [3.46].—Instead of being confined to the consideration of this contract, the debate, in view of the amendment proposed by the honorable member for Barrier, has been allowed to drift into a general consideration of outside questions. That, on the whole, is regrettable, because we have before us a specific business proposal, which deserves practical consideration from honorable members on its own merits. When the Prime Minister announced the terms of the contract to the House, I tendered to him my congratulations for having made an arrangement which will put an end to much of the hesitation, doubt, and derangement of business that has existed for so long. I can say now, on behalf of many mercantile men in the community, that there is great satisfaction that the Government have concluded this contract. I share the view expressed

by a previous speaker that it would be an advantage to ascertain what proportion of the total sum of £170,000 is applicable purely to the services of the Postal Department, and what to the extra freight conditions introduced. The Minister might promise to obtain the information for the benefit of honorable members. In view of the desire to have the contract settled, it would be wise at this stage to avoid any amendments on the floor of the House, seeing that the whole of the details have been the subject of serious consideration by all the parties to the contract, in consultation with their solicitors, and that it would be imprudent to dislocate any one portion of it. But for that consideration I should have asked the House to accept an amendment to provide that, consequential upon the agreement being adopted, an accelerated service for the interim period should be required. On public grounds, I do not think that it would have been asking very much from the contractors or from the Government to consent to that provision, inasmuch as it is admitted that two of the steamers are quite competent to shorten the time at present occupied in the transit of the mails. I do not see any substantial reason why there should not be some improvement in the service every fortnight during the interim period. I know that many honorable members share that view, but it is not desirable to delay the conclusion of this contract. I am disposed to believe that a proposal to the end I have indicated would receive a large support. There ought, at least, to be an undertaking that the steamers will arrive at Largs Bay in sufficient time every Monday to allow the mails to be conveyed by the overland express on that day. These are practical suggestions which I do not think ask too much, even if the contract has been substantially approved. I hope it is part of the understanding that we shall have the advantage of the rapid service *via* Brindisi, in view of the fact that the mail service has been practically arranged for the next twelve years. The two points I have raised I commend to the earnest consideration of the Minister, because they represent practical necessities, for which some provision should be made in the contract. Special significance has been given to the fact that the mail steamers will fly the Australian flag. I hope that the Australian flag will always receive due recognition; but I point out that when the vessels, in coming through the Suez

Mr. Knox.

Canal, mix with the vessels of all nations of the world, an impression may be conveyed that Australia is a separated entity in the Empire. The British Union Jack is quite sufficient for me, and I think it ought to be sufficient on the mail steamers. If those steamers were conveying exclusively our own people or our own produce, or if they were owned by Australia, then there might be something in the claim that the Australian flag should appear at the masthead. But these conditions do not prevail, and at Colombo, where fresh passengers and new mails are taken on board, the flying of the Australian flag may convey an erroneous impression. While I have no desire to say anything that might be construed into disrespect for the Australian flag, I think that this is one of the clauses which might have been left out of the contract. We are informed, it is true, that the flying of the Australian flag is at the instance of the contractors; but, nevertheless, I regard this condition in the agreement as somewhat unnecessary.

Mr. SPENCE.—The Australian flag has the Union Jack in the corner.

Mr. KNOX.—That is so; but, at the same time, I do not think that it is worth while making the flying of the Australian flag a stipulation in the contract. I very much regret that the whole question of Socialism should have been introduced into this debate, though, perhaps, the discussion of the contract from that point of view was inevitable. I find from the *Shipping World Year-Book* for last year that the number of vessels entered from British possessions and foreign countries to the United Kingdom was 66,840, carrying 55,623,974 tons, and that the number of vessels cleared to British possessions and foreign countries from the United Kingdom was 65,880, carrying 56,416,700 tons. The imports into Great Britain from British possessions and foreign countries were valued at £565,019,917, and the exports at £407,596,527. In the case of Australia there are 703 vessels which go to and from Great Britain, carrying 1,830,000 tons. This mail contract, large as it may bulk in our eyes, is unimportant when we consider the great volume of trade of the Motherland. On the question of Socialism, the honorable member for Barrier last night made use of an expression which I regard as absolutely unworthy of him, or the party he represents. The honorable member made the statement that the Chambers of Commerce would

sell Jesus Christ for thirty pieces of silver. When challenged this morning, the honorable member was given an opportunity to explain that statement away, and as he did not do so, I am justified in believing that it was not made inadvertently in the heat of debate, but as the result of deliberate thought and consideration. I characterize the statement as an outrageous slander. Regarded as the outcome of the honorable member's personal ignorance, the statement will perhaps have a degree of importance attached to it which it would not deserve, but the honorable member was speaking as an exponent of the views of the party to which he belongs. We are told that we should not generalize from isolated instances as to the attitude of the Labour Party on any question, but the particular utterance to which I refer, if it does not disclose ignorance of the facts on the part of the honorable member who was guilty of it, discloses the most venomous spirit which it would be possible for any man to attribute to a great party like the Labour Party. The particular class of persons to whom the honorable member referred represent the large interests of those to whom the members of the Labour Party are opposed as faithfully as Labour members can claim to represent the interests of any other class in the community. The utterance to which I take exception comes with the worst possible grace from an honorable member who not infrequently ascends the pulpit to urge the precept of his Redeemer that there should be peace and good will in this world.

Mr. BAMFORD.—This is too thin altogether.

Mr. KNOX.—It is more like the kind of utterance we should expect to come from the crowd who cried, "Give us Barabbas." At that historic referendum—which by the way is a principle which the honorable member for Barrier strongly supports—the popular voice did not find expression as the result of experience and thoughtful consideration on the part of those who said "Give us Barabbas." We have to consider the spirit which lies behind the honorable member's statement that the Chambers of Commerce would sell Jesus Christ for thirty pieces of silver.

Mr. THOMAS.—I said "a Christ."

Mr. KNOX.—The only possible excuse would be that it was out of his ignorance that the honorable member had spoken. I

ask whether honorable members in the Labour corner imagine for a moment that they are the only exemplars of all that is good and righteous. It has been my fortune to come in contact with members of the party to which the honorable member belongs who have been men of depraved habits and tastes, and actuated by extreme selfishness. I have known workers who, when they became possessed of means, proved themselves to be the hardest of taskmasters. Should we be justified because of the character and conduct of such men in condemning the whole of the aspirations of the Labour Party? There are members of that party in this House whose honesty of purpose I have not hesitated to acknowledge.

Mr. BAMFORD.—I rise to a point of order. I ask whether the honorable member is discussing the mail contract?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The honorable member is quite in order. He is replying to a statement made by the honorable member for Barrier.

Mr. KNOX.—If I am out of order, much of the previous debate on the motion has not been in order. I recognise the ability of the honorable member for Barrier. The great industry he has displayed in familiarizing himself with the details of this matter, and in obtaining a grasp of the subject, has earned the respect of honorable members generally. The honorable member will probably regard it as a distinction when I say that he was the first who, on the floor of this House, claimed that the members of the Labour Party were Socialists. In answer to myself, the honorable member made the admission in the first Parliament during the consideration of the Conciliation and Arbitration Bill. He can claim to have made the first public admission in this House that honorable members in the Labour corner are Socialists.

Mr. THOMAS.—If that is so, I am very proud of it.

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—What is the honorable member's definition of Socialism?

Mr. KNOX.—My feeling is that honorable members in the Labour corner who are advocating Socialism are floundering along from one session to another, groping their way in a vain effort to discover what Socialism really means, and fearful of giving public expression to their real views on the subject.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—We have put them in our platform.

Mr. KNOX.—Honorable members have modified their platform when they have found public opinion against them. Do they accept the programme of the Social Democratic Federation?

Mr. HUTCHISON.—No, we follow our own programme.

Mr. KNOX.—I believe there is no extreme of Socialism to which the honorable member for Barrier is not prepared to go, except that which might lead to the depletion of the contents of his own pockets. One of the planks of the socialistic platform is the abolition of monarchy.

Mr. THOMAS.—Terrible!

Mr. KNOX.—I say it would be terrible, though we may attach no greater importance to the monarch as a monarch than that arising from the fact that he represents the apex of our constitutional system.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Whilst the honorable member was in order in criticising the statements made by the honorable member for Barrier, he will not be in order in indulging in a general disquisition on Socialism.

Mr. KNOX.—I intend to connect my remarks with the statement which the honorable member made.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—If I were to permit the honorable member to follow his present line of argument, I should have to allow other honorable members also to discuss the general question of Socialism instead of the mail contract which is immediately before us.

Mr. JOHNSON.—On a point of order, sir, I should like to know whether the honorable member will not be in order in discussing the question of Socialism as affecting the amendment moved by the honorable member for Barrier?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The amendment simply provides that the Government should acquire and control a line of mail steamers.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Does not that involve the question of Socialism?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I am not here to define what is and what is not Socialism.

Mr. KNOX.—If the debate had not been allowed to drift towards the question of Socialism, there would have been no occasion for me to refer to the matter, since I think that the amendment is a counter business proposition. I should not have touched upon the question of Socialism but

for the remarks made by the honorable member for Barrier, remarks which I am sure he will, upon reflection, regret. I should have been wanting in my duty had I not, on behalf of the Federated Chambers of Commerce, of which I have been President for three years, resented the suggestion that he made. No body of men is perfect, but it is wrong to suggest that the Chambers of Commerce have any disrespect for religion and are devoid of honorable and charitable instincts. Many of their members have thrown themselves into the work of endeavouring to improve the industrial conditions of Australia. It is a misfortune that the words to which I have referred should have fallen from the lips of an honorable member of this House, speaking either on behalf of his party or as an individual member of it. The incident is all the more regrettable since I am certain that the honorable member himself desires to lead an exemplary life, and I conclude that his remarks were due either to absolute unblushing ignorance, or to venom and a feeling of antagonism towards these bodies, the display of which on the part of any honorable member is most regrettable. Honorable members of the Labour Party arrogate to themselves the right to act as sole custodians of the interests of the workers. In that respect, they do an injustice to honorable members sitting, not only on this side of the House, but behind the Government, whose desire is that the interests of all classes shall be considered. My own life has been spent in an effort to assist my fellow man, and in a direction altogether different from that which the honorable member for Barrier, in words that should not appear on the records of the House, has indicated. I deeply regret that the honorable member should have been guilty of such an exhibition of venom and irreverence.

Mr. BATCHELOR (Boothby) [4.18].—I cannot join with the honorable member for Kooyong in congratulating the Government on what he described as "the highly successful arrangement" made by them for the carriage of our oversea mails. On the contrary, I think that we ought to condole with the Government in that they have been unable to conclude a more satisfactory contract. How can it be said that we should congratulate the Government on having entered into a contract for the carriage of our mails at an increase of

£92,000 per annum on the subsidy granted under a former agreement? So far as the carriage of mails is concerned, the only additional advantage that we shall secure by this increased payment will be a saving of two days in the time occupied on the voyage. In no other respect is the contract superior, from a mail point of view, to the old one. I admit that it has some possible advantages in respect of the carriage of perishable products; but viewed solely as a mail contract it offers no advantages as compared with that which will shortly expire. I have risen chiefly for the purpose of explaining why I intend to vote for the amendment, although on a previous occasion I voted against a similar proposition. The contract which was then before us appeared to be very much more advantageous to the Commonwealth than does the proposed contract.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—In what way was it more advantageous to the Commonwealth?

Mr. BATCHELOR.—It involved the payment of a subsidy of £50,000 less than does the new contract. It provided for an accelerated speed, and for the employment of larger ships than those which will be used under the new contract.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—Under the old contract vessels of 12,000 tons were to be employed, whereas under the new one they are to be of 11,000 tons.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—There is not a great deal of difference so far as the tonnage is concerned. But the honorable member will recollect that five of the steamers to be employed under the proposed contract are named in the agreement, and that they fall very far short of 11,000 tons. The principal advantage that would have been conferred by the old contract was that it involved the payment of a subsidy of £50,000 less than does the new agreement. Surely that is an item which is worthy of our consideration. Upon the last occasion I hesitated a great deal before I decided to vote against the amendment submitted by the honorable member for Barrier. But it did seem to me that if the mail steamers were under Commonwealth control we should not have reaped any more advantages for a considerable time that we should have enjoyed if the old contract had been carried out. Further, I thought that it would be soon enough to consider the question of nationalizing the steamers when that contract had nearly expired. Since then, events have transpired which have induced me to

change my mind. One of the factors which have influenced me is the enormous expansion which has taken place in the formation of trusts all over the world, and particularly in so far as the ring which controls the oversea trade of Australia is concerned. To-day we know that there is a world-wide shipping combination in existence, and that the only means of preventing the producer from being victimized is competition by a Government which cannot be drawn into the combination. To-day practically all commercial concerns are being run by trusts and combines. The period when anybody was free to embark upon any enterprise if he chose to do so has gone by. It is our duty, as representatives of the people, to see that the producers are not victimized as the result of any arrangements into which we may enter. I am aware that there is a provision in the new contract under which we have power to cancel the agreement if the Orient Steam Navigation Company bring themselves within the scope of the Australian Industries Preservation Act. They are not likely to do that.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—They have only to dodge it within the 3 miles' limit.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—That is not a very difficult matter. The whole contract is hedged round with such an enormous number of conditions that it would be far better for us to undertake the responsibility of running a Commonwealth line of mail steamers. The Government have laid down so many conditions—conditions relating to the time occupied by the vessels on the voyage, the freight rates to be charged, the temperature at which produce shall be carried, the amount of insulated space that shall be provided, and the labour which shall be employed—that they practically control the service, except that the agreement is powerless to prevent the Orient Steam Navigation Company from entering into a combination to increase freights. Seeing that all these conditions are imposed, it seems to me that the time has arrived when we should undertake the carriage of our own mails, especially in view of the fact that we are being called upon to pay such an enormous subsidy as compared with the old subsidy. I wish also to voice my objection to this new contract, on the ground that it is something more than a mail contract. We have no right to deplete the Commonwealth revenue to the extent of scores of thousands of pounds

in order to assist the revenues of the States. If any expenditure is incurred in concluding arrangements for the carriage of perishable products, that expenditure should be borne by the States. Certainly it should not come out of the Commonwealth revenue. We are constantly piling up Commonwealth expenditure by performing work for the States for which we get no credit whatever. As a matter of fact, we get nothing but attacks from them, notwithstanding that we are constantly performing at the expense of the postal revenue some service which the States themselves previously performed. I do not propose to enter into a debate upon the general question of Socialism which has been raised. The discussion on that subject has been an exceedingly interesting one from some points of view.

Mr. WILKS.—We ought to set a session apart for its discussion.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—Neither a session nor a Parliament would suffice for a full discussion of the question of Socialism *versus* anti-Socialism, which has been going on ever since the first man began to wear clothes. I understand that under the new contract the mails will be landed in Adelaide on a Saturday.

Mr. MAUGER.—Probably they will be landed there on Saturday, but it will depend entirely upon the time table.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—I saw it stated in a newspaper that the time for arrival at Adelaide would be Saturday morning. The time is not mentioned in the contract, so far as I know. But if any such arrangement is made, it will be most unfair to South Australia.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Does the honorable member think there is any necessity for the vessels to call at Adelaide at all?

Mr. BATCHELOR.—I have seen the Treasurer in a number of moods, but the *rôle* of joker does not suit him. The reason for calling at Adelaide is to enable the mails from Sydney and Melbourne to be despatched as early as possible.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—Under this contract the vessels will have to call at Adelaide for another twelve years.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—At the end of that time there may be great improvements in the service.

Mr. WATKINS.—The mails might be brought down the east coast, and, in that event, Adelaide would receive them after Melbourne.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I think it is a pity that we have not a service from Vancouver for the carriage of English mails.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—I am addressing my remarks to a serious member of the Government, the Postmaster-General, who is not in the habit of treating questions frivolously. I put it to him that he should avoid making the time of arrival Saturday morning or mid-day, because that would mean additional cost to the Department in connexion with an extra delivery in South Australia. I assume that if the mails arrive on Saturday morning they will not be kept lying at the post-office until Monday. That would be ridiculous.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—We should save the cost of a mail train from Adelaide if the ships came straight on to Melbourne, and there would be hardly any loss of time.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—It is of no use to take any notice of insane ideas of that kind. I intend to vote with the honorable member for Barrier. I am not quite clear as to the meaning of some of the other amendments, and shall reserve my right to support them, or otherwise, as they come before the House.

Mr. JOHNSON (Lang) [4.37].—Most of the criticism has turned upon the amendment of the honorable member for Barrier. But we may take it for granted that his scheme of nationalization will not commend itself to a majority of honorable members. Therefore, I do not propose to waste much time in considering it. I may, however, point out that, although the honorable member occupied a considerable amount of time in discussing the amendment, it is quite evident, from speeches made by members of his party, that they recognise that there is no prospect of carrying it.

Mr. WATKINS.—If the honorable member had continued in the course which he followed in his early political days, he would have been with us.

Mr. JOHNSON.—The honorable member is mistaken. I have always been opposed to Socialism, and this is a Socialistic proposal. It is part of a general scheme of Socialism, in which the honorable member for Barrier believes. In support of that statement, I will quote a few sentences from a leaflet which he distributed amongst his electors only recently. I am quoting this to show that the honorable member's nationalization proposal in this particular is only a step in the direction of nationalizing all the means of production, distribution, and exchange.

Mr. WATKINS.—Quite right.

Mr. JOHNSON.—But, whilst the honorable member says "Quite right," other members of his party have been at great pains to disclaim any connexion with a general scheme of nationalization. Now what does the honorable member for Barrier say? He says—

It is the common holding of land and the means of production and exchange, and the holding of them for the equal benefit of all.

Further on he says—

You have to destroy the present competitive system—

That is the purpose of the scheme of nationalization. It is to destroy the present system of competition—

You have to destroy the present competitive system to erect on the ruins a system founded on justice and equity. You must vote for Socialism against anti-Socialism or anything else. Socialism is your gospel, your science, your remedy. You need it. And in your time.

Mr. EDWARDS.—Who made that statement?

Mr. JOHNSON.—The honorable member for Barrier made that declaration of the principles of his party, and its late leader has explained that their purpose is to reach their ultimate goal step by step—to take only one step at a time. This is one of the first steps which they propose to take in that direction. We have a direct connexion between this amendment in regard to the mail contract and the general socialising scheme of the Labour Party as embodied in their platform and as expounded by the honorable member for Barrier in an electioneering pamphlet. I do not propose to take up more time in discussing the matter, nor do I intend to follow the honorable member into all the highways and byways of the more or less intricate and chimerical question of Socialism. I am perfectly satisfied that the time has not arrived when the good sense of this country will consent to any disruption of the fundamental bases of society in that direction, so that we should not take the amendment too seriously.

Mr. KING O'MALLEY.—If the amendment were not Socialistic, would the honorable member support it?

Mr. JOHNSON.—Of course I would not, because it does not commend itself to me on the ground of common sense. I am sure that if it were adopted we should not be able to carry it out to a satisfactory conclusion. The speech delivered by the honorable member for Barrier last night has been addressed to the House on three

occasions. The whole of last evening was taken up by him with the mere further repetition of an old speech. I venture to say that had I, or any one else on this side of the House, attempted to do anything of the kind, or even to occupy a tenth of the time in that way, there would have been a united protest from that very corner against such an action. Yet the House listened patiently—despite the fact that honorable members knew the speech practically off by heart and could have delivered it, almost *verbatim*, as well as the honorable member did. With that passing reference to that matter, I shall proceed to consider the terms of the contract. In the first place, we have to make a comparison of the rate we are now asked to pay with the rate which prevailed only a few years ago, and to ask ourselves what advantages we shall get from this very largely increased subsidy. It is only three or four years since the price of the contract with the same company was £75,000 a year for a service of, I think, 696 hours. A little difficulty occurred in connexion with arranging for a new contract and a temporary arrangement was made with the company by which the amount of the subsidy was increased to £120,000, in order to tide the Government over a temporary difficulty. The company now carries the mails for that sum. The extra amount which is paid for the extension of the trip to Brisbane is for a special service, not for a mail service. But under the proposed contract the annual payment is to be £170,000, or more than double what it was for the same service only a few years ago.

Mr. WILKS.—No, it is £95,000 more.

Mr. JOHNSON.—I said more than double—£20,000 more than double. We are asked to pay nearly £95,000 more for what is practically the same service, with the exception that the mails will be delivered in fifty-eight hours' less time. That seems to me to be an excessive amount to pay for that acceleration of speed in the matter of delivery, especially as the company would have to run faster boats irrespective of a mail contract. What we have to consider is, how much of the proposed subsidy is to be paid for a mail service, and how much for a commercial service. The House had a right to expect the Postmaster-General to furnish some information on

that point. He has not offered any information, but has simply thrown the contract on the table, and practically said, "There is the contract, take it or leave it," forcing honorable members to delve into its provisions, in order to ascertain the advantages or the disadvantages as the case may be.

Mr. LIVINGSTON.—That was a very good idea, as it commits him to nothing.

Mr. JOHNSON.—The Postmaster-General has followed the bad example set by the Treasurer of withholding information which the House is entitled to receive. It is a most cavalier way of treating the House. I cannot understand why it calmly submits to treatment which practically amounts to an insult. It is tantamount to saying, "You are merely the Opposition, and you are not entitled to any consideration, not even to ordinary courtesy. We fling this contract in your face, and tell you to take it or leave it, as you like. We do not care what you do, because we have the numbers."

Mr. MAUGER.—How does the honorable member make out that when honorable members on this side intend to vote against its ratification?

Mr. JOHNSON.—The honorable member is following the very bad example of the Treasurer, when he fails to offer to honorable members the common courtesy of an explanation of the matters which he wants them to consider. This large increase from £75,000 to £170,000 in the course of three or four years is not justified by a mere acceleration of fifty-eight hours in speed in the transmission of the mails. So that we must conclude that a very large proportion of that increase is due to the commercial side of the contract, which I hold the House has no business to enter into. I am very sorry indeed to find that it is not a mail contract wholly, but is partly a mail contract, and partly a commercial contract. If this system of interfering with and trying to control commercial enterprises, and intervening between producers and consumers in this way is to continue, where is it going to end? If it is right that we should go into this kind of business in connexion with a mail contract, where are we going to draw the line? It has a very strong resemblance to a drift in the direction of Socialism, if it is not Socialism itself.

Mr. CARR.—Where is evolution going to end?

Mr. JOHNSON.—I do not call it evolution. I am certain that it is retrogression. We are fast departing from those sound principles of economic government which at one time prevailed in one, if not in all, of the States, and resorting to experiments, which may land us in great difficulties. The amount that we are asked to pay for the contract is very high, but has been justified by those who have supported the motion on the ground that the company is going to build new vessels, which will involve a large outlay. But the Orient Steam Navigation Company, which every one will acknowledge is a very fine one, if it is going to keep abreast of the times, and successfully face competition, must, irrespective of any subsidy, replace its vessels as they become obsolete with up-to-date steamers. If it does not, it will lose its cargo and passenger traffic. Therefore, there is not much weight in the argument that the subsidy should be increased because the character of the vessels is to be improved. It practically means we are to pay for building vessels in which we have no proprietary interests or rights. Consequently, the arguments for the increased subsidy are narrowed down to two points—the delivery of the mails in fifty-eight hours less time than formerly, and certain arrangements for the carriage of produce for the special benefit of one or two primary industries. We are entitled to know how much we shall really be paying for the mail service, and how much for the cargo service. The giving of assistance by the Government to the primary producers in the way of getting their produce to market, and developing the export trade, is a sort of bounty. Some may think that it is perfectly legitimate, but to me it savours in its basic elements a good deal of the policy of protection. The whole of the amount of the contract should not be charged against the Postal Department. The portion relating to the carriage of cargo should be debited to the general revenue account. It will, in my opinion, be necessary to amend clause 6. The proposed term of the contract is much too long. Even ten years would be too long, but this proposal really means that we cannot make any rearrangement within twelve years. Although provision is made for the company to accelerate the service if any other company provides a better service, that only relates to any competing service, *via* the Suez Canal. In agreeing to clause 6 as it

stands, the Government have overlooked two very important factors. One is the possibility of a trans-Asiatic railway, which will connect by boat with Port Darwin, whence the mails might be brought by rail to the various capitals. That may be accomplished at any time after a period of five years has elapsed, and would effect an immense saving of time in the delivery of mails from Europe to Australia. If we bind ourselves for the term proposed to the Orient Steam Navigation Company, we may find, after five or six years, that we have to pay £170,000 a year for a slower service than could be got by one or more alternative means. The other point which seems to have been overlooked is the time that will be saved in transit between Europe and Australia, once the Panama Canal is opened. Before ten years have passed, that direct route will probably become the main highway of commerce between Europe and the east coast of Australia, and with the increase in the speed of ocean-going steamers, we may by then have vessels making the trip from London to Sydney in four or five days less than the time proposed in the contract. Yet we should lose the benefit of that acceleration of speed in the delivery of our mails unless this clause is amended. Those two contingencies are both within the bounds of probability, and I am surprised that no thought should have been given to them.

Mr. PAGE.—When does the honorable member expect that the Panama Canal will be opened?

Mr. JOHNSON.—It is anticipated that the Panama Canal will be completed and opened for traffic within the next six years.

Mr. PAGE.—Yes; if everything goes on favorably.

Mr. JOHNSON.—No; five years is the time estimated, and I am allowing for possible delay.

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—Does the honorable member think that we could induce contractors to build vessels under such a short-term contract?

Mr. JOHNSON.—I have just pointed out that any shipping company, in order to keep their commercial and passenger trade, must build new ships of increased speed. The shipping companies do not go to the extra expense on our account; but because, if they did not do so, they would lose their trade. We have to consider how much of the subsidy should be debited to the mail service, and how much to the trading or commercial interests. I

do not wish to see the Postal Department loaded with the whole expense.

Mr. MAUGER.—That is a matter of finance.

Mr. JOHNSON.—But it is a matter we have to consider.

Mr. PAGE.—Exactly the contrary argument was used by the present Opposition when the last contract was under consideration.

Mr. JOHNSON.—I can only say that I did not use that argument.

Mr. PAGE.—How does the honorable member suggest that the mails should be carried, if not under contract?

Mr. JOHNSON.—I do not object to the mails being carried by contract; I am only saying that the portion of the subsidy relating to commerce should be debited to general revenue. I propose to submit an amendment, if the Government do not do so, to the effect that the period contemplated in paragraph 6 be seven years instead of six, and that the stipulations in regard to the Suez Canal be struck out. I thought at first of suggesting that in paragraph 6, after the words "Suez Canal," the words "or *via* the Panama Canal, in the event of its being open for traffic within that period," should be inserted.

Mr. MAUGER.—How could we put such a stipulation in the contract? We do not know what the charges or the conditions may be in regard to the Panama Canal.

Mr. JOHNSON.—The Postmaster-General has misapprehended me altogether. I am not saying that the mail vessels should come by the Panama Canal, but pointing out that the stipulation in the agreement refers only to the Suez Canal, and that we ought to make provision for any other route which mail ships may take.

Mr. HEDGES.—There may be airships.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Airships are problematical; I am referring to practical matters.

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—Does the honorable member seriously propose that we should upset this contract?

Mr. JOHNSON.—I do not see why my amendments should upset the contract.

Mr. MAUGER.—I am sure the amendments would have that effect.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Are we to tie ourselves to a contract for ten years when, at the end of five or six years, we may find ordinary passenger vessels outstripping the subsidized steamers?

Mr. PAGE.—The honorable member ought to vote for the amendment of the honorable member for Barrier.

Mr. MAUGER.—That is the only alternative.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Not so; the object I have in view can be attained by the amendments which I have indicated. Why should we limit the competition to the Suez Canal? I propose to move it in due course.

Mr. MAUGER.—We cannot accept that amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON.—An expenditure of £1,750,000 is involved, and we must not lightly sanction an expenditure of the kind, and, at the same time, bind ourselves for ten years without making reasonable provision for getting the quickest service during that period. Should the Panama Canal be opened within that time, we may have vessels arriving here from England in four days less time than will the subsidized vessels.

Mr. PAGE.—The distance is greater by the Panama Canal.

Mr. JOHNSON.—The distance is less; it is a direct route, and the delays would not be so great as by the Suez Canal.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The Panama Canal will not be finished for ten or twelve years.

Mr. JOHNSON.—As I have already said, it is anticipated that the Panama Canal will be completed in five years; in any case, if the Panama Canal is not completed, the amendment will not be operative.

Mr. FRAZER (Western Australia) [5.12].—I feel that I should say a few words on this matter. I regret that we are obliged to discuss a question of so much importance to the people in every part of Australia with the limited amount of information supplied by the Government. The contract, if ratified in its present form, would have an important effect in advancing or retarding the interests of those engaged in many industries throughout the Commonwealth. We had a brief speech on the contract from the Prime Minister, who admitted that he had been unable to devote as much time to the consideration of the question as he would have liked. The Postmaster-General threw the contract on the table without offering any opinion at all in regard to many of the important provisions it contains. In my judgment, there can be only two explanations of the honorable gentleman's action. Either he was

prepared to treat honorable members in a fashion which amounted almost to an insult to the House, or he was not competent to give the information which might reasonably have been expected from him.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—The honorable member is responsible for what is occurring.

Mr. FRAZER.—I admit that I have a certain responsibility, and I am not at all anxious that it should continue. The Minister should have been prepared with all the information which might reasonably have been expected from him in submitting to the House a matter of so much importance.

Mr. WILKS.—The Minister does not care.

Mr. FRAZER.—I admit that the honorable gentleman does not seem to care about anything. He appears to shine only at gatherings where he apologizes for two great men—the Prime Minister and Mr. Judkins.

Mr. WILKS.—He need not mind the honorable member, because he has got the handcuffs on him.

Mr. FRAZER.—There are no handcuffs on me. I have never approached the consideration of any question in this House with handcuffs on. I have no hesitation in saying that the manner in which the Postmaster-General submitted this proposal was insulting to the House. It displayed either incompetence to give the information required, or a deliberate intention to insult honorable members who are endeavouring to do their best for the country in this Chamber. The experience we have had of the members of the present Government, including the distinguished predecessor of the present Postmaster-General, in the launching of postal contracts, has been anything but satisfactory. The postal contracts which, in one form or another, have engaged the attention of this Parliament during the last two years justify us in saying that those who have been responsible for them might well be termed a band of mud-dlers. I have no hesitation in saying that if honorable members faced their responsibilities, the Government would have been compelled to accept greater responsibilities than they were called upon to accept for failing to recover the £25,000 due to the Commonwealth under the last contract.

Mr. WILKS.—They should have been "biffed" out.

Mr. FRAZER.—I think they should. Having made such a muddle as they did in connexion with a great public contract,

they should not have been continued in a position in which it would be possible for them to get into a greater muddle.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—The honorable member was very kind to the Government, at that time.

Mr. FRAZER.—I was too generous to my honorable friend, and in the future such generosity is likely to come to an end. The Postmaster-General was asked by the honorable member for Coolgardie what the people of the Commonwealth would be likely to realize from this contract. The extent to which the people who will make use of this service and who contribute to the revenue of Australia will benefit is a matter on which the Postmaster-General should have been able to enlighten the House. The honorable gentleman said nothing on the subject, and we may conclude that if he knew anything about it the information he would have had to disclose was so unsatisfactory that he thought it was just as well he should not take the House into his confidence. We are not justified in ratifying the proposed contract in its present form. Many years ago, when the population and trade of Australia were not what they are at the present time, the people of this country were paying a subsidy well under £100,000. The trade of Australia has increased very considerably during recent years, but we find that boats used in the service for which a very much lower subsidy was paid are still to be engaged although we are to be called upon to pay a subsidy considerably in excess of that previously paid. This appears to be a development entirely in the wrong direction. As the importance and trade of a country increases it is reasonable to expect that it will be able to secure a mail service at a reduced rate of subsidy. But this rule does not seem to apply so far as the Orient Steam Navigation Company is concerned. In the first place, we paid an annual subsidy of about £80,000. Then, after a *fiasco*, to which the Government contributed, we entered into an agreement under which a subsidy of £120,000 per annum was paid, whilst we have now before us an agreement providing for an annual subsidy of £170,000, although it is true that under it Brisbane is made a port of call.

Mr. TUDOR.—It is too strong.

Mr. FRAZER.—I think that it is. We find in this contract many remarkable features to which the Postmaster-General

might well have directed his attention, and concerning which he ought to have enlightened the House. In the absence of any such explanation we have to do the best we can with the information supplied by the Prime Minister. He appears to be the only member of the team capable of supplying honorable members with accurate information. Apart from those of the Prime Minister, the Ministerial statements made from time to time in this Chamber are on the verge of being valueless. We ought seriously to consider whether the Commonwealth should do more in this connexion than undertake a responsibility for the carriage of our oversea mails. I admit that the question of whether we should not do something to improve trade relations between Australia and the Mother Country is open to argument; but I feel that £170,000 per annum is too great a subsidy to pay to the Orient Steam Navigation Company for the services which it can render to the Commonwealth. Some time ago we were advised by the permanent head of the Postal Department that under the poundage system our oversea mails could be carried at a cost of about £40,000 per annum. Shipping companies engaged in the Australian trade have no option in the matter; if we desire it, they must be prepared to carry our mails on the poundage system, and I am sure that by resorting to that system we could effect a saving of £130,000 per annum without subjecting the community to any serious inconvenience. For a time a company might endeavour, under such an arrangement, to inconvenience the public. The Orient Steam Navigation Company itself has given us an illustration of what might be done in that direction. On one occasion one of the vessels of its fleet cleared out of a Mediterranean port, leaving our English mails on the wharf, and thus causing a delay of a week in their delivery. That was a fine exhibition of a generous spirit! The contention of the company was that it was merely compelled to take French mails from the port in question, and was not obliged to carry English mails that had been conveyed overland to that point. That was its flimsy pretext for subjecting the public of Australia to the inconvenience of a week's delay in the delivery of the English mail. Such an action on the part of the company is held to recommend them to the generous consideration of the Commonwealth Parliament! It might be impossible to stipulate that vessels carrying

our mails on the poundage system should leave certain ports at a fixed date, and reach the port of destination within a given time; but does any one imagine that in the event of the Orient Steam Navigation Company failing to run its vessels according to a time-table and to advertise months ahead the dates on which they would leave our ports and arrive at their destination, it would be able to secure the patronage necessary to enable it to continue in the Australian trade? I, for one, do not think that it would. The experiment of having our mails carried under the poundage system might well be tried; and I feel sure that we should thus be able to effect a saving of £130,000 per annum without causing any serious inconvenience to the community. Under such an arrangement, we should be able to avail ourselves of the services of the German and French mail boats. I should just as soon see Australian mails carried on a French or German steamer as on one of the vessels of the Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Company, although I candidly admit that I should infinitely prefer to see them carried on Australian-owned steamers. We have been told that under this agreement the vessels of the Orient Steam Navigation Company will fly the Australian flag. This patriotic Government, which is doing so much to instil in the hearts of Australians a love of their own land, is prepared to pay £170,000 per annum to secure, among other privileges, the right to fly the Australian flag over a British ship, whilst at the same time, it causes the King's head to appear on Australian stamps. We have in this instance a fine example of the consistency of the Government.

Mr. KING O'MALLEY.—Is not the honorable member aware that boodle is the demonstrator of patriotism?

Mr. FRAZER.—Boodle seems to have caused, in some quarters, a great demonstration of enthusiasm in regard to this contract. And, after all, we may be forced to enter into it. It seems possible to secure in this House combinations of parties that are prepared to agree to almost anything. But it is a serious matter for this Parliament to take upon itself the responsibility of tying down three succeeding Parliaments to a mail contract. Under this agreement, the Orient Steam Navigation Company will have absolute control of our mail service until 1920. Can honorable members regard with any satisfaction

the proposal under this agreement to fix freights in respect of certain perishable products for twelve years, when they recollect that within the last twelve years there have been such extraordinary changes in the matter of these charges? We are asked to take upon ourselves a responsibility that, in my opinion, we ought not to assume, particularly in view of the statement made by the honorable member for Barrier last night. He said that the present freight for the carriage of butter to the Old Country is £3 10s. a ton.

Mr. THOMAS.—For the last two years it has been £3 10s. a ton, and under the contract it is to be £4 13s. 6d.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—The companies have said that £3 10s. does not pay.

Mr. FRAZER.—They would advance many arguments to induce the Government to agree to another £10,000 per annum in the way of subsidy. Of course, the representatives of the Orient Steam Navigation Company have done all they could to secure the best terms for themselves, though I am not suggesting that everything has not been done honorably. It would appear, however, that they possess too much business knowledge, and proved too much for the business capacity of the members of the Government. No member of the Ministry has thought it worth while to reply to the statement of the honorable member for Barrier. I do not know whether the Government are aware how far they stand committed in this matter. Although for the last two years the butter freight has been £3 10s. a ton, when the Orient Steam Navigation Company said, "We cannot make it pay at that," the Government at once replied, "We will allow you to charge £4 13s. 6d. for the next twelve years."

Mr. THOMAS.—At the same time increasing the subsidy.

Mr. FRAZER.—The butter producers of Australia are not likely to be very enthusiastic in their commendation of this contract, and although the Government are prepared to put them in such an unfortunate position, I do not think that the House will agree to it. The possibilities of freight reductions between now and 1920 are so great that we are not justified in entering into an agreement of this kind. Had Ministers considered the House entitled to information, they might have mentioned this matter when dealing with the contract. Their success in fixing outward

rates of freight for butter and fruit has been of such a nature that producers of other commodities may thank their lucky stars that freights have not been fixed for them. But perhaps the Postmaster-General, if he survives the debate, will tell us in his reply why only butter and fruit were dealt with. In paragraph 7 of the agreement it is laid down that—

No differentiation of any kind whatsoever as between any ports of call within the Commonwealth shall under normal conditions be made by the contractors in respect of freight (exclusive of lighterage and other similar special charges if any) from the loading port in the United Kingdom that is to say no such differentiation shall be made by the contractors unless at the time being there is in operation a freight war which shall not have been entered upon with the consent of the contractors.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—The use of the words "under normal conditions" will enable a coach-and-six to be driven through that provision.

Mr. FRAZER.—Yes. Even the Minister could drive a coach through it. Were the Attorney-General here, I should ask him what the provision means. It might mean anything. But the latter part of it does not seem to be particularly advantageous to those who have been overcharged in the past. As the honorable member for North Sydney pointed out, although Fremantle is over 2,000 miles nearer to Europe than most of the eastern ports, the freight to it from Europe is 47s. 6d. a ton, whereas the freight to Melbourne is only 42s. 6d., and to Sydney 40s. To the best of my recollection a Western Australian Royal Commission, presided over by the late Mr. Diamond, M.L.A., reported that in nearly every instance freights were higher to Fremantle than to other places. But surely the port nearest to Europe should not be charged 7s. 6d. a ton more than is charged to other ports.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—Fremantle is the third port in Australia.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—Why should we differentiate?

Mr. FRAZER.—If there is to be any differentiation, the port nearest to Europe should pay lower freights than are charged to other ports. Fremantle is in no sense a dangerous port, because, in the course of conversation, the Admiral of the Australian Fleet told me that, although the *Powerful* draws more water than any of the mail boats, he is able to take her into Fremantle harbor, and swing her round with the greatest ease and safety.

If we are going to have this matter "squared up," I think that the Postmaster-General—but perhaps I had better appeal to the Prime Minister, because, evidently the Postmaster-General has had very little to do with the contract—

Mr. CROUCH.—That is not fair.

Mr. MAUGER.—The honorable member has been insulting all day—he cannot help it.

Mr. FRAZER.—I cannot be half as insulting as the Postmaster-General was to the House when he threw the contract upon the table without taking the trouble to explain its provisions.

Mr. MAUGER.—Was I personal to the honorable member?

Mr. FRAZER.—I am dealing with the Postmaster-General and not with Mr. Mauger.

Mr. MAUGER.—The honorable member is the rudest and crudest member in the House.

Mr. FRAZER.—I am dealing with the Postmaster-General, and my language is justifiable.

Mr. MAUGER.—The honorable member should behave himself like a gentleman.

Mr. FRAZER.—I will not take instruction from the Postmaster-General in regard to manners. If his habits are those of a gentleman, I do not wish to be a gentleman.

Mr. MAUGER.—The honorable member ought to be ashamed of himself.

Mr. FRAZER.—I have evidently exposed the conduct of the Minister to some purpose.

Mr. MAUGER.—The honorable member has insulted every Minister who has sat here. He may learn better sense some day.

Mr. FRAZER.—I do not look to the Postmaster-General either for common-sense or for lessons in behaviour. I complain that in the past Fremantle has been unduly penalized by the Orient Steam Navigation Company in regard to importations. As a matter of fact, it has been cheaper to consign some goods to Sydney and tranship them to Fremantle than it has been to consign them direct to that port.

Mr. FOWLER.—The freight to Fremantle is 30 per cent. higher than that charged to any other port, with the exception of Townsville.

Mr. FRAZER.—Seeing that the Prime Minister had a hand in its drafting, we might have expected that the terms of this

contract would have been much more clearly drawn. Concerning the proposal to include Brisbane as a port of call of the mail steamers, I see no reason why the chief ports of Australia should not be treated with equal consideration. But I have the greatest doubt as to whether this Parliament should assume responsibility for entering into a general contract of that description. I do not think that the Commonwealth ought to be saddled with an expenditure of £20,000 annually on account of Brisbane being made a port of call. Further, if that port is to be included in the itinerary of mail steamers, there is equal justification for including Hobart. The representatives of Tasmania have strong ground for complaint concerning the way in which their State has been treated in connexion with this contract. If special consideration is to be extended to various ports upon a semi-commercial basis, I think that Hobart might reasonably have expected that during the busy season it would have been mandatory, instead of optional, that the mail steamers should call there. If any of the Tasmanian representatives move in that direction, I shall be found supporting them. I come now to the amendment proposed by the honorable member for Barrier. Seeing that we are asked to authorize the payment of £1,700,000 for the carriage of our mails during the next decade, we should be wise if we undertook the service on our own account. The arguments which have already been advanced in favour of the nationalization of public utilities, such as railways and post and telegraphs, do not require any elaboration at my hands. I trust that the amendment of the honorable member for Barrier will be carried. Even if it be defeated, I am entirely opposed to the new contract covering a period of ten years, because the advance which is likely to be made in methods of transportation, and in scientific discovery, may render the present ships almost obsolete before the expiration of that term. Further, should Australia become a great exporting country, it will probably be found that the present freight charges are excessive. Consequently, if we do not agree to nationalize the service, we ought at least to considerably reduce the period over which the contract shall extend. Personally, I think that the substitution of the poundage rate for the payment of a subsidy would commend itself to the people of Australia.

Mr. Fraser.

Mr. SPENCE (Darling) [5.51].—Like other honorable members, I have been somewhat curious to learn why the Postmaster-General submitted the proposal for the ratification of this contract without explaining its provisions. Is it because the Postmaster-General is not quite satisfied with the contract, but, out of loyalty to his colleagues in the Cabinet, does not desire to say so? Has he, for that reason, thought it wise to leave the responsibility of recommending it to the House to the eloquent Prime Minister, who is the only member of the Government who has said a word about it? According to the logic of the honorable member for Echuca, although a man may be silent, and although his face may be solemn, there may be wicked thoughts behind; and we should really like to know what the Postmaster-General is thinking. He might tell us whether he is enthusiastically in favour of the contract, or whether he recognises some of its defects. He ought not to resent criticism, because, after a measure has been submitted and debated, it is a fair thing to expect the Minister in charge of it to reply. That practice tends to shorten debate. I can, however, quite understand the Postmaster-General being unable to work up an enthusiasm for this contract. He has to administer a Department which has nothing to do with cool storage, and all that sort of thing, although he has to find the money for it; and if there is a deficiency at the end of the year the blame will be thrown upon him. Now, what does this contract do? It appears to me that if any one is to be congratulated, it is the Orient Steam Navigation Company, who have made an exceedingly good bargain for themselves. They have not had the luck to do exceedingly well in recent years. They have done very good work for Australia in the past, and deserve credit for it. But, regarding this contract from a business point of view, I have been looking for some justification for the extra large sum which is to be paid to the Company. I recollect distinctly that when a jump was made from £80,000 to £120,000 in the subsidy to the Company, honorable members were practically unanimous in condemning the increase. It was generally felt that we were being asked to pay too much for our whistle. But, on this occasion, the members of the Opposition seem to be Government supporters, and have not a word to say in denunciation of the enormous jump from £120,000 to £170,000. There is one satisfactory feature about it,

namely, that if we do ratify this contract for ten years it will save us from having to pay an increased amount five years hence. The representatives of the Orient Steam Navigation Company seem to have struck the Government at the right time. Ministers have recently been in the mood for paying bounties. They have been proposing, for example, to throw away £200,000 or £300,000. The Orient Steam Navigation Company came along, and saw that this was a favorable chance for making a bargain. They found the Government ready to meet them, and they have secured a contract under which the payment is largely in the nature of a bounty. But what are we to get for it? We are to have increased speed. The commercial people who do business with the Old World will be benefited in that respect. But that is a business which the Government, according to their own declared policy, do not wish to increase. The policy of the Government is to encourage the local production of goods for our own requirements. Of course, the general public will share in the increased facilities, but, nevertheless, they are mainly for the benefit of the commercial classes, who will get their letters two days quicker than they used to do. When the last mail contract was under consideration, an estimate was made that a subsidy of £120,000 meant paying for the carriage of our letters over £2,200 per ton. That is an interesting fact, although we have to recollect that we do not pay for the mere bulk and weight of our mails, but for regularity and speed. But it is well known that, owing to the perfecting of ships' machinery, improvements in models, and so on, it is now possible to obtain a higher speed without a greatly increased expenditure. Therefore, when it is urged that an increased subsidy is required on account of the increased speed of the vessels, I think that the argument is misleading, because there is no increased cost to the Company to the extent of the increase in the subsidy. Then we have a guarantee with regard to cool storage. Well, cool storage would be provided on the Company's ships if we did not increase the subsidy. A company nowadays would not build ships for the purpose of carrying cargo to Australia without providing cool storage accommodation. The Government make a great point of having fixed freight rates. But it seems to me that that is by no means an advantage when the facts are analyzed. Hitherto

the Orient Steam Navigation Company has taken a hand in a combine of five lines, which made an arrangement regarding freight rates. I am not condemning such arrangements, if they are fair. I only condemn them when they are injurious. It is a curious situation that the representatives of the Commonwealth, in acting with the representatives of one State in making arrangements for the freight that is to be paid on these vessels, should have actually brought up the price. They have helped to do what the Combine has been aiming at—that is, to arrive at an understanding as to a uniform freight. Whether the freight fixed is too high or too low is best known to those who have gone into that point. But it appears to me that the rate has been rather increased, and that it is a mistake to fix freight rates for nearly thirteen years ahead.

Mr. MCWILLIAMS.—That is the worst feature of the contract.

Mr. SPENCE.—It is not to be supposed that the science of ship-building will stand still during thirteen years. Consider the number of vessels of the *Dreadnought* type which are being built in the Old World. Notwithstanding their immense weight of steel, their speed has been enormously increased. The fact is that, owing to improvements in ship-building, speed can be increased without such a greatly augmented cost as was formerly entailed. Probably long before the twelfth year of the period is completed such improvements will have been made as will enable other lines to cut under the freights fixed in this contract. There is nothing particularly binding upon those who have come to the arrangement, except a sort of mutual understanding or promise. Competition may come in from outside. But when it does come in and takes from the Orient Steam Navigation Company a portion of its income, the contract provides for an increase in the amount of the subsidy. We also find in the document other provisions which, at first sight, seem to be all right. For instance, there is a provision to the effect that the company shall be debarred from joining in any combine. If it can be proved to the satisfaction of the High Court that they have become a party to a combine, the Postmaster-General is empowered to cancel the contract. The point I want to make is that it would be impossible to satisfy the High Court that that which has been generally termed in

the Old World the Shipping Conference is a combine. I was a member of the Shipping Service Commission, and those who are interested in the producing industries will derive considerable information from the evidence we took regarding the arrangement in the Old Country, which is generally spoken of as a ring or combine. In the High Court, however, a question has to be dealt with on legal principles, and, according to evidence, and that which is generally known to the community is not accepted by the Judges without clear proof. The representatives of the shipping companies who have had experience of the alleged ring deny that it is a combine. They describe it as a very simple thing indeed—as a mere understanding amongst the shippers. They say that it is not composed of ship-owners, but of merchants and others, and is a nice friendly arrangement by which to settle the freightage to Australia. The Combine controls the ships. It can lay up a vessel just as it likes, fix the freights, or decide how much freight a ship shall take, but I doubt whether it would be possible to get the necessary evidence to satisfy the High Court that it is a combine. If that evidence cannot be procured, the provision in the agreement counts for practically nothing. Unless things have been materially altered since the Shipping Service Commission took evidence, I doubt whether the Orient Steam Navigation Company will be able to secure goods in the Old Country to bring out here, unless it belongs to that particular ring. It will be very difficult indeed to prove that it is a ring, although it carries out the very work which a ring does, and we have to suffer accordingly. We shall have no voice in determining the rates of freight for the carriage of our imports. It will also have to be proved that any understanding which has been arrived at affecting exports is illegal before the contract can be cancelled. The Government have actually been helping to make a combine. They are appealing to a certain firm which has been entering into competition here, and cutting down the freights for the carriage of perishable products. The Government have been aiding them to raise those freights a little more. That is the most extraordinary position which a Government could take up. Then, as a kind of sop—of course, to please the Labour Party—they say that the contractors are going to cease to discriminate between unionists and non-unionists. That is no

Mr. Spence.

sacrifice on the part of the Company, because it is generally admitted by the shipping companies that the Seamen's Union provides the best sailors. In making that promise, the contractors are not making any concession. To their credit they have always manned their ships with white men. The experience of shipping companies has demonstrated that it is not cheaper to employ lascars. Again, consider that wonderful sacrifice which the contractors have made in undertaking to fly the Australian flag. A representative of the Melbourne Chamber of Commerce, in the person of the honorable member for Kooyong, is not pleased even with that concession. That is the only little fault which he can find with the contract. I think it is rather a good idea to let persons on the high seas and in the Old World know that there is such a place as Australia. In the contract the Government have stipulated the freight for the carriage of only two products. Suppose that the rate is very reasonable, perhaps only sufficient to cover the bare cost. Is that a very great concession, having regard to all the other items in respect of which the contractors are left free to fix the freights? Seeing that the Government have been helping to bring all the competitors into a little ring, will it not be easy for the contractors to arrange what freights they please in respect of products other than butter and fruit? It seems to me that the Government have reached a sort of half-way stage between the old individualist method and the Socialist method. They had to choose between yielding to the steam-ship company or accepting the proposal of the honorable member for Barrier. The better plan, I think, would have been for the Commonwealth to establish a line of its own ships, which, I contend, could be done without resorting to borrowing. But the Government have been trying to please everybody, and it seems to me that they are not likely to please any one. The contract contains another peculiarity which I think has not been sufficiently emphasized. Not only is it to run for the term of ten years, but we are required to put up for a couple of years with the existing steamers, which are so much behind the age. Practically a period of eight years will elapse before a full service is provided. It will only be provided during the last four years of the contract. Again, take the increased size and better description of boats which the contractors undertake

to have constructed. Those very boats, when constructed, may be out of date as compared with modern ships. Although we shall have to pay the enormous subsidy of £170,000 per annum—how much that represents per ton of letters I do not know—still we shall not get the type of ship which is described in the contract, except during the last four years of its currency. That really adds to the amount of the subsidy, and certainly it shows how unreasonable it is. The clause in regard to Tasmania might just as well have been left out of the contract. Because it can only be taken as an expression of opinion. This document is supposed to be an agreement drawn up in legal terms, but I think that an average layman will readily perceive that certain of its conditions are not mandatory. They are only a sort of promise, and are put in apparently for rhetorical effect. They are quite foreign to a legal document or binding agreement. Apparently the only penalty provided is that either side can break the contract. There may be some good in that, although, apparently, the Commonwealth is fairly tied up. Should the Commonwealth pass legislation that presses heavily upon the shipping company, the company can give notice to terminate the agreement. It might be possible to end the arrangement in that way. The clause that deals with the calling at Tasmania, boiled down, simply means that the boats are to call there if it pays them. If the Tasmanians are to expect the mail boats to call there and give them the advantage that accrues from prompt delivery, they will have to guarantee sufficient cargo; but the Commonwealth has no guarantee, in the interests of Tasmania, that the boats will call at Hobart at all. It seems unfair to stipulate that the boats are to call at the principal port of all the States except the smallest one, which should have the first consideration for the very reason that it is small. The bigger States can very well look after themselves, because they are, financially, in a better position than are States like Tasmania and Queensland. The principal industry of Tasmania is fruit-growing, although, probably, there will be a development of the butter trade in that State. It should not be left optional for the boats to go to Hobart. Of course, it is provided that the company has to satisfy the Minister that it would not be profitable for them to do so. If the company find that it pays them to go to Hobart, they will go, but if they find that they can

make a greater profit by going somewhere else for freight, will any Minister compel them to go to Tasmania, and suffer the loss that would be involved thereby? The whole contract shows that the shipping company has very much the best of the deal. This and previous experiences in fixing up the mail service indicate that private enterprise has got a grip of the Commonwealth. If anything was calculated to make converts to the views of the Labour Party, it would be the experience of the Commonwealth Government in arranging mail contracts. On the last occasion we put forward proposals that were dismissed in a light and airy fashion, because a syndicate made an offer which the Government, and a majority of the House, regarded as *bona fide*, although it turned out to be rather in the nature of a confidence trick. But the syndicate's estimate of the cost of vessels bore out the correctness of the report of the Shipping Commission, of which the honorable member for Barrier was Chairman. The experience of this contract is still more strongly in favour of the views that we put forward. The Government, in their timidity about taking a bold step and launching out in a mail and cargo service of their own, allowed themselves to be placed at the mercy of the shipping companies, who hold them in the hollow of their hand. I do not object to the provision for improved speed, although it mainly benefits one class of the community, nor do I take exception to the principle of regulating freights, which is an interference with private enterprise that the anti-Socialists in this House seem ready to swallow without making a wry face. On the whole, the contract compares unfavorably with the proposals made by the honorable member for Barrier, which have not had a proper discussion here yet. We have been accused of wandering into speculative projects. It reminds me very much of the theologian of the days of Galileo. When the astronomer said that he could see through his telescope the moons of Jupiter, the theologian declared that it was utterly impossible. He refused to look through the telescope, and when asked to explain how it was that others could see the moons, he declared that there were spots in the glass. He was then asked to explain why the same spots did not appear when the telescope was turned on to Venus or Mars, but he still asserted that it was impossible that there should be moons. The attitude of certain honorable members

is exactly similar. They turn their mental eye on to something that no one has put forward, and in a light and airy fashion they say that it is impracticable. That is what the honorable member for Flinders, like the old theologian, did, and merely because certain proposals differed from his ideas of things. That is not a fair or honest attitude to adopt towards any proposal put forward seriously with the weight of evidence and argument behind it. Some honorable members, from whom I expected very much better things, have wandered away into a condemnation of something that no one has proposed, and that may never happen. They have avoided looking at the practical proposal that has been made as an alternative to the adoption of a contract which some of them have so severely criticised. They have alarmed themselves by putting a label on the proposal. We call it nothing but a sensible business proposition, and, if it is so, it surely ought to be examined on its merits. They see the word "Socialism" on the glass of their telescope, and that frightens them. It excites them more than the proverbial red rag does a bull, although Australian bulls are not frightened by red rags. Australian representatives in the Australian Parliament, however, are frightened by the bogey, Socialism. The honorable member for Kooyong was terribly worried and excited to-day, but even he, with his vast experience and knowledge, had to admit that he does not know what Socialism really is. How, then, can honorable members be anti-something which they cannot define? On a previous occasion when our proposal was put forward, some honorable members raised the objection that there would be difficulties in managing a State-owned line. It is noticeable that no objection seems to have been raised to the proposal of the honorable member for Barrier on its merits, nor has it been contended that it would not be possible to obtain some one to successfully manage a Commonwealth line of steamers. The representative of the Orient Steam Navigation Company would, I think, be a good man to superintend such an enterprise, if one may judge from the way in which he has managed the Government; and doubtless, if an adequate salary were offered, we could obtain his services. I was surprised that the honorable member for North Sydney should suggest that if we nationalized all industries, a workman would not be satis-

Mr. Spence.

fied to receive only £2 per week, while the manager was receiving £1,000 a year.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I was not then speaking about the management of a steamship company.

Mr. SPENCE.—No, but the honorable member used an argument of that kind against the Socialistic proposals, of which the amendment of the honorable member for Barrier is said to be one.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I used that as an argument against complete nationalization.

Mr. SPENCE.—In any case, I was surprised that the honorable member should wander into the regions of speculation in regard to universal nationalization. I shall not follow the honorable member, who drew pictures, which, so far as I know, very few members of the Labour Party have any idea will be realized. But even if his speculations were to be translated into fact, I altogether differ with him as to the probable results. The honorable member contended that if the whole of the people were State employés, they would demand unworkable conditions; but my experience of the working classes is that it is exceedingly difficult to induce them to make even demands that are admittedly reasonable. The shareholders in the great co-operative societies of the United Kingdom represent about one-fourth of the population of the Old Country. Many industries are entirely controlled by co-operative shareholders; and yet we there observe all the differences in wages which are to be found under private enterprise. There is no endeavour to reduce all salaries and wages to one level, but, as elsewhere, the remuneration of the manager is vastly different from that of other employés.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON. — Those co-operative associations are managed from the outside.

Mr. SPENCE.—No, they are managed by the shareholders.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—But not by employés only.

Mr. SPENCE.—The associations are managed entirely by the shareholders, who are not outsiders.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—But all the shareholders are not the employés of the associations.

Mr. SPENCE.—I could mention several co-operative associations in the Old Coun-

try in which the workmen are all shareholders, and yet there are none of the results which the honorable member seems to fear. Much that has been said by anti-Socialists, in the course of the present discussion, is to be attributed to the fact that the proposal of the honorable member for Barrier is not open to hostile criticism. The trend in every country, especially in the older countries of the world, is in the direction of collective ownership of public utilities such as railways, telegraphs, gas-works, and tramways; and, at the present time, about two-thirds of the trams in Great Britain are owned by municipalities. There is a strong feeling, not only in England, but also in America, in favour of the nationalization of the railways; and most of us know the great dangers connected with the privately-owned railways in the United States, not only to employés but to the travelling public. In the United States, with an immense population, the average fare on the privately-owned tramways is 5 cents per mile, whereas in the United Kingdom, where most of the trams are owned by public bodies, the fare is less than half. Then, in point of safety, speed, and administration, the railways and tramways of the United Kingdom are far ahead of those of the United States; and the Australian railways on all points are admitted to be much superior to those in any part of the world. As showing the advantages to the public of State-owned railways, compared with privately-owned railways, I may say that in Tasmania, on the privately-owned line from Burnie to Zeehan, a distance of 88 miles, the fare is 22s. second class, as compared with 8s. 9d. for a single second-class ticket on the State-owned railway from Burnie to Little Hampton, a distance of 88½ miles. On the privately-owned line from Strahan to Queenstown, a distance of 28 miles, the fare is 7s. 6d. second class, as compared with 3s. charged for the same distance on the State-owned railway from Zeehan to Strahan. In New South Wales, on the privately-owned railway from Moama to Deniliquin, a distance of 45 miles, a second-class ticket costs 9s., whereas for a similar distance on the State-owned railway, only 5s. is charged. We must also remember that when selectors and farmers are suffering from drought the Railways Commissioners of the various States may step in and materially assist by carrying starving stock and fodder at

low rates, whereas we know that, under such circumstances the owners of private railways do not give concessions.

Sitting suspended from 6.30 to 7.45 p.m.

Mr. SPENCE.—The honorable member for Barrier evidently anticipated the line of argument that would be adopted by those opposed to his amendment when he said that they would not object so much to his proposal as to what might follow it, if it were acted upon. I have said that that is not a fair way to deal with the matter. To label a proposal with the name of some principle one does not approve, and then to urge as a justification for opposing the proposal the name that one has himself applied to it, is a peculiar way in which to reason, if it can be called reasoning at all. We have heard during this discussion, as we always do in the discussion of proposals of the kind, that we must take human nature into account. Whilst the general characteristics of human nature may remain practically unchanged, it is always altering and changing in some respects. The party with which I am associated believe that if we remove the temptation to do ill deeds they are less likely to be done. It is no argument against any proposal to say that it does not represent absolute perfection. If we had reached perfection the world would be at a stand-still. Advance and development is possible only where there is room for improvement. How is any one to judge that a business is well or ill managed if he looks at it from one point of view? I cannot avoid saying that the line of reasoning adopted by the critics of proposals of this kind is not calculated to inspire confidence in their judgment. Those who pretend to criticise a proposal by setting up and knocking down something else never come to close quarters with the real question under discussion. The remarks of the honorable member for Parramatta appeared to me to be a little contradictory. In discussing the difference between private monopolies and what the honorable member termed Government monopolies, in his fear that something terrible might happen under a Government monopoly, the honorable gentleman expressed a preference for private monopolies. Apparently he has less fear that evils would arise under private monopolies. The same idea appears to have been in the mind of the honorable member for North Sydney, when he referred to what might happen

should all industries become nationalized, and the people engaged in them become State employés. There is nothing in the honorable member's contention, because we find that under State management various sections are still looking after their own interests, and that will continue to be the case until human nature, by new environment, has become so altered as to bring about a better state of affairs. The honorable member for Parramatta feared that a State monopoly would give rise to tyranny or the loss of freedom—and I understood the honorable member to refer to the freedom of the individual; but surely the honorable member must agree that if such results, arising from private monopolies, can be checked by the power of the State, in the enactment of legislation to bring about new conditions, it is not likely that the community as a whole, under a system of State monopolies, would put up with such evils. There is a great lack of faith in the possibility of the improvement, not only of our social conditions, but of the character and nature of the individual units who, together, make up society. The honorable member for North Sydney should be able to recognise that long before we shall have reached the stage when all industries will become nationalized immense changes will have taken place. I believe that the conditions of society will have become so changed, as the result of the use which mankind will make of the advantages conferred by applied science, that it is not too much to say that every one will enjoy the equivalent of an income of £1,000 a year at the present time.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I should like to ask the honorable member if he proposes to connect his observations with the proposal before the House? I have been listening to him for some time in the hope that he would do so.

Mr. SPENCE.—I am endeavouring to reply briefly to arguments which have already been used, and which I have, therefore, assumed to be relevant to the question.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Not so much to arguments as to a mere incidental expression.

Mr. SPENCE.—The honorable member will see that if a prompt contradiction is not given to some statements that are made it might be assumed that it is because honorable members approve of them. The proposed mail contract, if carried, would continue in operation for ten or

twelve years, and I have been trying to show that, as a result of the changes which are continually going on in the world, there is no reason for the fear that the evils to which reference has been made would arise under what would be entirely new conditions. I have already said that to enter upon speculative arguments is not a fair way in which to discuss the proposal at all.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The honorable member believes that after many thousands of years we have struck the road to the Millennium at last.

Mr. SPENCE.—It is only the honorable member for Parramatta who talks about the Millennium. He has repeated many times that we must reckon with human nature, and I say that that is exactly where we start from.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I point out that in elaborating an irrelevant argument the honorable member is not dealing with the question before the Chair.

Mr. SPENCE.—I shall not pursue that line of reasoning. I wished to reply to some statements made by the honorable member for Parramatta in discussing the amendment moved by the honorable member for Barrier. Perhaps I might be allowed to refer to one other statement which the honorable member has made about the danger that the inspection under Government management would not be efficient, and I need only remind honorable members in answer to that that the highest prices are obtained for butter which has been inspected by Government officials. The honorable member for Parramatta made some observations with respect to the introduction of sentiment into business. That is a very important element which we are introducing into business. By recent legislation we have decided to introduce a great deal of sentiment into business. We are introducing the sentiment of justice, and it is upon that basis that we put forward such a proposal as that now before the House. It has in it more ethics than some imagine. We believe that to leave to private enterprise services of this kind is to open the door to injustice and various evils. I do not mean to suggest that that is the result of all private business; but the fact that we have been called upon to take action with a view to the abolition of sweating is evidence that private enterprise must be restricted. We are led by humanitarian considerations to the conclusion that such action is necessary.

Mr. LIDDELL.—I suppose that there is no injustice taking place in the Post and Telegraph Department?

Mr. SPENCE.—No one suggests that everything is what it ought to be; but the fact that there are numberless applicants for admission to the Public Service should be some indication of whether or not those already in the service are doing fairly well.

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—If we had a Labour Government we should soon set right matters in the Public Service.

Mr. SPENCE.—Yes. My argument was directed chiefly against the spirit of pure commercialism which is responsible for so many wrongs. We are introducing humanitarian considerations into our legislation, and I disagree entirely with those who say that there should be no sentiment in business. The public ought to be protected against persons whose selfishness and greed would lead them to take advantage of others on the ground that they were acting merely in accordance with commercial principles. I think that the proposed contract is a big mistake, and I am afraid that if more business acumen were not displayed in national enterprises than has been shown on behalf of the Commonwealth in the negotiations for this mail service, there would be some ground for the contention of our anti-socialistic friends. With a State-owned line of mail steamers we should be free from the dangers that now beset us, and I feel confident that before the expiration of this contract we shall have a Federal Parliament that is prepared to view these matters from the same stand-point as does the honorable member for Barrier, whose amendment I intend to support. I am not prepared to be a party to the granting of such a large subsidy to a private company, however worthy it may be. I can find no justification for the payment of so large a sum, a considerable part of which will be an absolute gift to the company. I shall vote for the amendment, which may yet be carried.

Sir JOHN FORREST (Swan) [7.59].—I am sorry to take up the time of the House, because I know that we have a great deal to do before the Christmas vacation; but, as one of the representatives of Western Australia, which is much interested in regular mail communication between Australia and the Old World, I feel constrained to offer a few observations. I have listened with attention, and with some regret, to the remarks that have been made concerning the unbusiness-like attitude taken

up by the Government with reference to the Laing contract. When a member of the Government, I had not, at the outset, much to do with the negotiations, but we were buoyed up with assurances that it would be carried out. A good deal of the delay that occurred was due to the fact that we were loth to cancel the contract while the Prime Minister and the present Treasurer were in England, and while there was still some reason to hope that the requisite capital would be forthcoming. It is easy to find fault, but had we cancelled the contract without giving the contractors every opportunity to carry it out, we should have been very much blamed. We did not cancel it until all hope of its being successfully carried out was at an end. I regret, too, that the question of Socialism should have been allowed to obtrude so largely into this discussion. The contract has been placed before us, and it is for us to say whether or not we approve of it. The Government have given it careful consideration, and have submitted it to us for confirmation. They have taken the responsibility of signing it, subject to its ratification by Parliament, and since it is a signed and completed document it would be voided by being amended. If it were amended, it would be open to the Orient Steam Navigation Company to withdraw from the arrangement. If any new provisions are necessary, the only thing to do will be to make an additional agreement, apart altogether from this agreement.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The contract is not complete.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—It is complete so far as the Government are concerned, and any amendment of it would void it.

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—Then, what is the good of referring it to the House?

Sir JOHN FORREST.—Many proposals that may not be amended are submitted, in order to validate them. The Government submit to the House important proposals in connexion with the Estimates, and if they are not carried, their course is clear, as it is in this case. I have no objection, on socialistic grounds, to the State ownership of mail steamers. I do not think that the ownership of mail steamers could be said to be any more socialistic than is the State ownership of railways. The railways are trading concerns; the Railway Commissioners are common carriers. There is a great difference, however, between a fleet of steamers trading beyond the

limits of Australia to other parts of the world, and railways which, lying wholly within our borders, are completely within the control of our Governments. The railways, telegraphs, telephones, and other public services which I need not mention, are, in Australia, State-owned monopolies, shielded by law from competition. Prior to Federation the telegraph and telephone services were, in most of the States, carried on at a loss, though they are approaching the paying point now, while some of the State railways were also run at a loss. But businesses of private concerns must be made to pay, because those who direct them have no taxpayers to fall back upon to provide for losses. They know that, if they cannot make profits, their business must go to the wall. I believe competition to be, in the main, a good thing. It is enterprise and competition that has made the British Empire what it is. We have progressed, not because our people have done as little as they could, but because each has tried to do his best. A monopoly guarded from competition can charge what it likes. In Australia we may fix what rates we please for the transmission of a telegraph message or the carriage of goods by rail. But a Commonwealth line of mail steamers trading to England and other countries would have to face the competition of other lines. My objection to the proposal of the honorable member for Barrier is, not that it is socialistic, but that it is opposed to public policy. It would not, in my opinion, pay to run a Commonwealth line of steamers in competition with private lines. It is not the business of the Government to send out vessels to trade here, there, and everywhere throughout the world; such undertakings should, I think, be left to private enterprise. The proposed Commonwealth fleet, if brought into existence, would—at any rate, once it got beyond Australian waters—have to compete with other lines for passenger and goods traffic. But perhaps—and I do not think that this is too far-fetched to be mentioned—it is intended by the Labour Party, so soon as the line of State-owned steamers is established, to ask this Parliament to forbid the importation or exportation of goods in vessels other than those owned by the Government of Australia.

Mr. CARR.—Does the honorable member say that the existing Government monopolies are abused?

Sir JOHN FORREST.—I am in favour of State-owned railways, telegraphs, and

telephones, but it is quite possible that if they were privately owned they might be run more economically. It is only in Australia that there are so many monopolistic enterprises protected by law from competition.

Mr. MATHEWS.—Is our telephone and telegraph system dearer than those of other countries?

Sir JOHN FORREST.—Yes; though for long distances it is very cheap.

Mr. MAUGER.—It is cheaper.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—Our telephone system is the worst managed in the world.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—I do not know that it is the worst; it is certainly capable of improvement, in Melbourne at any rate.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The London telephone systems are worse.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—I commend to the attention of the Attorney-General, or of any one else who cares to consider constitutional questions, an inquiry as to the powers of the Commonwealth to embark in a shipping trading business beyond Australia with other parts of the world.

Mr. GROOM.—Have we not the right to provide for the carriage of our mails?

Sir JOHN FORREST.—A fleet of steamers would never be built merely for the carriage of mails. It would be necessary to provide for passenger and goods traffic as well. In my opinion, the construction and management of a fleet of mail steamers engaged in the carrying trade with other countries beyond Australia was never intended to be within our constitutional powers.

Mr. THOMAS.—The honorable member has not considered the matter.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—I have given some consideration to it, though I have not considered it as much as it requires to be considered.

Mr. THOMAS.—I think that. If the honorable member had considered it thoroughly, he would not have come to the conclusions which he has expressed.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—I venture to think that when the matter is carefully looked into it will be found that it presents more difficulties than he is aware of. I am opposed to the proposal of the honorable member for Barrier, not because it is socialistic, but because, as I have said already, it is, in my opinion, opposed to public policy and unconstitutional. I wish now to refer to some remarks on the subject of the employment of coloured

labour on mail steamers, made by a member of the Labour Party. While he was speaking I made several interjections which I should like to explain, though it is not necessary for me to explain my general views in regard to the employment of coloured labour, because I have made them known in this House, and have not changed the opinions to which I have given utterance. I shall not go over the ground again, as the honorable member for Barrier has done. He has given us three long speeches in explanation of his proposal, but, as he cannot find new arguments each time, every speech is to a large extent alike. No doubt if he had an opportunity next week he would make a fourth speech almost exactly like those we have already heard. There is no reason why we should not insist upon any condition we please in regard to the class of labour to be employed on the vessels which carry our mails. I prefer, and always shall prefer, men of our own colour to the darker races of the world; but I contend, as I have contended before, that honorable members who would exclude coloured labour from all employment at sea are not consistent, because, when they travel, they travel on vessels manned by coloured crews.

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—The honorable member should speak for himself.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—I do speak for myself. Probably the honorable member has never been away from Australia.

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—Yes, I have.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—I do not know why the honorable member so constantly interjects. He should wait until he gets more experience, and should have respect for the older members of the House. It is impossible to travel to the eastern parts of Asia in vessels which do not carry coloured crews. When we send our merchandise to Japan, China, India, and other places, to which we are glad to have an opportunity to export it, we send it in ships carrying coloured crews. Our mails—when they are not carried in the contractor's vessels—are forwarded under poundage rates by steamers which employ coloured seamen. Yet, when we enter into a mail contract we draw the line by declaring—very much to our disadvantage—that the contractor's vessels shall not carry coloured crews. I do not think it is logical—and I scarcely think it is honest—that we should take credit to our selves for providing that our steamers shall employ only white men, when we enter into a contract for the carriage of our mails,

whilst at the same time we send our merchandise and a portion of our mails Home and about the world under different conditions.

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—The employment of white labour costs very little extra.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—I am aware that that statement was made by the manager of the Orient Steam Navigation Company. I am, however, inclined to think that the employment of white men on ships must cost the contractors more than would the employment of coloured crews. I am glad to notice that under the new contract Western Australia has been fairly treated. That State will not get any more advantages than it previously enjoyed, but it will get as many. Fremantle will be a port of call for the mail steamers, and that is all that Western Australia has a right to expect. Some exception has been taken to the insertion in the contract of a provision prescribing the maximum rates to be charged for freight. In my opinion that is a reasonable provision. It does not provide that the rates specified shall be the ruling rates. If there be keen competition, as the years go by—as it is surmised there will be—those charges will have to be reduced. There is nothing new about a provision of this kind. I recollect that in the Western Australian mail contracts for the carriage of mails from Cambridge Gulf to Eucla, a clause is always inserted, specifying the maximum passage money to be charged, and the rates for the carriage of stock, timber, and other produce. That provision works extremely well, and still obtains in the current coastal contracts made recently by the Federal Government. To my mind, the Government are to be congratulated upon having safeguarded the interests of the producers by stipulating that though the rates specified in the contract may be reduced, they cannot be increased. Personally, I would insert some such provision in all mail contracts for the purpose of preventing extra charges being imposed upon our producers in time of temporary stress or difficulty.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—In all private railway Acts, the maximum charges are specified.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—Yes. They usually provide that the companies shall not charge more than the Government rates. There is just one omission to which I should like to draw attention. The contract makes no provision for space

being reserved for the carriage of fruit and butter from Western Australia. But I do not think that in practice any difficulty will be experienced in this connexion. The Orient Steam Navigation Company consists of keen business-men, who will recognise that it is to their interests to work in with the producers of all the States. If their agents inform them that there is so much produce awaiting shipment in the chief port of any State—irrespective of whether it be Hobart, Fremantle, or other port—they will in fairness reserve sufficient space for it. The spirit of the contract undoubtedly is that a reasonable quantity of space shall be reserved to the port at which the steamers will call in each State. I am very glad to observe that under the contract the freights from the Old Country to all parts of the Commonwealth under normal conditions will be identical. That has not been the case in the past. Some time ago I asked the Postmaster-General a question in regard to the matter, and he promised to make a note of my complaint. He has done so, with the result that under the new contract the freight charges from England to all ports in Australia will be identical. At present 10s. per ton more freight is charged for cargo to Fremantle than to Sydney. Seeing that Fremantle is as well equipped—if not better—as any port in Australia for the despatch of business, there is no reason whatever why that should be so. I found to my great pleasure—I will not say to my surprise—in looking up the figures, that Fremantle is now the third trading port in Australia. It stands next after Sydney and Melbourne. That fact alone shows that Fremantle is no longer a small place. Seeing that it possesses all the latest appliances, including electric cranes, and has an abundance of sheds, there is no reason why freight to Fremantle should be greater than it is to other ports thousands of miles further on. I ask the Postmaster-General whether he cannot do something at once to remove this injustice. I ask him whether something cannot be done at once to remove the anomaly whereby 10s. more per ton is paid for freight to Fremantle than to Sydney—2,000 miles further on. I have a word to say about the term of the contract. It is no doubt a big order to make a contract of this kind extending over the next twelve years. But we must remember that the contract has not been run after by num-

bers of tenderers. After the Government had advertised all over the world, only three tenders were received, and that of the Orient Steam Navigation Company was considered the best of the three. So that the Government is not in the same position as it would be if the contract was eagerly sought after. It will, I think, be a source of great comfort and satisfaction to the trading community and the producers of Australia to know that for the next twelve years they have a certain means of getting their produce to the Old Country at reasonable rates. With regard to the question of freights I see no reason why they should not be lowered during the term of the contract. There is no reason why there should not be any amount of competition. In that event we may expect that the freight will be considerably reduced. There is another matter which I wish to bring under the notice of the Postmaster-General. I trust that he will give the gravest consideration to the days and times of call at the different ports. At the present time the Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Company's mail steamers call at Fremantle on Mondays and Tuesdays. Those days are, as a rule, very convenient days for the arrival of mails from the East and from Europe. But, unfortunately, in Western Australia, as in some other States of Australia, when an event which is connected with a public holiday falls on any other day of the week, the holiday is celebrated on Monday. All the shops are shut, and it is difficult to get men to do work when other people are holiday-making. The greatest trouble often arises through this cause. I know that it is not an easy difficulty to get over but by consulting the local authorities connected with shipping companies it may be possible for the Postmaster-General to make an arrangement whereby the vessels will not arrive at Fremantle on Monday. It is not only Western Australia that is concerned, but the difficulty affects the other States also. I am quite sure that my honorable friend will give the matter attention. As to the contract price, when we recollect that the last contract was for £120,000 a year and that £26,000 more was paid by Brisbane—making £146,000 altogether—it will be seen that this contract only involves an additional sum of £24,000 per annum. When we recollect also that instead of having 6,000-ton ships we are to have a fleet of magnificent large vessels of 11,000 tons each, with a very

much quicker service, it will, I think, be conceded that we are getting value for our money. A service shortened by fifty-eight hours necessarily means increased cost to the contractors. Taking all these considerations into account, I think that we may be fairly well satisfied. I, at any rate, approve of the contract, and shall do my best to secure its acceptance by this House.

Mr. KING O'MALLEY (Darwin) [8.31].—The question of the ratification of this mail contract has been discussed by many honorable members. I have listened attentively to their speeches, but I must confess that I am greatly disappointed with the Opposition and their auxiliary corner. I had hoped to hear something interesting about the financial side of this proposition from honorable members opposite. The Government are asking for an enormous sum to be paid by the taxpayers of Australia. What it means is that we are going to provide the Orient Steam Navigation Company with money to build their fleet and keep them going for ten years, at the end of which time our position will be infinitely worse than it is now. To me the prospect is sorrowful. Before I proceed to discuss the financial aspect of the proposition, I wish to say that, personally, I was delighted with the way in which the Postmaster-General laid the contract before us. Instead of taking up an hour or two of our time explaining it, he made a simple little business statement, laid the contract upon the table, and said, "Now, have a go at it." That is a splendid way of doing business. It would be much better for all of us if we limited the length of speeches in this House to ten or fifteen minutes. Now, if this question had been dealt with by the great financial authorities on the Opposition side of the Chamber, I, as a labour man, should not have had anything to say about it. But I am bound to recognise that the Labour members are the only real financial men in this House. There is no doubt in my mind that the members of the Opposition and of the Opposition corner possess little knowledge of finance. I originally came into this House having great faith in them. But what do I see when a proposition involving important financial considerations is laid before us? Here is a contract involving the expenditure of £170,000 a year. It is to operate for ten years. Can any one realize what may happen in ten years? Why, Napoleon's period of great glory did not last much longer than that time.

Mr. MALONEY.—Didn't it! The honorable member had better read history.

Mr. KING O'MALLEY.—I have done so. Napoleon was defeated at Waterloo on the 18th day of June, 1815.

Mr. MALONEY.—Where was he ten years before?

Mr. KING O'MALLEY.—Only a few months before he was a prisoner on the Island of Elba, and ten years before he was fighting for his life. Ten years is a very long period for which to enter into an engagement of this kind. In ten years the whole world may be launched into "chaos and old night." In ten years every member of this House may have passed into Heaven.

Mr. WILKS.—If they have any luck!

Mr. KING O'MALLEY.—Yet honorable members are prepared to rush into a contract of this nature for so long a term. We are practically voting away £2,064,000—because money doubles itself at 3 per cent. interest, paid every six months, in less than twenty-four years, and it doubles itself at 3½ per cent. in less than twenty-one years. I am going to discuss this matter on the basis of 3½ per cent., because it is nonsense to talk about a lower rate of interest than that at present. Some time ago the honorable member for Barrier brought before the House a splendid report, as the result of the inquiry by the Shipping Service Commission. I avail myself of this opportunity to congratulate the honorable member, of whom I think the House ought to be proud. He is a consistent, straightforward, out-and-out advancer; but I am sorry that he is a free-trader. He brought before the House a proposition to nationalize, not all the steam-ship lines in the world, but a steam-ship line. He proposed that the Commonwealth should own a line of steam-ships. He is a Britisher who was born in England, and believes in the British Empire. It is because he has faith in the British Empire that he wishes to lay the foundation of its Federation under its own flag. But, alas! honorable members sitting on the Opposition benches and in the Opposition corner, have not yet risen out of their swaddling-clothes to understand the greatness of the British Empire. The honorable member for Barrier based his estimates on a loan obtained at 3 per cent., and involving an interest charge of £90,000 a year. But I go one better than that. With a sum of £3,000,000 we could provide a fleet of eight steamers, and the annual interest

charge at $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. would come to £105,000. The Government propose to pay the Orient Steam Navigation Company an annual subsidy of £170,000 for a mail service. It will be seen that if we had our own fleet, and were paying an interest charge of £105,000, there would be, as compared with the cost of this contract, a sum of £65,000 a year for us to play with. If we established a sinking fund on a 2 per cent. basis, the annual contribution would be £60,000, and in ten years, at $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., it would amount to £735,000, and we would be running our own steam-ships. I am here to-night to show the Government that they are making a bad bargain—one which, if made by a boy of ten or fifteen years of age, would result in his being sent to an asylum to be treated for softening of the brain. I have not a word to say about the Government, because they cannot help what they are doing. I want it to be distinctly understood that I am an out-and-out supporter of theirs. It is a good thing for a Government to be criticised, because it is only by criticism that we can effect any reforms. If we do not call the attention of a man to his mistakes, he never can reform. Reformation of the Ministry is what we want. I wish them to get out of their fossilized ideas of going to the combines. At the end of ten years, I repeat, we would have £735,000 in our sinking fund. Although we would be paying £105,000 a year as interest on the loan, still, we would be saving £5,000 a year out of the balance of £65,000. Money invested at 2 per cent. to-day, if payable half-yearly, will double itself in thirty-four and a-half years. At the end of that period, with a sinking fund on a 2 per cent. basis, we would have extinguished our debt to the money lender. Out of the revenue from the steam-ships, we would be able to provide a repair fund, a renewal fund, a re-insurance fund, and a replacement fund. The line would be improved just as our other property is improved. At the end of thirty-five years the fleet would have been paid for, and paid for with money which otherwise we would have been contributing to a steam-ship company to be used in building a line for itself. Is it any wonder that the people of Australia owe £243,000,000 when that kind of financing has been going on? Is it any wonder that we are running into debt year after year, and do not know where we

King O'Malley.

stand? Under such a financial system we never will know where we stand. Of course, my honorable friends on the other side have heard supporters of the Government apologizing, and stating that the Orient Steam Navigation Company say, "Take it or leave it."

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—They should not approach this House like that.

Mr. KING O'MALLEY.—My honorable friend is a thinking man, and so he is looking into this question very carefully. I only wish I could get this boggy of Socialism out of the minds of my honorable friends opposite. Well, sir, do I remember how they used to frighten me when I was a child. My grandmother—who, by the way, was a Scotch woman—used to say, "Send him out to Botany Bay." I was afraid of Botany Bay, and as soon as I landed in Sydney I went to see what sort of a place it was that had scared me for years. I found that it was all right. The word Socialism frightens a number of honorable members. I ask them to get the boggy of Socialism out of their minds, and to look at this proposal just as a number of cold business men sitting round a table would do. When the great Beef Trusts of America were not in combination, a man could put his fat cattle on the trucks in the Western States, weigh them, and wire to Chicago, "Sell for me thirty thousand pounds of beef," and the next day he would receive a wire, "Sold on the hoof; five cents." He could take his wire to his banker and get an advance with which to carry on his business, because he knew exactly what he would receive for his cattle, less the leakage going to Chicago, 1,000 or 1,500 miles away. As soon as ever the Fowlers and those men entered into a great combination that was all stopped, and a man had to send his cattle to Chicago. The buyer for one trust or other would go round, and say, "They will not suit me." My object in using this illustration is to show how the Government have been hoodwinked. At 3 o'clock in the afternoon, when the farmer saw that night was coming on, he realized that the trust owned the stockyards, the feed, and the water, and double-banked him for pay. Then he would say to them: "For goodness sake, what will you give me?" They would not deal, and next day he would have to accept any price. Wherever a combination or trust exists, the country

is cursed, and the producers are at its mercy. The same thing happened in the State of California. When the farmers went down to meet the railway people, the representative of the combination, with a cigar in his mouth, said: "You are meeting combination. This is what we will carry your wheat for; take it or leave it." And the farmers had to take it. The same thing happened in the case of the Canadian-Pacific a few years ago in Manitoba. That line was transporting all the wheat from Manitoba to the seaboard. The farmers joined together and built a road from Manitoba to the United States line, and then there was a riot there, because they met another combination. Surely these things ought to weigh with honorable members. They are not representing the people conscientiously and justly if they fail in this House to exercise their intelligence for the benefit of the electors. What do the vast multitude of the people know about this matter? They selected honorable members because they believed that they were the best men to represent them, and that they would fight for their rights. I ask honorable members: Are you fighting for the rights of the producers of Australia when you allow this company to say, "Our price is £170,000; take it or leave it?" The company say that they have never been able to pay a dividend, and that they cannot float a loan.

Mr. HEDGES.—We sell the stamps for the letters which they carry.

Mr. KING O'MALLEY.—The total revenue we get from that source is £60,000 a year, and in return we propose to give the company £170,000 a year. Is this business in Australia? I am afraid I have come to the wrong country.

Mr. WILKS.—It is easy for the honorable member to go back.

Mr. KING O'MALLEY.—Nay; the scriptures enjoin us to go forth into the world, and preach the gospel to the heathen, and this state of things is heathenism. I am going to stay here and convert the honorable member, if possible. In the United States, we had a number of lines of steamships running to Louisiana, Texas, and other States. There were fifty or sixty different lines, but they are all in one ring now, under Morse, and President Roosevelt has ordered the United States Attorney-General to enter an action against the trust. Millions of pounds of the people's money are going to the lawyers to try to burst up

these rings. When we have such an opportunity, and it is proposed to lend the financial power and credit of the Commonwealth to a private corporation to float a loan, I ask, "Why don't we do it ourselves?" Let the Labour Party withdraw the name of Socialism, call it something else, but do it. I will surrender the name "Socialism" if another name will suit honorable members opposite. We might call it "The Water Lily Rockbound," after my church. Let us enter into this contract, say for two years, for the carriage of the mails, and in the meantime start to build our own line. If that is regarded as socialistic, will honorable members help me if I move that we should buy a controlling interest in the Orient Steam Navigation Company? Honorable members are fond of that company, and seem to feel that they are under a deep obligation to them, yet I found I had to pay just as much to them as to any other company when I wanted to travel.

Mr. MATHEWS.—We might buy a controlling interest in the company, as Disraeli did in the case of the Suez Canal.

Mr. KING O'MALLEY.—About thirty years ago, Disraeli bought a controlling interest in the Suez Canal, and those shares are now paying dividends of 28 per cent. to Great Britain. If it was good enough for Disraeli to take that action, honorable members should not be afraid to buy a controlling interest in this company with which they are all so much in love. I want to see Australia have a fleet. As soon as we have our own steam-ships, Canada, South Africa, India, and England will probably follow suit. The Union Jack will float over all those ships, and we shall have a practical Imperial Federation. Do honorable members opposite believe in the British Empire? Have they no faith in it? I was sorry to hear the right honorable member for Swan talk about wanting coloured men to man our ships.

Mr. HEDGES.—The right honorable member for Swan did not say that.

Mr. THOMAS.—He regretted that we could not employ coloured labour if we desired to.

Mr. KING O'MALLEY.—I wish to be fair. The name of the right honorable member for Swan will live in Australian history. He was a great explorer, and is a great man. He is a Britisher, who believes in the Empire. That is the kind of man I like. I am going to say what I like here about the Empire, but when any

outsider attacks it I shall be on the inside to fight the rooster outside. We want reforms from within, and not from without. I do not believe in panic scares, but a certain great nation in Europe has just voted £17,500,000 for additions to its navy. I do not know what that is for, unless it is to look after one specific nation. If that is so, does any honorable member believe that blackfellows manning British ships will lick the white Europeans that will man the ships of that great nation when the crash comes?

Mr. FOWLER.—The nation that the honorable member refers to does not allow coloured aliens on its ships.

Mr. KING O'MALLEY.—That is quite true. I mention no names, because it is best for us not to name nations, or talk war with them. If there is a war, we can never fight the white men of Europe with the coloured men of India.

Mr. MALONEY.—Admiral Field, in the House of Commons, said that it was impossible.

Mr. KING O'MALLEY.—That is what I say. Recently, when there was talk about the United States not being allowed to do certain things, a fleet of sixteen battle-ships was ordered to Manila. Our trouble, if any, will come from the East, and, at the present time, the United States is shouldering our burden for us. But we cannot expect the help of the United States, or of any other nation, unless we are prepared to help ourselves; and to do this there must be means of training white sailors in our merchant service. The northern States of America were full of sailors when the war broke out, because their flag was flying on merchant ships all the world over; but in the south, there were no sailors, because there, dependence was placed on slavery. I am sorry to think that in many countries patriotism is based on "boodle," and public sentiment and opinion can be created and guided by means of money. Booodle is the demonstrator of aristocratic patriotism. I admit that if we create a Commonwealth fleet of mail ships, a great battle will have to be fought for trade; but there is no need to depend on politicians to conduct business of this kind. We are at liberty to engage the best business talent in the country, just in the same way as, if we were to establish the postal banking system that I advocate, we should engage the services of those who are experienced in bank-

ing. Australia ought to be the leader of the Mother Country and of Canada, but, as a matter of fact, we are behind the latter place, as honorable members may gather from the facts in connexion with preferential trade. If we adopt the amendment of the honorable member for Barrier, we shall, at the end of ten years, have in our sinking fund £735,000; and we shall be the owners of better ships than are now engaged in the service. If honorable members will not go that far, let us buy half of the interest in the new mail steamers, and thus have half socialism and half individualism. I have to thank the honorable member for Franklin for calling my attention to an injustice which is inflicted upon Tasmania under this contract. The fruit-growers of Franklin and elsewhere in Tasmania have had to fight hard enough to keep their homes together, and it would be a serious matter for them if the mail ships should have it in their power to decline to call at Hobart. There might be a pliant Postmaster-General at the head of affairs, though I know that the present Minister is imbued with the spirit of justice and righteousness. If there were in control of the Department a Postmaster-General inclined to meet the views of the shipping company in this connexion, the fruit-growers of Tasmania would be absolutely ruined. My contention is that, within the four corners of this contract, it should be stipulated that the mail steamers shall call at Tasmania six times a year, whether they may be specially wanted there or not. There is the finest harbor in the world at Hobart, and the second finest is at Burnie. It will not do to leave this matter in the discretion of these gigantic corporations, who have no souls to be damned or bodies to be punished. The trouble is that the Government do not seem to have yet recognised the importance of Tasmania. That State entered Federation without making any special condition, although, as we know, the honorable member for Swan insisted on special terms for Western Australia. The fact is that at the Federal Convention the antiquated representatives of Tasmania were asleep, and, as the other delegates had been taught to respect old age, they were allowed to sleep on. I can remember well as a boy, when the *Great Eastern* came to America from England, and people declared that she represented a piece of folly, and that vessels of her class would never be able to reach New

York without lightening their cargo. But the *Great Eastern* was only an infant compared with the *Lusitania*. What I am afraid of is that within the ten years during which this contract is to run—

Mr. MATHEWS.—Twelve years.

Mr. KING O'MALLEY.—Surely not? I was afraid to read the contract carefully, lest my conscience should turn against the Ministry. My feeling just now is that I should keep the members of the present Government in power until they die by effluxion of time. I do not wish to believe that they have been guilty of making such a bad bargain that I should be obliged to turn against them. I ask the Minister to say now whether he will have what I have suggested inserted in the contract?

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—We should strike the proviso out.

Mr. KING O'MALLEY.—If we strike out the proviso, this soulless corporation will say, "Our boats will not go to Tasmania unless you give us £4,000 or £10,000," and we shall never see them unless we make some special arrangement of that kind.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—We could leave the clause in and strike out the proviso.

Mr. KING O'MALLEY.—If the honorable member means that we should insist upon these boats going to Hobart, I am with him; but I want to have everything in black and white when I deal with a corporation, and I want to sleep on the contract for a week before I sign it, lest there should be some means by which the corporation could escape their obligations. I seriously object to the differential rates that are known as "rebates." If one Melbourne merchant is in a position to make more advantageous terms with the steamship companies than are granted to his competitors, he will destroy his rivals in trade as Rockefeller has done in the United States. One merchant might say, "I shall ship my goods by your steamers, but if I do I shall expect a 30 per cent. rebate," and the company might say, "Very well; we agree, and at the end of the year we will give you a rebate of 30 per cent. on the freight charged on your goods."

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—That kind of thing is done now.

Mr. KING O'MALLEY.—That is so; and it means that every small shipper must go to the wall. This practice of granting rebates has destroyed hundreds of business men in the United States, and by this

means, within the last sixteen years, one huge corporation in that country has succeeded in plundering the people of £200,000,000, which has been paid out in dividends to the shareholders. There should be inserted in this contract provision for a heavy penalty against the granting of rebates. If honorable members say that those who feel injured might appeal to the Courts, that would involve the briefing and refreshing of barristers, the fight would be continued for years, and the citizens of Australia would lose whichever way the case went. I say that the responsibility to fight the steamship companies should not rest with the merchants, but with the Government.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—Everything we require should be contained within the four corners of the contract.

Mr. KING O'MALLEY.—That is what I say. I should insist upon this shipping corporation keeping out of rings so far as the trade of Australia is concerned. A good point was raised by an honorable member here to-day. Ships are leaving Australia now every week for England, and for £40,000 a year we could get our mails carried under the poundage system. Forty thousand pounds a year for ten years, with interest at 3½ per cent., would be about £485,000. If we take £485,000 from £2,064,000, we have £1,579,000, which this Commonwealth could save by adopting the poundage system, and with which we could start to build our own steamships, and so to push on the federation of the British Empire. I want to do something for the Empire. I desire that years after we are dead and buried people shall be able to say, "The Federal Parliament of Australia, at such and such a time, established the British Empire Steamship Company. They established a line of steamers owned by the Commonwealth, and now State-owned vessels are to be found in every part of the Empire, carrying marines and training men." Every man on board of these vessels would be both a soldier and sailor, and would be trained to shoot, to love the flag and the nation, and to fight for the nation. The talk we hear about individual liberty and personal liberty is ridiculous. When I lived among the Yaki Indians, in Mexico, I found they had individual liberty. They did as they liked. They stood on their heads naked if they pleased, and they danced the war dance

on Sunday ; but in civilized countries there is no such thing as individual liberty. Let three or four honorable members stand at the corner of a street here, and the constable will tell them to move on. The liberty of the individual must be silenced as the liberty of the community advances.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Even the Postmaster-General is not at liberty to make this contract.

Mr. KING O'MALLEY.—That is so ; and we ought to bear with the Postmaster-General. It is bad policy for men to come in here and denounce individuals. The policy and arguments of honorable members opposite may be bad, but they are not themselves bad. Let me ask honorable members to put the question of Socialism aside, and work for the nation. We should remember that we are not legislating for ourselves. I will be out of this in a few years, and most other honorable members will follow me, and I desire that the rising generation should be able to say, "You put down the land-marks, and we are proud to follow on the lines you laid down. Joe Cook, Wilks, and McWilliams did this. It was good enough for them, and it is good enough for us to go on and improve upon them."

Mr. WILKS (Dalley) [9.14].—We have listened to practically the same debate for three nights running. We are dealing to-night with a motion for the ratification of a mail contract. I mention the fact lest there should be some misunderstanding on the subject. Last night we dealt with the Manufactures Encouragement Bill, in connexion with which the question of nationalization was raised, and the same arguments were used in discussing that question then. We are told that we have either to accept or reject the contract ; that we cannot amend it.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—Then what is the object of discussing it ?

Mr. MAUGER.—Honorable members may take the responsibility of rejecting it.

Mr. WILKS.—Apparently if we disapprove of any part of the contract, that is the only course open to us. No honorable member has yet expressed entire approval of the agreement. Some honorable members are dissatisfied with the terms, others with the extent of the subsidy, and others again with the direction of the contract.

Mr. MAUGER.—It contains forty-nine clauses, and objection has been taken to only two short ones.

Mr. WILKS.—Many of the clauses are comparatively unimportant. In his own grotesque style the honorable member for Darwin has presented a good many sound arguments to the House. I have always been opposed to subsidies and subventions. Under this contract the people of Australia are called upon to pay a large sum of money in order to provide—so far as the carriage of mails is concerned—for an accelerated service for the sole benefit of the mercantile community. To the average man a delay of two days in the delivery of a letter from the dear Old Mother Land is a matter of no importance ; but those who call themselves anti-Socialists are asking the people to pay a subsidy to provide an accelerated mail service for one distinct class. We find, also, that this contract provides, not merely for the carriage of mails, but for the cheap and speedy transit of the products of certain classes to the old world. It is both a mail and a commercial contract.

Mr. SINCLAIR.—But does the contract provide for the cheap carriage of perishable products ?

Mr. WILKS.—If it does not the honorable member will be able to vote against it. If anti-Socialists are prepared to vote a large subsidy to a company to secure special freights for the carriage of perishable produce—for the benefit of primary producers—then they are not far removed from the Labour Party, who ask us to go a step further and nationalize this shipping service. I am absolutely opposed to its nationalization.

Mr. KING O'MALLEY.—Would not the honorable member meet us half way ?

Mr. WILKS.—No. If I had my way I should abolish the subsidy altogether, because I think that it is an improper impost upon thousands of the people of Australia who have no interest in this contract. At the end of ten years we shall have paid £1,700,000 by way of subsidy under this agreement, and shall have nothing to show for it. And yet we are told that this is a good bargain. I do not think that it is. When the Reid-McLean Administration signed a contract for a mail service at a subsidy of £120,000 per annum they were severely criticised, and yet some honorable members declare that a contract which provides for an increased subsidy of £170,000 per annum is an excellent one. I admit that the Orient Steam Navigation Company has had a hard struggle in the Australian trade. This has been due to the

fact that, unlike the Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Company, it has not had an auxiliary trade. The Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Company has an Eastern trade, its Australian trade being merely an auxiliary service, whilst the German line of mail steamers, which receive a national subsidy, has not only an Australian, but also a Western trade. Whether we give them a subsidy or not, they must, if they are to remain in the Australian trade, have new boats. Vessels like the *Orontes* pay well; but a steamer like the *Ophir*, which came into prominence some years ago on being chartered to bring the Duke of York to Australia, pays only when it is being used for yachting cruises on the Mediterranean and elsewhere. It burns too much coal, and has too little cargo space to be able to compete successfully with vessels of large carrying capacity. It must be admitted that the Orient Steam Navigation Company have always laid themselves out more than the Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Company to cater for the Australian passenger and goods traffic, though the Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Company are not quite so conservative nor so swagger as they were some years ago. I give credit to the Orient Steam Navigation Company for what they have done for the Australian trade, and would rather they than any other got this contract. They have paid only four or five dividends; but, on the other hand, it must be remembered that their managerial and office expenses are very heavy. They have also had great losses, and suffer for lack of an auxiliary and feeding service. This is, however, an excellent bargain for them. They are to get £170,000 a year for ten years, to do what they would have been compelled by competition to do in any case—to shorten the journey from England by fifty-eight hours. But the public is being asked to pay too much for this gain. That would be admitted by any body of persons outside the mercantile community. The people at large will not be in favour of paying £170,000 a year merely to get their letters from England fifty-eight hours earlier. The days of subsidies have nearly gone. A few years ago in England a strong effort was made to abolish subsidies; but they were revived because Germany was subsidizing German vessels, not to obtain mail services, but to assist in building up

a navy, to encourage colonization, and to force her trade upon the outer world. The last mail contract has, after months of haggling, fallen through. The sum of £25,000 for which security was given has not yet been recovered.

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—We shall get it.

Mr. WILKS.—I should like to know that it was safe in the Treasury. The honorable gentleman thought that he had made his position safe, but, although no one would call him a fool, or say that he could not see through a sharp deal, apparently those with whom he negotiated were too shrewd for him. Another objection I have to the proposed contract is that it is for too long a period. The right honorable member for Swan said that things would hardly get into working order before we should be thinking of renewing the contract, though afterwards he admitted that the term was a little too long. I do not know why we should not seek to amend this clause of the contract. Surely the Orient Steam Navigation Company are not in such a strong position that they can say that they will not consent to alter a mere draft agreement.

Mr. ATKINSON.—This is a signed contract.

Mr. WILKS.—It has been signed merely subject to the approval of Parliament, and I do not see why Ministers should not accept amendments in it. If Parliament amended it, they could draw up a fresh agreement, and say, "Are you prepared to accept the will of Parliament, or will you forego the contract altogether?" No one can foretell the changes which the next twelve years may bring. The increased use of turbines, the substitution of oil for coal as a fuel, and other improvements are all tending to increase speed and to reduce cost, while the inventive genius of the world is directed towards discovering still further improvements. Another reason why I say that the term of the proposed contract is too long, is that we have no right to bind the public for twelve years. We do not know that before the end of that time there will not be a strong desire for the nationalization of this service.

Mr. CARR.—The people would vote for it now, if there were a referendum.

Mr. WILKS.—If my electors gave me any mandate, it was against nationalization, not only of the iron, but also of the shipping industry. All who stood as

anti-Socialists must oppose nationalization in any form. I admit that the proposed experiment offers more probability of success than others that could be undertaken, because the possibilities of profit and loss are clearly ascertainable. If we once commence an enterprise of this kind, we shall have to continue it. But, apart altogether from my objection to nationalization, I am opposed to the proposal of the honorable member for Barrier on the ground that we have already too many public servants in Australia. I can remember when the foremost radicals of the Labour Party in New South Wales used to speak of the civil servants as parasites, as men in easy billets, who do little for the money they draw. I do not wish to add another Department to the Commonwealth Public Service. I do not want to make Australia a gigantic civil service. It is believed that five-sixths of the public service now vote for labour candidates, which may be the reason why the Labour Party defends the service so stoutly.

Mr. KING O'MALLEY.—We want to raise the standard of wages.

Mr. WILKS.—I admit that our public servants, generally speaking, do their work well; but I do not think that we should create more. Those who are in favour of spending £170,000 a year to get a quicker mail service for the mercantile community, and to obtain lower freights and better conditions for the shippers of primary produce, are sailing perilously near to nationalization. By supporting a proposal of this kind, they are supporting a proposal for extending the sphere of governmental activity. While they are desirous of spending the people's money in the interest of the mercantile and commercial classes, the Labour Party have a right to ask that the interests of the masses shall also be considered. Coming now to the labour question, I have always been an advocate for the employment of white labour. I have differed from my leader upon that subject. I am absolutely in accord with that portion of the agreement which renders the employment of white labour upon our mail steamers compulsory. My reason is that Australia has yet to build up her mercantile marine and her naval forces, and she cannot accomplish these things unless she provides employment for her own seamen. To-day Great Britain experiences considerable difficulty in manning her vessels with people of our own race. I have heard it said that the coloured alien makes

a better fireman than does the white man. Speaking with some knowledge of the subject, I say that he does not. But the truth is that the lascar is more amenable to discipline. If one were to ask an engineer on board our mail steamers what class of firemen he preferred, his answer would always be in favour of the white man twenty-four hours after the vessel had left port. For the first twenty-four hours the white man is disposed to be rather restive, but after that he settles down to his work and is in reality equal to three coloured men. Take the case of Britain's warships by way of illustration. Are they manned by coloured firemen? The stokehold of *H.M.S. Powerful* is, I venture to say, from seven to eight degrees hotter than are the stoke-holds in our mail steamers. Yet none save white men are employed there. It is merely a question of the payment of a standard wage. One of the redeeming features of the Orient Steam Navigation Company has been that up till very recently they voluntarily manned their vessels with white labour. When the Labour Party in this House submitted their proposal in favour of the nationalization of our mail service they knew very well that it would not be carried. Had they desired to carry it, why did they not submit it in the Senate, where they have a majority? The Government would then have had either to accept or reject it. To those who talk so much about Socialism and Christianity, I would commend the statement of a German writer—

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Germany again!

Mr. WILKS.—Nearly all authoritative authors upon Socialism are Germans. The writer whom I have in mind declared that the great distinction between Christianity and Socialism was that the former means "Mine is thine," whilst the latter means "Thine is mine."

Mr. McDUGALL.—He knew a great deal about Socialism.

Mr. WILKS.—Undoubtedly he did. There are honorable members of this House who were as well versed in the subject of Socialism twenty years ago as is the honorable member to-day. I shall move—

That the following words be added to the motion, "Subject to the inclusion in the Agreement of a clause providing that whenever practicable the mail steamers shall be docked in Australia."

Now the words "whenever practicable" do not imply that we have first to inquire whether we have the necessary docking ac-

commodation. There is no doubt that we have. There are two docks to my knowledge which can accommodate the largest ships trading with Australia. They will accommodate *H.M.S. Powerful*, which draws more water going over the sill than do the mail steamers. The Postmaster-General is nominally responsible, though the contract was laid before the House by the Prime Minister. The honorable gentleman himself said nothing on its behalf. But if we insert conditions for the benefit of the commercial community, it is only fair that Australia should have the benefit of some of the docking. I do not ask that the vessels shall be docked here during their periodical overhauling. What I mean is simply that whenever practicable they shall be docked in Australia.

Mr. MAUGER.—The company could not do it as a regular thing. There would not be time.

Mr. WILKS.—The vessels spend the same period in port at this end as they do in London. The ex-Postmaster-General would not insert a provision as to docking in the last contract, but he secured a verbal undertaking from the contractors. Cannot the present Postmaster-General do that?

Mr. MAUGER.—The company will do their best, but they will not include a provision in the contract.

Mr. WILKS.—I simply mean that the ships should be docked here whenever practicable. My desire is that Australia shall have its share of the docking. Those who are protectionists and believe in the employment of our own labour should support me in this respect, because I can assure them that there are thousands of people who would every year make something out of the docking of the vessels here. The honorable member for Lang has moved a very useful amendment, which I shall support. He asks that the term of the contract shall be reduced to seven years. That should be quite enough. Surely the company do not require a guarantee of ten years before they will undertake the contract.

Mr. MAUGER.—They do.

Mr. WILKS.—It is not to be supposed that the Orient Steam Navigation Company intend to go out of the Australian trade. They intend to fight for business as hard as they can. The mere fact of reducing the term from ten to seven years will not vitiate the agreement. But we shall be able to make fresh arrangements both as to freights

and fares if we provide for the shorter term. I do not think that the Australian public will receive an adequate recompense for the £1,700,000 which they will pay to this company in the ten years. At the end of the period we shall have nothing to show for our money. I quite agree with the honorable member for Barrier in that respect, though I am not prepared to vote for nationalization, which would mean creating another branch of the Public Service. But if the Labour Party increase in power, they may desire to submit a scheme for a national steam-ship service before the end of ten years. Why should they be clewed for so long a period?

Mr. MAUGER.—We can buy the ships at any time.

Mr. WILKS.—Yes; at a price.

Mr. MAUGER.—Of course; we could not get them without a price.

Mr. WILKS.—I mean that we can buy them at the company's own price.

Mr. MAUGER.—The price will be fixed by arbitration.

Mr. WILKS.—I was not aware of that, which is a fair condition. I again ask honorable members to support me in regard to the docking conditions, which might be made the subject of a supplementary agreement.

Mr. MAUGER.—We will try to get all we can for the honorable member.

Mr. WILKS.—Why not embody the condition in an agreement?

Mr. MAUGER.—We cannot do that; the honorable member must know that this contract has only been arrived at after enormous struggle and toil.

Mr. WILKS.—Well, there is not a Bill which Parliament considers that is not the result of enormous struggle and toil. But do we trouble about that? We simply slash Bills to pieces if we do not like them.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—The company will not drop it; they have too good a thing on.

Mr. MAUGER.—The House has either to accept this agreement or reject it.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—Very well, then, if the Minister talks like that, let us reject it.

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—Does the honorable member say that he would vote for rejecting this contract?

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—Yes, if we cannot get it in the form that we desire; and then throw out the Government for agreeing to it.

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—The honorable member and his party are not strong enough to do that.

Mr. WILKS.—I begin to think that the Postmaster-General and the Minister of Trade and Customs are the champion bluffers of Australia. I used to think that our Christian friend, the Postmaster-General, was too sincere to be a bluffer, but I have changed my opinion after his attempt to make us believe that the Orient Steam Navigation Company would throw up a good thing for the small detail which I am asking for. Now, the Labour Party either mean business or they do not. Are they serious in regard to their amendment?

Mr. MAUGER.—Nationalization means, of course, throwing out the whole contract.

Mr. WILKS.—Does the Minister say that we cannot alter a word of it?

Mr. MAUGER.—I say that the House has either to accept it or reject it. If the House votes for nationalization it means rejection.

Mr. WILKS.—Surely the Minister does not mean to say that a little amendment providing for the docking of ships would cause the Orient Steam Navigation Company to surrender their contract? It is absurd.

Mr. MAUGER.—Such an amendment would vitiate the contract, because we should have to go all over the ground again. Then we should have to wait until the Senate met, send home to London, and make an entirely fresh arrangement.

Mr. WILKS.—We are not children. The Postmaster-General is not talking to a Sunday School now.

Mr. MAUGER.—Unfortunately, I know that perfectly well.

Mr. WILKS.—I wish he would recognise it, and not talk so childishly about this matter. The representatives of the Orient Steam Navigation Company signed this agreement on the distinct understanding that it was subject to the approval of Parliament. It is not a live document until it has been approved by Parliament. How can we vitiate something which is not alive? I think I now understand why the Postmaster-General has neither attempted to explain this agreement nor to defend it. Had he done so, he would have made a ten times more miserable job of it than he has done by his interjections. I now understand why the Honorable Samuel Mauger merely lent his name to this document, whilst the Prime Minister did all the work, and he is well advised by the Cabinet.

Mr. MALONEY.—It is a fair division of labour.

Mr. WILKS.—It is so far as the Postmaster-General is concerned. I am not at all interested at the Cabinet saying to him,

"Drop the contract on the table; do not attempt to say a word about it." I ask honorable members are they so childish as to believe that the mere carrying of any amendment, except that of the honorable member for Barrier, is going to vitiate the contract? I hope that my amendment will be carried.

Mr. MATHEWS (Melbourne Ports) [9.55].—In a deliberative and statute-building assembly like this we can hardly expect arguments to have any effect. If they had any effect our proposal to establish a national mail service would have been carried by this time. I feel very disappointed, because I had hopes that the age of reason would come in my time. In putting off the acceptance of our proposal for twelve years the Commonwealth will lose a golden opportunity of building and owning a mail fleet. Like all Heaven-born politicians, I had an idea as well as other honorable members. I believed—although I may be called Utopian for holding the opinion—that we had a splendid opportunity of not only owning a mail fleet, but also combining in that fleet part of our defence from the sea stand-point.

Mr. CROUCH.—Let us run the steamers as torpedo boats.

Mr. MATHEWS.—The honorable member may run a wheelbarrow for a torpedo boat for all I care. I am endeavouring to express what I consider common-sense. In view of the fact that the nations of Europe have been subsidizing their mail boats to act as auxiliary fleets, is it out of the way to imagine that Australia could build and own a fleet of mail steamers which could when required act as cruisers? What could be better for us, so far distant as we are from the Old World, than to own mail steam-ships able to act as cruisers or men-of-war, and to defend themselves when carrying the commerce of Australia? There is nothing far-fetched in that idea. It can be grasped, I suppose, by even the most dense member either here or elsewhere. We are asked to sanction an annual expenditure of £170,000, and I believe that £120,000 of that sum would be lost. For what purpose? To carry the mails a little more quickly, and to give a little Socialism to those who say that they do not want it, namely, the commercial men. That is what it really means. The commercial men who are represented in the Opposition corner, on the Opposition benches, and also, I believe, on the Government benches, and who have always decried any proposal with a

socialistic tendency, will under this very contract get as large a slice of Socialism as they can hope to get in one bite.

Mr. WILKS.—It does not make them sick, either.

Mr. MATHEWS.—It would take a lot of that kind of Socialism to make the commercial men of Australia sick. We have heard a great deal here concerning our sea-going defence, and the building of cruisers. We are told that we are wasting time in that regard, and that if we attempt to do anything different from what is done by the Mother Country, we shall be doing something wrong. Perhaps if we built a fleet of ships for both mail and commercial purposes, the commercial men might say, "We will not give you any assistance." I suppose that those who had butter, meat, and wool to send Home would not employ Government-owned ships, because they do not believe in Socialism when it operates against their class.

Mr. KING O'MALLEY.—But they would have to pay just the same.

Mr. MATHEWS.—Yes. Seeing that the State is engaged in the carriage of goods throughout Australia by land, what great stretch of imagination is it to suppose that it could operate in that direction on water, in spite of all the opposition which might be offered to its boats? There is one point on which the honorable member for Barrier and I will always differ. During his address, he expressed the opinion that the mail ships of the Commonwealth must be built in the Old Country, as there was no possible chance of getting them built in Australia. Some honorable members remarked that the boats could be built here at a price, and the price seemed to bar their local construction. Suppose that it did cost Australia £100,000 more per boat to have the fleet built here? We shall have to start building our boats at some time or other. Could a start in that direction be made at a better time than when the Commonwealth Government, in making this contract, and bringing into existence a fleet in respect of which the people of Australia will pay an annual subsidy of £170,000 for ten years? I could have no objection to honorable members on the other side, like the honorable member for North Sydney and the honorable member for Parramatta, opposing the local construction of mail boats. But when I see protectionists who at other times say that we can do this

and that in Australia joining sides with those who say that we cannot at any time build ships, I am deeply disappointed. If we do not make a start we never will build any ships. It was on that point that I differed from the honorable member for Barrier.

Mr. THOMAS.—I hold that at present it is impossible.

Mr. MATHEWS.—To the mechanics of Australia nothing is impossible. They can do anything which can be done in any other part of the world.

Mr. CROUCH.—Move an amendment.

Mr. MATHEWS.—The honorable member is again at his wheel-barrow torpedo boat. I suppose that if there were some fishing boats to be constructed here he might be more interested. I believe that I am striking a note. We could despatch our mails on the poundage system by various steamers trading to our ports, and if we are not ready now to enter upon the construction of a Federal fleet, perhaps in two or three years we might be prepared to take that step. Is there an honorable member who does not believe that during the next ten years the commercial world, and the sea-going boats may be revolutionized? Here we are asked to commit the Commonwealth to a contract service for a period of ten years, and to forego an opportunity, which may not recur for a period of fifty years, of bringing into existence a fleet which would be beneficial not only to the commercial classes, but also to the men who are looking for work whereby they may earn a living. I do not wish to discuss this matter at all exhaustively, but I had hoped that before the expiration of twelve years Australia would cease to be dependent upon a private corporation for the carriage of its mails. We have been told by the Government that we must either accept the contract or leave it alone. I shall vote against their motion. Those who wish to see any amendments made in the contract will, of course, do just as they like. I believe that in voting for its ratification honorable members will be foregoing an opportunity which Australia will not have until the expiration of twelve years. I shall not be one of those who will vote to throw away a glorious opportunity to benefit the people of Australia, especially the workers.

Mr. MCWILLIAMS (Franklin) [10.3].—This is the third occasion on which the

House has, since I became a member of it, been called upon to ratify a mail contract. If there has been anything which was likely to convert honorable members to the amendment of the honorable member for Barrier it has been the blundering and muddling in connexion with those three contracts. The first contract submitted to the House in my time was made by Mr. Sydney Smith, as Postmaster-General, on behalf of the Commonwealth Government. I was one of the few members supporting the then Government who opposed its ratification, believing that it was not a satisfactory one. However, it was approved. Then we had what is known as the "Croker contract," which, in my opinion, should not have been submitted to the House, because it was a bit of syndicate-mongering from start to finish. We all remember the eulogistic terms in which it was recommended for our approval. How is the present contract submitted? Honorable members are told by the Government, "Here is the contract. You can discuss its provisions, but if you alter a word in them it will be withdrawn."

Mr. KING O'MALLEY.—Let them withdraw it! Who cares?

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—I agree with the honorable member. That is not the way in which a contract of this kind should have been presented to the representatives of the States for their approval.

Mr. McDougall.—One would think that the syndicate was greater than Parliament.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—According to the Government, this Parliament, representing the whole of the people of Australia, is to go down on its knees to a company because the company may say, "If you do not take the contract which we now offer we will withdraw it, and you cannot get a contract anywhere else." That is mere empty bluff. Let any one analyze the figures, and see whether or not the contract is one that the company will withdraw from. We are to pay the company £170,000 a year for ten years. They are to build five new boats, at an estimated cost of £300,000 each. That means that the Commonwealth will absolutely buy those boats, and present them to the company, giving them a substantial sum in addition to assist to run the boats. The five new boats will cost £1,500,000, interest upon which, at 5 per cent., is £75,000 per annum. Consequently we are giving the company

£95,000 per year after making them a present of their boats. That is the contract in which we are told that the Commonwealth is making such a splendid deal that if a word of it is altered it will be rejected, and we shall have to go down on our knees to the company. If the contract is not altered, I shall be one to assist to the utmost of my ability to give the company an opportunity of saying what they will do if we refuse to accept it.

Mr. CROUCH.—It is a triumph for Mr. Mauger!

Mr. MAUGER.—That is what the Senate said.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—We are not here to discuss what the Senate said or did. It is hardly necessary to deal with that aspect of the case any longer, because the figures speak for themselves. We are asked to tie the hands of the Commonwealth, by the interim contract and the new contract, for twelve years, although it has been pointed out very forcibly that, within that period, the whole of the commercial relations of Australia with the rest of the world may be entirely revolutionized. Even if that happens there will be no possibility of our getting out of the payment of this large sum, and the rates which we fix now are to be quite unalterable. The contract is not a good one; it is altogether in favour of the company; it is an exceedingly bad one, from a financial stand-point, for the people of Australia, and I protest once more against such a proposal being thrown on the table without a word of explanation, while this House, representing the people of Australia, is told that it must not alter a comma lest the company drop the contract. One very important point, which it was the bounden duty of the Postmaster-General to explain to the House, has not been touched upon yet. We are fixing in this contract for the first time maximum rates for the mail company to charge for the carriage of produce, and we are also preventing any differential charges being made as between the different States.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Does the honorable member think that there should be differential charges?

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—I do not say so. I am referring to the conditions in the contract. Who is to allot the space among the States? Who is to prevent any man or company in one State from contracting for the whole of the space, to the detriment of the other States?

Mr. MAUGER.—Who prevents that now?

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—Do I understand the Postmaster-General to say that there is to be no regulation in this regard, and that we are to fix the maximum charges and leave it to any speculator to contract for the whole space, thus putting the producers of Australia at his mercy? Is no provision made for a fair distribution of the space, so that the producer, in whose interest these conditions are inserted, and not the middleman, may get the benefit? If there is no such provision, the House should be doubly careful before ratifying the agreement. A very serious responsibility will rest upon the Postmaster-General in this regard. There is only one fair way in which the contract can be carried out. For instance, provision is made for the carriage of butter. If New South Wales exports half the butter from Australia, half the space, and no more, should be allotted to her. If Victoria exports one-third, she should have one-third of the space, and no more. Other States should have their fair share reserved for them, and speculators in the larger centres should be prevented from mopping up the space and blackmailing the producers elsewhere before they can touch it.

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—Does the honorable member contend that we should rent all the space and take the risk of filling it?

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—If we compel the company to provide a certain amount of space and fix the charges in the interests of the producers, the Postmaster-General should see that each contributing State receives fair play. The Government have now interfered in these matters. I do not say that they should rent the space and distribute it. But unless they see that each contributing State gets fair play, the State which has the first port of call will have the others at its mercy.

Mr. MAUGER.—Has that ever happened?

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—We have never had conditions such as these before. Hitherto, there has been fair open competition between the States, who have bargained privately for their own space, and secured it.

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—They can do that now.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—That interjection shows that the Government have not given the subject the slightest consideration. The States cannot do it now, because the Go-

vernment have fixed in the agreement the maximum charges which can be made, and there will be no possibility of competition. I give the Government credit for the maximum charges which they have fixed, and which are distinctly favorable so far as fruit is concerned.

Mr. MAUGER.—Are they not favorable in the case of butter?

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—The advantage is not nearly so great in the case of butter. There are companies now carrying butter from Australia at a lower rate than is fixed in the agreement, so that the advantage as regards butter is not appreciable.

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—All the butter experts say the contrary.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—The Prime Minister distinctly said quite the reverse of what the Minister of Trade and Customs now says. We have been told that one company is carrying at 1s. 10d. a box, and that arrangements are being made whereby this company shall raise the charge to 2s. So far as the carriage of fruit in the mail boats is concerned, there is a distinct reduction in price. We have been paying to the mail boats, under private contract, up to 3s. 3d. per case for apples; and now the maximum charge is fixed at 2s. 7½d., which, of course, is a distinct advantage to the fruit-grower.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—What is the honorable member objecting to?

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—A proviso has been inserted in the contract which will deprive the Tasmanian producers of the whole of the advantages they have hitherto enjoyed. In clause 9, paragraph 8, it is provided that at least six of the mail boats shall call each year at Hobart during the apple season, but there is the following proviso:—

Provided always that if in any year the contractors shall prove, to the satisfaction of the Postmaster-General, that calls at Hobart during that year are or would be unprofitable the Postmaster-General may direct that the whole or any of such calls for that year may be omitted.

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—That is at the option of the Government. This is the first time that the mail boats have been bound to call at Hobart; and, apparently, the honorable member is trying to prevent that part of the contract from being carried out.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—The Minister of Trade and Customs is trying to draw me off the track. The proviso is an absolute sham, because it will really place the fruit-growers at a disadvantage.

Mr. PAGE.—Does not the honorable member think that the six Tasmanian senators are as much interested in Tasmania as he is?

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—If the honorable member for Maranoa were acquainted with the facts, he would know that one of the Tasmanian senators proposed that this proviso should be omitted, but, unfortunately, the other Tasmanian senators had already spoken and could not second the amendment.

Mr. CROUCH.—Whatever the senators did, the honorable member has his duty to perform.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—Precisely; I am trying to do what is right; and what the Senate may or may not have done does not influence me. In this matter Ministers have acted in absolute ignorance of a trade which they are attempting to regulate. For the last seventeen years the mail steamers have been chartered by the fruit-growers themselves.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—And the fruit-growers in Tasmania have taken all the space, and left none for other producers.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—That is not so. What I desire is that the Postmaster-General shall so act that the producers of no one State shall receive more than their fair share.

Mr. MAUGER.—That cannot be done unless we take the whole of the space.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—Yes it can. The contract, in this connexion, is vague in the extreme, and shows a lack of knowledge of the business.

Mr. MAUGER.—The Prime Minister invited the States to co-operate, and they all declined.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—Of course they did, because this is a matter which can be better managed by the States than by the Federal Government; and the terms of the contract proves that to be the case. For the last seventeen years the calls by mail boats at Hobart have averaged eleven per annum.

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—That means eleven calls between the two lines of steamers, whereas now there will be twelve calls.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—Of course, if the fruit-growers choose, they could charter the boats to call all the year round. Surely Ministers are not going to take credit for the fact that calls have been made at Hobart by mail boats chartered by the fruit-

growers at their own expense? I desire to show the danger of this proviso. Occasions might arise when it would be easy for the shipping company to show that it would be unprofitable to call at Hobart. There is one maximum scale of charges for all ports; and the boats which are compelled to call at Adelaide and Melbourne may dispose of all their available space at those ports, and then, of course, there would be no inducement to go to Hobart—in other words, it would be unprofitable to go.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Would that not be the case if there was no contract at all?

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—If there was no contract, the fruit-growers could charter the steamers as they have done in the past, without any Government interference; and they are quite prepared to do so. The terms of the contract show, I am sorry to say, that the Treasurer has failed to grasp the situation. The contract makes it impossible for the Tasmanian producers to charter the boats, because a maximum charge of 60s. has been fixed, and, of course, no vessel can be chartered at over that rate. We cannot suppose that a mail boat, which could fill up at Melbourne, Adelaide, and Sydney would steam 400 or 500 miles in order to pick up cargo at the same rate. The fruit-growers of Tasmania have hitherto been able to obtain the mail boats, because, having the larger quantity to ship, they were able to outbid the producers of other States.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Now the honorable member has let the cat out of the bag!

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—This contract opens the door to secret commissions, as an inducement for the mail boats to call at Hobart.

Mr. CROUCH.—Is not the honorable member's argument in favour of a differential rate for Tasmania?

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—Somebody would have to make it worth the while of the agent to decide that it would be profitable for the boats to visit Hobart. I object to Tasmania being placed in this position when the boats are to call at the ports of the other States free.

Mr. HEDGES.—Not at Fremantle.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—Fremantle is not placed in the same position as Hobart. It is not necessary under this contract to show that it would be profitable for the boats to go to Fremantle before they are obliged

to call at that port. Tasmania, under the contract, will pay £6,800 towards the subsidy, and if the boats are to call at Hobart only six times we shall be paying more per trip than any other State in the Commonwealth.

Mr. HEDGES.—But Tasmania will get her mails all the year round.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—That applies to the other States also. We are willing to make the contribution for which we are asked under this contract if we have a guarantee that the boats will call at Hobart. The honorable member for Darwin illustrated the difficulty under which our exporters would labour. Suppose one of these boats is due at Hobart on 27th February. The people who have fruit to export must bring it to the wharf at Hobart, and I remind honorable members that it would be absolutely worthless for anything but export to England. It would be picked at an early stage to ripen on the voyage. It would not be in a marketable condition for sale in Tasmania or in Australia, and if it is not shipped to London it might just as well be thrown into the sea. If the proviso to which I take exception were allowed to remain, there would be no certainty that the fruit brought to the wharf at Hobart would be shipped for London. Contracts for the carriage of fruit have to be made twelve months in advance. We make our contracts in Tasmania in November for shipment in the following year. Under these conditions those who have fruit to export would have to bring it to the wharf at Hobart without knowing until, perhaps, the very last moment, whether the mail-ship would call for it or not. I ask honorable members to see that justice is done to Tasmania in this matter. We do not want the boats to call all the year round, because we have not trade for them, but we have been getting them to call at our own expense for the last seventeen years. If the Government were passing a mail contract pure and simple for the carriage of mails between England and Adelaide, the first port at which the advantage of railway communication could be availed of, we should be content; but the Government are proposing something more than a mail contract. They are proposing that we should give a very large subsidy, not merely for the carriage of mails, but also in order to subsidize the export trade in perishable products—for that is what this contract

means—and that being so, I ask that in the name of common justice all the States should be put on the same footing.

Mr. MAUGER.—Tasmania will be on a better footing than Victoria and South Australia, because the boats will go direct from Sydney to Hobart.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—Tasmania will not be on a better footing than the States referred to so long as we are left to the mercy of any one who may ring into this contract something that is not there. No business men would sign a contract containing the proviso to which I take exception. In making a contract, the terms of the service for which we are paying should be definitely stated, and we should, in this contract, provide for a definite service to the principal ports of all the States in Australia. Last year I fought to the best of my ability to prevent the continuance of what I believed to be an injustice to Queensland. That State was at the time called upon to bear her proportion of the subsidy without getting the benefit of the service. I am glad to see that under this contract justice is to be done to Queensland, and I ask that Tasmania should be placed in the same position.

Mr. PAGE.—Does the honorable member desire that we should assist him to strike out the proviso to which he has referred?

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—Yes.

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—The honorable member does not wish the boats to go to Tasmania at all.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—I hope the Minister of Trade and Customs will not attempt to mislead the honorable member for Maranoa. In answer to the honorable member's question, I say that I wish to retain the clause, and to strike out the proviso. In the clause it is provided that the boats shall go six times a year to Hobart, whilst the proviso says that if the company can show that it would not be profitable for the boats to call at Hobart, the Postmaster-General shall be at liberty to relieve them of the obligation to call. I say that the proviso would place Tasmania in a worse position than she is in now, because until the last minute our exporters would not know whether a boat was going to call in at Hobart or not, and whether the perishable produce brought to the wharf could be got away.

Mr. MAUGER.—If the fruit were on the Hobart wharf that would be a good reason why the boats should call there.

Mr. MCWILLIAMS.—The whole of their space might have been applied for by the exporters of fruit from Victoria and South Australia, and in that case the company could claim that it would not be profitable for the boat to call at Hobart.

Mr. MAUGER.—But they would visit Tasmania before they called at Melbourne or Adelaide.

Mr. MCWILLIAMS.—The honorable gentleman overlooks the fact that it is a question of whether the space on the boats is taken up or not. These boats will not call at a port to find out whether they could get cargo. Under existing conditions we apply for the space we require for the shipment of fruit twelve months in advance of shipment. We have had eleven boats calling at Hobart annually during the last seventeen years at our own expense, but this contract by providing for maximum charges would prevent our ships from arranging a private charter.

Mr. MAUGER.—Would prevent them from quoting differential rates.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—And from securing a monopoly.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—The honorable member wants all the space.

Mr. MCWILLIAMS.—No, the honorable member is telling a deliberate untruth.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Order! The honorable member must withdraw that statement.

Mr. MCWILLIAMS.—I withdraw it, but I am very glad I got it in.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Order! The honorable member must withdraw the statement unreservedly.

Mr. MCWILLIAMS.—I withdraw it unreservedly.

Mr. CROUCH.—Can the honorable member not see that the whole year's trade must be unprofitable, and not one trip only?

Mr. MCWILLIAMS.—I answer the honorable member by saying that our fruit season does not last for more than three months. If the fruit is not handled within that time we can get no market for it in London. It has been said that we want the whole of the space. We do not. We are prepared to take our share, but let me tell honorable members that last

year, whilst the whole of the rest of Australia shipped 160,000 cases of fruit, Tasmania alone shipped 540,000 cases.

Mr. MAUGER.—Where the trade is the ships will go.

Mr. MCWILLIAMS.—They will if there is fair competition. I wish the Minister to remember that the space provided by these mail boats is not sufficient to carry more than one-fourth or one-fifth of our yearly export of fruit.

Mr. MAUGER.—Then there is not the faintest danger that anything injurious to Tasmania will happen?

Mr. MCWILLIAMS.—How can the honorable member say that? He has overlooked the fact that competition under this contract will be closed.

Mr. MAUGER.—The honorable member wants a differential rate for Tasmania.

Mr. MCWILLIAMS.—I want no differential rate.

Mr. MAUGER.—What does the honorable member want?

Mr. MCWILLIAMS.—I desire that the contract shall provide that the boats shall call at Hobart six times a year, and that it shall be out of the power of any one to interfere with that arrangement. I shall move—

That the proviso to clause 8 be omitted from the contract.

Mr. HEDGES (Fremantle) [10.35].—Looking carefully through this contract, I find that Fremantle has been mentioned in it in a casual kind of way, although it has been pointed out to-night that it is the third port in Australia.

Mr. GROOM.—In what sense?

Mr. HEDGES.—From the point of view of the value of its imports and exports. Western Australia has produced gold of the value of nearly £80,000,000 in addition to other minerals, and yet the Ministry who are supposed to represent the Commonwealth, in drawing up this contract, have practically forgotten it. Several important clauses contain no reference to it, whilst in others it is only casually mentioned.

Mr. MAUGER.—What does the honorable member mean by "casually" mentioned?

Mr. HEDGES.—I maintain that Western Australia should receive the same consideration as is extended to other States. For the last five years, Western Australia has sent to the eastern States £1,000 per day in money orders, and yet she has been forgotten.

Mr. GROOM.—What is the honorable member's point?

Mr. HEDGES.—That Fremantle has scarcely been treated as an Australian port; it is put in the same category as Colombo.

Mr. PAGE.—But the vessels of this service must call at Fremantle.

Mr. HEDGES.—No. Under this agreement, on the completion of the Panama Canal, the route may be altered. I have signed hundreds of contracts and have been a party to big arbitrations, and have no hesitation in saying that this is one of the most loosely-worded agreements that I have ever read. In connexion with arbitration proceedings, I have known meanings to be read into clauses that at the time that the contracts in which they were embodied were signed, were believed to mean practically nothing. In clause 3 of this contract, we have the provision that—

On each inward and outward voyage respectively—

each of such mail ships shall—

proceed to call at and start from the following intermediate ports or places, namely, Colombo and Fremantle.

As I have said, Colombo and Fremantle are placed in the same category. The Government seem to have forgotten that Fremantle is the port for the larger half of Australia.

Mr. MAUGER.—What provision would the honorable member have inserted in the clause from which he has quoted?

Mr. HEDGES.—I should have applied common-sense to the drafting of the agreement. I have never seen a more loosely-drawn contract. The provisions of one clause are contradicted by another, and heaven only knows how this agreement will be construed if one of the parties to it has ever to fight to the bitter end. In sub-clause 5 of clause 4 it is provided that the contractors—

shall commence each outward voyage (that is to the United Kingdom) of the said mail ship from Brisbane, calling at Sydney, Melbourne, and Adelaide.

Both Fremantle and Hobart are not mentioned. Then again, sub-clause 7 of clause 4 provides that—

Each of the mail ships on each call at Adelaide, Melbourne, Sydney, and Brisbane, in pursuance of this agreement, shall remain in each of such ports for such periods as may be reasonably necessary to discharge cargo and to receive cargo, including butter and fruit.

I think I am fairly entitled to ask why no reference is made in that provision to Hobart or Fremantle. A very large quan-

tity of fruit is annually shipped from Hobart and Fremantle, and within the next twelve years, more fruit will be exported from Fremantle than from any Tasmanian port.

Mr. KING O'MALLEY.—No.

Mr. HEDGES.—Some apple-growers in Western Australia last year produced from 10,000 to 14,000 cases each. During the last month, thousands of frozen lambs have been shipped from Fremantle, and yet the contract does not require space to be set apart for the carriage of frozen meat or fruit from that port.

Mr. KING O'MALLEY.—These mail steamers are generally fully loaded before they reach Fremantle. The honorable member should move an amendment.

Mr. HEDGES.—Five years hence, the construction of the Panama Canal will have been completed, and the route may then be changed.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—No; it will not be completed within the next five years.

Mr. HEDGES.—I think that it will be. Coming to the amendment, I may say at once that I am not in favour of nationalizing this service.

Mr. KING O'MALLEY.—Would the honorable member meet us half way and let us have a partly State-owned, and partly individualistic service.

Mr. HEDGES.—I would not. It would be a mistake to try to run a Commonwealth line of mail steamers. Government railways have no competition to face, and wear and tear and deterioration are not so serious matters with them as with a steamship line. Besides, if a vessel bumps into anything, she is probably lost altogether.

Mr. MATHEWS.—As a business man, would the honorable member let his vessels go uninsured?

Mr. HEDGES.—The honorable member for Darwin did not mention insurance. The honorable member for Wide Bay, in speaking on the amendment of the honorable member for Barrier, said many nasty things against private enterprise; but I claim that private enterprise has made the British nation. The ships that carry the commerce of the world and the warships of the world—even some of those of Germany—have been built by private enterprise in Great Britain.

Mr. THOMAS.—There are very big Government dock-yards in Great Britain.

Mr. HEDGES.—Yes; but the British Government gets its warships built by

private enterprise, and I am proud to be a Britisher. Britishers know more about ship-building and shipping than any other nation in the world, and if it were wise for the Government to have fleets of merchantmen as well as fleets of war vessels, the British Government would have such fleets. Honorable members talk a lot of "highfalutin" about Socialism; but they forget that if we had an Australian merchant fleet we should require an Australian squadron to protect it from insult. No foreigner dare insult merchantmen flying the Union Jack.

Mr. PAGE.—What worse insult could there be than the action of the Russians in firing on a fishing fleet?

Mr. HEDGES.—I had no sympathy with the Russians in what they did then. It is very easy for honorable members who have never been in business to criticise commercial enterprises. It is easy for men who have never done anything in the world to say what they would do if they had the handling of other men's business.

Mr. KING O'MALLEY.—I would take on any business proposition in competition with the honorable member, and, for all his cleverness, get the shirt off his back.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I ask the honorable member for Darwin not to interrupt.

Mr. KING O'MALLEY.—Are the members of the Labour Party constantly to be insulted by being told that they know nothing? Honorable members will turn this into a fighting shop if they make such remarks.

Mr. HEDGES.—When a man finds a gold reef he soon ceases to be a Socialist.

Mr. KING O'MALLEY.—I have a bigger mine than any that the honorable member possesses, and it pays me, too. I own it myself.

Mr. HEDGES.—The honorable member in his speech used so many figures that I could not put them all down. A countryman of his once impressed it upon me that figures could not lie, "but," he added, "look out when liars take to figuring."

Mr. KING O'MALLEY.—What figures of mine does the honorable member challenge?

Mr. HEDGES.—The honorable member told us how many boats he could build for a certain amount of money, what sinking fund he would establish, and how long it would take him to repay the outlay; but he failed to tell us where he would get the money in the first instance. If £4,000,000

were to be wrung from the people in extra taxation they would be so impoverished that they will have no need for a mail fleet.

Mr. KING O'MALLEY.—I said £3,000,000, and I spoke about borrowing the money in England.

Mr. HEDGES.—The honorable member got quite wild at the thought of the British people running an Australian mail service, and yet he proposed to go to Great Britain to borrow money to enable us to run boats of our own.

Mr. KING O'MALLEY.—I could borrow in America or France.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—America wants all her money just now.

Mr. HEDGES.—It seems to me rather strong to propose to borrow money to enter into competition with the person from whom you borrow.

Mr. KING O'MALLEY.—All that the money lenders would trouble about would be their interest.

Mr. MATHEWS.—We are sending money Home now.

Mr. HEDGES.—We shall have to send a lot more Home during the next ten years.

Mr. FISHER.—There is no more solvent country in the world than Australia.

Mr. HEDGES.—The honorable member's interjection suggests that I am saying that the country is not solvent. But all my speeches, both in this chamber and outside, prove that I hold the opposite view. What we owe is nothing compared with our assets. In conclusion, I wish to impress upon the Government the desirableness of seeing that Fremantle is better treated than it will be under the terms of this contract. Since the agreement was made public, I have received many wires from that centre, expressing dissatisfaction with the treatment which has been accorded it. I cannot support the amendment of the honorable member for Barrier, and, therefore, I shall be compelled to vote for the motion.

Mr. TUDOR.—Why not move an amendment?

Mr. HEDGES.—Because I recognise that we must either accept the contract or reject it. I am certain that in the near future large quantities of fruit will be exported from Western Australia, and the mail steamers should be required to provide space for it when asked to do so.

Mr. FOWLER (Perth) [10.57].—I had intended to offer some remarks bearing principally upon observations made by other

honorable members. But at this hour of the night I shall confine myself to asking the Postmaster-General to explain the particular clause to which the honorable member for Fremantle has alluded. I entirely agree with him that in this contract provision is made for the abrogation of whatever advantage it may confer upon Western Australia.

Mr. MAUGER.—To which clause does the honorable member refer?

Mr. FOWLER.—I am alluding to sub-clause 7 of clause 4, which reads—

Each of the mail-ships on each call at Adelaide, Melbourne, Sydney, and Brisbane, in pursuance of this agreement, shall remain in each of such ports for such periods as may be reasonably necessary to discharge cargo and to receive cargo, including butter and fruit.

Mr. MAUGER.—That provision was inserted because the minimum number of hours that the steamers must remain at Adelaide, Melbourne, Sydney, and Brisbane is not specified in the contract. The other clause is intended as an intimation that the vessels must stay at Fremantle to discharge and take in cargo—that might not occupy more than two hours, but it is specified that the boats shall stay for not less than six hours.

Mr. FOWLER.—If, in respect of Adelaide, Melbourne, Sydney, and Brisbane, it is necessary to stipulate that the mail steamers shall remain in port for such time as may be reasonably necessary to discharge and receive cargo, why is not a similar condition imposed in the case of Fremantle? The truth is that under the proposed contract, if the steamers are full of cargo, and their owners do not wish them to remain in the Western Australian port for a longer time than is stipulated, they will be at liberty to depart, and to leave produce lying on the wharf. That is the danger which I foresee. The stipulation that these vessels shall call at Fremantle for cargo is absolutely useless unless some provision be made for reserving to that State its proportion of space.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—There will be an equal disability in the case of every port unless the space is regulated.

Mr. FOWLER.—That is why I am anxious to see some provision inserted in regard to the receipt of cargo.

Mr. MAUGER.—We cannot make provision for what the honorable member desires unless we agree to take the whole of the space provided on the vessels.

Mr. FOWLER.—In the face of all the minutæ which is contained in the agree-

ment, I fail to see why an agreement cannot be drawn up which will insure that no State shall be left out in the cold.

Mr. MAUGER.—We tried to do that, but found that the proposal was absolutely impossible unless we agreed to take the whole of the space.

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—If the States would only agree to each take a portion of the space provided, the contractors would be very glad for us to take it off their hands altogether.

Mr. FOWLER.—It seems to me that we require to take only a very short step to nationalize the service. Some honorable members have objected to the statement that Western Australia had been penalized under the old freight rates. I hold in my hand a document issued by a large firm of shipping agents in London, from which I desire to make one or two quotations. From it I gather that the freight from the Old Country upon 30 lbs., or $1\frac{1}{2}$ cubic feet, to Adelaide, Brisbane, Melbourne, or Sydney is 6s. 6d., whilst to Fremantle and Townsville—which two places are bracketed together—the charge is 9s.

Mr. MAUGER.—That state of things cannot obtain under the new contract.

Mr. FOWLER.—If it can, I confess that I have not much faith that the Orient Steam Navigation Company will do other than what will pay it best. I may also mention that the charge for 100 lbs., or 5 cubic feet, of cargo from London to Adelaide, Brisbane, Melbourne, or Sydney is 12s., whereas the charge to Fremantle is 16s. It seems to me that Western Australia might fairly claim a little more consideration than will be extended to her by the proposal to charge equal freights to all Australian ports. I need scarcely point out that the distance between Fremantle and Brisbane represents a fifth of the entire journey from London, notwithstanding which the freight to Brisbane is to equal that charged to Western Australia. In other words, Western Australia is to be penalized for the advantage of those States which are furthest removed from the European market.

Mr. GROOM.—Surely the honorable member does not object to all the States being placed upon an equal footing?

Mr. FOWLER.—It seems to me that, whilst the welfare of Brisbane and of other ports has been carefully studied in this contract, that of Western Australia has

been overlooked. I shall vote for the amendment of the honorable member for Barrier.

Mr. ATKINSON (Wilmot) [11.5].—I should like to add my congratulations to those already offered the honorable member for Barrier for the fine speech which he delivered in submitting his amendment. But although I listened with pleasure and admiration to his address, I know that he does not expect me to support his proposal to nationalize our mail service. I do not think that that matter is within the range of practical politics, and therefore, the honorable member will not wonder at my not supporting his amendment. Regarding the contract generally, I think that it is one upon which the Government can fairly be congratulated. Considering the history of mail contracts, I do not see how it could be expected that they could secure better terms for a subsidy of £170,000. It is true that that is a large increase upon what we previously paid, but it must be remembered that we are to have a greatly accelerated speed.

Mr. SINCLAIR.—Is it worth the extra money?

Mr. ATKINSON.—I do not know, but certainly the shipping companies regard increased speed as an important element in the cost of running their steamers. When a ship is steaming at her top speed, the last two or three knots add considerably to the consumption of coal. Consequently, if we insist upon increasing the speed of the mail ships we must expect to have to pay a higher price. Another consideration is that the vessels are compelled to run with great regularity, and they are to employ white labour only. All those points must be considered when forming an opinion upon the contract price. Bearing all these factors in mind, I am of opinion that the Government have made a good bargain, and that the amount of the subsidy is not out of the way. The contract is for ten years. That certainly seems a long time in these days of scientific improvement. But really, I do not see how the Government could have done better in that respect. The Orient Steam Navigation Company could not be expected to enter into a contract of this nature, involving large expenditure on new vessels, a shorter period. Their interests need to be safeguarded as well as those of the Commonwealth. There is, however, a pro-

viso whereby the Postmaster-General can, as improvements are made, insist upon their adoption. We could not expect a more elastic provision in a contract such as this. In that respect, also, I think the Government have done as well as could be expected. There is one consideration affecting the State which I have the honour to represent and in regard to which the contract has not been framed as I think it ought to have been. I refer to the clause which compels six mail boats to call at Hobart during February to May inclusive. The clause proceeds—

Provided always that if in any year the contractors shall prove, to the satisfaction of the Postmaster-General, that calls at Hobart during that year are or would be unprofitable, the Postmaster-General may direct that the whole or any such calls for that year may be omitted.

In the first place, I suppose that the onus of proving that a call at Hobart would be unprofitable would lie with the company. The Postmaster-General has discretionary power as to granting the exemption. But suppose that the ships fill up with cargo at Brisbane or Sydney, and that, nevertheless, the Postmaster-General says "You must go to Hobart." If they have no space for a fair amount of produce, I do not see that that would be of any benefit to the fruit-growers of southern Tasmania. What we want to insure is that there shall be reasonable space available when the ships get to Hobart; because there is always a fair quantity of apples and other produce on the wharfs awaiting shipment at that time of the year.

Mr. SALMON.—Would it not save a lot of money to bring the Tasmanian produce over to Melbourne in small boats and then tranship?

Mr. ATKINSON.—The fruit-growers do not look at it in that light. The cost of transhipment would be too great. The re-handling of fruits would necessarily add to the cost materially. I do not for a moment suppose that when the contract was entered into either of the parties contemplated any trouble arising under the clause in question. But the possibility of such a thing happening has to be guarded against, for fear the contract should ever come into a Law Court and be interpreted strictly. Such a clause might put Tasmania in a worse position than she is in to-day. It appears to me that if the whole clause were left out, and Tasmania were left to charter boats as she has been doing, it would be better for the State, be-

cause then no risks would be run. If the clause were deleted possibly the Orient Steam Navigation Company, seeing that Tasmanian growers would have to pay their own charter fees, might be prepared to reduce the subsidy.

Mr. PAGE.—How is the shipping of fruit from Tasmania regulated?

Mr. ATKINSON.—As far as I know, circulars are issued to the growers about the quantity of fruit which they are likely to send and the space which they are likely to require.

Mr. PAGE.—By commission agents?

Mr. ATKINSON.—I am not sure by whom it is done, but that is the principle. The maximum price to be charged by the Orient Steam Navigation Company is 60s. for 40 cubic feet of space. In the past, the Tasmanian growers have paid 70s. for that amount of space. Therefore, if the clause were struck out, the contract would require to be revised in order to place Tasmania in the same position as she was in before. The honorable member for Franklin is an authority on the fruit trade, and he has moved to delete the proviso, thus insuring that the mail-boats shall call at Hobart six times in the year. Seeing that Brisbane is made a port of call, as I think it should be, it would be only fair that Hobart should also be made a port of call to the limited extent mentioned here. I shall support the amendment of the honorable member for Franklin.

Mr. STORRER (Bass) [11.16].—During the debate many remarks have been made which have not been relevant to the question of the mail contract, and reflections have been cast upon the Postmaster-General for not explaining its provisions to the House. In view of the very full and clear explanation which was made last week by the Prime Minister, I think that the Postmaster-General saved a considerable amount of time in submitting the motion as he did, and I commend him for his conduct. Reference has been made by the honorable member for Franklin and others to the mail-boats calling at Hobart. That, I think, is one of the wisest provisions in the contract. It is quite clear that if it could be proved to the satisfaction of the Postmaster-General that in any year it would be unprofitable for mail-steamers to call at Hobart they would not be compelled to do so. I ask any one

who is acquainted with the fruit industry in Tasmania, what would be the good of the steamers going to Hobart when there was a failure in the fruit crop? Of course we all hope that there will not be a failure in the fruit crop, but it has occurred on several occasions and it may occur again. In a case of that kind it should be left to the Postmaster-General to say whether the steamers shall call at the port or not.

Mr. ATKINSON.—That is protecting the company against ourselves. I think that we ought to protect ourselves against the company first.

Mr. STORRER.—It is protecting both ourselves and the company, because it would be of no use to the people of Tasmania for the boats to go to Hobart unless they had fruit or something else to export. Remarks have also been made about the filling up of the steamers at the various ports. Any company which trades with Australia wishes to please the whole of the people. At the various ports they have their agents, who know fairly well what cargo is likely to be received at certain places. In the event of the States not having agreed to take the space the agents must act as best they can to regulate the trade for the steamers.

Mr. ATKINSON.—There will be other articles of export besides apples.

Mr. STORRER.—If the Commonwealth or the States do not guarantee the space we shall have to trust to the agents and the owners of the steamers to do the best they can for the whole community. I have no doubt that they will always act impartially, and that if it is profitable for the steamers to go to Hobart as it has been in the past, they will continue to go there. I am very glad to see that a freight has been determined for their particular trade, and that in the future it will not be left to a commission agent or any special individual to make arrangements for the sending of fruit or anything else from Tasmania. In the past it has been left to private persons to engage space; and for every case of fruit which they sent away they received a commission of 3d., which, of course, had to come out of the pockets of the growers. If the contract is carried out satisfactorily and the agents arrange for the steamers to call at Hobart, and for the space required, the growers will not only be relieved of that commission but also effect a considerable saving in

freight. In my opinion the Government have done well in securing that benefit to Tasmania. I would have liked to see in the contract a provision to the effect that when our fruit industry on the Tamar is sufficiently developed the mail-boats shall call at Tamar Heads and pick up the fruit there, instead of its being sent by train to Hobart. Last year we despatched our first shipment of fruit from the Tamar, and the whole of the land on its banks has been turned into orchards. I hope that before the expiration of the contract we shall have the mail steamers calling at the Tamar Heads to pick up our fruit. The only thing I regret about the contract is that it is made for such a long term. In a period of ten years things may change, but we shall be bound by the contract. The Government was in a difficulty when it received the tenders, and the tender from the Orient Steam Navigation Company was the lowest one. While we are left at the mercy of a combine or a ring the present unsatisfactory state of things will continue to exist. Apparently the cost of the mail service is going up, and if that is to continue we shall regret that we did not make the current contract at £120,000 a year for a period of ten or twelve years. Unless the motion is carried we shall be at the mercy of a combine, and have to pay whatever they may charge. I have other notes, but, as the hour is so late, I shall conclude with congratulating the Government upon the first benefit which they have secured for Tasmania, so far as the calling of the mail steamers is concerned.

Mr. ATKINSON.—It may not prove so.

Mr. STORRER.—If the fruit is available, the Postmaster-General can always insist upon the steamers going there, and if he fails in his duty it will be for Parliament to deal with him as it may think fit.

Mr. CARR (Macquarie) [11.23].—In the first place, I lay down the principle that all means of communication and transit should belong to the people. I consider that, representing as the means of communication and transit do the commercial arteries of the nation, when we allow them to get into private hands we practically allow private hands to get on the jugular vein of the nation, and on that account I shall vote for the amendment of the honorable member for Barrier. A monopoly of means of communication or

transit on land we deny, and I contend that the avenues of trade on water are just as important in the development of a nation. This monopoly is the next worst to the monopoly of natural opportunity, which is the earth. Of course, we cannot debate the question of land monopoly at the present time, but this being the next greatest evil from which we as a civilized people suffer, I certainly urge upon honorable members the advisability of placing it under the control of the Government, that is the people. The arguments which have been adduced against the proposal do not influence me, and I suppose it is hardly necessary for me to say why they do not, because my reasons would not appeal to the Opposition. Though I think there is some logic on the opposite side, yet when honorable members say that to make this a Commonwealth concern would be to give absolute control of Government affairs to those within the concern, and that it would be a dangerous experiment, they are absolutely on the wrong track. We have enacted that all men and women are mentally equal. I admit that that is a mere assumption, but for the want of something better we have assumed it, and, as we have conceded political equality, as soon as the people have their eyes opened a little more, they will insist—and the power to do so already exists—upon controlling these things, despite honorable members on the Opposition benches. Those members naturally stand up for their vested interests and their individual rights, nor do I blame them. It is perfectly natural and logical that they should do so, but it is illogical for them to contend that when the people speak, as they do through us, the people are asking for the extension of a dangerous principle. The Labour Party is one of the tangible results of that principle, and we as a party in this chamber are the outward and visible sign of that political equality which will enable the people more and more to control these things for themselves. The people will take out of the hands of private enterprise first and foremost those that rank amongst the most vital of all concerns, including the means of transit and communication. We know the devious methods that are resorted to by private enterprise in order to exploit the people. That, again, is perfectly natural, and if the people are foolish enough to give opportunities for this to be done, it will

be done so long as the people are too blind to see that they have the right and the power to take over these things for themselves and still govern them by deputy. We must always have government by deputy, but as the community grows more enlightened there will be a higher intelligence reflected in the seats of government. Is there any provision in the contract to check the pernicious system of rebates? I can find none.

Mr. MAUGER.—A rebate would be a differential rate.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—There is a special law against it.

Mr. CARR.—The rebate system is one of the most effective means by which private enterprise exploits the people. In America rebates are used to throttle trade, or only to permit it to exist so far as it is necessary to the manufacture of the dollars of private enterprise.

Mr. THOMAS.—Does the Postmaster-General mean that rebates from England can also be prevented?

Mr. MAUGER.—We cannot control that.

Mr. CARR.—I quite realize that we shall not have the full power necessary to prevent those questionable practices, so long as over-sea traffic is in private hands, or until we bring it under Government control, to be supervised by duly appointed officers, subject to public criticism, and guided by the public sense of right and wrong. That public sense is always keen. Those who question the right or ability of the people to more directly rule themselves question the whole system of creation itself. Man is deficient nowadays, not so much because of any innate lack in himself of a higher conception of life, as because of a want of opportunity to achieve his aspirations. Otherwise, there would be no progress; and there has been progress, so far as we have adopted enlightened legislation, and given to the people a more direct control of affairs than ever existed in bygone days. That policy must be pushed forward, and I am here to push it forward. Assuming that the amendment of the honorable member for Barrier is not agreed to, the contract, so far as it can be made a machine to regulate the traffic, is, in my opinion, effective, but it does not go so far as I want it to go, because the mail service will be practically under private control. This is as satisfac-

tory an arrangement as we are likely to get under those conditions. There has been a good deal said about the danger we run in shutting ourselves out from the advantages that must accrue from improvements in means of locomotion, but clause 6 appears to provide for that. It gives the Postmaster-General the right at any time after the fifth year to call upon the company to provide a more accelerated service, if more accelerated services have become the order of the day. That is a fairly safe provision, and to a great extent answers many of the objections that have been raised. We have also the right to alter the route from *viâ* Suez, if that is at any time deemed necessary. I presume that means that we shall be able to take advantage of the Panama Canal, if it is thought advisable to do so, when the canal is opened for traffic. Those are the main objections that have been raised to the contract, with the exception of the question of calls at Hobart. Here, again, we are faced with the consideration that, unless we take the service over entirely, we shall not be able to compel the boats to call at any port when they are already full. We must assume that those interested in a business concern will take freight when they are in a position to do so, but if their holds are full it will be of no use for the boats to call. The people of Tasmania may find themselves in that position. If that does happen, it will be one of the inevitable results of handing this business over to private enterprise. If it was in the hands of the Government, it might be possible to hold certain boats in reserve, or to divert boats from certain lines to take up traffic that was urgent at the time. Otherwise, I fail to see how Hobart is to get any more consideration than is offered under this contract, unless the Government go a step further, as indicated by the Minister of Trade and Customs, in the direction of controlling the refrigerated space. The Government would have to undertake to fill the space if the shipping company were compelled to accommodate the Hobart trade.

Mr. MAUGER (Maribyrnong—Postmaster-General) [11.35].—Notwithstanding the remarks of honorable members, I do not propose, even now, to make anything like a long speech. I should like, as I could have done, to say a great deal about the many phases of this most interest-

far-reaching, and important question. I could have said much about the rates, the history of mail contracts, the difference between this and other contracts, and what we lost by the concessions we made on the last contract. But at this stage of the session I feel impelled to say but little. I am sure honorable members will acquit me of any intention to slight the House, and will give me credit for doing the best that is possible in the circumstances. I have already said that this contract has been fully explained by the Prime Minister; fully, fairly, and favorably discussed by almost every newspaper in the Commonwealth; and, after debate in another place, adopted almost unanimously. Therefore, every honorable member must be seized of its meaning. I further said that I was quite prepared to answer any questions to the best of my ability. Could anything more have been done, in view of the fact that we are so pressed for time? I have no fault to find with the manner or matter of the speech of the honorable member for Barrier in moving his amendment, which is, of course, the real question we have to test to-night.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I have another amendment.

Mr. MAUGER.—I hope the House will not accept any amendments. The Prime Minister, the officers of the Department, my colleagues, and myself have done our very best in the interests of Australia. If honorable members knew as much as we know, but are not privileged to tell, they would not attempt to amend the contract on the lines suggested. It is provided that there shall be no differentiation as between States, and that provision penalizes no one. All we say is that, whatever advantages New South Wales, for instance, may secure in consequence of the facilities which she enjoys, no extra charge shall be made at any of the other ports. New South Wales, in this matter, is not penalized in any way.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Excuse me; New South Wales is penalized.

Mr. MAUGER.—The honorable member is wrong.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—New South Wales is deliberately deprived of her natural advantages.

Mr. MAUGER.—Nothing of the kind; all we say is that, whatever natural advan-

tages Sydney may enjoy as a port, no extra charge must be made in any of the other States.

Mr. MATHEWS.—And quite right, too!

Mr. MAUGER.—Quite right, too.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—It is right for Melbourne.

Mr. MAUGER.—Does the honorable member object to Melbourne reaping some advantage from the contract, if New South Wales is thereby in no way injured? The Government have been, and are, most anxious to secure the very best advantages for Australia. As to the amendment of the honorable member for Franklin, do honorable members imagine for one moment that any Postmaster-General would dare to give authority for these boats not to call at Hobart unless for marvellously strong reasons?

Mr. ATKINSON.—I do not think so.

Mr. MAUGER.—I am sure honorable members do not think so. The clause referred to was inserted in the interests of Hobart, and marks a decided step forward for Tasmania, to which State there can be no danger, unless through a crop failure. I do not think that any one would contend for a moment that the mail ships should call at Hobart merely for the sake of calling. I could say a great deal more, but I am going to trust to the good sense of the House to accept the assurance that everything has been done by the Prime Minister and his colleagues to secure the best possible conditions. If this contract is varied, our work will have to be done over again, and we might not be able to get terms so advantageous as those which are now offered, and are submitted to the House for its approval.

Mr. FRAZER.—Will the putting of the amendment of the honorable member for Barrier preclude the moving of any further amendments?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I point out that all the amendments moved hitherto have been by way of the addition of words, and each will be put in turn.

Question.—That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the question (Mr. THOMAS' amendment)—put. The House divided.

Ayes	24
Noes	17

AYES.

Atkinson, L.
Chapman, Austin
Cook, Joseph
Coon, J.
Crouch, R. A.
Edwards, R.
Ewing, T. T.
Foxton, Colonel
Groom, L. E.
Hedges, W. N.
Liddell, F.
Livingston, J.
Lyne, Sir William

Mauger, S.
McWilliams, W. J.
Quick, Sir John
Salmon, C. C.
Sampson, S.
Sinclair, H.
Thomson, Dugald
Thomson, John
Wilks, W. H.

Tellers:

Cook, Hume
Johnson, W. E.

NOES.

Carr, E. S.
Catts, J. H.
Fisher, A.
Fowler, J. M.
Frazer, C. E.
Maloney, W. R. N.
Mathews, J.
McDougall, J. K.
O'Malley, King

Page, J.
Poynton, A.
Spence, W. G.
Storror, D.
Thomas, J.
Watkins, D.

Tellers:

Hutchison, J.
Tudor, F. G.

PAIRS.

Wise, G. H.
Archer, E. W.
Bowden, E. K.
Brown, Tilley
Forrest, Sir John
Deakin, A.
Smith, Bruce
Harper, R.
Edwards, R.
Irvine, W. H.
Knox, W.

Bamford, F. W.
Batchelor, E. L.
Webster, W.
Chanter, J. M.
Watson, J. C.
Foster, F. J.
Hall, D. R.
Brown, Thomas
Hughes, W. M.
McDonald, C.
Mahon, H.

Question so resolved in the affirmative.

Amendment negatived.

Amendment (by Mr. FRAZER) negatived—

That the following words be added to the motion:—"Subject to a provision being inserted in the mail contract that the freights for importations shall be the same to all Australian ports at which the mail boats touch."

Amendment (by Mr. JOHNSON) proposed—

That the following words be added to the motion:—"Subject to the term of the contract being reduced from ten to seven years, with the right of extension for a further period of three years on the same terms."

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Are we to understand that all debate on the question is closed?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I point out that the Postmaster-General has already replied to the debate. The procedure hitherto followed in the discussion of similar motions has been to regard the motion and amendments as so interwoven that speeches made in connexion with the amend-

ments are regarded as having been addressed to the original question also. Mr. Speaker has always regarded such speeches as speeches made on the original motion.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Is it not also a rule that where requested to do so, Mr. Speaker or the Chairman of Committees will put complicated questions in sections?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I point out to the honorable member that the agreement is not before the House. All that is before the House at the present time is the motion moved by the Postmaster-General.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Would not the agreement bear the same relation to the motion as, for instance, a schedule would to the Bill to which it is attached?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—No; that is not so. There is before the House only the bare motion moved by the Postmaster-General.

Question—That the words proposed to be added be so added—put. The House divided.

Ayes	20
Noes	23
Majority				3

AYES.

Bamford, F. W.
Catts, J. H.
Fisher, A.
Fowler, J. M.
Frazer, C. E.
Hutchison, J.
Liddell, F.
Livingston, J.
Mathews, J.
McDougall, J. K.
McWilliams, W. J.

O'Malley, King
Salmon, C. C.
Spence, W. G.
Thomas, J.
Tudor, F. G.
Watkins, D.
Wilks, W. H.

Tellers:

Carr, E. S.
Johnson, W. E.

NOES.

Chapman, Austin
Cook, Joseph
Coon, J.
Edwards, R.
Ewing, T. T.
Forrest, Sir John
Foxton, Colonel
Groom, L. E.
Hedges, W. N.
Lyne, Sir William
Maloney, W. R. N.
Mauger, S.

Page, J.
Quick, Sir John
Sampson, S.
Sinclair, H.
Smith, Bruce
Storror, D.
Thomson, Dugald
Thomson, John
Wise, G. H.

Tellers:

Atkinson, L.
Cook, Hume

Question so resolved in the negative.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. POYNTON (Grey) [12.0].—I move—

That the following words be added to the motion:—"Subject to the inclusion in the

Agreement in clause 9, sub-clause 4, after the word 'fruit' in the second line, of the words 'or frozen meat,' and in line 4 of the same sub-clause after 'fruit' and 'd. per lb. net for frozen meat.'"

In submitting this amendment—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The honorable member has already spoken.

Mr. POYNTON.—You are under a misapprehension, sir. I refrained from speaking to the amendment.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—But the Minister has replied.

Mr. THOMAS.—I rise to a point of order. I desire to say, sir, that I had a chat to-day with Mr. Speaker in regard to this very question, and was informed by him that after my amendment had been disposed of, any further amendment would be open to discussion.

Mr. JOHNSON.—After the mover of the original motion had replied?

Mr. THOMAS.—I admit that that point was not raised; but I am sure that those who were desirous of dealing with some of the arguments raised during this debate would have objected to the Postmaster-General replying when he did had they thought that his reply would close the debate. Mr. Speaker told me that I could not move a further amendment, but that it would be competent for me to speak to a further amendment moved by any other honorable member. I submit that this amendment may be discussed.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—On the point of order, I dare say, sir, that technically your ruling is right; but I am under the impression that Mr. Speaker has always allowed the fullest latitude in the discussion of such a matter as this. He has treated a contract of this kind as being in the nature of a schedule to a Bill, and therefore alterable in any part. I submit that on an occasion like this that procedure should be followed. I and several others find that we are not in a position under your ruling to submit several amendments that have occurred to us during this exhaustive debate, and I know of no honorable member on this side of the House who could submit them on our behalf. The trouble is that under cover of a motion this contract has been submitted in the House instead of in Committee. It is an ordinary motion, but one having led to it an exhaustive schedule, and

there should be some way of discussing its details. I therefore ask you, sir, to permit honorable members to speak on amendments which may be moved.

Mr. SALMON.—I would suggest, sir, that standing order 264, which provides that the reply of the mover to the original question closes the debate, refers to the original question, and to any amendment which is proposed. As you are aware, sir, an amendment must be disposed of before another amendment on the main question can be submitted. If standing order 264 were to apply as suggested by you, it would be impossible for any further amendment to be moved. As a matter of fact, the only amendment which has actually been moved, properly stated and put, is that proposed by the honorable member for Barrier.

Mr. GROOM.—Notice has been given of other amendments.

Mr. SALMON.—Notice has been given of them, but they have not been moved. I would point out, sir, that under your ruling it would be impossible for a second amendment to be moved to any motion if the mover of the original motion had replied prior to the first amendment being tested.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. — In this instance the questions raised by the amendments and the main issue have been so interwoven that it would be almost impossible to separate in any speech the arguments directed to an amendment from those directed to the main question. Standing order 264, which has been cited by the honorable member for Laanecoorie, directs that in all cases the reply of the mover of the original question closes the debate. The Postmaster-General has replied to the main question, and the debate is therefore closed. But the practice has grown up—I do not say that it is a right or that it is a wrong one—when honorable members have intimated that they intend to move certain amendments, of taking those amendments in rotation, after the mover has replied. That is the course I am following. I cannot, however, allow the main discussion to be re-opened.

Mr. POYNTON.—The ruling puts me in a false position, because I purposely refrained from speaking on the main question.

Mr. THOMAS.—Do I understand that, if the honorable member for Grey had

moved his amendment first, and it had been discussed, my amendment would have had to be put without debate?

Mr. SALMON.—The amendment of the honorable member for Grey could not have been moved first.

Mr. THOMAS.—It seems to me that the position is an awkward one. The honorable member for Grey purposely refrained from speaking on the main question in order to speak on his amendment.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The honorable member for Grey would have been quite in order in moving and speaking to his amendment before the Postmaster-General replied. On the first day that this Parliament met, I, following a practice that is sometimes allowed in the Queensland Assembly, rose to speak after the then leader of the House, now Mr. Justice Barton, had replied; but it was ruled by Mr. Speaker that I could not do so, and the ruling has held good ever since.

Mr. TUDOR.—Is the honorable member for Grey prevented from speaking because the Postmaster-General has replied, or because his amendment is so interwoven with the main question?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Because the Postmaster-General has replied.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I do not dispute the strict legality of your ruling, sir; but, in view of the exceptional nature of these proceedings, which could not have been contemplated when the Standing Order was framed, I suggest that it would be a gracious thing to consult the wishes of honorable members who desire to move amendments, and to state shortly their reasons for doing so.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I cannot take it upon myself to do that; but I think I shall be meeting the wishes of the House if I put the question that the honorable member for Grey be heard.

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—That is not fair.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I think it would be better to adhere to the ruling. I have an amendment, too.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I shall adhere to my ruling; but the course which I am now taking is the customary one. If it is the pleasure of the House, I shall allow the honorable member for Grey to proceed, but not otherwise.

Colonel FOXTON.—I submit that, although as a matter of convenience, with a view to curtailing debate, it may be customary, when several amendments have been moved on the original question, to regard speeches as applying to both amendments and the main question, there can be only one question before the House at a time. When the Postmaster-General was replying, the only question before the House was the amendment of the honorable member for Barrier.

Mr. MAUGER.—I replied to arguments advanced with regard to all the other amendments.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—If the honorable member for Brisbane questions my ruling, he should move that it be dissented from.

Colonel FOXTON.—I thought that I was raising a point which has not been considered. I was submitting that the Postmaster-General replied, not to the original motion, but to the amendment of the honorable member for Barrier, which was strictly the question before the Chair.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Does the honorable member intend to move that my ruling be dissented from?

Colonel FOXTON.—If you rule, sir, that the Postmaster-General has replied to anything more than the question which was immediately before the House, I am disposed to do so.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I rule that the Postmaster-General having replied, the debate upon the motion has been closed.

Question—That the words proposed to be added be so added (Mr. POYNTON'S amendment)—put. The House divided.

Ayes	17
Noes	27
<hr/>			
Majority	10

AYES.

Bamford, F. W.	O'Malley, King
Catts, J. H.	Poynton, A.
Fisher, A.	Salmon, C. C.
Frazer, C. E.	Spence, W. G.
Hutchison, J.	Thomas, J.
Liddell, F.	Tudor, F. G.
Livingston, J.	<i>Tellers:</i>
McDougall, J. K.	Batchelor, E. L.
McWilliams, W. J.	Wilks, W. H.

NOES.

Archer, E. W.
Atkinson, L.
Carr, E. S.
Chapman, Austin
Cook, Joseph
Edwards, R.
Ewing, T. T.
Forrest, Sir John
Foxton, Colonel
Groom, L. E.
Hedges, W. N.
Lyne, Sir William
Maloney, W. R. N.
Mathews, J.

Mauger, S.
Page, J.
Quick, Sir John
Sampson, S.
Sinclair, H.
Smith, Bruce
Storrer, D.
Thomson, Dugald
Thomson, John
Watkins, D.
Wise, G. H.

Tellers:

Cook, Hume
Coon, J.

Question so resolved in the negative.

Amendment negatived.

Amendment (by Mr. WILKS) put—

That the following words be added to the motion:—"Subject to the inclusion in the Agreement of a clause providing that, whenever practicable, the mail steamers shall be docked in Australia."

The House divided.

Ayes	19
Noes	26
Majority	7

AYES.

Bamford, F. W.
Batchelor, E. L.
Catts, J. H.
Fisher, A.
Fowler, J. M.
Frazer, C. E.
Hutchison, J.
Liddell, F.
Livingston, J.
Mathews, J.

McDougall, J. K.
O'Malley, King
Poynton, A.
Spence, W. G.
Thomas, J.
Tudor, F. G.
Wilks, W. H.
Tellers:
Maloney, W. R. N.
McWilliams, W. J.

NOES.

Archer, E. W.
Carr, E. S.
Chapman, Austin
Cook, Joseph
Coon, J.
Edwards, R.
Ewing, T. T.
Forrest, Sir John
Foxton, Colonel
Groom, L. E.
Hedges, W. N.
Lyne, Sir William
Mauger, S.
Page, J.

Quick, Sir John
Salmon, C. C.
Sampson, S.
Sinclair, H.
Smith, Bruce
Storrer, D.
Thomson, Dugald
Thomson, John
Watkins, D.
Wise, G. H.

Tellers:

Atkinson, L.
Cook, Hume

Question so resolved in the negative.

Amendment negatived.

Amendment (by Mr. McWILLIAMS)—
put—

That the following words be added to the motion:—"Subject to the proviso in clause 8 being omitted from the contract."

The House divided.

Ayes	21
Noes	23
Majority	2

AYES.

Atkinson, L.
Bamford, F. W.
Batchelor, E. L.
Cook, Joseph
Edwards, R.
Fisher, A.
Frazer, C. E.
Hutchison, J.
Liddell, F.
Livingston, J.
Mathews, J.

McDougall, J. K.
McWilliams, W. J.
O'Malley, King
Sinclair, H.
Spence, W. G.
Thomas, J.
Thomson, Dugald
Wilks, W. H.

Tellers:

Archer, E. W.
Johnson, W. E.

NOES.

Carr, E. S.
Catts, J. H.
Chapman, Austin
Ewing, T. T.
Forrest, Sir John
Foxton, Colonel
Groom, L. E.
Hedges, W. N.
Lyne, Sir William
Maloney, W. R. N.
Mauger, S.
Page, J.

Quick, Sir John
Salmon, C. C.
Sampson, S.
Smith, Bruce
Storrer, D.
Thomson, John
Tudor, F. G.
Watkins, D.
Wise, G. H.
Tellers:
Cook, Hume
Coon, J.

PAIRS.

Poynton, A.
Deakin, A.
Fowler, J. M.
Hughes, W. M.

Chanter, J. M.
Fysh, Sir Philip
Irvine, W. H.
Knox, W.

Question so resolved in the negative.

Amendment negatived.

Amendment (by Mr. EDWARDS) proposed—

That the following words be added to the motion—"And further, that arrangements should be made that Queensland be relieved during the currency of the interim contract of the payment of the extra subsidy now paid by that State to the Orient Steam Navigation Company."

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—It seems to me, sir, that the amendment has nothing to do with the question of the contract, and I desire to know if it is in order?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. — The amendment which the honorable member for Oxley seeks to add to the motion is a proviso that certain words shall be inserted in the contract, if ratified by the House, before it is formally completed. In the circumstances, I rule that it is in order.

Question—put. The House divided.

Ayes	12
Noes	33

Majority ... 21

AYES.

Bamford, F. W.
Fisher, A.
Foxton, Colonel
Frazer, C. E.
Liddell, F.
McWilliams, W. J.
Page, J.

Sinclair, H.
Spence, W. G.
Thomas, J.

Tellers:

Archer, E. W.
Edwards, R.

NOES.

Batchelor, E. L.
Carr, E. S.
Catts, J. H.
Chapman, Austin
Cook, Joseph
Coon, J.
Ewing, T. T.
Forrest, Sir John
Fowler, J. M.
Hedges, W. N.
Hutchison, J.
Johnson, W. E.
Livingston, J.
Lyne, Sir William
Maloney, W. R. N.
Mathews, J.
Mauger, S.

McDougall, J. K.
O'Malley, King
Poynton, A.
Quick, Sir John
Salmon, C. C.
Sampson, S.
Smith, Bruce
Storrer, D.
Thomson, Dugald
Thomson, John
Tudor, F. G.
Watkins, D.
Wilks, W. H.
Wise, G. H.
Tellers:
Atkinson, L.
Cook, Hume

Question so resolved in the negative.

Amendment negatived.

Question—That the motion be agreed to—put. The House divided.

Ayes	29
Noes	14
Majority	15

AYES.

Atkinson, L.
Carr, E. S.
Chapman, Austin
Cook, Joseph
Coon, J.
Edwards, R.
Ewing, T. T.
Fisher, A.
Forrest, Sir John
Foxton, Colonel
Groom, L. E.
Hedges, W. N.
Liddell, F.
Lyne, Sir William
Maloney, W. R. N.
Mauger, S.

Page, J.
Quick, Sir John
Salmon, C. C.
Sampson, S.
Sinclair, H.
Storrer, D.
Thomson, Dugald
Thomson, John
Watkins, D.
Wilks, W. H.
Wise, G. H.

Tellers:

Archer, E. W.
Cook, Hume

NOES.

Bamford, F. W.
Batchelor, E. L.
Catts, J. H.
Fowler, J. M.
Frazer, C. E.
Livingston, J.
McDougall, J. K.
McWilliams, W. J.

O'Malley, King
Spence, W. G.
Thomas, J.
Tudor, F. G.

Tellers:

Hutchison, J.
Mathews, J.

PAIRS.

Bowden, E. K.
Reid, G. H.
Deakin, A.
Knox, W.
Smith, Bruce
Fuller, G. W.
Chanter, J. M.

Webster, W.
Brown, Thomas
Foster, F. J.
Mahon, H.
Hall, D. R.
Hughes, W. M.
Poynton, A.

Question so resolved in the affirmative.

Resolved.

That the House of Representatives approves the agreement made and entered into the 15th day of November, 1907, between His Majesty's

Postmaster-General in and for the Commonwealth of Australia of the first part, Orient Steam Navigation Company Limited of the second part, and the Law Guarantee and Trust Society Limited of the third part for the carriage of mails and services to be performed as therein provided, a copy of which agreement has been laid upon the table of the House.

ADDITIONAL SITTING DAY.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [12.47 a.m.].—I desire, by leave, to move—

That until otherwise ordered this House do meet at half-past 10 o'clock a.m. on Monday in each week in addition to the present sitting days.

Mr. BAMFORD.—Is the question of the mail contract concluded? You have not put it from the chair, sir. The last division did not conclude the matter so far as I am concerned.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—That matter has been disposed of. Has the Treasurer permission to move this motion without notice?

Mr. LIDDELL.—I object.

SPECIAL ADJOURNMENT.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [12.50 a.m.].—Then I move—

That the House, at its rising, adjourn until this day at 11 o'clock a.m.

Had there been no objection to the motion regarding sitting on Mondays I should not have moved for a sitting to-day at all, as it is now very late and honorable members are tired.

Mr. FRAZER.—Can a motion of that description be moved without notice, seeing that it alters a sessional order regarding the days of sitting?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The Standing Orders provide for the moving of motions of this description.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH (Parkes) [12.52 a.m.].—I understand from what the Treasurer said that this motion is moved in order to test the feeling of the House.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—No.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—We are placed in a peculiar position. According to his statement, the Treasurer is now trying to force us to sit again to-day, not because the House has frustrated his wishes in any way, but simply because one honorable

member objected to leave being given him to move a motion without notice.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I was going to take the sense of the House.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—Will the Treasurer take the sense of the House as to whether we should meet again for two hours to-day?

Mr. FISHER (Wide Bay) [12.53 a.m.].—The Treasurer's proposal is fair if we intend to try to complete certain work before we rise for Christmas. The criticism of the honorable member for Parkes was not quite warranted, because if we do not meet later to-day it is obvious that we shall lose the Monday sitting also. If the honorable member for Hunter will withdraw his objection, we can avoid meeting again to-day, and meet on Monday.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [12.54 a.m.].—I understand that the Treasurer, if he could have made arrangements for the Monday sitting, did not intend to ask the House to meet again to-day.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I was going to take the sense of the House as to whether they desired to sit to-day.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I understand that the Treasurer proposed to sit to-day, in order to fix a meeting for Monday.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—If we do meet to-day, I propose that we shall do business.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—We are here to do business, and as we have been kept from our homes, I suggest that the honorable member for Hunter withdraw his objection, and that we sit both to-day and on Monday.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

ADJOURNMENT.

MAIL SERVICE TO EUROPE—DAYS OF SITTING—TASMANIAN MAILS.

Motion (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) proposed—

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. POYNTON (Grey) [1.0 a.m.].—I desire to ask the Treasurer whether, before any moneys are paid on account of the extension of the mail service to Brisbane, the House will be given an opportunity to express an opinion on the subject.

Mr. LIDDELL (Hunter) [1.1 a.m.].—I desire to explain why I took the action I did in regard to the proposed extra sittings. I consider that we, as a House, have been very scurvily treated by the Treasurer. I heard the remarks which you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, made the other day, and I concur in every word you said. The way in which the Tariff has been dealt with is a disgrace to the country. Item after item of no consequence has been dealt with, while important items have been left over until the fag-end of the year, in the hope of getting them through in the rush. I am prepared to sit every day if necessary; but I must enter my protest against the manner in which business has been conducted.

Mr. STORRER (Bass) [1.2 a.m.].—The threatened coal strike in New South Wales caused a reduction in the number of mail steamers running between Tasmania and the mainland. There has been only one mail from Tasmania since last Wednesday, and there will not be another delivered until Monday. I desire to know, now that the strike is over, when the ordinary service will be resumed.

Mr. WILKS (Dalley) [1.3 a.m.].—The Treasurer has always been known as a sturdy advocate of the workers; and I desire to know what he proposes to do in the case of the dockers. The honorable gentleman has had a conversation with the manager of the company.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—That was private.

Mr. WILKS.—Then I shall do no more than ask the honorable gentleman to devise some means of getting over the difficulty.

Mr. MAUGER (Maribyrnong—Postmaster-General) [1.5 a.m.].—In reply to the honorable member for Bass, I may say that instructions will be given for the ordinary mail time-table between the mainland and Tasmania to be resumed at once.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [1.6 a.m.].—In reply to the honorable member for Grey in regard to the cost of the extension of the mail service to Brisbane, I have to say that that is a matter for the Prime Minister, but I think I can safely assure him that no definite arrangement will be made, and no money paid, without the concurrence of the House.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

House adjourned at 1.6 a.m. (Saturday).

House of Representatives.

Saturday, 23 November, 1907.

ABSENCE OF MR. SPEAKER.

The CLERK acquainted the House that he had been informed of the unavoidable absence of Mr. SPEAKER.

Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER took the chair at 11 a.m., and read prayers.

PORT DAVEY.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether negotiations are proceeding on the subject of establishing telephone communication with Port Davey on the south-west coast of Tasmania?

Mr. MAUGER.—The question of connecting Port Davey by telephone is engaging the attention of the Post and Telegraph Department and the State Premier, from whom it will be necessary to obtain a guarantee.

WIRELESS TELEGRAPHY.

Mr. FOWLER.—I desire to ask the Postmaster-General a question relating to a clause in the mail contract with the Orient Steam Navigation Company, which I had intended to refer to last night, but which, owing to the lateness of the hour, I refrained from dealing with. The clause specifies that certain steps shall be taken by the contracting company with reference to establishing communication with a wireless telegraphy station on Rottnest Island. I wish to know whether the establishment of a wireless telegraphy station on that island is likely to be undertaken at an early date. There certainly is a great necessity for its establishment.

Mr. MAUGER.—The matter of establishing a wireless telegraphy station on Rottnest Island is receiving the attention of the Post and Telegraph Department, and I hope that long before the commencement of the contract it will be established.

Mr. KING O'MALLEY.—Has the Postmaster-General yet made any arrangement to connect King Island, a very important part of the Darwin electorate, with the mainland, by means of wireless telegraphy?

Mr. MAUGER.—No such arrangement has yet been made, but I have no doubt that so important a place will receive every consideration.

RABBIT DESTRUCTION.

Mr. LIDDELL.—I see by this morning's *Argus* that the report of Dr. Tidswell, with reference to rabbit destruction, has been furnished to the press. So far as I am aware, no information on the subject has yet been given to the House. I desire to know whether the Treasurer proposes to furnish the House with the report, and also why it should be supplied to the press before its supply to honorable members.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I have not yet received, nor has the Prime Minister received, the report of Dr. Tidswell. Yesterday afternoon I received from Mr. Ashton a letter advising me that he had been furnished with a copy of the report by Dr. Tidswell, who had informed him that he had posted one to me, which I would receive yesterday afternoon, and asking me not to give it to the press here until the time when he intended to give his own copy to the press in Sydney. I did not receive the report by yesterday's mail, nor have I received it by this morning's mail. Knowing that it would be handed to the press in Sydney, I informed one or two persons connected with the press here yesterday that it would be available in Sydney, and that they had better get it telegraphed to Melbourne. With the concurrence of the Prime Minister, I shall lay the report upon the table of the House as soon as it is received, and the Cabinet will consider what action shall be taken.

PAPER.

Mr. DEAKIN laid upon the table the following paper—

Papua—Ordinances of 1907—

No. 9.—Supplementary Appropriation, 1904-5.

No. 10.—Supplementary Appropriation, 1905-6.

POST-OFFICE: PENOLA.

Mr. LIVINGSTON.—Some time ago the Postmaster-General was good enough to promise me that he would ascertain the cost of improving the post-office at Penola, in South Australia, and I desire to know if he has yet received a report on the subject.

Mr. MAUGER.—If the honorable member will make inquiries at the office of the Department, I shall be able to give him full information. As there are thou-

of post-offices in the Commonwealth, it is quite impossible for me to carry in my mind such information as he desires to obtain in reference to the Penola office.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—I find that in the *Age* report of the division on the amendment of the honorable member for Barrier for the nationalization of the ocean mail service, a number of honorable members are reported as having voted on the side of the "ayes" who ought to have been reported as having voted on the side of the "noes." I find also that the names of certain members have been entered in the pair-book in the same way. The division is reported in the *Age* as twenty-four "ayes" and seventeen "noes." The seventeen "noes" comprise members of the Labour Party. Those honorable members who paired against the amendment are reported in the newspaper as "noes."

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The pair-book is wrong?

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—Yes. The impression is given to the public that Mr. Wise, Mr. Archer, Mr. Bowden, Mr. J. T. Brown, Mr. Fairbairn, Sir John Forrest, Mr. Deakin, Mr. Bruce Smith, Mr. Harper, Mr. W. H. Irvine, and Mr. Knox paired in favour of the "nationalization" amendment. With regard to the laughter which my remarks evoke, I think it will be sufficiently suggestive to the public of the error that the idea of those honorable gentlemen pairing for such an amendment has provoked so much humour on the part of members of the House. The pair-book justifies the report in the newspaper, because the names I have read are entered under "For," and the absent members of the Labour Party are reported as having paired against their colleague's amendment.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I may mention that the House does not recognise pairs in any way, and that the pair-book is kept merely for the convenience of honorable members who desire to be absent.

ADDITIONAL SITTING DAY.

Motion (by Mr. DEAKIN) proposed—

That, until otherwise ordered, this House do meet at half-past ten o'clock a.m. on Monday in each week, in addition to the present sitting days.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [11.8].—I shall offer no objection to the motion, though I think that it comes not very appropriately from the Government,

who have frittered away during the session a lot of valuable time, which might have been spent very profitably on the important topic of the Tariff. However, it seems to me that in the closing hours of this period of the session we are to be treated to what I described the other night as a "legislative orgy." It is to be deprecated, in the interests of the commercial classes, that we should be driven into these straits in the consideration of the Tariff. On the other hand, there is the difficulty that, if we do not make some progress now, the commercial classes—indeed, all sections of the community—will suffer still more by reason of the delay. We are in one of those difficult positions in which one does not quite know the best way to proceed. I believe that we shall be consulting the best interests of the country if we err in favour of a full and favourable consideration of the interests of those outside, who are so profoundly affected by the Tariff. With that condition I shall support the proposal. I hope that it will not be necessary for the Government to resort to all-night sittings if we are going to sit six days a week and all the hours of the clock except the night hours. It should be made a rule not to entrench on those hours which we ought to devote to sleep. We shall have little enough time if we are to get any sleep at all to devote ourselves to business; and the Tariff is, after all, the most important business which can engage this Parliament at the present time. Every man, woman, and child in the country is directly affected by it. I trust that we shall devote ourselves uninterruptedly to it—I say that advisedly—without the interpolation of other measures in the manner attempted during last week by the Government. Last night we were actually asked by the Attorney-General to consider the Quarantine Bill. Surely that is a matter which can wait until we meet again, when we can deal with it with minds free and untrammelled by the weight of other important business, such as we are engaged upon now. The country will lose nothing, and no interest will suffer if the Quarantine Bill is delayed a little. Indeed, I think that the country will gain from the more careful and deliberate consideration of such a measure rather than by rushing it through during the closing hours of sittings when honorable members are tired and cannot possibly give to it the attention that it deserves.

That is the way not to do the country's business. One reason why this Parliament is becoming so unpopular in the States as a whole is by reason of the crude and ill-digested legislation which has been put through during the closing hours of sittings when honorable members have been too tired to give to the business the consideration to which it is entitled. I hope, therefore, that no interpolations of the kind will be attempted. We should address ourselves steadily to the specific task before us, and pursue it uninterruptedly, in the hope that we may reach a conclusion with every interest fully conserved and properly considered. I should like to ask the Prime Minister what he proposes to do regarding Saturday sittings? That is a point upon which he was very vague.

Mr. DEAKIN.—I thought that the fairest thing was to allow the House, next Friday, to fix its own time.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—If the Prime Minister leaves it until next Friday, honorable members from other States will have made their arrangements. The trouble seems to be that no one is thought of in these matters but honorable members from the Prime Minister's own State. That is not fair to others. I submit that the Government ought to forecast the business for the week, so that honorable members may know when the House is going to sit. In that case, those who have homes in other States will be able to make their arrangements. Their convenience ought to be met. I should like to suggest, also, that if we are to sit on Saturday, we might try to get more than two hours' work done. It is hardly worth while for the House to meet for two hours.

Mr. THOMAS.—We should not have been meeting to-day, except for the honorable member for Hunter.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—That was quite a misunderstanding.

Mr. LIDDELL.—We should have sat to-day under any circumstances.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The Treasurer gave us his assurance that he intended to ask the House to sit on Saturday, as well as on Monday. If he made a different statement to other honorable members, I was not aware of it.

Mr. THOMAS.—He said that we need not sit to-day because we sat late last night.

Mr. SALMON.—The Treasurer stated while the discussion was going on that he did not intend to ask the House to meet to-day.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The Treasurer told me distinctly that he proposed that we should sit to-day as well as on Monday. It is just as well that the honorable gentleman should clear the matter up. In the meantime I ask the Government to state what they propose to do in the matter of Saturday sittings.

Mr. FISHER.—(Wide Bay) [11.15].—I agree that the principal business to be dealt with by the House before the Christmas holidays should be the Tariff, and that the Government should, as far as possible, arrange to devote the whole of our time to it. They should also endeavor to look ahead so that honorable members from other States may be able to make their arrangements. I suggest that the Prime Minister should make his motion include Saturday sittings. If that is done it will be quite easy on any day during the week to move that the House at its rising on Friday adjourn until Monday, if it is not desired to sit on Saturday. That is the best course to take.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The honorable member wants the House to sit on Saturdays, I suppose?

Mr. FISHER.—Oh yes.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—But not for two hours.

Mr. MAHON.—Why not sit on Sundays, also?

Mr. FISHER.—For the obvious reason that we have other duties to perform. Some of us would prefer to be with our families on Sundays.

Mr. MAHON.—The better the day, the better the deed!

Mr. FISHER.—I have no objection to the honorable member moving that the House sit on Sunday if he chooses, but I do not recommend such a proposition to the Government. I do hope that the Tariff will be the principal work, and that we shall complete it before we rise for the Christmas holidays. But I also desire to observe that the Government should see to it that the wages prescribed by Mr. Justice Higgins shall be paid to the workmen who are entitled to them. If that be done, I desire to say, on behalf of myself and the party to which I belong that, those conditions fulfilled, very reasonable terms will be agreed to regarding other matters. The intention of Parliament clearly »

insure the payment of fair and reasonable wages to the workmen, and not to collect revenue in the form of an Excise duty. I think there will be time enough to have that matter attended to before we adjourn. I shall do my utmost in assisting the Government to get the Tariff through before the Christmas holidays.

Mr. JOHNSON.—The honorable member believes in sitting all the year round, holidays included.

Mr. FISHER.—All that I have to say in reply to that remark is that it is one of those interjections that are not only irrelevant but utterly incorrect.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The honorable member should not take such a remark too literally.

Mr. FISHER.—The two matters to which I wish to have attention given are, first, that we should get the Tariff through before the holidays, and, secondly, that justice should be done to those people who are interested in the Excise legislation in securing them that which Parliament intended that they should have, and to which a High Court Justice has decided that they are entitled.

Mr. MAHON (Coolgardie) [11.19].—The extraordinary part of the speech of the honorable member for Parramatta was, that being as he has told us, intensely opposed to this motion, he should yet be able to give his vote for it. He has put forward the plea that the commercial community are waiting for the settlement of the Tariff. If the Tariff could be definitely fixed before Christmas there would be a great deal to be said for what the honorable member has urged. But he knows, as we all know, that if we pass the duties remaining for consideration it will not mean finality with regard to the Tariff, and that the unrest which is affecting the commercial community will continue just the same. There can be no doubt about that. Therefore, there is no excuse whatever for rushing the Tariff through.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I hope that the honorable member does not think that I desire the Tariff to be rushed through the House. I say emphatically that I will not assist in rushing it through.

Mr. MAHON.—But the honorable member is supporting this motion, the object of which undoubtedly is to facilitate the rushing of the Tariff through this House.

BRUCE SMITH.—Not at all.

Mr. MAHON.—Then what is its object? Finality will not be reached even if this House does dispose of the Tariff before Christmas.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—The passing of the motion will not induce me to forego any protest that I think I ought to make.

Mr. MAHON.—Quite so; but surely the honorable member must recognise the condition into which the House is drifting. When honorable members are utterly worn out physically, it is impossible for them to attend here regularly to support his eloquent protests, so that the duties proposed by the Government are agreed to. The honorable member for Parramatta has rightly said that the Tariff profoundly affects every man, woman, and child in the community; hence it should be considered when members are in full possession of their faculties. Our work cannot be properly done otherwise, and the public will suffer from our slipshod decisions. I fail to recognise the necessity for this motion, and think that it is little short of an affront to the House to submit it without any explanation. I should willingly make any reasonable sacrifice in order that the Tariff might be finally disposed of before Christmas; but we all know that although the powers of the Senate are not exactly co-ordinate with our own, it can make requests and hold up the Tariff until we either approve or disapprove of those requests. That being so, is it reasonable to suggest that it is necessary for this House to dispose of the Tariff before Christmas? I see no urgency in the matter, and am prepared to indorse the views of the honorable member for Parramatta not only as to the manner in which the Tariff has been submitted, but as to the general conduct of business during the last three or four months. If the Government had desired an honest discussion of the Tariff, instead of introducing it and endeavouring to rush it through the House in the closing weeks of the session, they should have made it the first business.

Mr. JOHNSON.—And it should be dealt with in sections in different sessions in order that it might be carefully considered.

Mr. MAHON.—My experience of the consideration of two Tariffs in this House has satisfied me that Parliament is, perhaps, the worst tribunal that could be selected for the adjustment of duties; the work is one that requires expert knowledge and the utmost deliberation on the part of those to whom it is intrusted. We have,

however, to make the best of the position, and that I contend we are not doing. I fully indorse the remarks of the honorable member for Parramatta regarding the practice of rushing legislation through Parliament at the end of a session. During the consideration of the Tariff schedule I had occasion to move for a reduction in the monstrous sugar duties, and was then reminded of a provision in an Act of Parliament passed some time ago in which we fixed the Excise and bounty. As a matter of fact, that measure was rushed through this House, just as the Government are now rushing the Tariff through it, and without anything like adequate or fair consideration. A bargain was then made which I was reminded the other day must bind the whole Commonwealth for many years. That in itself constitutes a valid and forcible reason for our refusing to hurriedly fix duties the effect of which may be to divert the whole course of trade and business. If the Government had had any real desire that the Tariff should be properly considered, instead of wasting the early part of the session they would have submitted it to the House as soon as we met. There was nothing to prevent them doing so. They had before them the progress reports of the Tariff Commission, and should have been able without difficulty, to decide what recommendations they were prepared to support, and what variations of the recommendations of the Commission they desired. I have spoken but rarely during the consideration of the Tariff, believing that an honorable member should confine his attention to those items of which he has expert knowledge. On several occasions, when I intended to speak, I have been forestalled by gentlemen who are continually on their feet, and who in some way have secured a monopoly on the debate. I am not going to continue that line of action, and I do not think that the passing of this motion will facilitate business. I protest against this House meeting on Saturdays, as well as on Mondays. If honorable members would come to a reasonable frame of mind, and speak only on the questions of which they have expert knowledge, the volume of talk would be considerably reduced, and the ordinary days of sitting would be ample to enable us to pass the Tariff within a reasonable period. It is true that the Government, when rearranging the business of the House, have got into the habit of consulting the convenience of certain honorable members. But they make a mistake if they think

that everybody else is going to acquiesce in these secret bargains in which their convenience is not considered. In such circumstances, the Government cannot complain if they are subjected to a little criticism. The arrangement to rush the Tariff through the House before Christmas, and then to have a fairly long adjournment does not particularly suit the convenience of members from other States. I am not one of those who will be specially inconvenienced.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—The Government consult the leaders of the various parties.

Mr. MAHON.—And the leaders should consult their followers before making a bargain.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I should like to know what leaders have been consulted.

Mr. MAHON.—When I asked the honorable member for Wide Bay yesterday whether there was to be a Saturday's sitting, I received the answer "No"; yet I find myself here to-day when I should preferably be somewhere else. It is the duty of the Government to consult honorable members generally.

Mr. THOMAS.—We are here to-day as the result of the action of one honorable member.

Mr. MAHON.—That view has been disputed by the honorable member concerned.

Mr. THOMAS.—By whom?

Mr. MAHON.—By the honorable member for Hunter.

Mr. THOMAS.—Why he has stated that he would take the same course again.

Mr. MAHON.—I am not responsible for that. I want to know where is the necessity for this House sitting on Saturdays?

Mr. LIDDELL.—I rise to a point of order. I wish to know whether it is fair that an honorable member's name should be used in discussion when he cannot hear the remarks which are being made concerning him?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I would point out that the dialogue which has been proceeding is altogether irregular.

Mr. MAHON.—I have endeavoured to make my remarks relevant to the question before the Chair. I understand that the House did not adjourn till 1 o'clock this morning. I do not believe that the public expect a man to ruin his health by sitting in this badly ventilated chamber till such an unreasonable hour. No adequate reason has been assigned why we should be required to do so. I would point out to

Government that honorable members like myself have a large correspondence with our electors to transact, and a great deal of departmental work to perform. I represent a considerable area—an area which is rapidly developing—and I have a voluminous correspondence with various Departments to attend to, and especially with the Postal Department. That work must be neglected if I am required to attend here every day in the week and practically all the hours of the clock.

Mr. LIVINGSTON.—The honorable member is not suffering in health yet. He looks splendid.

Mr. MAHON.—I thank the honorable member for his compliment, but I would remind him that people sometimes believe their looks. Although honorable members may not feel the effects of this legislative debauch immediately, I am satisfied that they will feel it eventually, and that they will regret having given their assent to the proposal now under consideration. I would remind honorable members that the first all-night sitting in connexion with the Tariff resulted from the Government's anxiety to get the hat duties passed. Now, a certain member of the Ministry was aware that I had in my possession a document which would have changed the views of a great many honorable members regarding those duties.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Where was the honorable member on that occasion?

Mr. MAHON.—I happened to be unwell, and consequently went home, having been assured by the Government Whip that the hat duties would not come on for consideration that evening.

Mr. HUME COOK.—I do not think that statement is correct.

Mr. MAHON.—It is quite correct. I took a note of it at the time. Further, the honorable member made an arrangement to provide me with a pair upon every division taken in connexion with those duties. I was to be paired in favour of the lowest duty on each occasion. But, notwithstanding that definite arrangement with him, I find that my name appears in the pair-book only in connexion with one division. If it would be in order for me to do so, I should read the document to which I have alluded to the House. I repeat that one member of the Government was aware that I had evidence which I intended to place before the Committee, and which would have considerably influenced the votes of a large number of honorable mem-

bers occupying seats in this corner of the chamber in respect of the hat duties. It is impossible to absolve the Government from condemnation for having compelled the House to sit all night for the purpose of passing those duties.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—Under suspicious circumstances.

Mr. MAHON.—If the honorable member knew as much as I do, he would think that the circumstances were very suspicious.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—At the end of that debate I stated that I would endeavour to obtain a recommitment of those duties. I hope that the honorable member will support me in that.

Mr. MAHON.—If the honorable member moves for a recommitment, I shall be found supporting him. I hope, too, that he will move for a recommitment of other duties which were put through under very suspicious circumstances.

Mr. CARR.—What are the suspicious circumstances? I should like to know.

Mr. MAHON.—The duty upon condensed milk was rushed through—

Mr. FISHER.—Under suspicious circumstances?

Mr. MAHON.—Yes.

Mr. CARR.—No.

Mr. MAHON.—As a very new member, the honorable member for Macquarie is entitled to his opinion, but I hold that the circumstances were very suspicious. Although I have been absent from the House, I may inform him that I have kept a very close watch upon its proceedings. I have read the newspaper accounts of them, and also the *Hansard* reports, so that I do not think I have missed very much.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—The honorable member might safely have missed the daily newspaper reports if he desired to obtain an accurate knowledge of the proceedings of the House.

Mr. MAHON.—That is true, and it is a strong argument for the publication of a daily *Hansard*.

Mr. FISHER.—The honorable gentleman is to be commended for his industry.

Mr. MAHON.—I should have preferred to be able to exercise it in this House. I repeat that some of the duties have been put through in very suspicious circumstances.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The honorable gentleman should not make reflections.

Mr. MAHON.—I do not reflect upon the Treasurer at all. We know that in his kindness of heart he sometimes yields to influences to which he should not yield. The Government should agree to recommit the duties about which we complain, and I, for one, will be prepared to assist the Opposition in an endeavour to have them recommitted later on. It is out of all reason to expect honorable members to work six days a week in this House. I have worked six days, and, indeed, seven days a week before now, but the demand upon a man's physical and intellectual powers involved in sitting in this chamber, and following the deliberations of the House, is far more trying than the same number of hours spent in merely physical exertion would be. As one of the Labour Party, I object to the violation of the eight hours' principle, even to put a Tariff through. The Government must be quite conscious that it would not relieve the minds of the commercial community in any way to put the Tariff through the House of Representatives before Christmas. The duties will not have been finally decided upon until the Tariff has been passed by the Senate, and even after that, by combinations of members in this House, particular duties might be subjected to revision and reduction.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—The honorable gentleman must recognise that it is not likely that the action taken in remitting the duties on such lines as linen and fodder will be revised.

Mr. MAHON.—There will not be many duties remitted if the Government can help it. What will probably happen will be that some of the duties will be slightly reduced.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Order.

Mr. MAHON.—That would not relieve the commercial community. They will still be in a state of unrest.

Mr. THOMAS.—What about a duty on kerosene?

Mr. MAHON.—If the honorable member for Barrier is really in earnest about the kerosene duty—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The honorable member should not discuss the Tariff.

Mr. MAHON.—I was following up an interjection.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Interjections are disorderly, and it is equally disorderly to reply to them.

Mr. MAHON.—If I had been allowed to proceed without interruption, I should not have occupied so much time. The Government might arrange to postpone certain items, and bring up for consideration a particular duty such as that referred to by the honorable member for Barrier. I am sure they would be supported by the House in a case of that kind. I have heard no reason from either side in support of the present proposal. Anything that has been said in favour of the motion has been said by the honorable member for Parramatta.

Mr. THOMAS.—And by the leader of the Labour Party.

Mr. MAHON.—The leader of the Labour Party merely wished to have Saturday added to the motion. I think the honorable gentleman did not quite understand the position, because the Government are able at any time to move that the House should meet on Saturdays.

Mr. FISHER.—That would be without giving notice to honorable members.

Mr. MAHON.—It might so happen that even where notice was given, the Government would not be able to secure the presence of a quorum. I shall not assist them to obtain a quorum on Saturdays, nor on Mondays, unless we adjourn at a reasonable time. I believe there are several honorable members who hold a similar opinion on the subject. The members of the Government are well aware that I have so far treated them with absolute fairness. I have not been obstructive in any way, although they have done many things I heartily disapprove of. I have sympathized with them in many of their difficulties. I think now, however, that they are proposing to put the last straw on the animal's back, and it is about time it was resented. The excuse is the necessity of removing the uncertainty which exists in commercial circles. That uncertainty will continue to exist in a greater or lesser degree until both Houses have passed the Tariff. Such an excuse is therefore inadequate to justify the undue haste now being made; which, if persevered in, will result in the imposition of duties unfair in their incidence and injurious alike to the producers and consumers of Australia.

Mr. LIVINGSTON (Barker) [11.48].—I do not often support the Government, but I wish to say that during the whole of this week I have distinctly understood that House would sit on Saturday morning,

on Monday next. I should have been very much disappointed if that course were not adopted. The Treasurer is blunt, and tells honorable members straight what he means. That is one good trait in the honorable gentleman's character. As a doctor, the honorable member for Hunter may be perfectly justified in urging a reduction in the hours of sittings in the interest of the health of honorable members, but, taking a general view of the House this morning, I have not in my long experience seen a better or a fresher-looking lot of men. Judging by their appearance, honorable members might sit for ever. I do not blame the Government for trying to get on with the Tariff. It is idle to say that if we pass the Tariff in this House it will not lead to finality. There may be a few alterations suggested in another place, but honorable senators will be found willing to study the wishes of this House. I hope that whatever the Government do they will push on with the Tariff, and I urge the Prime Minister not to allow honorable members to go away from Melbourne until they have dealt with it. If that were done, we could look forward to a fairly long Christmas recess.

Mr. HUME COOK (Bourke) [11.50].—The honorable member for Coolgardie seems to be under the impression that I have treated him unfairly. He says first that I informed him that the hat duties would not come on on a certain night. I do not remember making that statement, but it is probable that I said that in my opinion they would not or might not come on. One cannot tell exactly what is going to happen with regard to any particular item, because sometimes a great many items are passed, and at other times only a few. I can only give my opinion. I will not further dispute as to that matter. With respect to the pairing business, it is true that the honorable member told me that he desired to have a pair always for the lowest duty, and, as far as possible, I have endeavoured to arrange it for him. But a most serious difficulty arose as to giving pairs to any honorable member on the particular occasion to which the honorable member refers. The honorable member for Lang, who is the Opposition whip, will bear me out that we had extreme difficulty in making matters fit for all sides of the House. The Government decided to propose a fixed instead of an *ad valorem* duty on hats.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—How long before the vote?

Mr. HUME COOK.—The Government are responsible for that part of the business. I will simply explain my part. When the question was put, the honorable member for Parramatta began a series of amendments which culminated in an amendment for a 75 per cent. *ad valorem* duty on hats. Knowing that the honorable member for Coolgardie desired to vote for the lowest duty, and that he was returned as a free-trader, I could not conceive that I would be doing him justice by recording him as in favour of a 75 per cent. duty.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK—As against 150 per cent.?

Mr. HUME COOK.—That is not the point.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The honorable member must confine himself to a personal explanation on the matter with which he is now dealing. Otherwise he would open up a discussion upon the whole question of the Tariff.

Mr. HUME COOK.—I am simply making a personal explanation. It seemed to be doing an injustice to the honorable member, to have it telegraphed to Coolgardie that he had voted for a duty of 75 per cent. on hats.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The honorable member must not debate the question.

Mr. HUME COOK.—I am giving the reasons why I took a certain course.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I understand that the honorable member for Coolgardie complained that he was not paired on a number of other occasions.

Mr. HUME COOK.—The honorable member does not complain about other occasions. His pairs were recorded. I consulted with the honorable member for Yarra generally over the question of pairs on the hat duties, and he also agreed that it was difficult to know what to do. In the circumstances I submit that, in fairness to the honorable member for Coolgardie, I did what I thought was best in his interests, and just to the party to which he belonged. With regard to the matter to which the honorable member for Parkes has referred, there has been no mistake in the way in which the pairs are recorded in the pair book. The proposition of the honorable member for Barrier was to omit certain words from the motion of the Postmaster-General. The pairs are recorded in the pair book on that question exactly as they

have been recorded on every similar occasion. Those who desired to omit the words would vote with the noes, because the question put was "That the words proposed to be omitted stand part of the question."

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—The amendment is not set out in the pair-book. It simply says "Mr. Thomas' amendment."

Mr. HUME COOK.—I am not responsible for the way in which the press records the pairs. The honorable member for Parkes and others, who desired to vote against the amendment of the honorable member for Barrier, voted "Aye" for the retention of the words in the motion. Consequently no mistake has been made. The honorable member for Lang, who with me helped to enter the pairs, can bear out my statement.

Mr. KNOX (Kooyong) [11.55].—As a city member, I desire at all times to fall in with the wishes of those who are not able conveniently to reach their own homes. I am sorry that the honorable member for Coolgardie has taken up an obstructive position, but I trust that on consideration he will recognise that the public interests must be above any personal consideration in a question of this great importance. Speaking with some authority, I may tell the honorable member that he is quite in error in supposing that no great inconvenience exists in Melbourne, or elsewhere throughout the Commonwealth, through the Tariff not being settled. He would find the bonds all over Australia at present crowded with goods which are awaiting the fixing of the duties before they are taken out. I know in two cases of large mining enterprises whose machinery has been stored in Sydney waiting for the settlement of the machinery duties. It is the most pressing and important duty of the House to get the Tariff completed without delay. Regarding the days of meeting, if honorable members decide to miss the Friday expresses to Adelaide and Sydney, surely they might as well sit as close up to the departure of the expresses on Saturdays as is convenient. If they miss the trains on Saturday, then by all means Monday should be available as a sitting day. I understand that these extra sittings are only for the purpose of endeavouring to get the Tariff through before the House rises over Christmas. I shall support the Government on this occasion, but I earnestly urge that there should not be a repetition of what took place with regard to the hat duties. If we have to attend

here morning after morning at 11 o'clock, there should be some limitation as to the time to which we are expected to remain, because we have not only to give our attendance, but also all the ability, knowledge, and information that we possess to the consideration of the important question of the Tariff. While I support the Government on this motion, I recognise that much of the feeling which exists is due to their own want of business foresight. With them must rest the responsibility for the present confusion, because they might easily have enabled a much speedier consideration of the Tariff to take place. I am anxious that we should make as much progress as possible before Christmas.

Mr. LIDDELL (Hunter) [12.0]. — I shall oppose this motion, even at the risk of being misunderstood by my fellow members and the country generally. It might be suspected that my opposition is on personal grounds, and that I objected to attend the sittings of Parliament every day of the week. But I have no personal feeling whatever in the matter; I am prepared to sit day after day, as often as may be necessary for the proper expedition of business. My opposition to the motion is based entirely on other grounds. I quite agree with the remarks of the honorable member for Coolgardie, and I am glad to think that he supports the position which I take. My object is to direct attention to the action, in the past, of the present Government. I am perfectly satisfied that the end which the Government have in view, in wishing us to sit day after day, is to rush the Tariff through when members are in a state of mental exhaustion. It has been suggested that my action in this connexion is based on health grounds; but that is not so. I would point out, however, that it is impossible for us to carry on the business of the country satisfactorily if we are overworked. There is a marked difference between men who work regular hours and those who work irregular hours, such as we do; and I have felt the evil effects. I may not talk so often, or at such length, as do other honorable members, but I endeavour to be here whenever a division is taken; and I think that my attendances will compare favorably with those of honorable members generally. When I entered the chamber the other night, after having been absent for the greater part of the day, I noticed the exhausted mental condition of honorable members. I noticed that Mr. Speaker

mistake, named three tellers on one side; and I am satisfied that that would not have occurred if his brain had not been nearly exhausted. Furthermore, if we have continuous sittings at this period of the year, when the temperature is so high, and in a chamber ventilated as this is, it is absolutely impossible for honorable members to do themselves justice. All the non-contentious items of the Tariff have been passed, but the important items have been postponed until, I suppose, members are exhausted, and anxious to get to their homes. Under such circumstances honorable members desire to pair, and are not here to oppose with their voices the proposals of the Government.

Mr. STORRER.—The honorable member knows very well why the items have been postponed.

Mr. LIDDELL.—I am explaining that, in my opinion, the Treasurer, expert underground engineer as he is, has brought about the postponement of the items with the object of rushing them through at the end of the session. I see no reason why there should be great anxiety to dispose in such a hurried manner of the Tariff. No doubt the commercial world, and the community generally, are anxious to have this matter settled; but I fail to see how there can be any satisfactory result if we are called upon to work long hours on six days of the week. Why should there not be a reasonable adjournment at Christmas, so that we may come back fresh to the work of settling the Tariff? I consider that the Treasurer, and the Government generally, and to a certain extent the Labour Party, are responsible for the present position of affairs. From time to time the Government have thrown the Tariff aside, and introduced other measures, such as the Mail Contract, or the Bill to grant a bonus to the iron industry. No doubt it was necessary that the Mail Contract should be ratified; and I am sure that, in this connexion, the Opposition have been most reasonable. But we find the new leader of the Labour Party, who, apparently, is prepared to take more drastic steps than was his predecessor, supporting a proposal for nationalization.

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—Surely the Mail Contract is an important matter?

Mr. LIDDELL.—That may be, but this is not the time for the discussion of nationalization proposals. Then the members of

the Labour Party took advantage of the introduction of the Manufactures Encouragement Bill to cause further delay in dealing with the Tariff. I hope I shall find many honorable members to support me in my opposition to this motion.

Mr. J. H. CATTS (Cook) [12.8].—If the Prime Minister proposes an amendment to the motion he has placed before us that will, so far as I understand, preclude us from subsequently debating the question; and as such a position would be absolutely unfair, I wish to say a few words now. Before we decide to sit every day in the week we ought to have the opportunity to discuss the proposal. Personally, I am prepared to sit, if necessary, even all night in order to expedite business. No time has been wasted, and, as a vast amount of work has been accomplished, there is, in my opinion, no necessity to sit on Saturdays as well as on Mondays. Let the Prime Minister adhere to his determination to call the House together on Mondays; but I think it ought to be left to us to decide whether it is absolutely necessary to sit on Saturdays. The honorable member for Hunter has charged the Labour Party with taking up time over the Mail Contract proposals and the Manufactures Encouragement Bill, both of which measures he describes as side issues. In my opinion, however, both are most important, in view of the fact that the Mail Contract, for instance, binds the country, during the next ten or twelve years, to a large expenditure of money. The honorable member for Wide Bay, when he expresses a desire to sit on Saturdays, speaks for himself alone, and not for any other member of the Labour Party. Every honorable member who does his duty has a good deal of departmental and personal work in connexion with his constituency; and such work cannot be done properly if we are compelled to sit every day of the week. The honorable member for Kooyong has expressed his approval of extra sittings; but I notice that, when the House sits until a late hour, the honorable member generally goes home to his comfortable bed and allows others to keep a quorum. The Government are yielding to clamour from other parts of the chamber to sit on Saturday, but that is not the quarter to which they will look for making a quorum if they get into a corner. If they will not extend to us some consideration with regard to Saturday, I do not intend to consider them when they get into difficulties. I have come to their rescue on

several occasions, of which they are well aware. I want not only to give a vote on the various items in the Tariff, but also to be present in the chamber, and to intelligently follow the discussion on each item. I want to be able to justify to my constituents every vote that I give. I do not want to be compelled to attend to the affairs of my constituency or departmental work in some part of the building, and to trot down to the chamber, like a blindfolded man, to vote on one side or the other. On the contrary, I desire to be able to sit in the chamber and to intelligently follow the discussion on every item. If, however, the Government are determined to sit on Saturdays, as well as on every other day, it will preclude honorable members from sitting here, and giving their undivided attention to the arguments, and also from performing their duty to their constituents.

Mr. SALMON.—It will be for only two Saturdays.

Mr. CATTS.—If it is determined by the House to sit on Saturdays, "unless otherwise ordered," I do not know how long that arrangement may last. We are expected to transact the business of the country with reasonable despatch, but that does not mean that we are to do an unreasonable thing—to rush and bullock the Tariff through without its receiving decent consideration. I suggest to the Government that, while they are prepared to consider the suggestions of honorable members who are opposed to them tooth and nail, and will do everything they can to discredit them and defeat their proposals, they ought also to be prepared to treat those who try to be fair to them in a sympathetic fashion.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [12.13].—In view of certain remarks by the honorable member for Hunter, I think it will be wise for me to say a few words in reply. He must know that the consideration of certain items in the machinery section of the Tariff was deferred with the concurrence of the deputy leader of the Opposition. The items were submitted to the honorable gentleman before their consideration was deferred, so that we could deal at once with those items which were not contentious. Only contentious items have been deferred. I do not think that the honorable member for Hunter intended to misrepresent, but I feel that he has misrepresented my attitude in regard to deferring items in division VI. of the Tariff. The reason why the

Government wish honorable members to sit almost continuously until near Christmas is to get the Tariff put through this House, if possible, in order that the Senate—which will re-assemble perhaps a month or six weeks before this House does, if honorable members do as we desire—may be able to deal with a large number of the items before we re-assemble. Our proposal is also made with a view to giving to honorable members a little rest. The Prime Minister has already stated that if we can get the Tariff put through this House by the second week in December, we shall probably adjourn until the end of February or the beginning of March.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—That has been said very plainly.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Yes. I am prepared to sit day after day, except on Christmas Day and Sundays, but my feeling is that honorable members do not want to sit continuously, and it is only with a view to meet the general desire that the Government have submitted this proposal. I have had an analysis made of the remaining items in the Tariff, and the deputy leader of the Opposition has seen how it has been made. There are about 118 items which are not very contentious. Some items are not contentious at all.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I do not agree with the honorable gentleman about that.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—That may be, but, according to a memorandum I have received from the Deputy Comptroller-General, there are still 215 items to be dealt with; of which 62 items are free; 24 items, free with preference; and 129 items, dutiable. He considers that there are 118 items which are practically non-contentious, and 97 items which are debatable.

Colonel FOXTON.—Can the honorable gentleman give us an analysis of the items which have been dealt with, for the purpose of making a comparison?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I think that more than one-half of the items in the Tariff have been dealt with.

Colonel FOXTON.—In three months?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—We have spent only two months in dealing with the items.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Those figures are not quite correct. In addition to the 129 dutiable items, we have to deal with a number of postponed items, and consider the items in divisions VI.A and VI.B.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—No, not the items in division VI.B

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The honorable gentleman is not going to proceed with that division?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The House has affirmed the principle of the Manufactures Encouragement Bill and division VI.B in the Tariff was only intended to be considered in case the grant of the iron bounty was not approved. At the present moment I do not see that we should deal with that division at all.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—But we have the postponed items to deal with.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I have gone through the Tariff, and it seems to me that the memorandum I have read represents the position. Suppose that the Manufactures Encouragement Bill is not passed by the Senate, we shall have to deal with division VI.B afterwards.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Order!

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I only want to say a few words more, sir. I think that there has been very little waste of time. In the early days of the discussion of the Tariff items, many items of business cropped up. When we started in earnest to deal with the Tariff in detail, I gave my assurance that, so far as I was concerned, I would prevent its consideration from being interfered with, and, until this week, I think I may say that, practically, its consideration has not been interfered with. Of course, when the Senate decided to adjourn over a certain period, we had to submit some urgent business, and that is what has caused the loss of this week as regards the Tariff. However, if we sit day after day until the 13th, 14th, or 15th December, we shall have a good many days in which to deal with the Tariff. I am sure that a large majority of honorable members desire to get it through if possible by Christmas. I do not think that there will be any slumming. Reasonable discussion will, I am quite sure, take place. Unless we cannot otherwise get through with the business, I do not like to sit late at night. That, I think, should be obviated as far as possible.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—We cannot sit all day, and every day, and late at night too.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Exactly. I hope that when we resume the consideration of the Tariff on Monday next, the attitude of honorable members generally will be so temperate that we shall not be compelled to sit late at night.

Mr. FRASER.—Will the honorable gentleman endeavour to let us get away at 11 p.m.?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Certainly. That I think is quite late enough unless there are very exceptional circumstances.

Mr. TUDOR.—It certainly is if we start at 10.30 a.m.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Quite so. I should like to see honorable members leave a little earlier at night than 11 o'clock, but I cannot promise not to sit later than that.

Mr. FRASER.—Will the honorable gentleman explain why it is proposed to sit on Monday at 10.30 a.m. and on Tuesday at 2.30 p.m.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—That is a matter in the hands of the Prime Minister. I hope that honorable members will see that the Government have been compelled to interrupt the consideration of the Tariff. I gave a promise to the deputy leader of the Opposition that I would ask honorable members to deal with the Manufactures Encouragement Bill before they dealt with division VI. of the Tariff. The consideration of that measure occupied some time, and I am not complaining of the action of the leader of the Labour Party in moving the motion which he did. I know perfectly well what the desire of the party is. The Government do not blame them at all for what they did. As regards the mail contract the same influences had operated in the minds of honorable members, and we cannot complain of that. I hope that there will be no interference with the consideration of the Tariff until it is completed. I hope that honorable members will meet on Monday in a temper which will not compel us to ask them to sit late at night, certainly not after 11 o'clock, unless it is unavoidable.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH (Parkes) [12.20].—The speech which the Treasurer has just delivered reminds me of a very good story about a young barrister who appeared before the Court in order to argue a motion. When he concluded a very long speech, the Judge told him that they were entirely with him until they heard him. The Treasurer has just supplied us with data which have convinced me of the soundness of a general conclusion against himself to which I had previously inclined. He considers that no time has been wasted in the consideration of the Tariff. He admits that its consideration has occupied two months, and also that what is left represents one-half of the Tariff, apart from the postponed

items. According to his own statement, therefore, we are asked to pass more than one-half of the Tariff in a few weeks.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—No; not quite one-half.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—The honorable gentleman is going back on his own statement. That is always the difficulty when we have to deal with anything which he has said; he interjects either that he did not say it or that he said it in another way.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I said that we had dealt with more than one-half of the Tariff. The honorable gentleman misunderstood me.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—There are still 215 items to be dealt with, and we started with 400 items.

Mr. STORRER.—We are wasting a lot of time this morning.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—That may be, but I am the best judge of what I am doing, and my constituents are the best judges of me. The honorable member quite mistakes his object if he supposes that any of his observations will affect, except to lengthen the time I shall take. The Treasurer has supplied data to show the House the utter absurdity of the proposal which the Government have submitted. He practically says that one-half of the Tariff has yet to be passed. I am of opinion that more than one-half of the Tariff has yet to be passed. The honorable gentleman has made the unsophisticated admission, no doubt with an argumentative purpose, that the House, so far, has only dealt fairly with the Tariff, that the time has not been wasted, that the discussion was necessary, and that he has no comment of an adverse character to make upon it. What does it all mean? We have three weeks in which to deal with the remainder of the Tariff. The Treasurer is proposing to us that in three weeks we should dispose of exactly the same amount of business that we have disposed of in two months. That is not the only consideration. There is a much more serious one. The Prime Minister and the Treasurer have held out to the House a sort of bribe as regards a holiday. They have said, "If you complete the Tariff in the next three weeks we will let you off until the beginning of March. But if you do not complete the Tariff during the next three weeks you must come here in February."

Mr. SALMON.—The honorable member knows why that statement was made by the Prime Minister.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—The Prime Minister needs no champion in the honorable member.

Mr. SALMON.—He only said that in reply to an inquiry.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—I know what the Prime Minister said, and I know how carefully he weighs his words; and the Treasurer has reiterated his statement.

Mr. SALMON.—He only made the statement when he was asked a question from the opposite side.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—The honorable member has had some experience as Chairman of Committees, and therefore he ought to be a preceptor in the matter of observing order. The Prime Minister has offered that as a sort of bribe. "You can have an extra month's holiday," he has said, "if you will only push the Tariff through in three weeks, although we admit that in taking two months to deal with a similar quantity you did it reasonably and without unnecessary delay." I have made up my mind at great personal loss and inconvenience to see the Tariff put through this House. I tell the Prime Minister and the Treasurer that I shall not give up one iota of my criticism on every item in the Tariff; because I think that the Deputy Speaker has, as a member of this House, very carefully and very truly summarized the methods which have been adopted in putting the Tariff through. I agree with the leader of the Opposition that a great deal of matter, if not brought forward by the Government, has been connived at by them in order to push over the consideration of the Tariff until the last few weeks of the session. I have no hesitation in believing that it has been done in the hope by the Treasurer that we should be less inclined to debate the Tariff, and give him an opportunity of afterwards boasting to his constituents that he had managed to "bullock it through" somehow or other, and to say "There is my Tariff."

Mr. MATHEWS.—That is a bit unkind, I think.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—We say many unkind things here, and think that we are justified. I generally agree with the honorable member for Kooyong as regards most of the statements which he makes, but I entirely disagree with him in criticism.

the speech of the honorable member for Coolgardie as one of "obstruction." I think that the honorable member has given utterance to some exceedingly wholesome home truths, and they are emphasized very appropriately in what seems to be the leisurely atmosphere of a Saturday morning sitting. He has commented upon the way in which the hat duty was put through. I think it was the most reprehensible—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Order!

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—The most reprehensible feature in connexion with this or the last Tariff; because, at the last moment, as every one knows, the whole situation was suddenly changed so that it was impossible to say what percentage was imposed.

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—The matter was discussed all night.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—It may have been, but the difficulty became a hopeless one, and to discuss it all night was the only means honorable members had of expressing their feelings as to a change of front made in such an objectionable manner.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Order! The honorable member must not pursue that line of argument.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—The Government Whip has endeavoured to excuse himself in regard to the statements made by the honorable member for Coolgardie.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Order! I expressly asked the honorable member for Bourke whether he was going to speak upon the personal explanation made by the honorable member for Coolgardie, because I saw that if I permitted him to do so it would lead to a general debate.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—I only wished to say that the Government Whip had paired the honorable member for Coolgardie up to 50 per cent. and then stopped.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Order!

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—You allowed the honorable member for Bourke to say what he wanted to say.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I must point out that the honorable member for Bourke had a right to make a personal explanation at any time. He could even have made one in the middle of a debate.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—It is a great pity that his statement was made by way of personal explanation, and that he was permitted in that way to direct an argument against me.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I did not understand that the remarks of the honorable member for Bourke were directed against the honorable member. I understood that he merely desired to explain some conduct of his to which exception was taken.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—I hope you will admit, sir, that if in the course of a personal explanation an honorable member makes a statement which misrepresents other honorable members, they should have an opportunity of pointing out the misrepresentation. I do not wish to go into the matter at all. I merely desire to say that the honorable member for Bourke made a statement from which inferences may be drawn—that he paired the honorable member for Coolgardie up to 50 per cent.

Mr. SALMON.—Is that obeying the Chair?

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—I am not disobeying the Chair.

Mr. STORRER.—The honorable member has been repeating his statement over and over again.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—Because I was interrupted by the Deputy Speaker calling me to order. I make no comment upon the fact to which I have called attention. It is a matter of inference, and I give every honorable member credit for sufficient intellectual agility to make that inference for himself. I desire to emphasize what I have said as to the action of the Government in putting this extraordinary proposition before us. It does not require any very high flight of imagination or any particular logical faculty to see the utter hopelessness of the Government proposal. The Minister admits that we have not wasted time in occupying two months over one-half of the Tariff, and now he says he will give us three weeks to pass the other half; and that if we pass it we shall have an extra month's holiday; but that if we do not we shall have to come back again as early as the end of January or the beginning of February. I have only one other observation to make, and that is that I have been a little concerned about the shock that our many late sittings must necessarily give to the principles of the Labour Party. Throughout their lives, honorable members of that party have been advocating the eight hours principle, and I heartily recognise the great sacrifice of

principle which is involved in their sitting here so frequently beyond the ordinary hours.

Mr. SALMON (Laanecoorie) [12.34].—I wish to make a personal explanation. I remained in attendance in the House last night and until we adjourned at an early hour this morning, and I came here again at the opening of the sitting this morning anxious to put to the best use the two hours that I hoped were to be devoted to business. But, judging by present appearances, and by the word splitting indulged in by opponents not of the motion but of the Government, I recognise that it is useless to expect any good to result from our meeting to-day.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—We hate hypocrisy. Let the Government say what they really mean.

Mr. SALMON.—The honorable member has taken up a considerable portion of our valuable time in repeating over and over again his so-called arguments.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—Because the honorable member did not understand my first statement.

Mr. SALMON.—The honorable member was not addressing his remarks to me. He knows that, so far as most of his opinions are concerned, it is absolutely useless for him to attempt to convert me to them.

AN HONORABLE MEMBER.—The honorable member is not prepared to hearken to the voice of reason.

Mr. SALMON.—Not to the so-called reason of the honorable member for Parkes. I and the people of Australia generally know him too well to expect to find reason in his arguments. I deplore the lamentable waste of time that has occurred this morning, and after listening to the speeches of not only those who are opposed to the motion, but those who are in favour of it, have come to the conclusion that we are not likely to do any business to-day, and that it is just as well that I should take my departure. I, therefore, wish honorable members a very good day.

Mr. JOHNSON (Lang) [12.37].—As one who is somewhat affected by the remarks that have been made in regard to the question of pairing, I wish to make a personal explanation. I have more than once thought that confusion was likely to arise from the system of entering pairs, and have suggested that, in order to avoid mistakes when practicable, the subject itself on which

honorable members paired should be entered in the pair book. It appears, however, that it has not been the practice to do so, and I have given way to those having greater experience of these matters than I have.

Mr. HUME COOK.—But could the system suggested by the honorable member be successfully carried out?

Mr. JOHNSON.—Not in every case. As to the position of the honorable member for Coolgardie some difficulty has arisen in arranging pairs, and it has sometimes been found advisable in order that every honorable member called away from the House should be fairly treated, to substitute one name for another in the pairs, rather than to exclude altogether from the lists the names of some honorable members. A great deal of difficulty has arisen especially in connexion with divisions that have taken place in rapid succession. On some occasions five or six divisions have followed rapidly upon each other without debate, and it has been practically impossible to do anything like justice to the work of entering, or even deciding pairs. Some amendments are of a more or less complex and varied character, and absent members have had no opportunity of declaring themselves regarding them.

Mr. HUME COOK.—We have also had to deal with amendments of which no notice had been given.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Yes. In order to overcome the difficulty, honorable members should arrange their own pairs and definitely acquaint the whips as to the subject to which they desire their pairs to apply. The whips cannot be expected to know what is in the mind of every honorable member with regard to a succession of complicated amendments. In dealing with the pairing of the honorable member for Coolgardie on the hat duties, the honorable member for Bourke said that it was a matter of pairing him as a free-trader in favour of a duty of 75 per cent., and that he did not think he would be justified in doing so. He forgot to mention, however, that the division was on the question of whether the duty should be 75 per cent. *ad valorem*, or a fixed duty equal to 150 per cent. *ad valorem*, and that the honorable member was not paired on the amendments for fixed duties on hats at 17s. 6d., 20s., 21s., and 22s. 6d.

Question resolved in the affirmative

RABBIT DESTRUCTION :

DR. DANYSZ'S EXPERIMENTS.

Mr. DEAKIN (Ballarat—Minister of External Affairs) [12.40].—I have received, since the matter was called attention to this morning, the report of Dr. Tidswell, which I lay now upon the table of the House.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—Is it identical with the report that appeared in the press this morning?

Mr. DEAKIN.—I assume that it is. The conclusions are summed up in two short sentences—

1. That the efficacy of the virus as a destroyer of rabbits has not been demonstrated.

2. That although the microbe could be made to infect certain small animals, there is no reason to apprehend danger from its practical use. In the last paragraph of the report Dr. Tidswell points out—

The results of the observations are of a reassuring character. We are no longer confronted with the mysterious microbe of unknown potentialities, but with the ordinary bacillus of rabbit septicæmia with which bacteriologists have been familiar for the last thirty years. Consequently there need be no apprehension of danger to human beings, whilst the risk to other animals is remote.

Mr. MAHON (Coolgardie) [12.41].—I move—

That the document be printed.

As the Prime Minister has omitted to move that the document be printed, I beg to submit the motion. Some time ago the New South Wales Government offered a reward of £25,000 for the discovery of a disease which would exterminate rabbits without being communicable to human beings. Amongst those who competed for that reward was M. Pasteur, the French savant, who sent out two representatives to Australia. To facilitate their experiments the Government established a station on Rodd Island in Sydney Harbor. Rabbits were obtained from the interior of New South Wales, and an expert bacteriologist was employed to test the experiments made by these gentlemen from France. The result was that upon that small island it was proved that the disease known as "chicken cholera" was not altogether efficacious in destroying rabbits. A long series of experiments demonstrated that whilst about seven out of twelve healthy rabbits contracted the disease automatically from an infected rabbit, the remaining five were immune. The New South Wales Government therefore concluded that chicken cholera was not a suitable disease with which to inoculate rabbits. But the representatives from France nevertheless de-

manded that further experiments should be conducted. They asked the Government to allow these to be made in the open country. The Government naturally concluded that if on a small area like Rodd Island their experiment was a comparative failure, it was not likely to be successful in the open country. They very properly refused to permit the experiment to be made, because they recognised that if the disease were propagated in the open it would be impossible to confine it to reasonable limits.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I have been following the remarks of the honorable member for some time with a view to ascertain whether he intends to connect them with the motion for the printing of the report.

Mr. MAHON.—I am just about to do so. The experiments which have previously been conducted in New South Wales should be of the utmost benefit to us. To complete the literature available in connexion with rabbit extermination the document presented by the Prime Minister should be printed. I would remind the House that though the residents of our cities are not directly interested in this question, it is one of vital moment to our farmers and pastoralists. Although many people find rabbit-trapping a lucrative business, we must recollect that sheep-growing is more profitable. We shall very probably obtain a great deal of information from the document which the Prime Minister has laid upon the table. I was very pleased to hear some of the concluding sentences which he read from that report. I regret that he has not had the paper printed upon his own initiative and distributed amongst honorable members. At the same time I think that the House has reason to complain that too frequently printed documents and reports find their way into the public press before they have been laid upon the table of the House. I do not say that that has happened in this particular instance.

Mr. TUDOR.—It appears in the newspapers this morning.

Mr. DEAKIN.—It was telegraphed from Sydney.

Mr. MAHON.—That is an instance of the enterprise of the Sydney representatives of the Melbourne journals.

Mr. DEAKIN.—A duplicate of the report was presented to the New South Wales Government last evening, and its contents were evidently communicated to the press there.

Mr. MAHON.—That does not affect my statement that very frequently the contents of documents are published in the press before honorable members have been made acquainted with them. A rather remarkable and even audacious instance occurred in connexion with the publication of information concerning the report of the Stamp Board. Before that report reached the Minister, or simultaneously with his receipt of the document, the substance of it, with portraits of the members of the Board, actually appeared in a Sydney publication. I do not know what the Postmaster-General thinks about that, but I hope he will sift the matter to the bottom and find out who was responsible.

Mr. MAUGER.—I think it was disgraceful. We are fully aware of the culprit, and are considering what steps can be taken.

Mr. MAHON.—Other Ministers might with advantage follow the course proposed to be adopted by the Postmaster-General. The printing of a document is not usually a debatable question, and it is unnecessary to furnish other reasons why this paper should be printed and circulated. It is of the utmost importance that we should have the fullest possible information on this question of rabbit extermination. Wool is, I believe, our most valuable article of export, and anything which would injuriously affect the pastoral industry of Australia must react upon the whole community.

Mr. FOSTER.—What about the rabbit-trappers?

Mr. MAHON.—I have dealt with that aspect of the question. However valuable the industry in which rabbit-trappers are engaged may be, it is not, I think, to be compared with the industry menaced by the existence of the rabbit. If this report adds to our knowledge of dealing with the pest, it should be of great service.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

ADJOURNMENT.

ORDER OF BUSINESS: SATURDAY SITTING:
MANUFACTURES ENCOURAGEMENT BILL.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [12.52].—I am ready to go on with the business of the House, but I have been informed that it is not at all likely that there will be a quorum after lunch. That being so, it would be a farce to consider the Tariff for five or ten minutes, and I do not wish to keep honorable members here in the circumstances. I therefore move—

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. FISHER.—What will be the business taken on Monday?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The Tariff.

Mr. FISHER.—Anything else?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Not that I am aware of.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [12.53].—I wish to say with what utter disgust I view the whole of the proceedings this morning. A week ago the Government announced their intention that the House should sit on Saturdays and Mondays, and honorable members, having made all their arrangements to be here, find that on the first occasion on which an attempt is made to give effect to their expressed intention, the Government are unable to conduct the business. It seems to me that it is about time that members of the Government looked round to see where they are.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—We know where we are perfectly well.

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—The honorable member has been looking round a good while.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I hope I shall look round a good deal longer before I reach the depths of degradation to which the Government have gone.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Order.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I hope I shall look round all my political life before doing that. I can conceive of nothing which more clearly shows the depths to which the Government have descended than the pitiable spectacle which is almost every day exhibited in this House. If the Government cannot do business, they should not have brought us here.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The honorable member is making a great fuss about having to stop here at the end of one week.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I am. I say that I have no right to be kept here unless the Government are going to do business. I therefore protest most strongly against the degrading spectacle we have witnessed to-day.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [12.54].—I am very much disappointed to hear that we are not to go on with the business of the country. I was induced to remain in Melbourne last night in the expectation that we should put in a good day's work on the Tariff to-day, only to find that the whole of the morning has been wasted. I think the Government might have shown a little more backbone and better generalship. Honorable members might just as well be at work on the business of the country as

hanging about here doing nothing. I protest against this wasted day. If the Government desire my assistance, they should keep their word with me. I was assured that the Tariff would be proceeded with to-day, and remained in Melbourne with that hope and expectation. I think that we should sit every day in the week, with the exception of Sunday, in order to get the Tariff through. I believe that, by continuous application to the business, we should get through our work more satisfactorily, and more expeditiously, than we can hope to do by intermittent sittings.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—Does the honorable member think that we can get rid of the rest of the Tariff in three weeks?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—I do not know that we can finish the Tariff in the time stated; but we should have regular, and not intermittent, sittings.

Mr. FRAZER (Kalgoorlie) [12.56].—When the Treasurer replies, I hope he will give honorable members some information as to why he proposes to proceed with the metals and machinery division of the Tariff before the Manufactures Encouragement Bill has been passed.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—That was agreed upon. The Treasurer said he only wanted a test vote on the Manufactures Encouragement Bill.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I said long ago that I wished to take a test vote on the Bill.

Mr. FRAZER.—The test vote has been taken, and the second reading of the Bill was carried, but not by an overwhelming majority. I am of opinion that it would be well for honorable members to know in what form the Bill is likely to be passed before they proceed with the consideration of the Tariff. Without trespassing upon the business of the Committee of Ways and Means, I might be allowed to say that the form in which the Manufactures Encouragement Bill is passed would have an important bearing upon the manner in which we should deal with certain items in the metals and machinery division of the Tariff.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Order. The honorable member must not discuss the Tariff.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—There might be alterations in another place.

Mr. FRAZER.—That is so, but I am concerned with the alterations that might be made here. I think it would be more satisfactory that we should know what is

to become of the Manufactures Encouragement Bill, and it would not interfere with the business of the House if we had the information before we resumed the consideration of the Tariff. I ask the Treasurer to give some consideration to the matter.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [12.59].—It would not have been in order for the honorable member for Kalgoorlie to enter into details; but I think I thoroughly understand what he means. Some time ago, in answer to a query put to me by the deputy-leader of the Opposition, I stated that I proposed to interrupt the consideration of the Tariff by taking a test vote on the Manufactures Encouragement Bill before we dealt with division VI. I said that then I would proceed with the division and with the remainder of the Tariff, until completed, and ask the House to deal with the Manufactures Encouragement Bill finally before the Tariff was sent away from this House. I desire to be practical in this matter, and if I did what the honorable member for Kalgoorlie suggests, and brought the Bill on now with the Tariff still waiting to be got through, how long do honorable members think it would take, judging by the experience we have had, to finish the Bill?

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—It would take until Christmas.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The honorable member is quite right. I therefore do not want to bring anything else on to interfere with the consideration of the Tariff. I am quite satisfied with the test vote that was taken as to the principle of the Bill, but I will say this to honorable members—I had not intended to say it to-day—that I will ask them to deal with the items in the Tariff as though the Manufactures Encouragement Bill had passed, and afterwards, if the Bill does not pass, or any alteration is made in it in a way that would affect any one item, I shall recommit that item to bring it into harmony with the Bill.

Mr. FRAZER.—Is it the Treasurer's intention to put the Bill through in addition to the Tariff before Christmas?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Yes; if possible.

Mr. FRAZER.—Then why not take the Bill first?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Because it would take all the time. It would be a gain, I admit, if we could send the Bill to the Senate along with the Tariff.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—Does the honorable member mean to ask the House to put the Bill through before Christmas?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—If we complete the Tariff in time, I shall certainly hope to send the Bill up with it.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—But the honorable member said just now that if the Bill was brought on its consideration would take till Christmas.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Yes; if honorable members opposite found that they could block the Tariff with it.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—I voted for it.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I know that the honorable member would use it in every possible way to prevent the Tariff from coming on. The deputy leader of the Opposition has just made a nice little speech, containing an attack on the Government, to be published in the Sydney papers. The honorable member laughs at his own audacity, now that I have exposed the reason why he made that speech. I hope that my statement will also be published in the Sydney papers.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I laugh because I have an impression now that the Government could get a quorum this afternoon.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I am not going to risk it. I am not going on with a quorum of enemies only. I do not wish to say anything harsh or disagreeable, because I want honorable members to work harmoniously together until we finish the Tariff. I am informed that there would not be a quorum after lunch, and I do not want to act the hypocrite by coming here and saying that I am ready to go on with business, if there is no reasonable prospect of a quorum.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

House adjourned at 1.5 p.m.

House of Representatives.

Monday, 25 November, 1907.

ABSENCE OF Mr. SPEAKER.

The CLERK acquainted the House that he had been informed of the unavoidable absence of Mr. Speaker.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER took the chair at 10.30 a.m., and read prayers.

PETITION.

Mr. POYNTON presented a petition from forty-four electors in South Australia praying the House to reduce the duties on agricultural implements.

Petition received.

TARIFF.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—In this morning's newspapers—and of course we get all our information first from that source—there is a statement to the effect that the Government proposes to ask honorable members to deal first with the non-contentious items in the Tariff. I should like to know from the Treasurer what his intention is in that regard? So far as I understand the position, we have taken the non-contentious items in the division now under consideration. I want to know if the statement in the press means anything more than that. I hope that it does not.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not know what statement appeared in the press this morning, but I have said once or twice here that there were so many non-contentious items and so many contentious items to be dealt with. If it is the desire of honorable members to take first the non-contentious items in each division I have no objection. I do not care much whether those items are taken first, or whether the items are taken in rotation. That will be a matter entirely for the Committee to decide. It cannot be done without the concurrence of all the leaders of the House and of the Committee, too.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—That is what I wanted done at the beginning.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not intend to make any proposal unless the Committee seems quite agreeable to take the items in that way. I propose to proceed with the postponed items in division VI., and the Committee can then indicate its wish in the matter.

MAIL SERVICE: TASMANIA.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—I beg to ask the Postmaster-General when the ordinary mail service to Tasmania will be restored. Owing to the recent strike permission was given to the contracting company to reduce the number of trips per week, but now that the strike has been settled there can be no reason why the contract service should not be resumed.

Mr. MAUGER.—Acting upon a promise I made to the honorable member for Bass, I issued an instruction this morning that the mail service should be restored, but I am very doubtful as to whether it can be restored at once.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—Why not?

Mr. MAUGER.—For the simple reason that the contractors tell me that they cannot procure a supply of coal. The regular service will be restored as early as possible.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—Does not the Minister think that the company should have coal stored for the purpose?

Mr. MAUGER.—That is another matter.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—It is a matter of carrying out the contract.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. FISHER.—Before the business is called on I wish to make a personal explanation. It is not often that I trouble the House in that way.

Mr. PAGE.—The honorable member need not apologize, when he is exercising a privilege.

Mr. FISHER.—In the Saturday edition of the Melbourne *Herald* it was stated that I had intimated to the Government and the House that I desired to sit on Sunday. No such statement was made by me. I said quite the contrary. I think that, in a case of that kind, any reputable journal should have ascertained the fact from the speaker if its representative were in doubt.

TARIFF.

In Committee of Ways and Means (Consideration resumed from 15th November, *vide* page 6118):

Postponed item 143. Iron, Plate and Sheet, viz.:—(A) Corrugated Galvanized, ad val. (General Tariff), 25 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 20 per cent. (B) Galvanized not Corrugated, and Corrugated, not Galvanized, ad val. (General Tariff), 20 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 15 per cent.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [10.35].—Since this item was postponed, I have received a petition, which I will read presently, asking that specific should be substituted for *ad valorem* duties. It has been suggested by a large number of influential importers that in paragraph A the duties on corrugated galvanized iron, instead of being 25 and 20 per cent. respectively, should be £3 10s. and £3 a ton respectively, and that in paragraph B

the duties should be £3 and £2 10s. respectively. Those sums are the equivalents of the *ad valorem* duties. The petition reads as follows—

We, the undersigned, hardware, iron, and timber merchants and distributors of galvanized iron respectively ask that whatever rate of duty may be levied on galvanized iron should be based on the tonnage thereof and not on its ad val. value. As the value of the different gauges of galvanized iron varies somewhat the latter method of fixing the duty is confusing to customers, and we consider it leaves an opening for fraud in relation to the invoice value thereof. It may perhaps strengthen our case to remind you that in all the States of the Commonwealth in the past the duty was always levied on the tonnage.

The petition is signed by Andrew Kerr and Company Proprietary Limited, T. Anthony and Company, Chalmers and Langford, Richard Johnson, Clapham and Morris, J. S. Kidd and Company, D. and W. Chandler, A. P. Allan, J. Stone, Morris and Meeks, Harvey, Shaw and Company, Joseph Ellis and Sons, Kemp and Sheehan, C. S. Green and Son, Jas. McEwan and Company Limited, W. Richardson and Company, Currie and Richards, Jas. Moore and Sons Proprietary Limited, John Sharp and Sons, W. H. Locke and Company Proprietary Ltd., and J. Wright and Sons.

Mr. POYNTON.—What the importers propose comes to more than the present duty.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I am informed by the officers that it is exactly the same.

Mr. POYNTON.—It works out to more than the present duty.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I have not worked out the figures. I asked the officers to work out the figures, and let me know whether or not the proposals meant an increase, and they informed me that they do not mean an increase.

Mr. POYNTON.—The duty is a little less in the case of paragraph A, and more in the case of paragraph B.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Why should we have a heavy duty when it is intended to give a bounty upon the production of the articles?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The list of names I have read out is, I take it, fairly representative of those interested in this trade, who are, I think, importers more than manufacturers.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—They are not manufacturers of these particular goods.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—At any rate, they urge that it will be much easier for them to pay a fixed duty.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—They do not say that they desire the particular fixed duty proposed.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I requested the departmental officers to let me know what fixed duties would be equivalent to the *ad valorem* duties; and the information I received is that I have read to honorable members. The honorable member for Grey has said that the proposed fixed duties on the iron comprised in paragraph B are more than an equivalent for the *ad valorem* duties. I point out that I must depend for information on the officers of the Department; I cannot be expected to go into mathematical calculations of this nature. I hope honorable members will not accuse me of submitting this amendment without notice, seeing that I received the information only on Saturday morning. If the fixed duties be made equivalent to the *ad valorem* duties, and the fixed duties are preferred by the importers, then no injury can be done to others. I much prefer specific duties where they can reasonably be imposed; and I may point out that fixed duties were the rule under the States Tariffs prior to Federation. I intend to move—

That after the words "25 per cent.," paragraph A, the words, "and on and after 25th November, 1907, per ton (General Tariff), £3 10s.," be inserted.

Mr. FRAZER (Kalgoorlie) [10.44].—I do not feel disposed to offer any opposition to the proposal of the Treasurer, in so far as it relates merely to the substitution of a fixed duty for an *ad valorem* duty. It is very likely true that a fixed duty will give more satisfaction to both importers and users. But it is a very serious matter when we are asked to increase the duty from 15s. per ton to £3 10s. per ton.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—It has always been admitted that the duty of 15s. per ton was imposed in mistake.

Mr. PAGE.—This commodity ought to have been made free—that was the intention of Parliament.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—No, it was not.

Mr. FRAZER.—As I was not in Parliament when that duty was imposed, I am not in a position to say whether or not there was a mistake, but I know that a good deal of the commodity is being manufactured under a duty of 15s. per ton.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The only place I know of where this iron is being manufactured is at Lithgow, and I do not think that the industry pays.

Mr. FRAZER.—So far as I could judge, when I paid a visit to Lithgow, this class of iron was finished there pretty extensively. As I endeavoured to point out in a few words on the adjournment on Saturday, this item is intimately connected with the Manufactures Encouragement Bill; and I say frankly that, while I am prepared to give consideration to the iron industry by means of that measure, I am not prepared to give both a duty and a bounty.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—That will have to be done if the proposals of the Government are to have any effect.

Mr. FRAZER.—I have no doubt that when the industry has been established by means of a bounty, and is in a position to supply the whole of the requirements of Australia, it will be necessary to impose a duty in order that the market may be retained. Of course, in saying that, I am probably presenting the worst aspect from my point of view. Before we pass this item we are entitled to some information as to the Government attitude in reference to the position of this industry under the Manufactures Encouragement Bill. As I said before, if there be a bounty I am not prepared to vote for a duty; but if the Government are content to accept a duty in lieu of a bounty, I may possibly consider the proposal. I do not commit myself on this point, but merely say that it will be a matter for consideration. We ought to have some explanation from the Minister, so that we may know whether or not he is endeavouring to secure both a bounty and a duty in favour of this commodity.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—The bounty is granted for the manufacture of iron out of Australian ores, but this is to be a duty on imported galvanized and corrugated iron.

Mr. FRAZER.—The honorable and learned member for Bendigo the other night took up a similar attitude to mine on this question. He preferred a bounty on pig iron to a duty on the commodity, which might seriously hamper other industries.

Mr. SAMPSON.—That argument would apply to the whole ramifications of the Tariff.

Mr. FRAZER.—No, it would not, because in regard to other items there is no question of a bounty. I am prepared to vote for a bounty in preference to a duty, but we ought not to have both. The Treasurer might make a statement, explaining whether, in the event of the duty being

passed, it is his intention to proceed with the Bill which grants a bounty for the production of iron used for this purpose.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [10.51].—I am of the opinion just voiced by the last speaker—that it was understood that the question involved in this item was to be settled by means of a bounty, and that if a bounty were granted a considerable modification of these duties would immediately take place. I expected to hear a statement from the Treasurer to that effect this morning.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The honorable member expects me to say quite a number of things.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Do I understand that the Treasurer is waiting until the Committee have told him what to do?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I am not waiting for anything; I expect to have this duty passed.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The Treasurer would have the duty passed very soon if he would tell the Committee what he proposes to do in regard to the bounty, but honorable members object to blundering about in the dark.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—We propose to pass this duty if we are able.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Then the Treasurer has misled the Committee.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I have done nothing of the kind.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I understand now that the principle of paying a bounty of 10 per cent. on galvanized iron has been affirmed. That amounts to about 25s. per ton. Surely that is a very substantial modicum of protection in itself. I should like honorable members to recollect that the processes of galvanizing and corrugating have nothing to do with the production of iron. They are processes that present very little difficulty. All that the manufacturers have to do is to erect a furnace with a supply of spelter, and pass the iron through it after it has been prepared by a simple chemical process, which involves no complexity and no great skill. Numbers of boys can take part in the industry. Even if we intend to have a protective duty, a small percentage of difference between sheet iron and corrugated iron would meet all the requirements. But to impose the duty of 25 per cent. or 30 per cent. is absolutely absurd. It means a huge revenue duty, and nothing more.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Why should the honorable member object to that?

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Because it is an absurd revenue duty. There is nothing reasonable in it. Moreover, it means a crushing imposition upon the people of the country. If there be one duty in this Tariff that profoundly affects the people, from one end of this continent to the other, it is that on galvanized iron. In many parts of Australia galvanized iron is the material from which residences are made. It is a duty which, more than any other, weighs upon the primary industries. If the proposal be agreed to, it means, for many years to come, I have no hesitation in saying, a crushing revenue tax upon the primary producers of Australia. It falls with heaviest weight upon those who are least able to bear it, and upon those who get least advantage from protective duties. The Treasurer cannot justify it on any protectionist principle, because, for many years to come, the quantum of iron necessary in Australia to provide a sufficient supply of galvanized iron will not be produced here.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—It ought to be produced within twelve months, but it will not be if the honorable member has his way.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The plant available for the production from native ore of all the sheet iron from which galvanized iron is made cannot be erected and put in working order in Australia for many years to come. In the meantime, if this duty be imposed, it will really mean a revenue impost of from 25 per cent. to 30 per cent. A difference of 5 per cent. as between sheet iron and galvanized iron would be a substantial protective duty.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Nonsense.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I point out to those honorable members who favour a protectionist Tariff that what is proposed is merely a duty on the galvanizing and corrugating processes, and that it does not profess to overcome the difficulty regarding iron production.

Mr. WATKINS.—That is so; it does not make for the production of iron from native ore.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Not to the slightest extent. All the complexities and difficulties of iron production have to be faced at a period prior to that at which this duty will begin to operate. Galvanized and corrugated iron has been made for many years in many parts of Australia.

In most cases the sheets have been imported; in other cases, as at Lithgow, galvanized and corrugated iron has been made from scrap iron. Now at Lithgow they are producing it from iron made from their own native ores. Therefore, I say that this duty is simply absurd on the face of it, since it relates to a finishing process of the simplest possible character. But as the duty will be so widespread in its incidence, and will affect so profoundly the primary industries of Australia and those who are engaged in building up the prosperity of the Commonwealth at such great cost to themselves and with so much deprivation of home comforts, I hope that honorable members will not consent to impose this heavy tax.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume-Treasurer) [11.0].—The honorable member for Parramatta has simply been beating the wind; he has not touched the point at issue. The honorable member for Bendigo has shown exactly what this proposal means. It has nothing to do with iron which is manufactured here.

Mr. PAGE.—But will it protect the black iron?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—Certainly not.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—It will simply afford an opportunity for the local manufacture of iron. The bounty granted under the Manufactures Encouragement Bill will remain in operation for only three years, and will not be sufficient in itself to enable the establishment of the industry of, producing iron from native ores.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The galvanizing industry can be established in six months

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The honorable member has talked a lot of nonsense, and has confused this duty with the bounty under the Manufactures Encouragement Bill. The two are absolutely distinct. The protectionist section of the Tariff Commission recommended that a duty of 15 per cent. should be imposed. Is this industry, after the bounty has expired, to be left absolutely at the mercy of the Steel Trust of America, or are we to have in the Tariff a duty to come into operation in 1911 to prevent its absolute annihilation? Unless honorable members are very careful the industry will be at the mercy of the Steel Trust of America, with its enormous capital, which has secured control of nearly the whole industry in America, and desires to control these manufactures all over the world.

Mr. FRAZER.—The bounty, according to the honorable member's own calculation, will amount to 30s. per ton.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—That is not very much, having regard to the fact that it applies to galvanized iron to be made from native ore. The object of the bounty is to encourage the galvanizing of iron produced from our native ore, and not merely of imported black iron. I do not wish the industry to be confined to the mere galvanizing of black iron introduced from abroad.

Mr. PAGE.—The honorable member spoke of placing the industry at the mercy of the Steel Trust of America. Last year our imports other than from Great Britain were of the value of only £37,000.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I am going to fight for our own industries, and should not be mealy-mouthed in regard to a proposal of this kind, even if it did mean an increased price of 1s. per sheet. It is just about time that a determined stand was made for our own industries.

Mr. PAGE.—No crocodile tears!

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I certainly am not shedding any. We have vast deposits of iron ore in New South Wales, Tasmania, Queensland, South Australia, and Western Australia, and we should be prepared to grant effective assistance to their development. I wish to impress upon honorable members that we have not two duties applying to the one manufacture. The bounty is intended in the meantime to help these industries to reach a point of production at which they will be able to supply the local requirements.

Mr. FRAZER.—But is not the object of the bounty similar to that to which this duty is to apply?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—In the one case the iron will be made from native ore, and in the other case it is imported.

Mr. FRAZER.—But in both cases we have sheet and corrugated iron.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Quite so; but in the one case we have a duty, and in the other we have not. I find that the duty of 15s. per ton has not had the slightest effect on importations, nor has it increased the price of imported iron. I know what I am talking about, because for some time I administered the affairs of the Department of Trade and Customs. I wish to secure the imposition of a duty that will come on after the bounty has ceased.

Mr. FRAZER.—I am prepared to vote for such a duty.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—In the meantime, I wish to have something to check wholesale importations.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Then be straightforward and impose a duty on iron as such.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I am always straightforward; but the honorable member never is. I wish to take care that during the three years that the bounty is in operation this iron is not imported in large quantities and stored for distribution thereafter. During the three years of the operation of the bounty men will be struggling to establish the industry, and I wish to help them. I desire an effective Tariff to be passed. I certainly do not wish to see passed a Tariff that will afford no protection to this branch of the iron industry after the bounty has ceased. I should like to see iron works established not only in Tasmania, but elsewhere.

Mr. MATHEWS.—And more than one would be established if proper assistance were given.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I agree with the honorable member. I am in receipt of an official report which states that the duties levied upon this item are based upon the figures tendered to the Tariff Commission. I trust that honorable members will adhere to the Government proposals, and thus prevent us being exposed to the fearful machinations of the great trust which exists in the United States.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—Cannot the Government deal with that trust?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not know that we can deal with it effectively.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The bulk of the iron imported into the Commonwealth is of British origin.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The honorable member is speaking as a free-trader. He is in accord with the expressed intention of his leader to reduce the duties levied under this Tariff to such an extent that they shall be robbed of their protective incidence.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—He does not tell falsehoods.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—If the honorable member for Parkes would adhere as closely as I do to facts he would do a great deal better than he does. He is a party of one; he always was, and always be. The Government are in earnest

in their endeavour to effectively protect the galvanizing of sheets which are made from Australian ore.

Mr. POYNTON (Grey) [11.13].—It is unfortunate that upon almost every occasion that the Treasurer rises to address the Committee he should create more opposition than is really necessary. Before making the statements that he has made, I claim that he should have looked at the statistics relating to our importations of iron. Instead of this commodity being dumped into the Commonwealth from the United States, the truth is that out of a total importation valued at £1,069,174, no less than £1,032,000 worth comes from the United Kingdom.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. FOWLER).—The Committee is very disorderly this morning, so much so that it is impossible for the debate to proceed in this way. I must ask honorable members to restrain themselves.

Mr. POYNTON.—Under the old Tariff a revenue of about £47,000 was collected upon this item. I have taken the trouble to work out the amounts which a duty of 20 per cent. would represent upon various well-known brands of iron. I find that upon "Orb" of 24-inch gauge it would mean £3 16s. 5d. per ton; upon the same brand, 26-inch gauge, which is invoiced at £18 15s. per ton, it would represent £4 2s. 6d. per ton. Upon "Orb" of 28-inch gauge, the value of which is £20, the duty would be £4 8s. per ton. Upon the "Redcliffe" brand of 24-inch gauge, the invoice value of which is £16 17s. 6d., the duty would be £3 14s. 3d.; and upon the same brand of 26-inch gauge, which is invoiced at £18 7s. 6d. per ton, it would be £4 0s. 10d.

Mr. PAGE.—I can buy that brand of iron in Brisbane for less than the amount quoted by the honorable member.

Mr. POYNTON.—Its price, of course, depends upon the gauge. Quite recently a manufacturer wrote me complaining of the duty on this very article. He also forwarded me a clipping from a trade circular in which the price of "Redcliffe" iron of 26-inch gauge was quoted at £17 odd per ton.

Mr. PAGE.—How long ago is that?

Mr. POYNTON.—About a month or six weeks ago. Upon the plain iron a duty of 20 per cent. would represent amounts ranging from £2 8s. 6d. to £3 5s. per ton. The proposed duty upon

corrugated galvanized iron under the general Tariff will be equivalent to £3 10s. per ton, and under the Tariff for the United Kingdom it will be £3 per ton. Upon galvanized iron not corrugated the proposed duty of 20 per cent. under the general Tariff is equivalent to £3 per ton, and that of 15 per cent. under the Tariff for the United Kingdom is equal to £2 10s. per ton. To urge that these duties must not be considered in relation to the bounty which it is proposed to pay upon the production of iron is somewhat fallacious reasoning. For a considerable time to come the price of this commodity must be increased by the amount of the duty. Consequently the individual who is engaged in the manufacture of iron from Australian ores will have the advantage of the increased price of imported iron.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I think that I shall be able to show that he will not.

Mr. POYNTON.—I take it that he will. Anything which increases the price of the imported article must be of advantage to the local manufacturer.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—To the galvanizer, but not to the man who manufactures iron from the local ore.

Mr. POYNTON.—A bounty of 10 per cent. upon the production of iron would work out at from 30s. to 40s. per ton. If my contention be right the local manufacturer will enjoy an advantage of something like £5 per ton as a result of the bounty and the duty. It should not be forgotten that this is an article which is largely used throughout Australia. The old duty of 15s. is equal to a duty of about 5 per cent. on these imports, and we collected at that rate of duty £47,000 on the importations for last year. The item is one which appeals to me from the primary producers' stand-point. One of the first requirements of a man who takes up a piece of land is galvanized iron. He may be able to get a few straight spars on his holding with which to construct the frame of the buildings he must erect, but he must have galvanized iron to complete them. Recently, in South Australia, 400,000 acres of land have been made available for settlement, and have been taken up. There is not a stone to be found on that land, and the residences, as well as the necessary out-buildings of the settlers, will have to be constructed of wood and iron. The duty proposed on this item would be a serious tax upon those people.

Mr. MATHEWS.—The honorable member suggests that we should not manufacture anything at all in Australia.

Mr. POYNTON.—I do not expect to be able to convince the honorable member for Melbourne Ports. If the honorable member were in England he would advocate a duty on grapes, in order that they might be grown in that country. We can produce almost anything in Australia if we are prepared to pay for it. Whilst some honorable members may be anxious that the articles included in this item should be produced here, we should have some little consideration for the primary producers. Under this Tariff duties are imposed upon almost everything they require—timber, iron, and the implements used on the farm. On the cheaper class of iron the duty works out at over 20 per cent., which, from my stand-point, is exorbitant. People living where stone or bricks can be easily obtained, largely escape the duty, and it becomes a sectional tax and not a general tax. I recognise that there is something in the contention that there should be a difference between the duties imposed on corrugated and on plain iron, and I think that 5 per cent., which would represent about 15s. per ton, is a sufficient margin to provide for. The only reason advanced by the Chairman of the Tariff Commission for the duty recommended on corrugated iron is that certain works in South Australia have been closed down. The owner of these works had a few rollers with which he converted galvanized sheet into corrugated iron. He claimed that because no difference was made in the duties between galvanized and corrugated iron under the old Tariff, he was compelled to close down his works. For the information of the Chairman of the Commission I may state that the owner of the works is satisfied with a margin of from 15s. to £1 per ton between the duties on corrugated and on plain iron. Most of the importations under this item will be dutiable under the second column.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—No.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Ninety-six per cent. at least will.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Importations to the value of £336,780 came from the United States.

Mr. POYNTON.—Of what use is it for the Treasurer to make such a statement? Only £39,000 worth came from the United States.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I have the figures before me.

Mr. POYNTON.—If the honorable gentleman will turn to the published statistics he will find that the importations were from Canada, £495; Straits Settlements, £187; Belgium, £215; Germany, £215; United States, £39,194, and from the United Kingdom, £128,868.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—If the honorable member will allow me, the figures I gave were £336,780. I have just asked the officers of the Department, and I find that a mistake has been made. By some inadvertence an extra three was included in the figures supplied to me. I find that the value of the importations from the United States was £36,780, but I wish the Committee to understand how I was led to make the mistake.

Mr. POYNTON.—I propose to move—

That after the figures "25 per cent.," paragraph A, the words, "and on and after 25th November, 1907, per ton (General Tariff), 25s.," be inserted.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [11.31].—This Tariff really seems a hopeless job. The Treasurer makes an excited and exciting speech, and calls on his protectionist friends to support the protectionist duty which he proposed, but when he used his arguments he was either not aware of the effect of his own Tariff, or else attempting to deceive the Committee. I would not accuse him of that.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I was not doing so.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Then he did not understand the effect of his own Tariff. It is not a question of protection to the maker of iron from native ore at all, and no protectionist can view it as such.

Mr. MATHEWS.—If it is not imported, cannot we make it?

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Does the honorable member not know that under this Tariff black sheet-iron is coming in free?

Mr. MATHEWS.—It should not.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—That is not the point. We are dealing with the Tariff as brought down by the Minister. It is the free black sheet-iron that competes with the maker from native ores. It is not proposed to give him protection against it, and yet the Minister excitedly calls on protectionists to assist him to preserve the industry of making iron from native ores. That industry is not affected at all by this duty.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Yes, it is.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The sheet from which plain and corru-

gated galvanized iron is made comes in free under the Minister's own Tariff, and the enormous protection that the Minister now proposes is simply for galvanizing and corrugating.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—Is not that quite a simple process?

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Very simple. When Division VI.A is put into force, there will be a duty of 12½ per cent. on black sheet-iron, but at present there is none, although the Minister could ask that Division VI.A be put into force now if he liked. The enormous protection of £3 10s. and £3 a ton is all for the most simple processes of corrugating and galvanizing.

Mr. PAGE.—And a machine does the lot.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—They are processes that employ very little labour, and yet it is proposed to allow this enormous extra cost to go on to the shoulders of the consumers of galvanized iron for the sake of that small industry.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—Does the honorable member mean that the local man is going to charge so much more than the foreigner?

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—By agreeing to the Treasurer's proposal, we should be giving him the opportunity to do so. We have never been so reckless yet—not even the strongest protectionists here—as to say that we will give a duty enormously higher than is needed for the purposes of protection. By so doing we should only give the opportunity to the roller or corrugator or tinner to charge much higher prices to the consumer.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—It does not work out that way in the case of a simple process, because there is plenty of competition.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—If this enormous duty is proposed for revenue purposes, the whole revenue will disappear under it. Not a ton will be brought in after a time, except as black sheet-iron. We shall not be doing justice to the people of Australia if we impose such terrific duties as the Minister proposes on these articles. The Minister has succeeded in carrying a proposal for a bounty of 10 per cent. to iron manufacturers. As soon as that bounty has operated and the industry is sufficiently started, the Treasurer will be able to put a duty of 12½ per cent. on black sheet-iron and other duties on other iron goods.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—If we wait for that, we shall never get it done.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The Minister is trying now to impose, not a duty of 12½ per cent., which he will eventually have the right to do, but an infinitely higher duty on these articles, whilst he imposes no duty on black sheet-iron, so that there is no protection to the local industry of producing iron from local ore. I am sorry to have had to speak on this item. I had not intended to do so, but when the Treasurer makes a statement which is quite apart from the facts—I do not say that he did it knowingly—that by imposing the duty which he proposes, we can protect the local manufacturer from iron ores, that statement must be refuted. The making of it by the Minister only causes debate on his own Tariff. The proposal of the honorable member for Grey is ample for every purpose. It is even a protection for galvanizing and corrugating. The honorable member states that a man interested in a galvanizing mill in South Australia is perfectly satisfied with it.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—Mr. Morris says that they are not satisfied, and he gave evidence here.

Mr. POYNTON.—Mr. Weidenhofer says that he would be satisfied with a margin of 15 per cent.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I understand that the honorable member for Grey has the latest information on the point. If we impose such duties as the Treasurer proposes, for a reason which is no reason at all, because it is incorrect, upon the backs of the people of Australia, especially those in the back-blocks, and upon all the industries of Australia which use this iron largely, we shall be deserving of the reprobation of the public.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [11.38].—I venture to think that it will be found on full consideration, that the *ad valorem* rate is preferable to the fixed duty. Sufficient grounds have not been made out by the petition or memorial signed by merchants in favour of changing the *ad valorem* rate to a fixed rate. It may be a little more convenient in clearing goods out of the Customs, but that is not the point. The point is which method will result in securing the fairest duty and the most reasonable amount of protection. A fixed duty, whether of £3 or £3 10s. a ton, will operate equally upon small or inferior sizes or grades, as upon superior and more expensive sections and grades. I therefore do not think that a fixed

duty is a fair one, and that is the reason why the section of the Tariff Commission with which I was associated reported in favour of substituting an *ad valorem* rate for the old fixed rate. Consequently, I cannot support the Treasurer in the change which he proposes at the request of certain merchants. The plain black sheets from which the galvanized and corrugated sheets are made are admitted duty free. The Lithgow works received consideration by the granting of a bounty under the Manufactures Encouragement Bill. A section of the Tariff Commission, at the instigation of South Australian manufacturers, recommended certain duties; their recommendations did not originate in Victoria. We were informed in South Australia that there three expensive plants for the corrugation of iron, each costing about £1,500, were put down under the old State Tariff, and those interested in the industry asked for a differentiation against corrugated and galvanized sheets. It was alleged that the corrugating industry was one of the strangled industries, and the Commissioners were of opinion that it should be restored to the position which it occupied under the South Australian Tariff. The three witnesses who were examined on the subject were unanimous in the opinion that the Commonwealth duty, 15s. per ton, was insufficient for their protection against the importation of the cheap labour product of the Old World. Mr. Charles R. Morris, the representative of the English firm of Lysaght and Co., which makes galvanized and corrugated iron in the United Kingdom, said that the firm were not interested in the manufacture of flat sheet iron, or in galvanizing in Australia; but had found it convenient and economical to put down a plant for corrugating here, so as to enable them to satisfy themselves that the corrugated iron they supplied was sound and good. They had found that imported corrugated iron, when opened up, perhaps at some remote place in the interior, was occasionally faulty, and had to be returned to Adelaide at their expense. The old Commonwealth duty of 15s. per ton was equivalent to about 5 per cent. *ad valorem*, and the Tariff Commission recommended that the rate be increased to 15 per cent. *ad valorem*, which would be equal to a fixed rate of £2 5s. a ton. I am prepared to vote either for 15 per cent. *ad valorem*, or for the fixed rate of £2 5

a ton; but that is my maximum. The Government are proposing in the General Tariff a rate of 25 per cent. *ad valorem*, or £3 10s. per ton, and in the Tariff for the United Kingdom a rate of 20 per cent. *ad valorem*, or £3 per ton.

Mr. JOHNSON (Lang) [11.48].—The proposed duties, if agreed to, will fall most heavily upon the working classes, especially upon those who have to make homes for themselves in rural and mining districts. Galvanized iron is largely used for the building of cottages in country districts, where it is often impossible to get weatherboard or other suitable material, so that, not only the roofs, but the walls as well, are made of iron. This is especially the case in new mining settlements. Galvanized and corrugated iron is comparatively cheap building material, and for that reason, and because it is easy to deal with, it is very much in favour, and any action tending to make it dearer will cause the poorer classes of the community to suffer. The Treasurer, in an impassioned speech, spoke of the terrible importations of the American Steel Trust. He had afterwards to admit that the figures which he quoted in this connexion were wrong; but even had they been correct, they would not have supported his argument, because they showed that only a comparatively small portion of galvanized iron is imported from America. Nearly the whole of our importations of galvanized and corrugated iron come from the United Kingdom, whence we imported last year £1,033,118 worth, or 96.535 per cent. of the whole quantity brought here from abroad, while from the United States we got only £36,780 worth, or about 3.440 per cent.

Mr. MATHEWS.—But the fact that Great Britain sends all the commodity here will not console us.

Mr. JOHNSON.—That does not affect my argument in the slightest degree. The Treasurer bases his appeal for support of this duty on his assertion that we have to protect our local people from the competition of this vast American Steel Trust, which he implied was dumping its wares upon Australian soil.

Mr. PAGE.—But he withdrew that.

Mr. JOHNSON.—He corrected the figures, but he did not withdraw the implication. The total value of the importations from all countries outside Great Britain and the United States of America is only £276. Surely it is not worth while

to trouble about that. We have nothing to fear, so far as foreign countries are concerned, and according to the figures the Treasurer's impassioned appeal to his protectionist friends to resist the encroachments of the American Steel Trust falls to the ground. With regard to plain iron, we import from the United Kingdom £111,998 worth, equal to 55.98 per cent.; from Belgium, £18,705 worth; from Germany, £45,956 worth; and from the United States of America, only £22,301 worth. The imports from Belgium, Germany, and the United States of America, represent only 44.2 per cent. of the total importations, while from all other countries we import only £1,074 worth. It will be seen that the duty is really directed against British importations, and that its value as a protective duty is not worth talking about.

Mr. PAGE.—Where does the boasted preference come in?

Mr. JOHNSON.—There is no preference at all, because we already receive from Great Britain 96½ per cent. of our total importations without any preference. When we come to compare the proposed duties with the old duties, what do we find? As regards corrugated galvanized iron, 26-gauge, the f.o.b. value of which is £15 a ton, under the old Tariff the duty was 15s., but under this Tariff the duty in the general column is equivalent, not to £3 10s., as the Treasurer said, but to £3 12s. 6d.

Mr. BAMFORD.—As the price of that iron is continually fluctuating, those figures are no guide.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Exactly. We have to take the figures subject to fluctuations; but the proportions will remain about the same. Under the new Tariff the duty on corrugated galvanized iron from the United Kingdom is equivalent to £3 7s. 6d. As regards corrugated iron, not galvanized 26-gauge, the f.o.b. value of which is £10, under the old Tariff it was free, but under the new Tariff the duty is equivalent to 44s. in the general column, and 33s. in the preferential column. Then, as regards galvanized iron not corrugated the f.o.b. value of which is £16 a ton, under the old Tariff the duty was 15s., but under the new Tariff it is the equivalent of £3 10s. 5d. in the general column, and £2 12s. 9d. in the preferential column. There is another kind of iron which, treated in a different way, is fast coming into competition with galvanized iron. I

refer to corrugated bi-carbided iron, which is a new substitute for galvanized iron, and runs out at £3 a ton cheaper. The new process is said to be fast superseding the galvanizing process. The treatment has practically the same effect, and in all respects the corrugated bi-carbided iron serves the purpose equally as well as does the more expensive galvanized iron. Really there is no need for imposing a duty on this particular iron, because the importing expenses run from about 56s. to 67s. a ton, constituting a very high margin of natural protection. The object of the duty, of course, is to protect the corrugation and galvanization of imported plain iron sheets, but when we look at the evidence what do we find in that connexion? Mr. Weidenhofer, representing Lysaght's Corrugation Works in Adelaide said, in reply to questions 50923-4, in volume iv., page 2566, that their corrugating plant employed six men.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—The honorable member does not think that we ought to employ six men?

Mr. JOHNSON.—But look at the price which we are to be asked to pay for the employment of those six men. It would be better to pay the men double the wages they are getting merely to do nothing, than to impose these duties. According to the evidence of that witness the corrugating plant of Lysaght's Adelaide works employed only six men earning £15 a week amongst them. In reply to questions 50959-61 he said that twenty-four men required to work the three existing corrugating plants in Adelaide could "amply" supply the South Australian requirements, which amount to about 6,000 tons annually. Mr. Morris, another corrugator, in reply to question 50507 on page 2556, gave the value of the plant employing three men at about £1,500. That gentleman, in reply to questions 50545 and 50612, and Mr. Weidenhofer, in reply to questions 51005 and 51079-81, admitted that the local product would be increased in price. The Treasurer has just told us that there is no danger of the iron being increased in price as the result of the imposition of the duty. But here is Mr. Morris, an expert in this business, who says that the effect of the duty will be to bring about an increase in the price of the local article. In almost all cases where high duties are proposed there is a tendency towards the formation of combines. According to the evidence of Mr. Weidenhofer, there is a combine for the purpose of fixing and regulating prices in connexion with the in-

dustry. In reply to questions 50966-71 he admitted that three firms had combined to fix prices, namely, Lysaght of Sydney, Lysaght of Adelaide, and the Victorian Galvanized Iron Company. In reply to questions 84151-2, on page 2570, Mr. Thornley, the manager for Mr. Sandford's Esbank Iron Works, opposed the imposition of any duty on corrugated iron.

Mr. PAGE.—What has the Treasurer to say to that?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Mr. Thornley was very foolish.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Then if those primarily interested in the industry make statements which are, in the Treasurer's opinion, foolish, he must admit—

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—When Mr. Sandford's representative arrives by train to-day the honorable member can ask him what he thinks on the point.

Mr. JOHNSON.—I am not referring to what Mr. Thornley thinks, but to his sworn evidence before the Tariff Commission. If we asserted that interested manufacturers had said foolish things which affected their own industry, the Treasurer would be the first to resent such a statement as a reflection on their intelligence. As a matter of fact the manufacturers would derive an extra profit of nearly £7,000 from the proposed duty on a plant capital of £4,500, whilst the workers would share between them about £2,340 for their labour. It will be seen from these figures that it would pay the Commonwealth to give the employes double their wages and to keep them idle rather than to impose these duties, which would burden so large a section of the community. With regard to the question of galvanizing what do we find when we turn to the evidence? We find that in reply to questions 84151 and 84157 on page 2570, Mr. Thornley, representing the only firm in Australia which galvanize iron sheets, declared himself satisfied with a duty of 12½ per cent. on iron "corrugated, galvanized, and galvanized not corrugated," though preferring £2 per ton, but in reply to question 84158 he admitted that very little labour was employed in galvanizing, and in reply to questions 84182-3, that mostly boys and youths were employed in the industry. It will be seen that this is really a boys' industry. The process simply consists of dipping the black sheets into a zinc bath and afterwards polishing and corrugating them, and only boys and youths are necessary to guide the sheets through

machine. In New South Wales this industry was carried on under the Reid Tariff, when corrugated iron was free.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—There used to be a duty of £2 per ton in New South Wales.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Not at the time to which I am referring, when the Reid Tariff was in operation.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—There was a duty of £2 per ton when the industry was started.

Mr. JOHNSON.—But there was an alteration of the Tariff, and at the time of which I am speaking there was no protective duty. The Treasurer was mistaken in saying that the price of the commodity was not increased by the imposition of Commonwealth duty. As a matter of fact, as soon as the Commonwealth duty was imposed, £1 a ton was added to the local price.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—What was the price before the Tariff, in comparison with the price afterwards?

Mr. JOHNSON.—I have already said that the difference is £1 per ton.

Mr. HARPER.—Has not the price of iron gone up, apart altogether from the Tariff?

Mr. JOHNSON.—But this increase of price was coincident with the imposition of the duty, and, as I understand, had no relation to the usual fluctuations of the market. According to the *Australian Ironmonger*, in September, 1901, the price of "Queen's Head" plain galvanized iron in Sydney was £21 5s., and in November of the same year it was £22 5s., showing exactly the difference of £1 to which I have called attention. In the same period in Sydney, the price of the "Orb" corrugated galvanized iron increased from £19 to £20 per ton. In Melbourne, in September, 1901, the price of the "Queen's Head" brand was £23, and was the same in November, but the "Orb" brand increased in price, as in Sydney, from £19 to £20. In face of the facts and figures it appears to me that the proposed duty will prove very burdensome to large masses of the working community, who are trying to make homes of their own, and to whom cheap building materials are an absolute necessity.

Mr. HUME COOK.—The proposed duty will not make much difference in the cost.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Perhaps not to men in the happy position of the Government Whip, but it will make much difference to wage-earners and others of small means. In my opinion, the duties

proposed by the honorable member for Grey are too high, and ought not to be more than under the general Tariff, 15 per cent., and under the Tariff of the United Kingdom 10 per cent. I wish to move—

That after the words "25 per cent.," paragraph A, the words "and on and after 26th November, 1907, per ton (General Tariff), 15s.," be inserted.

Mr. STORRER (Bass) [12.12].—I think the duties proposed by the Government are rather high. I do not intend to go into details, but merely to intimate that if either of the amendments now before us is rejected, I shall move what I regard as a fair compromise between the protectionist and the free-trade proposals. In my opinion, the iron, under paragraph A, ought to bear duties of 45s. and 40s., and under paragraph B duties of 40s. and 30s.

Mr. WILKS (Dalley) [12.14].—I came here this morning with the idea of doing some "slogging" work in disposing of the Tariff, but, as a matter of fact, the Treasurer is going the right way to prevent any progress being made. Let us, for one moment, compare the duties now proposed by the Government with the duty which was finally adopted in 1902. No one will question the protectionist inclinations of either Sir George Turner or the honorable member for Adelaide, who were, of course, chiefly concerned in the first Commonwealth Tariff. The original proposal by the Barton Government, in this connexion, was a duty of 30s. per ton, but after long debate the Government accepted 15s. per ton. Yet we have the present Treasurer coming here ill-informed and ill-advised, and asking for a duty equal to 25 per cent. *ad valorem*. This is most singular, in face of the fact that the Barton Government were glad to accept a duty of 15s. per ton.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The Barton Government were not glad to accept that duty.

Mr. WILKS.—At any rate, the Barton Government sought to impose a duty of only 30s., as compared with the present duty of £3 10s. I have no doubt the Treasurer will shortly tell the country that the Opposition, on this item, are delaying the passage of the Tariff. As a matter of fact, the real cause of any delay lies with the Treasurer, who proposes prohibitive duties which even his protectionist supporters cannot accept. Whenever the Treasurer is in trouble he tries to rally his supporters by warning them against the opera-

tions of the American Steel Trust. It does not seem to matter whether the item be confectionery or anything else, he seeks to frighten honorable members with the American Steel Trust as with a bogey. It has been shown that that Trust supplies only 3 per cent. of the importations, and yet the Treasurer is surprised that his supporters cannot be "brought to heel" with such a cry. Seeing that the Treasurer is so ill-informed, the better course would be for us to go into recess, and give him time to study his own Tariff. The Treasurer, when brought to book, said that the imports from America represented £300,000, whereas the amount should have been about £30,000.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I said that the paper had been sent to me by the officers, and that they had not struck out a figure that they ought to have struck out.

Mr. WILKS.—The Treasurer, in his first speech, said that the bulk of these goods were the product of the American Steel Trust, and, when the honorable member for Grey proved from statistics that that statement was wrong, the Government Whip, flourishing, apparently, two pieces of blank paper, said, "We have the figures." If the honorable member for Bourke had the figures, all the worse for the Treasurer.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I did not say anything of the kind, and the honorable member ought not to continue to misrepresent me.

Mr. WILKS.—I shall try another way of stating the situation. The Treasurer called on his supporters, and told them that the American Steel Trust was forcing goods into Australia; and when the honorable member for Grey showed the inaccuracy of that statement, the Government Whip said, "We have the figures here." If the Government Whip had the figures, the Treasurer did not use them.

Mr. HUME COOK.—I said "I have the figures here."

Mr. WILKS.—That is the same thing.

Mr. HUME COOK.—No; it is not.

Mr. WILKS.—Am I to understand that the Government Whip is better informed on these matters than is the Treasurer? Under the circumstances, I think the consideration of this item ought to be postponed.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Let the honorable member move the postponement!

Mr. WILKS.—I should have much pleasure in moving to that effect. Let me represent the situation in still another way.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—The honorable member has not yet moved the motion for the postponement of the item.

Mr. WILKS.—I said that I should have much pleasure in moving it. The Treasurer admitted that there is to be a bounty, but said that it would expire in three years. Do I understand the honorable gentleman to propose a bounty plus a duty?

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Under Division VI.A of the Tariff there is provision for a duty after the expiration of the bounty.

Mr. WILKS.—The Treasurer must admit that he made a very miserable attempt this morning to explain the matter before the Committee. No one can doubt that the honorable member for Bendigo is a protectionist, and he is quite prepared to vote for a duty equivalent to £2 5s. per ton. In the 1902 Tariff the duty amounted to 15s. per ton. Surely if the Treasurer can get an increase of 30s. per ton that ought to be quite sufficient.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—It is too high.

Mr. WILKS.—It is much too high; but the Treasurer is even going beyond what avowed protectionists have asked for. The honorable member for Grey has shown that 96 per cent. of the galvanized iron imported into Australia is made in Great Britain. If the Treasurer believes in his own policy he will have to agree to grant a preference to British manufacturers.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—We are having nothing but a diarrhoea of words!

Mr. WILKS.—Even if I desired I could not be less accurate than the Treasurer was in dealing with this matter this morning. I came down to the House to-day quite prepared to "slog in" with the Tariff, but not to be humbugged by the Minister in charge of it. The proposals of the Government are so outrageous that some of their best supporters are supporting amendments against them. There is no item in the Tariff which affects the masses so keenly as this does. The best course for us to follow would be to postpone the item altogether, and so give the Treasurer time to understand its incidence. I move—

That the item be postponed.

Mr. HUTCHISON (Hindmarsh) [12.28].—I am against the postponement of the item, although I am quite prepared to vote for some modification of it. At the same time I must point out that only two arguments have been brought forw

against a reduction. The first is that this is an industry that only requires a simple plant and a small amount of labour. The inference is that we ought not to encourage the industry because it does not employ 1,000 people. If that argument were to be applied to all our small industries, we should wipe out the occupations of half the people engaged in the factories of the Commonwealth. The other argument against the proposed duty is that we should penalize the users of galvanized iron. But the first argument destroys the second. If the process is so simple the competition will be all the greater. I am quite satisfied that the result will be that the price will soon be far less than it is to-day. I admit that there is something in the contention of honorable members who contend that until a protected industry is well established the consumer has to pay increased prices. But that argument does not apply in the present instance. The honorable member for Lang pointed out that there are three plants established in South Australia, one of which is sufficient to supply the whole State. There are also plants in other parts of Australia, and notably those in New South Wales. The argument deduced from those facts is that there are already more plants established in Australia than are sufficient to do the whole of our work. But if that be so the consequence will be that the price will be considerably lowered. For that reason it does not matter whether the duty which we impose is that proposed by the Government or a lower rate so long as it is effective. It was proved to demonstration before the Tariff Commission that this was one of the strangled industries of Australia, and it was understood that honorable members were prepared to give consideration to those industries. It is one that is capable of great expansion.

Mr. POYNTON.—And how much duty do the manufacturers ask for?

Mr. HUTCHISON.—Witnesses before the Tariff Commission show that in New South Wales a duty of 15s. per ton on galvanized iron was inadequate, and that business was practically at a stand-still. It was further stated that the experience of manufacturers was that during the term of the duty of £2 per ton a satisfactory trade had been done. That surely shows conclusively that £2 per ton is a duty which would enable the industry to be carried on successfully.

Mr. POYNTON.—What have the South Australian manufacturers asked for?

Mr. HUTCHISON.—Mr. Morris, in conversation with me, said that he hoped the duties proposed by the Government would be carried. I am quite prepared to support the higher duty if the Minister intends to stick to it. But I wish to know what the Government intend to stand by. I find various honorable members moving amendments for reductions, and it is difficult to know how we stand. I should like to have a plain statement from the Minister.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I have already said that I intend to stand by the duty which I have proposed.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—I think there is no justification for a reduction, and if the Minister is prepared to stand by the duty proposed by him I shall support him; though at the same time I should be ready to support him also if he would agree to a reasonable reduction. I find the honorable member for Bendigo intimating that he is ready to go back on the recommendations of the protectionist members of the Tariff Commission. I understand that he is prepared to support a duty of 45s. per ton with a preference of 5s. to Great Britain. I think the Minister should be satisfied with that.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—A preference of 5s. per ton would mean 13½ per cent. against Great Britain as far as galvanized iron is concerned. The suggestion made is that as to paragraph A the duty should be 45s. per ton—which is 15 per cent. against the foreigner—and 40s. per ton, which is 13½ per cent., against Great Britain, and iron under paragraph B 40s. per ton, equal to 13½ per cent. in the case of foreign imports, and 35s. per ton, equal to 11½ per cent. on imports from Great Britain.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—Is the honorable member for Bendigo prepared to stand by the first proposal made by him that the duties should be 45s. and 40s. per ton? If he is, I shall support him.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—That is a very low percentage.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—I think it is sufficiently high to accomplish our purpose.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—It is a very high percentage on the process of galvanizing, but the Minister is trying surreptitiously to protect the iron itself.

Mr. HUTCHISON. — Those who do the work of corrugating and galvanizing complain that it is not sufficient, and I intend to support the highest duty, although I think it will matter little whether we support the highest or one slightly lower, as long as we secure protection to the industry. I am sure that the consumers of corrugated iron would not have to pay more than they have to pay at the present time for imported iron.

Mr. FOWLER (Perth) [12.35].—The honorable member for Hindmarsh is very optimistic as to the beneficial effect of the duty proposed by the Minister—far more optimistic than was even the one South Australian witness who appeared before the Tariff Commission to ask for protection. That manufacturer urged that a differential duty of only 15s. a ton would be sufficient to meet his case, and frankly admitted that it would have to be added to the cost of the iron to the consumer.

Mr. HUTCHISON. — What would there be to prevent my starting business in opposition to him?

Mr. FOWLER. — I intend to read from the evidence two or three short quotations which I think will induce the honorable member to appreciate the position a little more clearly than he seems to do. Mr. J. H. Weidenhofer, the South Australian manufacturer who was examined before the Commission, on 8th November, 1905, asked—

Do I understand you to say that this 15s. is absolutely necessary to enable you to carry on the corrugating industry in Australia?

His answer was—

I do not think it would be worth while to do it without.

The examination proceeded as follows—

You say 10s. goes in labour, and 5s. in interest on plant, and cost of supervision?—Yes.

The witness showed conclusively that these are actual charges that must be added to the cost of the material to the consumer—

If that is so, how is that price going to come down through competition, if it represents an absolute payment in value?—The competition? By saying that, I meant the competition would keep the price down to within reasonable limits—not an excessive profit would be made on it.

You cannot indicate where the 15s. is going to disappear when the price is quoted to the consumer, can you, seeing that it represents actual costs on value given?

The witness answered weakly enough—

I suppose it would make a little difference, a few shillings.

Seeing that the people who handle this galvanized iron in Australia appear to have an understanding as to the price, does it not look as if this representation was intended to secure some little monopoly for a few people, for the corrugating iron trade in Australia?—That is one way of putting it.

It cannot be denied that there exists practically a monopoly which it would not be worth while for any one to break into. Here are some further extracts from the examination of the same witness—

You told us that your plant, if kept going all the time, could pretty well turn out the requirements of South Australia?—I think we could, if put to the test, and had the necessary labour. You could not do it with eight hands; you would want more hands.

How many hands would you have?—Three or four more, I suppose, to keep the machines going. There would have to be relays of men—probably double the number.

Sixteen?—There would have to be relays of men, for the cases would have to be opened, the corrugations done, and the cases refilled. You cannot get one set of men to do that in eight hours. We would have to work overtime.

The witness was imagining an ideal condition of affairs.

Do you mean to say you would have to keep your plant going for two or three shifts?—Yes.

If you had twenty-four men, that would be the maximum?—Yes.

I ask honorable members to note the following questions and answers—

You have told us the 15s. a ton you are asking for represents 10s. that would have to go to labour, and 5s. that would have to go for interest on capital and cost of supervision?—Approximately I say that.

That represents an addition to the cost of material?—Yes.

You told us also that about 6,000 tons of this material was used in South Australia in a year?—Approximately. I have not been able to get the details from the Customs House.

What does 15s. a ton on 6,000 tons amount to?—About £4,500.

That was to be added to the cost of the consumer. Now comes the question to which those I have quoted were intended to lead—

Would it not be better for South Australia to employ these men that you propose to give work to in shovelling sand out of holes and into them again than to pay £4,500 additional for corrugating iron?—That is the free-trade view.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Who asked that question?

Mr. FOWLER.—I did. This is a striking instance of the absurdity of many protectionist duties. The struggling settlers of Australia, according to this evidence, would have to bear this heavy impost for the sake of employment being found for a mere handful of men. A common-sense

view is that it would be far better for the settlers, who would otherwise have to pay an enhanced price for their iron, to pension off all these men in order that it might come in free.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—Would not the same argument apply to scores of our industries?

Mr. FOWLER.—The distinction between this industry and others is that the latter start at the beginning in Australia. I take less objection to the protection of industries that are natural to the country than I do to those which are not. We have here a proposal to import the raw material and to dignify with the name of an industry the work of giving to it one or two insignificant touches.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—A Bill to prevent that is to be introduced.

Mr. FOWLER.—Then let it be introduced before these duties are imposed, rather than encourage the work of adding something to the tail-end of an industry and dignifying that work by the name of another industry. At least five-sixths of the total value of this production is created outside Australia, and every one who requires galvanized iron is to be taxed in order that we may give in Australia two insignificant touches to the imported material. The proposal is so childish that I am surprised that the Committee has devoted so much consideration to it. I wish to emphasize the point that those who sought protection for this industry wanted no more than a differential duty of 15s. per ton. Recognising that the numbers are against me, I am prepared to go to the extent of supporting such a duty, and surely protectionists do not wish to vote for a heavier duty than a protectionist producer himself declared would be sufficient to meet his case. If they do they will simply impose a tax on every unfortunate individual in Australia who has to buy this material.

Mr. FULLER (Illawarra) [12.46].—I had not an opportunity of hearing the speech delivered by the Treasurer in submitting this proposal, but from the comments made upon it, it would appear that he put before the Committee an incorrect statement as to the importations, and had subsequently to correct it. No reason has been given either during this debate or in the evidence given before the Tariff Commission for increasing the duty to anything like the extent proposed by the Treasurer. I fail to see how it can be justified, more

particularly in view of the fact that it is far in excess of the request made by any manufacturer who appeared before the Commission. The request made before the Commission was that a duty of 15s. per ton should be imposed in the case of galvanized iron and 30s. per ton on corrugated iron. That demand was supported by Mr. Morris, Mr. Weidenhofer, to whom the honorable member for Hindmarsh has referred, and Mr. Sandford, the representative of the only galvanizing works in Australia, whose highest demand was for a duty of £2 per ton on corrugated iron. His request was supported by Mr. Wade, the representative of the workers in the industry, and Mr. Thornley, the manager of Mr. Sandford's works, who gave similar evidence. That being so, there is no justification for the Treasurer's proposition, and I hold that it is the duty of the honorable member in every case in which he proposes to go beyond the demands of the manufacturer to explain fairly and openly his reason for doing so. I do not know that any such explanation has been given in this instance, and in its absence the debate will certainly be prolonged. It is clear from the evidence given before the Commission that very little labour is involved in the process of galvanizing and corrugating iron. The proposal of the Government is intended to protect not the iron manufacturer in Australia, but the galvanizing and corrugating industries, which employ very little labour, and which in reality only put the finishing touches upon material imported from abroad. Everybody knows that galvanized iron is an absolute necessity to the pioneers of Australia, who use it for roofing their homes. Why they should be penalized for the sake of developing industries which provide such a very small amount of employment can be explained only by a protectionist of the type of the Treasurer. The honorable member for Hindmarsh has made a strong plea on behalf of Mr. Weidenhofer, of South Australia, but Mr. Thornley, the manager of Mr. Sandford's works at Lithgow, admitted that the labour employed in the galvanizing of sheets was very insignificant, and that he would be satisfied with a duty of 12½ per cent. all round.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—I am supporting that rate.

Mr. FULLER.—As illustrating the small amount of labour employed in the corrugating of iron I may mention that a wit-

ness in South Australia admitted that his plant, which was one of three in that State, would be able with twenty-four men as a maximum to produce sufficient iron to supply the whole of its requirements, which were estimated at 6,000 tons annually. When he was asked whether it was worth while to impose an additional charge of 15s. per ton upon the annual consumption of corrugated iron in order to employ sixteen additional hands, he declined to express an opinion. As a matter of fact, it would pay the settlers of Australia to pension off the whole of those engaged in the industry rather than to be subjected to the imposts proposed. I think that the proper course for us to adopt is to accept the amendment of the honorable member for Dalley. It is evident that the Treasurer is not well versed in the facts relating to the industry, and to afford him an opportunity of becoming familiar with them, we might reasonably postpone the further consideration of the item until a later stage.

Mr. WYNNE (Balaclava) [12.56].—I think that corrugated iron stands on a par with wire-netting. The Committee reduced the duty upon wire-netting to as low a rate as possible, and I think that corrugated iron should be treated in the same way. We all desire to promote land settlement in Australia, and we know that the very first act of a selector is to erect three or four sheets of corrugated iron to provide him with shelter. We must recollect that his means are limited. In the mining districts almost all the houses are roofed with corrugated iron.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—Cannot he buy Australian corrugated iron?

Mr. WYNNE.—No. Why should these people be taxed to assist an industry which is not indigenous to the country? When I resided in Ballarat, the miners were at liberty to take up residential areas of a quarter of an acre each. They used to build wooden-framed cottages, and cover them with corrugated iron. All the sheds there are roofed with the same material. On the mining fields of Western Australia even the walls of the houses are of corrugated iron. It is not necessary to impose a heavy tax upon this commodity, and there is no necessity to increase the old rate of duty four or five-fold. The honorable member for Perth has already pointed out that those who have asked for a duty upon it are satisfied to accept 15s. per ton,

which is equal to about 15 per cent. Personally, I think that we should make this article dutiable at 15 per cent. under the general Tariff, and that we should extend a preference of 5 per cent. to the United Kingdom.

Sitting suspended from 1 to 2.15 p.m.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH (Parkes) [2.15].—I had intended, had I spoken earlier in the debate, to say something about the truly domestic nature of the commodity we are discussing, but honorable members have dealt with that already at some length. It has been pointed out that not only the pioneers of Australia, but the farmers and small householders all over the Commonwealth, depend upon galvanized iron for roofing material, as also to secure supplies of wholesome drinking water against times of drought. We know that bark roofs do not catch all the rain-fall, and what they do catch is so discoloured and impregnated with the flavour of the bark, that they are only resorted to where there is some difficulty in obtaining galvanized iron. This domestic article, it should also be stated, is used, except for industrial purposes, almost wholly by the poorer classes, because people of means, in building houses, prefer the use of more æsthetic tiles or slates. Once these facts are recognised we are induced to make the use of this material as economical as possible. I direct attention to the want of clearness in the explanation given by the Treasurer. It has never been properly explained to those honorable members who have not discovered the facts for themselves that what we are discussing now is not a duty on iron but a duty on two particular processes known as galvanizing and corrugating to which iron is subjected. The Minister spoke of the item as if the question involved were the imposition of a duty upon iron; whilst, as a matter of fact, it is proposed to impose a duty upon galvanized iron and corrugated iron with the object of encouraging only the local galvanizing and corrugating of iron. The Tariff Commission deal with the question remarkably well, and I propose to read a couple of paragraphs from their report. They say—

Only one firm in Australia appears to have undertaken the galvanizing of sheet iron, the manager of which admitted that the process required very little labour, and was a comparatively small thing in relation to the total value of the iron.

That is according to the evidence of Mr. Thornley, the manager of the iron wor

in New South Wales. The Commission further say:—

Two witnesses in South Australia and one in Victoria said that it was not possible to galvanize sheets in Australia.

Mr. MATHEWS.—That shows what the evidence given before the Tariff Commission is worth.

Mr. SAMPSON.—I have seen men galvanizing sheets at the New South Wales works.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—When a man says that he does a certain thing his evidence must be held to destroy the evidence of those who merely say that they have not seen it done. With respect to the remark made by the honorable member for Melbourne Ports, as to the value of the evidence given before the Tariff Commission, I should like to say that it is at least quite as valuable as some of the *ex parte* statements which the honorable member and other honorable members make in this House, when they take information from one side and do not take the trouble to balance it with the evidence given on the other side. However, I read, not from the evidence given before the Tariff Commission, but from the finding of the Commission in which they take care to set out both sides. Any one who reads their report must infer that there is at least one manufactory for the galvanizing of iron in New South Wales. The point, however, is that the processes of galvanizing and corrugating represent but an infinitesimal portion of the total value of galvanized and corrugated iron. The cost was placed by one witness at about 2½ per cent., and by others at from 4s. to 5s. per ton. The report of the Tariff Commission goes on to say—

The manager of the rolling mills in New South Wales admitted that there was very little labour employed in corrugating galvanized sheets.

I ask the Committee to note these facts. We all know that the corrugation of iron simply means that sheet iron is put between two corrugated rollers.

Mr. SAMPSON.—It is stamped.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—Some of it may be stamped, but I have known corrugated iron to be produced in the way I have stated. The average cost of iron f.o.b. is from £15 to £16 per ton, and the cost of corrugating and of galvanizing this iron is from 4s. to 5s. per ton, or about 1½ per cent., and about 2½ per cent. respectively. We are making a very liberal allowance when we say that the cost of corrugating

and of galvanizing will, together, come to 5 per cent. upon the f.o.b. cost of the iron. If we assume that the iron costs £15 per ton we should impose a duty of 5 per cent., which would represent 15s. per ton. The Minister, intentionally or unintentionally—and honorable members must judge for themselves as to that—is endeavouring to secure under this item a protection upon the manufacture of sheet iron, which is not what the House intends, since a majority have agreed to the second reading of the Manufactures Encouragement Bill, the object of which is to offer a bounty of 12s. per ton for three years or until the industry is established, and at the end of that time to impose a duty on the iron. Assuming that 5 per cent. would be sufficient to cover the two processes, the Minister is asking the Committee to impose an extra duty of 15 or 20 per cent., as the case may be, upon the actual iron sheets, which is contrary to the policy affirmed in connexion with the Manufactures Encouragement Bill. Honorable members must see that the only object of our discussion at present should be to discover what would be a fair measure of protection for those engaged in the two processes of galvanizing and corrugating. A duty of 15s. per ton would be ample in view of the small cost of the processes. I wish now to say a word about the way in which the business is being put before the Committee. I have commented more than once upon the absolute inefficiency of this House, not from an intellectual but from other points of view, to deal with Tariff matters. I do not care how big a man's intellect may be, or how commercial, mathematical or logical may be his mind, he must have the material to put into his mental mill before he can produce results of any value to the people in deciding the proper duties to impose upon various articles. No member of the Committee, unless he is prepared to devote his whole time to the work—which the Minister is paid to do—could collect all the data necessary to enable him to arrive at valuable conclusions with regard to all these items. From that point of view the work of the Tariff Commission must be regarded as most valuable. As, however, the Committee does not seem to attach very much importance to their work, we have a right to look to the Minister for a simple, straightforward, and trustworthy statement upon each item submitted. What have we had to-day? We have had the most lamentable exhibition that I think could possibly

be presented to a number of intelligent men. No doubt, with the intention of appealing to the prejudices of certain honorable members, the Minister told the Committee that no less than £390,000 worth of galvanized iron was imported to the Commonwealth from the United States of America. Upon that statement, as a premise, the honorable gentleman built an interesting and attractive edifice, with which he appealed to honorable members in a very heated way to resist great trusts in the United States of America, preventing anybody in Australia from engaging in these industries. The honorable gentleman assumed that his figures were correct, and made this appeal to the prejudices of certain honorable members to put the duty at a high level in order to prevent the possibility of these several industries being destroyed. What followed? We had the very pitiable exhibition of the Minister having to depend upon an exposure of error in his figures by the Government Whip. The honorable gentleman suddenly realized that instead of the imports from the United States of America amounting in value to £390,000, their value was only about £37,000, and the whole edifice on which he depended, in his appeal to honorable members to resist the American trusts, fell like a house of cards. But there is a moral in all this. It is impossible for us to look into all these matters for ourselves; and we are entitled to expect that a Minister, receiving a substantial remuneration, submitting the various items will supply information by which we may be guided. We expect him to recognise the difficulty of our getting this information for ourselves, and we ought to be able to rely upon every word the honorable gentleman utters as to the facts bearing upon the items under consideration. In this case it has been shown that the Treasurer is ignorant of the figures or careless as to their correctness; and even with the help of an officer behind the Speaker's chair, is unable to give the common or garden information which we should have to guide us in dealing with matters of this sort. By the accidental presence of the Government Whip who has run over the honorable gentleman's figures, we were able to discover that he had made a mistake of about 1,000 per cent. in those which he submitted to the Committee.

Mr. FRAZER. — The honorable member for Grey also corrected the Treasurer.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH. — That is so, and the honorable member for Grey gave the Committee a great deal of valuable information in the early part of the debate. If we had not the information which the honorable member for Grey, and also the honorable members for North Sydney, Illawarra, and Perth gave the Committee, we should have been in the dark unless we looked up the records for ourselves. It might not have any special pertinence to this particular item, but it shows that the Committee should be careful to note that the treatment of these matters by the Minister is absolutely prejudiced from the outset, and that he is absolutely unprepared, either through want of knowledge or want of industry in obtaining the necessary information, to put before the Committee the facts to which they are entitled when dealing with a question of this sort. If 5 per cent. on the cost of the iron will give a handsome protection upon the two processes of galvanizing and corrugating — because we do not want to protect the iron itself—we really ought to consider only the value of those two processes. It is altogether a misleading method of calculating the proper duty on this material to take the value of £15 per ton of the material itself. If the witnesses from whose evidence the Commission thought fit to draw the conclusion that 5 per cent. upon the original cost will give a handsome profit upon these processes, be right, we should be perfectly satisfied with that, remembering that we are not putting the duty upon the material itself, but upon the work which is now being accomplished, or was lately accomplished, in South Australia and New South Wales.

Mr. KNOX (Kooyong) [2.32].—It was suggested before lunch that galvanized iron should be placed in the same position as wire netting, upon which the Committee decided to lower the duty, but in that case the netting was a necessity in fighting a scourge throughout the Commonwealth. The galvanized iron accompanies the pioneer into every part of Australia. It will be found in the out-of-the-way mining camp, where after the tent comes the galvanized iron covering. It is in all ways an undoubted necessity of our development. My feeling, therefore, is that we should endeavour so far as we possibly can to allow it to reach the consumer at as cheap a rate as possible. The actual money spent in the work of galvanizing, rolling, and

corrugating is not very great, and, as has already been pointed out by the honorable member for Parkes and others, it is quite clear that for a long time to come we should not have the necessary black sheets made in Australia of such a character or quality as will be necessary for making these articles. I do not care from whom it comes. Even if the great Trust in America, against which so much has been said, likes to come here and establish works under Australian conditions, or if any of the great manufacturers of Great Britain come here for the same purpose, we can take no exception to them so long as they conform to the conditions which we in Australia establish. But I feel that the duty, whether it is a fixed or *ad valorem* rate, should be reduced to such an amount as will not exceed the recommendation made by the Tariff Commission, which should commend itself to the majority of the Committee. I should be prepared to support a fixed duty so long as it does not exceed an amount which will correspond with the *ad valorem* rate recommended by the Commission.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—That would be £2 5s. a ton—too much.

Mr. KNOX.—It would probably be about £2 a ton, but it might be less. In any case I think we should be justified in following the Commission's recommendation. We have here the spelter necessary and the workers ready to do this work, but I am not prepared to impose such a duty as will make the cost to the consumer greater than is desirable, but I certainly will not be prepared to follow the Government in their proposal for a higher rate.

Mr. JOHN THOMSON (Cowper) [2.37].—In view of the importance of the item and the large number of people likely to be affected by a duty on galvanized iron, it is desirable that the Committee should give it a fair amount of consideration. We know that the article is made from plain black sheet iron. It has been said that it does not require a great amount of capital for plant or a great deal of labour to convert black sheet iron into galvanized iron. Anybody who visited the Lithgow iron-works with us a little while ago would be well satisfied as to that. The honorable member for Parkes stated that 5 per cent. on the outlay would fairly represent the cost of the industry.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—I said 5 per cent. — the f.o.b. price of the iron.

Mr. JOHN THOMSON.—At any rate I think the honorable member's figures were about 15s. per ton. We must first consider whether the public are now getting the benefit that they should get. In order to ascertain that, I must turn to the figures furnished by the Commonwealth Statistician, Mr. Knibbs, in order to find the values of the articles. He gives the amount of plain sheet iron imported. That is on the free list. The total imported into the Commonwealth in 1906 was 458,197 cwt., of a value of £200,034. That works out at £9 15s. per ton. We imported of galvanized iron, plain and sheet, 1,245,211 cwt., of a value of £1,069,174, which shows that the average price would be about £17 2s. 6d. a ton.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—I took £15 or £16. The price the honorable member quotes would include the 10 per cent. added for Customs purposes.

Mr. JOHN THOMSON.—I should take the figures given by the Statistician in preference to any information furnished by a wholesale importer or manufacturer. What I have stated will be admitted by everybody to be the fair average price of the article imported. When speaking of an average price, I want it to be understood that in this particular item there are quite a number of different kinds of iron, not only in quality but in gauges. Anybody who has handled it knows that when you buy from 5 ft. to 8 ft. iron you pay less than for 9 ft. or 10 ft. iron.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—It depends on the thickness.

Mr. JOHN THOMSON.—Not only on the thickness but on the length. Those figures show that the declared value of galvanized iron, plain and corrugated, imported, is £17 2s. 6d. per ton, and of black sheet iron £9 15s. a ton, or a difference of £7 7s. 6d. a ton. I agree with the honorable member for Parkes and several other honorable members that 5 per cent. would be a fair thing to cover the cost. We saw that there were only a few hands engaged in the process of making galvanized iron, plain and sheet. Four boys were employed in dipping the iron, and there were two or three men at the stampers doing the corrugating. That is the whole process. The people of Australia are paying £7 7s. 6d. a ton for that, because the iron is in the hands of a number of importers and there is no competition. The Committee is always in sympathy with the primary producer, and the evidence I have goes to show that he is not getting

the benefit that he ought to get, simply because the iron is handled only by a few, and the cost of converting black iron into sheet or galvanized iron is not given to the people who should receive it. It would be very much better for our people—and the provisions of the Tariff allow it—to get black iron in free, and convert it at a cost of 5 per cent. into galvanized iron, so creating a number of industries whose competition would reduce the extra charge of £7 7s. 6d. per ton for conversion to somewhere about 17s. per ton.

Mr. POYNTON.—Does not the honorable member think that £7 7s. 6d. a ton is a good protection?

Mr. JOHN THOMSON.—The honorable member knows that prices are regulated more by competition than by either free-trade or protection. Every man who has an article to sell gets for it what the public will pay. I believe that we can create a number of industries; which do not require a very big capital—somewhere about £1,500, as has been stated—whereby black iron may be converted into corrugated iron. I think the proposals before the Committee will do that, even if the Government's proposals are considered too high. By that means we should be assisting our primary industries by allowing them to get plain and corrugated galvanized iron cheaper than they have in the past. I hope the Committee will agree to a duty which will be sufficient to give encouragement to the industry, apart from any assistance which we are giving to the production of black iron. I believe that by that means we should be able to supply the people with galvanized iron cheaper than they are getting it now from the hands of the importers. If further proof were necessary, it could be found in the evidence given before the Tariff Commission. A New South Wales witness, an importer, complained that under the present duty his firm felt very keenly the competition of Australian made galvanized iron. That shows that whenever there is competition from inside against the importer the public must be getting the benefit. The state of things that obtained before Federation is shown by the evidence of a Victorian manufacturer of galvanized and other sheet iron. He said that he was much better off under the Victorian Tariff of 30 per cent. The Commission states that in New South Wales the experience of manufacturers was that during the term of the £2 per ton duty on plain and corru-

gated galvanized iron, satisfactory trade had been done, but that when the duty had been removed, in 1896, business fell off to such an extent that one of the mills at one factory had been stopped, and the other used intermittently. Under the old South Australian Tariff, the duty on corrugated iron was 30s. per ton, and plain sheet iron was free. Several corrugating plants, costing about £1,500 each, had been put down and satisfactory business had been done. That evidence goes to show the possibility of starting works of this kind. By giving encouragement to the industry we should create inside competition, the price of the article would be reduced to the people, and by that means we should advantage them considerably, and also be creating an Australian industry.

Mr. LIDDELL (Hunter) [2.45].—I desire to put in a plea first for the consumer, considering the large number of people who are interested in this special duty. We must consider how largely corrugated galvanized iron is used. A great quantity is used for roofing purposes. The smallest house takes about half a ton of iron to roof it, and must be furnished with gutters and spoutings made of iron, which, after being galvanized, has to be twisted and turned into various shapes, so that it must be of superior quality. Galvanized iron is also frequently used for fencing material, and for the manufacture of household articles, such as buckets, tubs, ashpans, and the like. Then, in a climate like ours, no house is complete without its bath, and most baths are made of galvanized iron. Lastly, the conservation of water is absolutely necessary, and for this tanks made of corrugated and galvanized iron are extensively used. It will be seen, therefore, that sheet-iron is of immense importance to our pastoralists, agriculturists, dairymen, and miners. Are we going to penalize the whole of the producing industries of Australia by putting a tax upon its importation to encourage a very small industry? According to the Tariff Commission's evidence, the three South Australian firms to which reference has been made employ only about twenty hands each. The free-trade members of the Commission reported on this subject—

It was stated definitely that the margin of difference between the landed cost of imported black sheets, viz., £10 8s. 10d. per ton (or £1 18s. 10d. over the f.o.b. price in England) afforded a sufficient natural protection after allowing for the price of local bar and rod iron, viz., £9, which price it was stated covered

a substantial profit. Witnesses stated that any duty or charge on black sheets would seriously prejudice Australian industries which were now established, some doing a considerable export trade.

These are the recommendations of the protectionist section of the Commission—

That on galvanized or corrugated iron, plate, and sheet, there be a duty of 10 per cent. (equal to about 30s. per ton).

We have been told that in South Australia the industry has flourished without protection—

That on corrugated galvanized iron there be a duty of 15 per cent. That plate and sheet iron (ungalvanized and uncorrugated) remain free as specified under Division VIA., subdivision C. That on tanks containing goods, or empty, for every 100 gallons capacity, or part thereof, there be a duty of 3s.

If we impose a duty on the tanks in which various kinds of perishable goods are imported, we shall merely increase the taxation on those goods. Some of the raw material used by brewers is imported in iron tanks, and so, too, is mustard, as well as other commodities. These goods could not be imported in any other way, and, therefore, the tanks will continue to come in, notwithstanding the duty, and no encouragement will be given to their manufacture locally. I am in favour of the amendment of the honorable member for Dalley, who has suggested the postponement of the item.

Mr. JOHNSON.—That will mean the continuance of the present situation.

Mr. LIDDELL.—Yes. That is unfortunate. I am surprised that the Minister does not come here prepared with all the information necessary to guide our deliberations. Instead of being properly informed on this subject, he read figures which were entirely misleading, and was not man enough to take the responsibility of his mistake, blaming officers who, at the present time, are probably sweated and overworked.

Mr. MAHON.—Is not he, too, overworked?

Mr. LIDDELL.—No doubt we are all overworked just now. If I had my way, we would adjourn over the hot weather. The Government are piling business upon us at the last moment, when we are all anxious to get away, and possibly in the end the Committee will be so weary of the whole thing that it will pass the items *en bloc*, instead of dealing with them separately, as it should.

Mr. FRAZER (Kalgoorlie) [2.52].—I am as desirous as most honorable members

that a decision should be come to on this matter, but I feel that we should not divide on a question of such importance at the risk of a misunderstanding as to the result of accepting the Government proposal. Even the Minister must admit that the proposed duty will not benefit the iron industry, which is to be encouraged by the bounties to be granted under the Manufactures Encouragement Bill. What we have to consider is what duty should be imposed on galvanized and corrugated iron to encourage persons to do the galvanizing and corrugating here, the black sheets being admitted free. To my mind, it is doubtful whether it is advisable to impose any duty with a view to bringing this about.

Mr. FOWLER.—The industry costs far more than it is worth.

Mr. FRAZER.—I think so. The labour given by the industry is more than counterbalanced by the increased cost to the community of galvanized and corrugated iron.

Mr. JOHNSON.—It would pay the public to double the wages of those now engaged in the industry, on condition that they would go out of it.

Mr. FRAZER.—I think it would pay us to give the few boys employed in this industry a decent wage to go out of it. The encouragement of the manufacture of iron from native ores is an entirely different thing. To put a heavy impost upon the community, merely to encourage the galvanizing and corrugating of iron in this country, is not sound economy.

Mr. FOWLER.—The corrugating industry is a parasitic one.

Mr. FRAZER.—It practically comes under that category. The industry gives so little labour that we are hardly justified in considering it. When we were at Lithgow, we saw a few boys engaged in dipping the iron sheets into the galvanizing liquid, and passing them between rollers to corrugate them. We ought not to place a burden on the primary producers to support so small an industry as that. Out back, men cannot build houses of brick, with slate roofs, and when their homes are not constructed wholly of galvanized iron, they are, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, roofed with it. The Minister might well be satisfied with a small increase on the old duty. The maximum rates for which I shall vote are 30s. against foreign countries, and 20s. against Great Britain.

Mr. POYNTON (Grey) [2.57].—The speech of the honorable member for Cowper tended to show that galvanized and corrugated iron should be on the free list. He spoke of the average value of imported galvanized iron as £17 2s. 6d. per ton, and of imported black sheets as something over £9 per ton. The difference between those two prices—£8 per ton—surely allows a good margin of profit for those engaged locally in galvanizing.

Mr. JOHN THOMSON.—Without a duty, will not importers crush out the local industry, as has been done in other cases?

Mr. POYNTON.—Even if there be competition, there is a very large margin of profit to work on. My proposal is to fix the duty at 25s. in the general Tariff, and 20s. in the preferential Tariff.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—No; fix the duties at 30s. and 20s. respectively.

Mr. POYNTON.—I am not particular about fixing the duty in the general Tariff at 30s., because practically all the importations come from the United Kingdom. If we fix the duties at 30s. and 20s. respectively, we shall afford ample protection, plus the advantage which the local manufacturers already possess owing to the difference between the cost of black iron and galvanized iron. I would not press this proposal upon honorable members but for the fact that galvanized iron is one of the first requirements of the primary producers. We all talk about settling people on the land. If honorable members really want to help the settlers they will adopt my suggestion. Whatever duty is imposed will practically be a revenue duty. Why should we penalize the primary producers by levying that which after all is an excessive revenue duty? I propose to alter my amendment by substituting 30s. for 25s. per ton.

Amendment amended accordingly.

Sir JOHN FORREST (Swan) [3.2].—I do not wish to prolong the debate, but I hope that the Government will not insist upon the higher duty they have imposed on this article, which is largely used by the rural population all over Australia. We have been engaged in imposing high duties on many commodities which are used by the farming and pastoral population, and it has been difficult to see how they will derive any special benefit therefrom. We are now afforded an opportunity not to impose a high duty on a commodity which is used very largely by all persons engaged in rural pursuits. To the pastoralist, to the

agriculturist, to the miner, in fact to every one in the rural industries, galvanized iron is a necessity, and in many cases it has to be carted long distances, whereby its cost is very much enhanced. I hope that the Committee will accept the proposal to levy a duty of 20s. against the United Kingdom and 30s. against other countries. This is a case in which I think the Government might do something for the rural people, who will not benefit from many of the duties which we have been imposing during the last month or two.

Mr. HEDGES (Fremantle) [3.6].—I also hope that the Government will not insist upon levying a high duty on the articles embraced in this item, especially on plain galvanized iron, which is used more considerably than honorable members seem to think. In the interior of Western Australia it is used for the purpose of building houses. It is nailed on the inside of the studs and is papered. It is very easily manipulated, and the cottages are made to look very nice indeed. Again, hundreds of tons of the article are used in Australia, not only to be corrugated, but also for making guttering, ridge-caps, and all kinds of things.

Mr. McDougall.—If it is used so generally it is strange that no attempt has been made to manufacture it in Australia.

Mr. HEDGES.—It is used so generally that when iron is made in Australia there will be some sense in levying a duty on plain galvanized iron.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—We shall never make iron in Australia if I continue to get such support as I shall get on this occasion.

Mr. HEDGES.—This article is in the same category as wire-netting. It is corrugated here. Any one who has seen a corrugating machine at work knows that it is attended to by a boy.

Mr. LIDDELL.—No, it takes two men to put in the sheet and one to take it out.

Mr. HEDGES.—That might have been the case when the honorable member was inspecting a corrugating machine at work, and it must have been done merely to mislead him as to the cost of the operation. Whenever I have seen a corrugating machine at work the process was very simple. I hope that the Committee will recognise that the first thing which a man requires, whether he is engaged on a block of land or on a mine, is a cheap house of some kind. In the country, galvanized iron is the material which is chiefly used in the

construction of a house. I claim that we should make it as easy as possible for a man to procure a home in which to live. I had hoped that the duty under the new Tariff would not exceed the duty under the old Tariff. I shall be prepared to vote for duties of 15 per cent. and 10 per cent. respectively, or something like those rates.

Motion (to postpone the item) negatived.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [3.10].—I think that it would be very convenient if the Committee would now decide whether the duties on the articles contained in this item should be *ad valorem* or fixed. I am pledged at the present time to vote for the imposition of *ad valorem* duties, and against the imposition of fixed duties. If I were afforded an opportunity to vote for the imposition of *ad valorem* duties, I should be prepared, in the case of corrugated galvanized iron, to vote for a duty of 15 per cent. in the general Tariff and 10 per cent. in the preferential Tariff; and in the case of iron galvanized, but not corrugated, and iron corrugated, but not galvanized, to vote for a duty of 10 per cent. in the general Tariff and 5 per cent. in the preferential Tariff. I think that the Minister should take a test vote as to whether the duties shall be fixed or *ad valorem*. If that is not done, I might be called upon to vote against the imposition of fixed duties which would be almost equal to the *ad valorem* duties I prefer, whereas, if a test vote is taken, I may be able to approximate to some proposition equivalent to the *ad valorem* duties. I am bound to vote against the imposition of any fixed duties.

Mr. BAMFORD (Herbert) [3.11].—I agree with the honorable and learned member for Bendigo that we should decide at once whether the duties are to be fixed or *ad valorem*. There is no question that the price of this commodity fluctuates so very considerably that a duty of 10 per cent. at the present time would yield more than would a duty of $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. at a later time, and *vice versa*. I do not intend to vote for the imposition of a duty higher than that which prevailed under the old Tariff. In the session of 1901-2 this item was debated at very considerable length, and the Labour Party intimated its desire that it should be placed on the free list. I think it will be generally admitted by those who took part in the discussion on that occasion that a serious bungle was made when the item was not put on the free list. Galvanized iron is used very

largely in my constituency. I should say that it is used exclusively for roofing purposes. If we impose a high duty on galvanized iron, which is the roofing material used in the back country, the price of every other kind of roofing material will be almost certain to rise in sympathy with the price of galvanized iron. I refer to such materials as slates, tiles, and rubberoid. I shall not vote for the imposition of any duties higher than 40s. and 30s. respectively. I do not say that I will not vote for less than those rates, but certainly I shall not vote for higher rates.

Mr. PAGE (Maranoa) [3.13].—When the former Tariff was under consideration, I, together with many other members, was under the impression that galvanized iron would be duty free, but somehow or other, in the putting of the question, we got boxed up. After it was passed we found ourselves in the position that the article was liable to a duty, and of course we had to bow to the inevitable. If this were a proposal for the protection of a primary or secondary industry, I should vote the whole protection which the Government desire, but it is nothing of the sort; it is simply a question of giving a protection of £3 per ton to those who are engaged in the tinning and corrugating of iron. All the houses which are erected in the far western districts of Queensland are built of galvanized iron. Do honorable members intend to inflict a specific duty on the pioneers of the interior of Australia? I venture to say that even in Victoria 80 per cent. of the houses outside Melbourne are roofed with corrugated iron. If honorable members intend to penalize men for going out back and making the country what it is, by all means let them vote duties as high as the Treasurer wishes them to do. The honorable member for Fremantle has stated that it takes only a boy to operate a corrugating machine, but the honorable member for Hunter interjected that three men are required. In England I have seen women galvanizing, not only sheet iron, but other materials. If ever there was an instance of bunkum, it is to be found in the case of this particular duty. The Treasurer made a mistake concerning the value of £300,000, and admitted it.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The honorable member knows perfectly well how that happened.

Mr. PAGE.—I accept the honorable member's statement. I am sure that he would not, for one moment, attempt to mislead the Committee, especially in a case involving hundreds of thousands of pounds. However, the fact remains that the imports from the United States are represented by a value of £37,000, as compared with £1,032,000 in the case of England. Where, then is the preference to the Mother Country? I should be willing to see a duty of 5 per cent. or 10 per cent. against foreign nations, with free ports for the United Kingdom. If the Government will consent to a substantial preference, as was wisely granted in the case of cotton goods, I for one shall be found voting with them. I shall not be found casting a vote for throwing any man or woman out of employment, but, on the other hand, I cannot load my constituents with an enormous duty of this character, merely in order to keep half-a-dozen men employed in Melbourne, or, for that matter, in Brisbane. I intend to vote for the lowest duty possible.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [3.19].—In order to test the question whether the duty be *ad valorem* or fixed, I move—

That the amendment be amended by leaving out the words "per ton," with a view to insert in lieu thereof the words "ad val."

If my proposal be accepted, the amount of the duty may be decided afterwards.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [3.20].—I explained to the Committee that a communication received from the principal importers had caused me to propose the substitution of a specific for an *ad valorem* duty. Personally I regard it as immaterial what kind of duty is imposed, and, if it be the desire of the Committee, the Government are quite prepared to accept an *ad valorem* duty.

Mr. BAMFORD.—Let us have a fixed duty.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Quite so; but it would appear that any proposal I make, however good the reason, is the signal for objections. As a matter of fact, the Government are not wedded to a specific duty, though I regard it as the better impost of the two.

Mr. POYNTON (Grey) [3.23].—At the request of a number of honorable members, I have agreed to alter the duties proposed in my amendment to 30s. and 20s.

Mr. ATKINSON (Wilmot) [3.24].—I hope the Committee will decide on a fixed duty.

Amendment of the amendment negatived.

Question—That after the words "25 per cent.," paragraph A, the words "and on and after 25th November, 1907, per ton (General Tariff), 30s." (Mr. POYNTON's amendment) be inserted—put. The Committee divided.

Ayes	29
Noes	25
Majority				4

AYES.

Archer, E. W.	Johnson, W. E.
Bamford, F. W.	Liddell, F.
Brown, Tilley	Livingston, J.
Catts, J. H.	Mahon, H.
Cook, Joseph	Page, J.
Edwards, R.	Poynton, A.
Fisher, A.	Sinclair, H.
Forrest, Sir John	Smith, Bruce
Fowler, J. M.	Thomas, J.
Foxton, Colonel	Thomson, Dugald
Frazer, C. E.	Wilks, W. H.
Fuller, G. W.	Wynne, A.
Fysh, Sir Philip	<i>Tellers:</i>
Hedges, W. N.	Atkinson, L.
Hughes, W. M.	Brown, Thomas

NOES.

Carr, E. S.	Mathews, J.
Chanter, J. M.	Mauger, S.
Chapman, Austin	McDougall, J. K.
Coon, J.	O'Malley, King
Deakin, A.	Quick, Sir John
Ewing, T. T.	Sampson, S.
Fairbairn, G.	Storror, D.
Groom, L. E.	Thomson, John
Harper, R.	Watkins, D.
Hutchison, J.	Wise, G. H.
Knox, W.	<i>Tellers:</i>
Lyne, Sir William	Cook, Hume
Maloney, W. R. N.	Tudor, F. G.

PAIRS.

Palmer, A. C.	Watson, J. C.
Reid, G. H.	Hall, D. R.
Glynn, P. McM.	Crouch, R. A.
Wilson, J. G.	Batchelor, E. L.
Kelly, W. H.	Kingston, C. C.
McWilliams, W. J.	Webster, W.
Willis, Henry	Foster, F. J.

Question so resolved in the affirmative.

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment (by Mr. POYNTON) put—

That after the words "20 per cent.," paragraph A, the words "and on and after 25th November, 1907, per ton (United Kingdom), 20s.," be inserted.

The Committee divided.

Ayes	41
Noes	13
Majority				28

AYES.

Archer, E. W.
Atkinson, L.
Brown, Tilley
Brown, Thomas
Catts, J. H.
Chapman, Austin
Cook, Joseph
Cook, Hume
Coon, J.
Deakin, A.
Edwards, R.
Ewing, T. T.
Fairbairn, G.
Fisher, A.
Forrest, Sir John
Fowler, J. M.
Foxton, Colonel
Frazer, C. E.
Fuller, G. W.
Fysh, Sir Philip
Groom, L. E.

Hedges, W. N.
Hughes, W. M.
Knox, W.
Livingston, J.
Lyne, Sir William
Mahon, H.
Mauger, S.
O'Malley, King
Page, J.
Poynton, A.
Sinclair, H.
Smith, Bruce
Storrer, D.
Thomas, J.
Thomson, Dugald
Thomson, John
Wilks, W. H.
Wynne, A.
Tellers.
Johnson, W. E.
Liddell, F.

NOES.

Bamford, F. W.
Carr, E. S.
Chanter, J. M.
Harper, R.
Maloney, W. R. N.
McDougall, J. K.
Quick, Sir John

Sampson, S.
Tudor, F. G.
Watkins, D.
Wise, G. H.
Tellers:
Hutchison, J.
Mathews, J.

PAIRS.

Palmer, A. C.
Reid, G. H.
Glynn, P. McM.
Wilson, J. G.
Kelly, W. H.
McWilliams, W. J.
Willis, Henry

Watson, J. C.
Hall, D. R.
Crouch, R. A.
Batchelor, E. L.
Kingston, C. C.
Webster, W.
Foster, F. J.

Question so resolved in the affirmative.

Amendment agreed to.

Colonel FOXTON.—I desire to state, by way of personal explanation, that during the division immediately prior to the one just taken I entered the chamber during the ringing of the bells, and seated myself on the right of the Chairman. Just before you ordered the doors to be locked, sir, it was intimated to me by the honorable member for Lang that I had been paired with the honorable member for Newcastle. Thereupon I proceeded to enter one of the seats railed off from those occupied by honorable members. While I was in the act of doing so I observed that the honorable member for Newcastle was in his place. The tellers did not record my vote on the ground that I was not strictly speaking within the chamber. I make this explanation in order that it may be recorded to explain the absence of my name from the division list.

The CHAIRMAN.—Of course I accept the honorable member's explanation. I under the impression that he was out-

side the precincts and was coming in, but several honorable members told me that he was about to go outside. Under the circumstances I shall direct that the division list be corrected.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—I wish to ask you, sir, whether honorable members are in order in crossing the floor after you have put the question?

The CHAIRMAN.—When honorable members were crossing the floor I had not used the words "the Ayes will pass to the right and the Noes to the left." It was when I was making that announcement that honorable members crossed over. They had a right to so cross until I had appointed tellers.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—Quite a number of honorable members crossed over after the question was put. Had I not thought that it was disorderly to do so, I should have crossed the floor myself.

Amendment (by Mr. POYNTON) put—

That after the words "20 per cent.," paragraph B, the words "and on and after 25th November, 1907, per ton (General Tariff), 20s.," be inserted.

The Committee divided.

Ayes	31
Noes	22
Majority	9

AYES.

Archer, E. W.
Atkinson, L.
Bamford, F. W.
Brown, Tilley
Brown, Thomas
Catts, J. H.
Cook, Joseph
Edwards, R.
Fairbairn, G.
Fisher, A.
Forrest, Sir J.
Fowler, J. M.
Foxton, Colonel
Frazer, C. E.
Fuller, G. W.
Fysh, Sir Philip

Harper, R.
Hedges, W. N.
Hughes, W. M.
Knox, W.
Liddell, F.
Livingston, J.
Mahon, H.
Page, J.
Poynton, A.
Sinclair, H.
Thomas, J.
Thomson, Dugald
Wynne, A.
Tellers:
Johnson, W. E.
Wilks, W. H.

NOES.

Carr, E. S.
Chanter, J. M.
Chapman, Austin
Coon, J.
Deakin, A.
Ewing, T. T.
Groom, L. E.
Hutchison, J.
Lyne, Sir William
Maloney, W. R. N.
Mathews, J.
Mauger, S.

McDougall, J. K.
Quick, Sir John
Sampson, S.
Storrer, D.
Thomson, John
Tudor, F. G.
Watkins, D.
Wise, G. H.
Tellers:
Cook, Hume
O'Malley, King

PAIRS.

Smith, Bruce	Salmon, C. C.
Palmer, A. C.	Watson, J. C.
Reid, G. H.	Hall, D. R.
Glynn, P. McM.	Crouch, R. A.
Wilson, J. G.	Batchelor, E. L.
Kelly, W. H.	Kingston, C. C.
McWilliams, W. J.	Webster, W.
Willis, Henry	Foster, F. J.

Question so resolved in the affirmative.

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment (by Mr. POYNTON) agreed to—

That after the words "15 per cent.," paragraph B, the words "and on and after 25th November, 1907, per ton (United Kingdom), 10s.," be added.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Postponed item 147. Mangles, Clothes Wringers, and Washing Machines, n.e.i., ad val. (General Tariff), 20 per cent.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [3.50].—I hope that, notwithstanding the mangling which the Government have just received, the Committee will pass by the poor washerwoman in the imposition of taxation. I move—

That the words "and on and after 26th November, 1907, ad val. (United Kingdom), 12½ per cent.," be added.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [3.52].—I would point out to honorable members that last year our imports of these machines from Great Britain were of the value of £2,600, whilst those from other parts were of the value of £6,520. The protectionist section of the Tariff Commission recommended that the duty should be 20 per cent. without a preference.

Question put. The Committee divided.

Ayes	30
Noes	22

Majority	8
----------	-----	-----	---

AYES.

Archer, E. W.	Knox, W.
Brown, Tilley	Livingston, J.
Brown, Thomas	Mahon, H.
Catts, J. H.	Poynton, A.
Cook, Josenh.	Quick, Sir John
Edwards, R.	Sampson, S.
Fairbairn, G.	Sinclair, H.
Fisher, A.	Thomas, J.
Forrest, Sir John	Thomson, Dugald
Fowler, J. M.	Watkins, D.
Frazer, C. E.	Wilks, W. H.
Fuller, G. W.	Wynne, A.
Fysh, Sir Philip	
Hedges, W. N.	
Hughes, W. M.	
Johnson, W. E.	

Tellers:

Atkinson, E. W.
Liddell, F.

NOES.

Bamford, F. W.	Mathews, J.
Carr, E. S.	Mauger, S.
Chanter, J. M.	McDougall, J. K.
Chapman, Austin	O'Malley, King
Coon, J.	Page, J.
Deakin, A.	Storror, D.
Ewing, T. T.	Tudor, F. G.
Groom, L. E.	Wise, G. H.
Harper, R.	
Hutchison, J.	
Lyne, Sir William	
Maloney, W. R. N.	

Tellers:

Cook, Hume
Thomson, John

PAIRS.

Smith, Bruce	Salmon, C. C.
Palmer, A. C.	Watson, J. C.
Reid, G. H.	Hall, D. R.
Glynn, P. McM.	Crouch, R. A.
Wilson, J. G.	Batchelor, E. L.
Kelly, W. H.	Kingston, C. C.
McWilliams, W. J.	Webster, W.
Willis, Henry	Foster, F. J.

Question so resolved in the affirmative.

Amendment agreed to.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Postponed item 148. Agricultural, Horticultural, and Viticultural Machinery and Implements, n.e.i.; including Cane-loaders on wheels; Channel-making Graders; Feed Grinders; Garden and Field Spraying Machines; Garden and Field Rollers; Garden Hose Reels; Garden Syringes; Horse Road Rollers and Machines; Lawn Mowers, Sweepers and Sprinklers; Road-making Ploughs; Road Scoops and Scrapers; Scoops; Stump Extractors, ad val. (General Tariff), 20 per cent.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [4.0].—I move—

That the words "cane loaders on wheels; channel-making graders," be left out.

At a later stage I shall move to embody "cane loaders on wheels" and "channel-making graders" in item 155.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—At whose instance is the Treasurer taking this step?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—It is a recommendation of the Department in the re-arrangement of the items.

Mr. MAHON (Coolgardie) [4.2].—I wish to know what there is about a cane loader which renders its manufacture in the Commonwealth impracticable. If the mining industry is to be taxed up to the hilt I should like to know why the sugar industry—which is already receiving a big subsidy from the funds of the Commonwealth in addition to a protective duty—should be relieved from taxation.

Mr. FISHER.—The industry receives a protection of £5 per ton.

Mr. MAHON.—The honorable member was disposed to deny that some time ago. Why should a mere revenue duty be

collected upon this machine whilst a high protective duty is imposed upon other machines?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I wish that in all his votes the honorable member would give effect to the principle which he is now advocating.

Mr. MAHON.—I am prepared in all my votes to extend equal consideration to the States. But I am not willing to make an exemption in favour of one State as the Treasurer proposes to do. He knows perfectly well that these cane loaders are used only in Queensland.

Mr. ARCHER.—Is that the trouble?

Mr. MAHON.—The representatives of that State have already tasted blood, and naturally they want more of it. They have secured a bounty upon the production of sugar, and they have also gained an advantage under the new mail contract. Now they want more. Of course, we all know that an appetite grows by what it feeds on, and I do not blame them for compelling the Treasurer at the point of the bayonet to make an exception in favour of these machines. Why should the sugar-growers receive different treatment from that which is extended to the miners and producers of the Commonwealth? It is idle for the Treasurer to urge that the Department has effected a re-arrangement of these articles. Who has approached the Department? Seeing that cane loaders on wheels are included in this item, what has happened to warrant their removal? I shall resist the Government proposal, and, if necessary, I shall divide the Committee upon it.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [4.7].—I am much obliged to the honorable member for his little lecture. I may inform him that nobody has approached either the Department or myself in reference to this matter. Upon more than one occasion I have told the Committee that I intended to re-arrange the items relating to machinery with a view to reducing the duties upon those articles which are not likely to be made in the Commonwealth. I have done that. I instructed the Department to consult two experts—professional men—as to the articles which could be and were being made locally. The report of one of these gentlemen is that this class of cane loader is not made in the Commonwealth, and not likely to be.

Mr. ARCHER.—It is patented.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Yes. It is the patent which prevents it from being manufactured in the Commonwealth, and that is the reason why I propose that it should be subjected to a lower rate of duty. But for the fact that it is patented it could be made here.

Mr. MATHEWS.—Then we ought not to grant patents to any article unless it is made here.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—We have a patent law in operation with which I am not in agreement. I regret that the honorable member for Coolgardie should have almost cast aspersions upon me. If these articles could be made locally I should fight for a protective duty upon them. One of the gentlemen to whom I have referred is an official in the Customs Department, and the other expert is connected with the Melbourne University.

Mr. BAMFORD (Herbert) [4.10].—The warmth which has been introduced into this debate is quite unnecessary. As the Treasurer appears to have such an intimate knowledge of these cane loaders on wheels, I should like to know what they are. Certainly I do not know. I have never seen a cane loader which could not be made by any rough carpenter and blacksmith. As for the articles being patented, the statement is an utter absurdity. I presume that the channel grader is something like a magnified plough, and, if so, I do not know why it should be admitted free. I shall certainly vote with the member for Coolgardie in favour of retaining both these articles in this item.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN (Indi) [4.12].—I hold in my hand the following letter, a copy of which has been forwarded to the Treasurer—

With reference to item 148, Division VI. of Customs and Excise Tariff, viz., agricultural, horticultural, and viticultural machinery and implements, n.e.i., which includes channel-making graders, horse road rollers and machines, road-making ploughs, road scoops and scrapers, scoops, dutiable at 20 per cent. ad val., we, the undersigned, at the request of Carolin Machinery and Furnishing Company, have examined parts of the above-mentioned implements, and we submit that, under present conditions, they cannot be manufactured within the Commonwealth, and owing to the very limited demand for any of the above goods in Australia, we would not, and believe no other manufacturer would, go to the expense (which would be enormous) of obtaining the necessary appliances and machinery for the construction of these goods. Any duty placed on the above-mentioned implements would not be of any benefit to any one in the Commonwealth; but,

on the contrary, will increase the cost of formation and maintenance of our country roads, thus adding to the hardships of our settlers. We may add that we do not desire any duty to be placed on any of these implements or machines nor parts thereof.

Mr. STORRER.—Are the signatories to the letter manufacturers or importers?

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—They are manufacturers who built up their industries under the old protective policy of Victoria. They distinctly affirm that they do not desire any alteration in the old rate of duty. All along the line the Treasurer has taxed the primary producers. I hold that the agricultural, horticultural, and viticultural pursuits are already sufficiently taxed. Even the protectionist section of the Tariff Commission only recommended a duty of 12½ per cent. upon these articles. I would further point out that under the old rate of duty they yielded a revenue of £21,883. It is now proposed to impose a duty of 20 per cent. If an amendment to that effect has not already been moved, I am prepared to move that the articles in item 148 should remain dutiable at 12½ per cent., the rate fixed under the old Tariff, and recommended by the Tariff Commission.

Mr. FOWLER (Perth) [4.15].—The Treasurer has been very ready to inform the Committee that the cane-loader cannot be made in Australia because it is patented. How often has the honorable gentleman insisted that other patented articles also—absolutely necessary in industries that derive no benefit from protection ought to be made in the Commonwealth, and that the patentees should be compelled to make arrangements for their manufacture here? When we dealt with high-class water-tube boilers used in connexion with mining, and a statement was made that they were not made in Australia because they were patented, the honorable gentleman said, "Let us put duties on and compel the patentees to make arrangements under which they can be made in Australia." Now, when we come to deal with a comparatively simple implement, which appears to be in limited demand, we are told that it should be admitted free, because, being patented, it cannot be made in Australia. It was the occurrence of just such instances as this in the consideration of the first Tariff that compelled the free-trade section of the Commission to recommend, as far as possible, a uniform duty on all importations of this kind, so that one industry

should not be allowed to escape taxation, whilst another was heavily taxed to make up the shortage of revenue. It would be a thousand times better, in the interests of a consistent system of protection, as well as in the interests of the country generally, that the Government should set aside these exceptions, most of which are absolutely absurd and unjustified, and propose a reasonable uniform duty which would give a certain amount of encouragement to engineering here, while it would not operate as a handicap upon those larger industries upon which engineering must depend for its existence.

Mr. ARCHER (Capricornia) [4.18].—I wish again to direct the attention of the Treasurer to the letter from the Carolin Machinery and Furnishing Company, which was referred to by the honorable member for Indi. I propose to read the letter in full.

Mr. TUDOR.—Is the honorable member objecting to the proposal to fix a lower duty on cane loaders?

Mr. ARCHER.—I am not, but I think there are some other articles in this item on which the duty should also be lower than that proposed. This is the letter which I wish to read—

With reference to item 148, Division VI. of Customs and Excise Tariff, viz., Agricultural, Horticultural, and Viticultural machinery and implements, n.e.i., which includes channel-making graders—

The honorable member for Herbert said he did not know what graders were. I can inform him that they are largely used in all our development work.

Mr. TUDOR.—The honorable member said he did not know what cane-loaders were.

Mr. ARCHER.—The honorable member for Herbert must have seen cane-loaders used in the sugar mills. The channel graders referred to are used for embankment work in railway and road-making. The letter continues—

which includes channel-making graders, horse road-rollers and machines, road-making ploughs, road scoops and scrapers, scoops dutiable at 20 per cent. ad valorem, we, the undersigned, at the request of the Carolin Machinery and Furnishing Co., have examined parts of the above-mentioned implements, and we submit that under present conditions they cannot be manufactured within the Commonwealth, and, owing to the very limited demand for any of the above goods in Australia, we would not, and we believe no other manufacturer would, go to the expense (which would be enormous) of obtaining the necessary appliances and machinery for the construction of these goods.

Any duty placed on the above-mentioned implements would not be of any benefit to any one in the Commonwealth, but, on the contrary, will increase the cost of formation and maintenance of our country roads, thus adding to the hardships of our settlers.

We may add that we do not desire any duty to be placed on any of these implements or machines nor parts thereof.

Yours truly,

CHARLES H. SMITH, Steelfounder, Brunswick.

A. ROBERTS AND SONS, Engineers, Bendigo.

A. HARKNESS AND CO., Engineers, Bendigo.

T. ROBINSON AND CO. PROPY. LTD., James Moore, Manager, Melbourne and Spotswood.

Here we have manufacturers of these articles in Victoria saying that the duty proposed would be of no use to them, and would only be a tax on development work. In the circumstances it is fair to ask the Treasurer whether he will not add some of these articles to those which he proposes to transfer to item 155? I think there might be a protective duty imposed on garden sprays and such things, but I do not see why we should impose a duty of 20 per cent. on ordinary agricultural implements when a duty of 12½ per cent. has already proved effective.

Mr. PAGE.—Does the honorable member mean to say that we cannot make channel graders here?

Mr. ARCHER.—No; what I say is that manufacturers in Victoria have said that they do not require the duty.

Mr. PAGE.—I have seen one of the best bore-channel graders that could be possibly be made at work in Western Queensland, and it was made in South Australia.

Mr. ARCHER.—The manufacturers whose names are attached to the letter which I have read say that the duty is not required.

Mr. FOWLER.—Does the honorable member suggest that they represent the whole of the Victorian engineering firms? They represent only three small firms.

Mr. ARCHER.—I quote them as manufacturers who say that these duties are of no use to them; and I ask why we should impose duties upon articles which are so necessary to our developmental work?

Mr. TUDOR (Yarra) [4.25].—The Treasurer has expressed his intention to put cane loaders on wheels and channel-making graders practically on the free list. I shall vote against any such proposal. The honorable member for Herbert, who is as much interested in the sugar industry as any honorable member on the other side

can claim to be, has said distinctly that these cane loaders, or unloaders as, I believe, they should be called, can easily be made in the Commonwealth.

Mr. PAGE.—Perhaps they are like the glue-pots.

Mr. TUDOR.—The honorable member reminds me of an amendment moved by Senator McColl in the last Tariff, to the effect that three-legged glue-pots should be admitted free. We have been given, by the honorable member for Capricornia, the opinion of people who are not engaged in making these articles, and who if asked to make them would expect a special price. If the cane-growers of Queensland were asked to quote a price for potatoes, they would quote a special price, because they do not grow potatoes. I hope the Minister will reconsider his amendment, in view of the speech made by the honorable member for Herbert, who told us that any bush carpenter could make the articles referred to. I voted for the protection given to the sugar industry amounting to 50 per cent., and would do so again, but I agree with the honorable member for Coolgardie that that industry has been treated very fairly. Those engaged in it could not expect that they should be allowed to get everything they required duty free, whilst a practically prohibitive tax is imposed on the article which they themselves produce.

Mr. PAGE (Maranoa) [4.28].—In view of the amendment he now proposes, it is amusing to recall the fact that when we were discussing the proposed duty on galvanized iron, the Minister put his back up, and said that he would fight for it to the very last. As I interjected during the speech of the honorable member for Yarra, I am reminded by the present proposal of an amendment moved by the then honorable member for Echuca, now Senator McColl, who desired that three-legged glue-pots should be admitted free.

Mr. FOWLER.—It was glue-pots and three-legged pots.

Mr. PAGE.—That was better still. The suggestion was that in this country we could not manufacture glue-pots or three-legged pots. With regard to channel-graders, I can bear testimony to the fact that old Mr. Cudmore sent up a channel-grader made in South Australia to Tara Station, which is owned by the Cudmores, and it proved to be one of the best ever made, and the fore-runner of many similar graders im-

ported to Western Queensland. Channel-graders are being made by Burns and Twigg, of Rockhampton; some of their makes are in use at Barcaldine Station, and at Northampton Station there are some made by the Austral Otis Company, of Melbourne. If honorable members are disposed to give a protectionist vote, I can see no reason why they should place on the free list an implement which can be made here.

Mr. ARCHER.—The question is whether the duty requires to be higher than under the present Tariff.

Mr. PAGE.—I understood that the Treasurer had said that he proposed to make these articles free.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I said 10 per cent.

Mr. PAGE.—If the Treasurer sticks to his Tariff, he will not go far wrong.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not know where I should be if I got a few votes like the one taken just now.

Mr. PAGE.—Does the Treasurer think he is going to have it all his own way? If he does, what is the use of responsible Government, or of members coming here from constituencies all over Australia? If he sticks to his text, he can only at the worst, go down on it. These graders can be made in Rockhampton, and I am sure that they can be made at Walker's, Limited, Maryborough. Where have the cane loaders on wheels been obtained from up till now?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I suppose they have been imported.

Mr. PAGE.—They are only little trucks. You, Mr. Chairman, have seen them scores of times. I have seen youngsters in Melbourne running trucks about on four wheels, exactly similar to a cane loader.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Let the honorable member move that cane loaders should be dutiable.

Mr. PAGE.—I cannot move for increased duties. That is the Treasurer's business. If the Treasurer will stick to what he originally said, I will support him. With regard to any article that can be made here on unionist lines, I am going to support the Government every time.

Mr. CHANTER.—Could not mangles be made here?

Mr. PAGE.—I voted for a duty on mangles. Corrugated iron can be made here, too, but the black sheet iron is not made here. I will vote for protection for Australian corrugated iron when it is made

out of Australian ore. Will the Treasurer tell me before I vote, why he wants to put these articles in another item.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I have already told the Committee. I am advised that there is one machine which is a patent. There may be a number of others that can be made here.

Mr. PAGE.—The Treasurer proposes to let all these machines in free from the United Kingdom under item 155, because one of them is a patent. Cane loaders on wheels are like the frames used on the railways for carrying rails from the truck to the head of the road. They consist of four wheels running on a tram-line, two axles, which are on two clips, the platform being of wood, with pieces fastened on to keep the cane from falling off. Where does the patent come in there? This bears out what the honorable member for Parramatta and the honorable member for Lang have told the Treasurer over and over again—that the Tariff is framed in such a haphazard way that the honorable gentleman does not know what he is doing. He allows his leg to be pulled in order to put on the free list two articles that are capable of being manufactured at any workshop in Australia. I hope the Treasurer will reconsider his proposal, and allow the two items to remain as they stand in the Tariff.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [4.35].—I desire to call the attention of the Committee to a more important matter than the mere proposal to eliminate cane loaders on wheels and channel making graders from the item.

Mr. FOWLER.—There is a most important principle involved.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—I see no reason why they should be deleted, but that is a trifling matter compared with the proposed increase in the duty from 12½ per cent. to 20 per cent. The protectionist section of the Tariff Commission, whose report I signed, divided the proposed duties upon agricultural implements into groups. The first included such machines as stripper-harvesters and stump-jump ploughs, on which a duty of 25 per cent. was proposed. The second group included other ploughs, harrows, cultivators, and chaff-cutters, upon which we proposed a 20 per cent. duty. The third group included the lighter and less expensive implements and articles, n.e.i., upon which we proposed 12½ per cent. No person in Australia, so far as I can remember.

proposed that the duty on the group of articles included in item 148 should be raised from the old rate of 12½ per cent. to the proposed rate of 20 per cent. I challenge any one to put his finger upon a line in the whole mass of evidence given before the Commission showing that there was any reason or justification for increasing the duty in that way upon this group of minor articles. The conclusion was therefore arrived at by myself and my colleagues Senator Higgs, Senator McGregor, and Mr. Frank Clarke that there was no reason or justification for increasing the duties upon them, and we accordingly recommended that they should remain at the old rate.

Mr. CARR.—For revenue purposes?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—No; the duty had a certain protective incidence. At any rate, no complaint was made by the manufacturers, and we received no request for an increase.

Mr. FRAZER.—Nearly all these articles are made here at present.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—Whether they are or not, I am dealing now with applications and requests made and evidence submitted to the Commission.

Mr. TUDOR.—Cannot we deal with that point after we have dealt with the proposal to omit these particular articles?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—The two things are, to some extent, bound up together, but after all, what the honorable member refers to is a minor question. I am a strong protectionist, but I will not go in for protection except upon articles or machines upon which we have been called upon to make recommendations for increased duties, and with respect to which there is a reasonable justification for such increase. On certain items, I have voted as strongly for protection as has any man in this Committee, but I shall not go strongly for it unless there is a justification for it.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Why did the honorable member recommend a 25 per cent. duty on wire-netting?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—I thought the justification was strong; but when there is no evidence justifying an increase, I shall not go strongly for it. There is nothing to justify the increase of duties from 12½ per cent. to 20 per cent. upon this group of minor articles, and I intend to vote straight against it. Road-making ploughs, road scoops, and scrapers are not made in Australia, and I admit that on them a 12½ per cent. duty is a revenue duty.

There is, therefore, no justification for an increase of duty in that case. All the protectionist members of the Commission recommended that the 12½ per cent. duties should remain unaltered. Protectionists are going out of their way needlessly to burden the cause of protection by proposing a large number of increases which are merely irritating, unnecessary, and unjustifiable.

Mr. SALMON (Llanecoorie) [4.40].—It would be better to settle first the question of deleting from this item the two articles proposed. But I am prepared to join issue with the honorable member for Bendigo with regard to the statement he has made concerning these matters generally. The honorable member proposed a general Tariff operating against all countries outside Australia, but we have before us also a preferential Tariff. I shall be prepared to see a duty of 12½ per cent. inserted in the United Kingdom column, but I shall not be prepared to forego a duty of 20 per cent. against the foreigner.

Mr. ARCHER.—What is the good of that when a number of these things are patents?

Mr. SALMON.—The honorable member has done remarkably well for his State. It looks very like ingratitude for him to be harassing the Treasurer in the way he is doing. There is no more difficult thing for a true protectionist to justify than voting for revenue duties. I am tired of doing it, and am not prepared to do it to any extent in the future. What I am sent here to do is to secure proper protection for Australian industries, and not to obtain large sums of money for the general revenue in order that they may be handed over to the States. The name of protection has been made responsible for very much more than it deserves, and much more than those who advocate it desire. The honorable member for Bendigo was scarcely fair to the Treasurer in his remarks. Many of the articles included in this item partake largely of the character of machinery.

Mr. PAGE.—What machinery is there in a channel-making grader?

Mr. SALMON.—I will tell the honorable member for Maranoa something about cane loaders that apparently he did not know when he spoke. I have never seen them, but I am assured that they consist not only of four wheels and a platform, but also of a crab winch, with a small crane.

Mr. PAGE.—Cannot we make crab winches and cranes in Australia?

Mr. SALMON.—We make capital winches in Victoria. I quite agree with the honorable member for Maranoa with regard to the magnificent ironworks of Walker's Limited, at Maryborough. I have seen them, and regard them as a credit to Australia, and to the protective policy of Queensland under which they were established. They are evidence of the benefits which have accrued to Queensland from the policy of protection. Many of these machines can be made, and I should like to see them made, here. Therefore I shall support the proposed duty. I do not feel disposed to vote for revenue duties unless they are shown to be absolutely necessary to the small States.

Mr. HUTCHISON (Hindmarsh) [4.45].—I am surprised at the reason given by the honorable member for Bendigo for not supporting the proposed duties. It is not long since the honorable member for Perth told us that only three witnesses appeared before the Tariff Commission to give evidence in respect to lead piping, and that not one of them asked for an alteration of the Tariff. Yet the honorable member for Bendigo in that case recommended the imposition of a duty of 50s. a ton. How does he reconcile that recommendation with his statement this afternoon that he is not going to vote for rates that have not been asked for? What is proposed now is a revenue duty. I am opposed to revenue duties, and will not vote for 12½ per cent. on any item. We should either give protection to local industries, or allow consumers to purchase in the cheapest market.

Mr. WILKS.—Will the honorable member vote for the proposal to make these rates lower?

Mr. HUTCHISON.—No. I cannot understand why the Minister proposes to strike out cane loaders.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not care what is done with them.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—I think that they should be dutiable, because they are simple inventions, upon which it will be easy for local makers to improve. Then, too, there should be no difficulty about making channel graders. We have, in Australia, workmen as skilful as any in the world, but we shall not have very many of them until we give more encouragement to local manufacturing. I wish to see our inventive genius developed.

Mr. WILKS (Dalley) [4.47].—The honorable member for Hindmarsh—and, apparently, the honorable member for Launceston, too—is opposed to the proposed deletion. The former said that as a protectionist he objected to revenue duties. The Minister has proposed the omission of certain machines, with a view to making the duty on them, if they come from foreign countries, 10 per cent., admitting them free if from the United Kingdom. No one will pretend that the honorable member for Bendigo, Senator McGregor, ex-Senator Higgs, and Mr. Francis Clarke, are not protectionists. They have been regarded as red-hot protectionists. Yet they thought duties of 12½ per cent. sufficient on all these machines. I shall vote for this proposal, not only because it is the recommendation of the Tariff Commission, but also because cane loaders and channeling machines are very bulky, and, if imported, would probably have to be brought here in parts, giving to our own people the work of re-assembling them. I shall vote for a duty of 12½ per cent., and against the proposed omission.

Mr. CARR (Macquarie) [4.48].—I am here as a protectionist, not as a revenue Tariffist, and it seems to me that this is a revenue Tariff proposal. As the revenue from these items was last year £22,000, it is clear that a duty of 12½ per cent. would not encourage their manufacture locally to the extent to which we as nationalists wish it to be encouraged. We recognise that without protection there is little hope of establishing manufactures here, because old firms elsewhere can always bring down values, with a view to discouraging local competition. We must protect our industries from the machinations of foreign manufacturers. Of course, we all recognise that local manufacturers may exploit the local market. But the Government have definitely promised to bring in regulating measures to prevent such exploitation, and the public will be against exploitation, and can express its views in Parliament. Therefore we need not be timorous about venturing on a national policy of this sort. I, for one, am not. If further assurance were needed, we have the statement of the Prime Minister that if it be found—he does not think that it will be found—unconstitutional to pass regulating measures, the Tariff will have to be reconsidered. I accept that statement for what it is worth. If our policy proves to be ineffective or abortive, the

public will clamour to have it altered, and I shall make one to alter it. But at the present stage of our national existence, we are justified in making this effort to encourage local manufactures.

Mr. SALMON (Laanecoorie) [4.50].—I suggest that the Minister should withdraw the amendment, so that we may vote on the item as it stands. I am prepared to move that the duty on goods the manufacture of the United Kingdom be $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. The honorable member for Bendigo could vindicate his position by voting for a duty of 20 per cent. against foreign importations, and of $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. against British importations.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [4.52].—It is all very well for honorable members to say that certain machines can be made here, but the fact is that they are not made here.

Mr. PAGE.—I have used them, and know what I am talking about. I am as good a free-trader as is the honorable member. I love the importers as much as he does.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The honorable member has been voting against them a good many times. While he was away he allowed himself to be paired by a high protectionist, with the result that he was paired with the Government all the time. I am sorry that he was not here to vote with us a little more often.

Mr. PAGE.—I am sorry that I was away. Had I been present, my vote on one or two occasions would not have been on the side on which I was paired.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The information I have is that the machines which have been alluded to are not made in Australia. There is not much going on in the industrial world which the Customs officials of Victoria do not know about. One of my objections to them is that they know a little too much, and put what they know into their interpretation of the Tariff, making it highly protective. Will it not be time enough to impose duties when we know that machines are being made here in sufficient quantities to suit our requirements?

Mr. TUDOR.—If we wait until then, we shall never put on duties.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Anything which will tend to lighten labour in the sugar fields should be encouraged. The great difficulty is to get the work done there.

Mr. MAHON.—Not this kind of work—crushing and cutting.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—This work is equally laborious and disagreeable. Anything which will enable white men to lighten their labours in the cane-fields should command the sympathy of those who believe in a White Australia. I shall have the greatest pleasure in voting to have the machines which have been mentioned placed on the free list.

Mr. PAGE (Maranoa) [4.55].—If the Treasurer will postpone this item until tomorrow, I will send an urgent telegram to Walkers Limited, at Maryborough, asking them if they can make these grading machines, ditchers, and channellers.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I will not postpone the item.

Mr. PAGE.—That firm makes most of the machinery used in the sugar-fields, and I feel certain that it can make the machines I have named. Channel graders were used in Queensland, in the central district, twelve or fifteen years ago, hundreds of miles of channelling being cut to conduct water from the bores to different parts of the runs. These graders came from South Australia. Seeing that they were made in the country then, I do not know why they cannot be made now.

Mr. SALMON.—I think that the honorable member is right about the cane loaders.

Mr. PAGE.—I am positive that I am. The firm of Walkers Limited, Maryborough, can make any kind of iron work.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [4.58].—I proposed the amendment because of a report made to me by the departmental officers; I know nothing about the matter myself. Still, I am unwilling that the discussion should continue interminably, and I cannot consent to any postponement. Therefore, I wish to withdraw the amendment, leaving honorable members to take the responsibility.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I object to the withdrawal.

Mr. THOMAS.—Do I understand that the Government do not propose to put these machines on the free list?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The representatives of Queensland say that these machines can be made there. I am not going to put them on the free list.

Amendment negatived.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [5.0].—I move—

That the words "Feed Grinders" be left out.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—For what purpose?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I am submitting this amendment with a view to bringing the articles under a higher duty. That is what I intended in the first instance.

Question — That the words "Feed Grinders" proposed to be left out stand part of item—put. The Committee divided.

Ayes	15
Noes	35

Majority	20
----------	-----	-----	----

AYES.

Archer, E. W.	McWilliams, W. J.
Brown, Thomas	Poynton, A.
Cook, Joseph	Sinclair, H.
Edwards, R.	Thomson, Dugald
Fowler, J. M.	Wilks, W. H.
Fysh, Sir Philip	<i>Tellers:</i>
Liddell, F.	Fuller, G. W.
Livingston, J.	Johnson, W. E.

NOES.

Bamford, F. W.	Maloney, W. R. N.
Brown, Tilley	Mathews, J.
Carr, E. S.	Mauger, S.
Catts, J. H.	McDougall, J. K.
Chanter, J. M.	O'Malley, King
Chapman, Austin	Page, J.
Coon, J.	Quick, Sir John
Deakin, A.	Salmon, C. C.
Fisher, A.	Spence, W. G.
Forrest, Sir John	Storrer, D.
Frazer, C. E.	Thomas, J.
Groom, L. E.	Thomson, John
Hedges, W. N.	Tudor, F. G.
Hughes, W. M.	Watkins, D.
Hutchison, J.	Wynne, A.
Knox, W.	<i>Tellers:</i>
Lyne, Sir William	Cook, Hume
Mahon, H.	Wise, G. H.

PAIRS.

Reid, G. H.	Ewing, T. T.
Palmer, A. C.	Watson, J. C.
Smith, Bruce	Harper, R.
Glynn, P. McM.	Crouch, R. A.
Wilson, J. G.	Batchelor, E. L.
Kelly, W. H.	Kingston, C. C.
Willis, Henry	Foster, F. J.
Forston, Colonel	Fairbairn, G.
Bowden, E. K.	Webster, W.
Atkinson, L.	Hall, D. R.

Question so resolved in the negative.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. POYNTON (Grey) [5.6].—Before the main question is put, I wish it to be clearly understood by the Committee that the last amendment for the omission of the words "feed grinders" was moved distinctly by the Treasurer with the object of making these liable to a higher duty.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—He said so.

The CHAIRMAN.—The honorable member will not be in order in reopening the question which has just been decided.

Mr. POYNTON.—I am quite satisfied that a large number of honorable members thought that feed grinders were going to be included in item 155, and that but for the original statement which was made to the Committee the recent vote would have been different.

The CHAIRMAN.—Order. The honorable member must not debate the question which has just been decided.

Mr. POYNTON.—The question of the item, as amended, has not yet been decided.

The CHAIRMAN.—The omission of the words "feed grinders" has been decided and cannot be further discussed.

Mr. POYNTON.—I understand that another amendment is to be proposed.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN (Indi) [5.9].—Under the old Tariff the duty on the articles embraced in this item was 12½ per cent. I move—

That after the words "20 per cent." the words "and on and after 26th November, 1907, ad val., 12½ per cent.," be added.

Mr. SALMON (Laanecoorie) [5.10].—When I spoke on this question a little while ago, it was pointed out that nearly the whole of the implements embraced in this item are imported from the United Kingdom.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—No.

Mr. SALMON.—That was pointed out to the Committee, and the honorable member told me so himself.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—That is not correct, as a number of them come from Canada.

Mr. SALMON.—The honorable member told me that nearly the whole of these implements come from Great Britain.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—The honorable member misunderstood me.

Mr. SALMON.—I am sorry that I did. I am acquainted with the majority of these implements, and I am under the impression that some of them come from Great Britain. I have used many implements of this kind which have been made here. Most of those that are used in Australia are made locally, and all can be made here. In those circumstances, I do not think that a duty of 20 per cent. is a bit too high, more especially when I am prepared to propose—and I think the public will be prepared to accept—a duty

of 12½ per cent. in the preferential Tariff. I think that the honorable member for Indi should be satisfied with that. He will gain nearly all he desires if he concurs in my view. I hope that the Committee will not reduce the duty in the General Tariff from 20 to 12½ per cent., but will be prepared to accept the very reasonable compromise which is offered.

Mr. FRAZER (Kalgoorlie) [5.12].—In view of the speech which has been delivered by the honorable member for Bendigo, I feel disposed to accept his opinion in regard to this item. He has assured the Committee that, after an exhaustive examination of those who use these articles, no requests were submitted to the Tariff Commission for an increase in the old duty, and I think that reasons have been advanced to demonstrate that very likely his opinion is a correct one. The honorable member for Laanecoorie is evidently taking up the attitude that, in his opinion, the Tariff in its present form is not a protective one.

Mr. SALMON.—A 12½ per cent. duty is not protective.

Mr. FRAZER.—With his next breath the honorable member said that, in his opinion, the majority of the imported articles come from the United Kingdom.

Mr. SALMON.—The honorable member is not quite correct. I said that I had been informed that most of them come from the United Kingdom.

Mr. FRAZER.—The honorable gentleman led the Committee to believe that, in regard to the preferential Tariff, he was prepared to fall in with that opinion.

Mr. SALMON.—I propose to move for a duty of 12½ per cent.

Mr. FRAZER.—Then, in the opinion of honorable members who are desirous of imposing these additional duties, a duty of 12½ per cent. is a revenue duty, and will not give sufficient protection, but that as long as the articles come from the United Kingdom it does not matter.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—Out of £162,000 worth, only £22,000 worth of these articles come from Great Britain.

Mr. FRAZER.—Very likely the workers of Australia will adopt the attitude that it does not matter whether the opposition comes from the United Kingdom, or Canada, or America, if it is going to deprive them of the employment which would be occasioned as the result of the local manufacture of the implements. There is

no advantage to the workers of this country from importation, whether the goods come from the United Kingdom or not.

Mr. SALMON.—Let the honorable member vote for a duty of 20 per cent.

Mr. FRAZER.—I am prepared to be guided by argument; but I think that the standard adopted in regard to this item ought to guide us in regard to items which are to follow.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The destruction of the Tariff! That is what the honorable member is bringing about.

Mr. FRAZER.—The Treasurer has absolutely no justification for making that remark. In any case, I can say, with double emphasis, that the Minister appears to be satisfied to "sit under" the destruction. I should like to hear the item debated; because we are now dealing with implements which are necessary in connexion with several of the great primary industries, and those concerned are certainly entitled to as much consideration as has been given in connexion with machinery used in other industries. I am inclined to think that a duty of 12½ per cent. is not enough. I am prepared to admit free, or to impose only a nominal duty, in the case of those commodities which cannot be produced in Australia on a commercial basis, and to give a measure of protection in the case of commodities which can be produced here. I am inclined to think that the honorable member for Laanecoorie has rather a strong case, of which, however, he has not taken advantage. His attitude is that as long as there is a duty of 20 per cent. against the world, a duty of 12½ per cent. ought to be sufficient against Great Britain. That, however, is not my attitude. If we are to have a Tariff on these commodities, we must first agree on an effective basis, and see that no goods are admitted below that basis, whether from Great Britain or any other country.

Mr. MATHEWS.—There is hope for the honorable member, after all!

Mr. FRAZER.—It is gratifying to hear that from one of the new recruits in this House.

Mr. HUME COOK.—The honorable member for Melbourne Ports is a veteran protectionist.

Mr. FRAZER.—Judging from the votes that have been given, there are a good many "veteran" protectionists in the House, who, as the honorable member for Darwin

pictured the Treasurer the other night, may be all right in their hearts, but not in their heads.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—If the honorable member's heart were as truly protectionist as mine, he would be a much better man!

Mr. FRAZER.—I do not question the Treasurer's heart in regard to protection, but I have sometimes questioned his head. My own opinion is that, although the Treasurer is suffering some reverses in regard to the Tariff—

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—And very unfair reverses, too!

Mr. FRAZER.—What I was going to say was that, although there have been some reverses, I think this Tariff is being framed on a basis which will prove eminently satisfactory to the people of Australia. It is my belief that by means of this Tariff material assistance will be given to local industries, resulting in a considerable increase in the number of employes in our factories, without inflicting any undue hardship on consumers. As I said before, this is one of the items which must of necessity be accepted as the standard for others to be discussed shortly; and I should like to hear arguments from those intimately acquainted with the subject, as to whether a duty of 12½ per cent. is sufficient. My vote will depend, to a degree, on the information thus given.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [5.20].—The amendment of the honorable member for Laanecoorie means relief to the users of these instruments throughout Australia to the extent of £1,650, and personally, I do not think that is sufficient. The old duty under which the manufacturer has flourished is quite sufficient; and to adopt the amendment would only mean injury to the users, without affording any further needed protection to the producer.

Mr. TUDOR (Yarra) [5.22].—A duty of 12½ per cent. would be a reduction on the Tariff which has been in existence for the last twelve months. In 1906 a duty of 25 per cent. was proposed on these agricultural implements and machinery, and was reduced to 20 per cent.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Not at all. What we are considering are now goods n.e.i.

Mr. TUDOR.—If the honorable member will look at the Tariff which was fixed last year, he will find that, in a House

which was supposed to be free-trade, the duty I have mentioned was fixed on harvesters and strippers.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—This House is more free-trade than the last.

Mr. TUDOR.—If honorable members turn to page 64 of the official statistics, they will see item 265, with the heading "Implements and machinery, agricultural, horticultural, and viticultural."

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—There are two or three distinct headings all relating to the same sort of materials.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—The major portion of the goods under the heading referred to were at 12½ per cent.

Mr. TUDOR.—According to the return, the duty was 12½ per cent., but only up to the 28th August.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—The goods on which 12½ per cent. was paid were valued at £145,796.

Mr. TUDOR.—That was because the bulk of the goods were imported before the date I have mentioned. According to the return, the goods on which 20 per cent. was charged after the 28th August were valued at £15,815; those on which 25 per cent. was charged, after the same date, were valued at £1,503; and then after the 7th December, a duty of 1½d. per lb. was paid on 16,451 lbs. I am quite prepared to believe that these figures are right, and that agricultural implements n.e.i. were dutiable at 20 per cent. before the Commonwealth Tariff was introduced, and that, therefore, a duty of 12½ per cent. would mean reduction.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [5.25].—The honorable member for Yarra is entirely wrong. I find that the Excise on chaffcutters and horse gears—one of the items in the present Tariff at 20 per cent.—was 10 per cent., clearly indicating that the duty was 20 per cent., the same as now. It will be seen, therefore, that we are not proposing to reduce the duty in any way. The honorable member, if he looks again at the matter, will find that the group of items on which these duties were placed last year are all under different headings in the present Tariff, at the same or increased duties. The items we are dealing with now are n.e.i., and exclude those on which higher rates of duty were imposed last year. I ask the Treasurer whether that is not so?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I think there is some variation, and that a few were at 20 per cent., though the bulk were at 12½ per cent.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The duty of 12½ per cent. last year, according to the report, covers goods valued at £145,796; the duty at 20 per cent. covers £15,000 worth of goods, and so on.

Mr. TUDOR.—That is from certain dates only.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The honorable member need have no fear that it is now sought to impose a lower duty; and we are quite right in objecting to an increase of duty on this group of items.

Mr. TUDOR.—These goods have borne duties of 20 per cent. and 25 per cent.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—That is not so. The Government themselves have always made a distinction between other kinds of machinery and implements used by those engaged in the horticultural and agricultural industries. Implements and machinery seem to be distinguished at the Customs House, and have always received separate treatment by Parliament. The reason is that the bulk of the machinery which is to-day used in horticultural work is patented, and cannot be made here, even if we wished to make it for ourselves. It is idle to tax a thing which we could not make in the country, even if we had a 100 per cent. duty. I know that that remark does not apply to all the articles affected, but it does to many of them. Another reason for the low duties was that it was always considered, even by strong protectionists, that it was a fair thing not to tax the implements of those engaged in the primary industries in the interior.

Mr. MAHON (Coolgardie) [5.32].—With regard to the remarks of the honorable member for Grey as to the omission of the words proposed, I should like to remark that he inferred—probably unintentionally—that those who vote for the amendment will be bound to vote for the increased duty upon the item. That is not so. The Minister himself indicated that voting for the amendment would not bind honorable members to vote for the item. I say that by way of personal explanation. I cannot agree to vote for a high duty of 20 per cent. on this item. I think that the rate is excessive. The subject was threshed out very extensively when the 1902 Tariff was before us, and, al-

though a higher duty was at first proposed, Parliament ultimately agreed to 12½ per cent. The free-trade section of the Tariff Commission have recommended a duty of 15 per cent. on some articles. It is a pity that they did not differentiate and tell us exactly what they wanted. I am inclined to think that a duty of 12½ per cent. is scarcely sufficient.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Supposing 20 per cent. were put in the first column, what would the honorable member propose to put in the second column?

Mr. MAHON.—I think that the same duty should be fixed in both columns, because the bulk of these implements come, not from the United Kingdom, but from the United States and Canada; and the United States is a country that never has, and never will—while the people are of the same mind as they are now—give any other nation Tariff consideration.

Mr. KING O'MALLEY.—They would give us reciprocity.

Mr. MAHON.—Yes; the kind of reciprocity that a cat gives to a mouse—they would swallow us. The United States, in reference to Tariff treatment, is hardly a country which can be held up for the admiration of mankind. What I propose to do, if I am in order, is to move that the duty be 15 per cent. in each column. I do not think that any consumer in Australia will pay 6d. more for an article because of an increase of 2½ per cent. in the duty.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Why is not the old duty sufficient?

Mr. MAHON.—I have no evidence, except the statements of the Treasurer and of honorable members on this side of the chamber. The Treasurer must have had some justification for putting the duty down at 20 per cent. The honorable member for Parramatta need not laugh.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I am laughing at the honorable member's laboured effort to explain why 12½ per cent. is not sufficient.

Mr. MAHON.—The honorable member's own friends on the Tariff Commission have recommended a duty of 15 per cent.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—In conjunction with a general scheme of revenue duties.

Mr. MAHON.—If the honorable member laughs at me, he had better laugh at his friends on the Commission also. I base my amendment on the consideration that an increase of 2½ per cent. will not make a particle of difference to the purchasers of this kind of machinery.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Why not say 17½ per cent., if the duty will not make any difference to the price?

Mr. MAHON.—Because 15 per cent. strikes me as being symmetrical and fair to all parties. If any considerable portion of this machinery came from the United Kingdom, I should be prepared to make a difference in favour of Britain; but since the quantify so obtained is small, and is not likely to increase, owing to the fact that most of the implements are subject to patent rights, I see no warrant for such a differentiation as is suggested by the honorable member for Laanecoorie.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The honorable member should leave the honorable member for Yarra to do this kind of thing.

Mr. MAHON.—I consider it to be my duty to move on my own account. A duty of 15 per cent. all round strikes me as being a very fair compromise.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The honorable member for Laanecoorie has proposed that the preferential duty be 12½ per cent.

Mr. MAHON.—I see no reason for a differentiation.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—A little more than one-third of these goods come from Great Britain.

Mr. MAHON.—A great many articles imported from Great Britain were free under the old Tariff, and these are included in the third mentioned by the Treasurer. I wish to move—

That after the words "20 per cent." the words "and on and after 26th November, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 15 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 15 per cent.," be added.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [5.38].—I wish to assure the honorable member for Yarra that I have checked the items in the Excise Tariff which affect the duties in question, and I find that every one of the articles mentioned is included in the Tariff schedule at 20 per cent.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN (Calare) [5.39].—The item under discussion relates to horticultural, agricultural, and viticultural machinery, and the goods are used by persons most of whom enjoy no form of protection whatever. Generally speaking, our horticulturists and agriculturists have to grow their products, and find a market for themselves, selling in competition with products from all over the world. It is most essential that agricul-

tural industries should be conducted on an extensive scale to make them pay, and in order that they may be extensively pursued, the most modern machinery must be used. Probably as a result of similar conditions in America and Canada, the greatest improvements in implements and machinery have been made in those countries. Some years ago, our agricultural and horticultural implements were manufactured in England. But those implements have now been displaced by more up-to-date and suitable ones manufactured in the United States and Canada. I have a recollection of using an English pitchfork many years ago. The difference between such an implement and an American pitchfork is most marked. In fact, I do not know of an instance where an English pitchfork is now used in connexion with agriculture in this city. A similar change has been made with respect to a number of other machines. We have to look to the United States and Canada if we are to carry on these industries profitably. I am glad to know that the inventive genius of this country has been equal to making some improvements. We are adapting ourselves to our own needs, and are producing implements that are more in accord with American types.

Mr. WISE.—Our own manufacturers ought to be encouraged.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—I quite agree with the honorable member, but for the sake of hypothetical encouragement, I am not prepared to lock out implements from America. Under the old Tariff, something like £162,000 worth of this class of machinery and implements was imported last year, of which £140,000 worth came from countries other than Great Britain—mainly from Canada and the United States. The Tariff Commission, composed of free-traders and protectionists, investigated this matter upon evidence submitted to them, and considered not only the interests of producers, but also of manufacturers. The protectionist section of the Commission agreed to recommend a duty of 12½ per cent. upon these protected lines, whilst the free-traders proposed a duty of 10 per cent. on most lines, and 15 per cent. on a few. The interests of the primary producers must be considered as well as those of the manufacturers, and I trust that honorable members will see their way to adopt the amendment of the honorable member for Indi.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [5.45].—I should like to point out that the protectionist section of the Tariff Commission were prepared to recommend a high duty of 20 per cent. on a certain group of agricultural, horticultural, and viticultural machinery and implements that it was considered were entitled to such protection. We recommended that implements and machines should be divided into three groups. In the first group we included implements and machines invented or specially improved in Australia, namely, stripper-harvesters, stump-jump ploughs, strippers, disc cultivators, horse and other power winnowers, combined corn sheller, husker and bagger, combined corn sheller and husker. We recommended that the duty on that group should be 25 per cent. In the second group, which we recommended should be dutiable at 20 per cent., we placed ordinary or common-place implements and machines, namely, ploughs (other), plough shares, harrows, cultivators n.e.i., chaffcutters and horse gear, scarifiers, castings malleable and other, plough mouldboards, wholly or partly prepared, corn shellers and corn huskers. We decided that the third group should consist of lighter and less expensive implements, specialties, &c., namely, articles not otherwise enumerated, and that they should be dutiable, as under the old Tariff, at 12½ per cent. The last-named group is substantially covered by the item now under consideration, and, although I have listened carefully to this debate, I have heard no statement of fact to justify any alteration in the opinion which I and my protectionist colleagues formed, that the duty should be 12½ per cent.

Mr. WISE.—Why did the free-trade section of the Commission recommend a duty of 15 per cent.?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—That was part of a general classification of the whole scheme of duties, ranging from 5 per cent. on raw materials to 10 and 15 per cent.—a cast-iron system of duties which it is evident would never work, and which apparently has been abandoned. We pointed out in our report that with reference to the third group—

Light and less expensive tools and appliances as well as specialties, parts, and novel and experimental improvements which have originated in other countries and for which there is a limited demand—

should be subject to a lower rate of duty than prevailed upon such high-class ma-

chines as harvesters, which were either invented here, or highly specialized and made in Australia, which we thought justified a higher duty than 12½ per cent. I see no reason for altering that opinion, and shall support the amendment moved by the honorable member for Indi.

Mr. MATHEWS (Melbourne Ports) [5.49].—I think it is a pity that the Government have not decided to at once give the House a holiday, so that some honorable members who were returned as protectionists may recuperate and come back in a normal state of mind, prepared to work up to the true protectionist standard. I am afraid that many protectionists are assisting free-traders to make the duties upon manufactured articles as low as possible, in order that the level now fixed may be taken as a standard when we are dealing later on with certain other items. We have heard a great deal as to what can and cannot be manufactured in Australia. If there is anything in this item that cannot be produced here, I think that Australia might just as well cease to attempt to manufacture anything. Those who talk so much about the primary producers ought to declare at once that we should wipe out the whole of the manufacturing industries of Australia, and should assist the Labour Party to impose a stiff land tax, so that the people will be able to secure land on which to settle.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Surely we ought to give the primary producer a show?

Mr. MATHEWS.—I am prepared to give him a show, but, at the same time. I think that we should give the Australian manufacturer a chance to carry on his industry.

Mr. JOHNSON. — He is getting every chance.

Mr. MATHEWS.—Does the honorable member say that 12½ per cent. is more than a revenue duty? Some protectionists declare, with their tongues in their cheeks, that it is a protective duty. They know that it is not. On the last division nine honorable members who were returned as protectionists voted for the lowest duty they could obtain, and yet at the next general election they will probably pose as protectionists, and receive as such the support of certain newspapers.

Mr. ATKINSON.—Is the Tariff to again be put before the people at the next election?

Mr. MATHEWS.—I hope so, if some of the recent votes are to be taken as an in-

dication of what the Tariff as finally passed will be. As to the implements in the item itself, the cry of those who suggest that we cannot make cane-loaders, for instance, reminds me of the story of the black gin, who said to a carpenter, "Why, you are a funny carpenter; you can't make a jam tin." Then, again, is the mechanism of garden rollers, which are included in the item, so complicated that it is impossible for them to be made in Australia? Why the protectionist section of the Tariff Commission should have included the implements named in this item in the lowest group, I cannot understand. To my mind, the lowest range of duties should apply only to those machines or commodities that cannot be manufactured in Australia. I am satisfied that all the implements covered by this item can be manufactured here, and that local competition will prevent high prices prevailing. Even the leader of the Opposition has admitted that the majority of honorable members of this House were returned pledged to protection, but apparently he knew when he made the admission that he could secure the support of certain protectionists to a proposal that the protection granted should be at the lowest ebb. I repeat that unless the Government can obtain the passing of more highly protective duties than they are securing just now, they should consider the desirableness of at once giving the House a holiday, so that at least some honorable members may come back with a better sense of their duty as protectionists.

Question—That after the words "20 per cent.," the words "and on and after 26th November, 1907, ad. val. (General Tariff), 12½ per cent." (Mr. TILLEY BROWN's amendment), be added—put. The Committee divided.

Ayes	20
Noes	22
			—
Majority	2

AYES.

Archer, E. W.
Atkinson, L.
Brown, Tilley
Brown, Thomas
Cook, Joseph
Fairbairn, G.
Forrest, Sir John
Hedges, W. N.
Irvine, W. H.
Johnson, W. E.
Knox, W.

McWilliams, W. J.
Poynton, A.
Quick, Sir John
Sinclair, H.
Smith, Bruce
Thomson, Dugald
Wynne, A.

Tellers:

Fuller, G. W.
Liddell, F.

NOES.

Carr, E. S.
Chanter, J. M.
Chapman, Austin
Coon, J.
Deakin, A.
Ewing, T. T.
Fisher, A.
Frazer, C. E.
Groom, L. E.
Lyne, Sir William
Mahon, H.
Maloney, W. R. N.

Mathews, J.
Mauger, S.
McDougall, J. K.
Salmon, C. C.
Spence, W. G.
Storrer, D.
Thomson, John
Wise, G. H.

Tellers:

Cook, Hume
Watkins, D.

PAIRS.

Edwards, R.
Palmer, A. C.
Bowden, E. K.
Wilson, J. G.
Sampson, S.
Kelly, W. H.
Reid, G. H.
Willis, Henry
Thomas, J.
Hughes, W. M.
Fowler, J. M.
Fysh, Sir Philip
Wilks, W. H.

Page, J.
Watson, J. C.
Webster, W.
Batchelor, E. L.
Harper, R.
Kingston, C. C.
Hall, D. R.
Foster, F. J.
Hutchison, J.
Bamford, F. W.
Catts, J. H.
O'Malley, King
Tudor, F. G.

Question so resolved in the negative.

Amendment negatived.

Amendment (by Mr. MAHON) agreed to—

That after the words "20 per cent." the words "and on and after 26th November, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 15 per cent.," be added.

Amendment (by Mr. TILLEY BROWN) proposed—

That after the words "15 per cent." just added, the words "and on and after 26th November, 1907, ad. val. (United Kingdom), 10 per cent.," be added.

Mr. WISE (Gippsland) [6.2].—This proposal is another instance of free-trade under the guise of preference, and emanates from an honorable member who, on the hustings, pledged himself to support the recommendations of the protectionist section of the Tariff Commission. That section has recommended the imposition of a duty of 12½ per cent. all round, and I hope that the Committee will not stultify itself by voting for a 10 per cent. duty under the guise of extending a preference to the United Kingdom.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [6.3].—I would point out to the honorable member for Gippsland that a duty of 15 per cent. under the general Tariff, and of 10 per cent. under the Tariff for the United Kingdom will yield more revenue than would a 12½ per cent. duty all round, which was the rate recommended by the Tariff Commission.

Mr. HEDGES (Fremantle) [6.4].—I shall support the amendment. In many instances we have extended a preference to Great Britain in respect of goods of which she has been supplying 80 or 90 per cent. of our importations. But 86 per cent. of our importations of the articles enumerated in this item are of foreign origin, and, consequently, I shall support the giving of a real preference to the United Kingdom.

Mr. SALMON (Laanecoorie) [6.5].—Upon a previous occasion I indicated that the duty upon this item, so far as the products of the United Kingdom are concerned, should be $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., but that was conditional upon an impost of 20 per cent. being levied under the general Tariff. Therefore those honorable members who voted for the reduction as against my proposal, and expect me to vote for a duty of 10 per cent. in the present instance will be disappointed.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [6.6].—The last speaker is to be congratulated upon the intelligent reason which he has assigned for his present attitude. He has told us that he intends to vote for a higher duty than he thinks ought to be imposed from motives of revenge. I hope that his constituents will take note of that fact.

Mr. SALMON.—I proposed a compromise, but honorable members opposite want that compromise to be all in their own favour.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—If there be any sincerity in our protestations of a desire to extend a preference to the United Kingdom, here is an item in respect of which we may extend to her a substantial preference. Only £22,000 worth of this machinery is annually imported from Great Britain, whereas no less than £140,000 worth is annually imported from other countries—principally from the United States of America. If these machines must come from foreign countries, an additional duty of 5 per cent. will not prevent their importation.

Mr. FRAZER.—If they must come from other countries, they ought to be admitted free.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Will honorable members opposite assist me to recommit the item, with a view to making it free? I hope that the Committee will agree to the preference proposed, which in view of the figures that have been quoted is not high.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [6.7].—I cannot see my way to vote for a 5 per cent. preference to the Mother Country in this instance, but I am prepared to vote for a duty of $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. upon British goods. I ask the honorable member for Indi to adopt that rate.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—I ask leave to withdraw my amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment (by Mr. TILLEY BROWN) agreed to—

That after the words "15 per cent.," just added, the words "and on and after 26th November, 1907, ad val. (United Kingdom), $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.," be added.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Postponed item 149. Chaffcutters and Horse Gears; Chaffcutter Knives; Corn Shellers; Corn Huskers; Cultivators other than disc Harrows; Ploughs other; Plough Shares; Plough Mould Boards; Scarifiers, ad val., 20 per cent.

Amendment (by Mr. JOHNSON) proposed—

That after the words "20 per cent." the words "and on and after 26th November, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 15 per cent.," be added.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [6.8].—The honorable member has proposed a reduction upon the old rate of duty. I hope that no such reduction will be made. Honorable members have had a promise from the Government that they will deal with the question of the new protection in a Bill which is to be introduced. But how can we do that if even the duties levied under the old Tariff are to be reduced? I maintain that they should be increased.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [6.9].—The Treasurer has referred to the new protection. We are aware that an Excise duty of 10 per cent. has been levied upon the articles now under consideration. If we are going to disturb the duty levied under the general Tariff, we shall have to revise the Excise.

Mr. FULLER.—It does not matter, because the manufacturers do not pay the Excise.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—It is most interesting to speculate whether the Excise is ever to be paid or whether effect is to be given to the conditions which would insure to manufacturers an exemption from its payment. It is thirteen months since the Excise was imposed, but up to date no revenue has been collected, and in many instances the rates of wages fixed by the Act have not been paid. It would be

really interesting to know how long a period is to elapse before the new protection is to become operative. I congratulate the Government upon the celerity with which they put the old protection through, and the tardiness with which they seek to give effect to the new protection. If we pass these laws, they ought not to remain a dead letter. Either we mean what is contained in their provisions, or we do not.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The honorable member is endeavouring to raise a discussion upon a subject altogether apart from the duty under consideration.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I should like to learn from the Treasurer when the complementary part of this Tariff is to become effective. We were told by the Prime Minister the other evening that the new protection and the old protection were both portions of the same scheme. No difficulty has been experienced in putting the old protection into operation, but there seems to be no possibility of giving immediate effect to the new protection. In other words, the Government are keen enough to protect the manufacturer, but are very tardy in seeking to protect the worker. We seem to have no concern about the speedy operation of a law intended to benefit the workmen. It is time that the Government decided either to repeal or enforce the law.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. JOHNSON.—I wished to withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN.—The Committee has got into trouble repeatedly because honorable members will not pay proper attention to the business which they have themselves submitted. It makes it very awkward and uncomfortable for the Chairman to be trying to do the business of other honorable members as well as his own. In this case I put the amendment distinctly, and it was negatived. I point out that if items were to be re-opened for discussion, there would be no finality to our proceedings.

Mr. JOHNSON.—You are quite right, sir. I confess that I was busy about some pairing when you were putting the question.

Amendment (by Mr. JOSEPH COOK) proposed—

That after the words "20 per cent." the words "and on and after 26th November, 1907, at val. (United Kingdom), 15 per cent." be added.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [6.21].—By agreeing to this amend-

ment honorable members will be absolutely reducing the present duty upon which the Excise was fixed. I hope honorable members will not consent to reduce the duty below what it is under the old Tariff.

Mr. JOHNSON (Lang) [6.22].—There might be some force in what the Treasurer said, if it were not well known that the Excise duty referred to is a farce. It is not collected, and is neither more nor less than a placard. From the experience of the past, we know that we might just as well do away with the Excise for any good it is. It is inoperative, and when the Treasurer appeals to the Committee not to interfere with the duty, so as to grant a preference on this item because the Excise duty was arranged in accordance with it, he has his tongue in his cheek all the time. In view of the fact that, although the Act has been in force for the last twelve months, not a penny of Excise has been collected under it, although wage and working conditions have not been fulfilled by the manufacturers enjoying the high duties. I hope the Committee will receive the statement of the Treasurer for what it is worth.

Question.—That the words proposed to be added be so added (Mr. JOSEPH COOK's amendment)—put. The Committee divided.

Ayes	12
Noes	28
<hr/>			
Majority	16

AYES.

Archer, E. W.
Brown, Tilley
Brown, Thomas
Cook, Joseph
Forrest, Sir John
Fuller, G. W.
Liddell, F.

Poynton, A.
Smith, Bruce
Thomson, Dugald

Tellers:

Johnson, W. E.
McWilliams, W. J.

NOES.

Carr, E. S.
Chanter, J. M.
Chapman, Austin
Coon, J.
Deakin, A.
Ewing, T. T.
Fairbairn, G.
Fisher, A.
Frazer, C. E.
Groom, L. E.
Hedges, W. N.
Irvine, W. H.
Knox, W.
Lyne, Sir William
Mahon, H.

Maloney, W. R. N.
Mauger, S.
McDougall, J. K.
Quick, Sir John
Salmon, C. C.
Sinclair, H.
Spence, W. G.
Storrer, D.
Thomson, John
Watkins, D.
Wise, G. H.

Tellers:

Cook, Hume
Mathews, J.

PAIRS.

Edwards, R.	Page, J.
Palmer, A. C.	Watson, J. C.
Bowden, E. K.	Webster, W.
Wilson, J. G.	Batchelor, E. L.
Foxton, Colonel	Sampson, S.
Kelly, W. H.	Kingston, C. C.
Reid, G. H.	Hall, D. R.
Willis, Henry	Foster, F. J.
Thomas, J.	Hutchison, J.
Hughes, W. M.	Bamford, F. W.
Fowler, J. M.	Catts, J. H.
Fysh, Sir Philip	O'Malley, King
Wilks, W. H.	Tudor, F. G.
Livingston, J.	Harper, R.

Question so resolved in the negative.
Amendment negatived.

Item agreed to.

Postponed item 150.—Combined Corn Sheller, Husker and Bagger; Combined Corn Sheller and Husker; Discs for Agricultural Implements; Disc Cultivators; Drills (Fertilizer Seed and Grain), and all attachments thereto; Stump Jump Ploughs; Winnowers (horse and other power); Seats, Poles, Swingle-bars, Yokes, and Trees for Agricultural Machines, when imported separately, ad val., 25 per cent.

Mr. POYNTON (Grey) [6.28].—I wish to move that the duty in the second column be 20 per cent., to give a preference of 5 per cent. in the case of goods imported from the United Kingdom.

Mr. LIDDELL (Hunter) [6.29].—I have a prior amendment to move. I move—

That after the words "25 per cent." the words "and on and after 26th November, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 20 per cent." be added.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—The honorable member cannot hope to carry that amendment.

Mr. LIDDELL.—I point out that in the previous item chaffcutters, corn shellers, and corn huskers are dutiable at 20 per cent., and I do not see why, under this item, a combined corn sheller, husker and bagger, and a combined corn sheller and husker should have to pay a higher duty. Why should there be an increase of duty on these articles?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—There is no increase proposed.

Mr. FAIRBAIRN (Fawcner) [6.30].—I have an amendment to move which I think is prior to that submitted by the honorable member for Hunter. This item covers discs for agricultural implements, and I am led to believe that these discs cannot be made here at all.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—If the honorable member attends an up-country show he will find that they are made here by the hunter.

Mr. FAIRBAIRN.—I am very much surprised to hear that statement. I propose to read a letter dated from Footscray, which will show the information I have on the subject. The writer says—

I herewith beg to respectfully protest against the duty of 55 per cent. imposed upon circular harrow disc plates, and 20 per cent. on chaff-cutter knives. I have been working for the past fourteen years to establish a factory for the manufacture of disc harrows, which I make a specialty of, quite 90 per cent. of my output being derived from the manufacture and sale of these machines, but owing to insufficient protection and severe American competition I have been unable to make the headway warranted by the energy and capital I have put into the business.

The circular disc plates—of which on an average twenty-two are used on each machine—were formerly free of duty, but under the present Tariff are subject to 25 per cent. ad val. Under the old Tariff these plates, although free of duty, represented 30 per cent. of the cost of the complete machines. You will, therefore, see what an important item they are to me, and how very essential it is that I get them at the lowest possible cost.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The writer is wrong in the statements he makes.

Mr. FAIRBAIRN.—The letter is a copy of one addressed to the Minister of Trade and Customs. I presume that if the manufacturer of these implements could make the discs he would do so. I intend to move the omission of the words "discs for agricultural implements."

Mr. TILLEY BROWN (Indi) [6.32].—I wish to prefer a request to the Treasurer. I do not desire that the breach between this Parliament and the State Parliament should be widened. An entertainment is to be given to-night at which I believe a number of honorable members would like to be present, and in the circumstances I ask the Treasurer to agree to adjourn at 9 o'clock. We have been here since 10.30 a.m. this morning, and if the honorable gentleman is a believer in the eight-hours principle he will grant the request. I think it would expedite business to do so.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [6.33].—All I can say is that at 9 o'clock I shall be able to see how far we have got, and what we can do. In the meantime I make no promise.

Sitting suspended from 6.33 to 7.45 p.m.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [7.45].—I have already pointed out that the duty proposed by the Government is the old duty, upon the basis of which the Excise is collected, and is to be col-

lected in the future. I sincerely trust that the Committee will not alter it. We have let it remain, as it is in consonance with the Excise duty passed in the last Parliament.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE (Flinders) [7.46].—The reasons advanced by the Treasurer ought to receive attention. This was something in the nature of a bargain with those who have entered into the industry. The Excise duty has been fixed on the basis of this Customs duty, and it would be unwise, so long as that Excise duty is allowed to remain, to lower or raise the Customs duty.

Question—That the words “and on and after 26th November, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 20 per cent.” (Mr. LIDDELL’s amendment), be added—put. The Committee divided.

Ayes	7
Noes	25

Majority	18
----------	-----	-----	----

AYES.

Brown, Thomas	Thomson, Dugald
Cook, Joseph	Tellers:
Edwards, R.	Johnson, W. E.
Smith, Bruce	Poynton, A.

NOES.

Brown, Tilley	Mathews, J.
Chanter, J. M.	Mauger, S.
Chapman, Austin	McDougall, J. K.
Coon, J.	O'Malley, King
Deakin, A.	Page, J.
Ewing, T. T.	Sinclair, H.
Fisher, A.	Spence, W. G.
Groom, L. E.	Storrer, D.
Hedges, W. N.	Thomson, John
Irvine, W. H.	Wise, G. H.
Knox, W.	Tellers:
Lyne, Sir William	Carr, E. S.
Mahon, H.	Cook, Hume

PAIRS.

Wilks, W. H.	Tudor, F. G.
Kelly, W. H.	Kingston, C. C.
Foxton, Colonel	Wynne, A.
Reid, G. H.	Hall, D. R.
Bowden, E. K.	Webster, W.
Atkinson, L.	Fairbairn, G.
Glynn, P. Mc. M.	Crouch, R. A.
Archer, E. W.	Salmon, C. C.
Fuller, G. W.	Maloney, W. R. N.
Fysh, Sir Philip	Harper, R.
Thomas, J.	Bamford, F. W.
Hughes, W. M.	Hutchison, J.
Liddell, F.	Watkins, D.
Willis, Henry	Foster, F. J.
Wilson, J. G.	Batchelor, E. L.
Livingston, J.	Sampson, S.
Fowler, J. M.	Catts, J. H.
Palmer, A. C.	Watson, J. C.
McWilliams, W. J.	Quick, Sir John

Question so resolved in the negative.

Amendment negatived.

Amendment (by Mr. POYNTON) put—

That after the words “25 per cent.” the words “and on and after 26th November, 1907, ad val. (United Kingdom), 20 per cent.,” be added.

In Division:

Mr. POYNTON.—I ask leave to withdraw my call for a division.

Mr. CHANTER.—I object.

The Committee divided.

Ayes	7
Noes	25

Majority	18
----------	-----	-----	----

AYES.

Brown, Thomas	Thomson, Dugald
Cook, Joseph	Tellers:
Poynton, A.	Edwards, R.
Smith, Bruce	Johnson, W. E.

NOES.

Brown, Tilley	Mathews, J.
Carr, E. S.	Mauger, S.
Chapman, Austin	McDougall, J. K.
Coon, J.	O'Malley, King
Deakin, A.	Page, J.
Ewing, T. T.	Sinclair, H.
Fisher, A.	Spence, W. G.
Groom, L. E.	Storrer, D.
Hedges, W. N.	Thomson, John
Irvine, W. H.	Wise, G. H.
Knox, W.	Tellers:
Lyne, Sir William	Chanter, J. M.
Mahon, H.	Cook, Hume

PAIRS.

Wilks, W. H.	Tudor, F. G.
Kelly, W. H.	Kingston, C. C.
Foxton, Colonel	Wynne, A.
Reid, G. H.	Hall, D. R.
Bowden, E. K.	Webster, W.
Atkinson, L.	Fairbairn, G.
Glynn, P. McM.	Crouch, R. A.
Archer, E. W.	Salmon, C. C.
Fuller, G. W.	Maloney, W. R. N.
Fysh, Sir Philip	Harper, R.
Thomas, J.	Bamford, F. W.
Hughes, W. M.	Hutchison, J.
Liddell, F.	Watkins, D.
Willis, Henry	Foster, F. J.
Wilson, J. G.	Batchelor, E. L.
Livingston, J.	Sampson, S.
Fowler, J. M.	Catts, J. H.
Palmer, A. C.	Watson, J. C.
McWilliams, W. J.	Quick, Sir John

Question so resolved in the negative.

Amendment negatived.

Item agreed to.

Postponed item 151.—Churns of all kinds; Cheese Presses; Dairy Coolers; Dairy Refrigerators; Supply Cans; Incubators n.e.i.; Foster Mothers, ad val., 25 per cent.

Amendment (by Mr. POYNTON) put—

That after the words “25 per cent.” the words “and on and after 26th November, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 12½ per cent.,” be added.

The CHAIRMAN.—The “Noes” have it.

Several HONORABLE MEMBERS.—The “Ayes” have it.

The CHAIRMAN.—There was only one “Aye.”

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—Are you going to insist, Mr. Chairman, that the “Ayes” or “Noes” when in a minority shall call one after another? I distinctly heard three voices in my neighbourhood; but the calls were identical in point of time, and may have sounded to you as one voice.

The CHAIRMAN.—If the honorable member had been sitting here as long as I have been, he could detect in an instant whether more than one voice was given for the “Noes.” On occasions I have had to put the question two or three times, to give honorable members who I thought desired a division an opportunity to make their wish known. On this occasion I heard but one voice, though, of course, I accept the honorable member’s statement that he heard more.

Question (Mr. POYNTON’S amendment) again put. The Committee divided.

Ayes	8
Noes	27
<hr/>				
Majority	19

AYES.

Brown, Thomas	Thomson, Dugald
Cook, Joseph	
Edwards, R.	
Poynton, A.	<i>Tellers:</i>
Smith, Bruce	Johnson, W. E.
	Wilks, W. H.

NOES.

Brown, Tilley	Mathews, J.
Carr, E. S.	Mauger, S.
Chanter, J. M.	McDougall, J. K.
Chapman, Austin	O’Malley, King
Coon, J.	Page, J.
Deakin, A.	Quick, Sir John
Ewing, T. T.	Sinclair, H.
Fisher, A.	Spence, W. G.
Groom, L. E.	Storrer, D.
Hedges, W. N.	Thomson, John
Irvine, W. H.	Wise, G. H.
Knox, W.	<i>Tellers:</i>
Lyne, Sir William	Cook, Hume
Mahon, H.	Tudor, F. G.

PAIRS.

Kelly, W. H.	Kingston, C. C.
Foxton, Colonel	Wynne, A.
Reid, G. H.	Hall, D. R.
Bowden, E. K.	Webster, W.
Atkinson, L.	Fairbairn, G.
Glynn, P. McM.	Crouch, R. A.
Archer, E. W.	Salmon, C. C.
Fuller, G. W.	Maloney, W. R. N.
Fysh, Sir Philip	Harper, R.
Thomas, J.	Bamford, F. W.
Hughes, W. M.	Hutchison, J.
Liddell, F.	Watkins, D.
Willis, Henry	Foster, F. J.
Wilson, J. G.	Batchelor, E. L.
Ston, J.	Sampson, S.
J. M.	Catts, J. H.
A. C.	Watson, J. C.
Iams, W. J.	Forrest, Sir John

Question so resolved in the negative.
Amendment negated.

Amendment (by Mr. JOHNSON) put—

That the words “and on and after 26th November, 1907, ad val. (United Kingdom), 15 per cent.,” be added.

The Committee divided.

Ayes	12
Noes	24
<hr/>				
Majority	12

AYES.

Brown, Tilley	Poynton, A.
Brown, Thomas	Smith, Bruce
Cook, Joseph	Thomson, Dugald
Edwards, R.	
Fowler, J. M.	<i>Tellers:</i>
Irvine, W. H.	Johnson, W. E.
Knox, W.	Wilks, W. H.

NOES.

Carr, E. S.	McDougall, J. K.
Chanter, J. M.	O’Malley, King
Chapman, Austin	Page, J.
Coon, J.	Quick, Sir John
Deakin, A.	Sinclair, H.
Ewing, T. T.	Spence, W. G.
Fisher, A.	Storrer, D.
Groom, L. E.	Thomson, John
Hedges, W. N.	Wise, G. H.
Lyne, Sir William	
Mahon, H.	<i>Tellers:</i>
Mathews, J.	Cook, Hume
Mauger, S.	Tudor, F. G.

PAIRS.

Kelly, W. H.	Kingston, C. C.
Foxton, Colonel	Wynne, A.
Reid, G. H.	Hall, D. R.
Bowden, E. K.	Webster, W.
Glynn, P. McM.	Crouch, R. A.
Archer, E. W.	Salmon, C. C.
Fuller, G. W.	Maloney, W. R. N.
Fysh, Sir Philip	Harper, R.
Thomas, J.	Bamford, F. W.
Hughes, W. M.	Hutchison, J.
Liddell, F.	Watkins, D.
Willis, Henry	Foster, F. J.
Wilson, J. G.	Batchelor, E. L.
Livingston, J.	Sampson, S.
Palmer, A. C.	Watson, J. C.
Atkinson, L.	Catts, J. H.
McWilliams, W. J.	Frazer, C. E.

Question so resolved in the negative.
Amendment negated.

Mr. WILKS (Dalley) [8.12].—Churns and other implements contained in this item are essential to dairying, and we should not only reduce the duty on them, but give a preference to the Mother Country. The proposed difference of 10 per cent. just negated may have been too great; but I do not think that that objection should

be taken to a difference of 5 per cent. I therefore move—

That the words “and on and after 26th November, 1907, ad val. (United Kingdom), 20 per cent.” be added.

Mr. SINCLAIR.—What are “dairy refrigerators”?

Mr. BRUCE SMITH (Parkes) [8.14].—No doubt the Minister imagines that he is going to carry this item through without an explanation. The items in the schedule are virtually the tools of trade of those engaged in the primary industries. No industry has received more assistance in Victoria, the leading butter exporting State, than has that of dairying, for the encouragement of which very large sums of money have been spent in bounties. The Ministry proposes to place a duty on churns of all kinds, cheese presses, dairy coolers, dairy refrigerators, supply cans, incubators, and foster mothers.

Mr. STORRER.—They can all be made in Australia.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—These are all very bulky goods, which, of course, occupy a very large cubic space for the purpose of shipment. There is in that a much larger protection than is now sought to be imposed. If we are talking seriously, as many of us have done, of making mining machinery and other articles of that kind free, why is it not proposed to extend some consideration to the dairy industry? Dairy refrigerators are really tools of trade of an industry which we have treated as primary, and to which Victoria—which generally leads the way in artificial aids to national success—has thought fit to give a very large bounty. I ask the Committee to consider that point, and also whether a duty of 20 per cent. is not ample in the case of articles of this kind.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Moreton) [8.17].—It appears to me that dairy refrigerators should be put on the same footing as the articles embraced in item 149. I find that under item 279 dairy refrigerators may be construed to mean either refrigerating machinery, or machinery made up on the same principle as are the foster mothers. Item 299 includes “ice chests or refrigerators.” If the Treasurer will tell me whether the term “dairy refrigerators” in item 151 refers to ice chests I shall be satisfied.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [8.18].—I am surprised that the hon-

orable member for Moreton, who has to do with the dairying industry, and the honorable member for Parkes, do not know what the words “dairy refrigerators” mean.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—I take it that a dairy refrigerator is an apparatus for cooling a dairy.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The term means ammonia coils.

Mr. SINCLAIR.—That is just what it does not mean, I think.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—That is what I am informed it means. I thought that any one who had anything to do with dairying would know all about it.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—The Minister admits that he had to be informed, so that even he did not know all about it.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—That does not matter. The honorable member who knows everything should not ask me to inform him as to anything. The honorable member for Moreton is mistaken in imagining that the term means anything else.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Moreton) [8.20].—I am not satisfied that I am so ignorant as the Minister has suggested. I should like to have a little more time in which to look up this matter. If the Treasurer will take that trouble, I think he will find that ammonia coils are specially mentioned in another part of the Tariff. I suspect that he has been trying to have a little sport at my expense.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—No. I assure the honorable member that I never use these machines, and I did not know what the words meant until I was informed.

Mr. SINCLAIR.—The honorable gentleman tried to make as little as he could of my knowledge of this matter. But I happen to know something about it.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—That is why I thought the honorable member ought to know all about it.

Mr. SINCLAIR.—My knowledge, however limited it may be, should not be set aside by the Treasurer's ignorance, no matter how extensive that may be. The Committee is entitled to know what the term actually means.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I have told the Committee.

Mr. SINCLAIR.—The honorable gentleman has said that it refers to ammonia coils.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—He has to look up what he told the honorable member. He is a 'mere automaton here with an office at the back of the chair.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—That is what the honorable member has been all his life. He has never got any further.

Mr. SINCLAIR.—The term "dairy refrigerator" may include an ice chest or a mechanical arrangement for compressing ammonia, and not ammonia coils, as the Treasurer has wished us to understand. I should like to know exactly what the term includes. If it means a mechanical refrigerator, it should be placed on the same footing as the articles embraced in item 149.

Question—That the words "and on and after 26th November, 1907, ad val. (United Kingdom), 20 per cent.," be added (Mr. WILKS'S amendment)—put. The Committee divided.

Ayes	14
Noes	20

Majority	6
----------	-----	-----	---

AYES.

Brown, Tilley	Sinclair, H.
Brown, Thomas	Smith, Bruce
Cook, Joseph	Thomson, Dugald
Edwards, R.	Wilks, W. H.
Irvine, W. H.	
Knox, W.	<i>Tellers:</i>
Mahon, H.	Johnson, W. E.
Poynton, A.	Thomson, John

NOES.

Carr, E. S.	McDougall, J. K.
Chanter, J. M.	Page, J.
Chapman, Austin	Quick, Sir John
Coon, J.	Spence, W. G.
Deakin, A.	Storror, D.
Ewing, T. T.	Tudor, F. G.
Fisher, A.	Wise, G. H.
Groom, L. E.	
Hedges, W. N.	<i>Tellers:</i>
Lyne, Sir William	Cook, Hume
Mathews, J.	O'Malley, King

PAIRS.

Kelly, W. H.	Kingston, C. C.
Palmer, A. C.	Watson, J. C.
Glynn, P. McM.	Crouch, R. A.
McWilliams, W. J.	Frazer, C. E.
Fuller, G. W.	Maloney, W. R. N.
Fysh, Sir Philip	Harper, R.
Reid, G. H.	Hall, D. R.
Bowden, E. K.	Webster, W.
Willis, Henry	Foster, F. J.
Wilson, J. G.	Batchelor, E. L.
Archer, F. W.	Salmon, C. C.
Livingston, J.	Sampson, S.
Liddell, F.	Watkins, D.
Thomas, J.	Bamford, F. W.
Hughes, W. M.	Hutchison, J.
Foxton, Colonel	Catts, J. H.
Fowler, J. M.	Mauger, S.
Atkinson, L.	Wynne, A.

Question so resolved in the negative.

Amendment negatived.

Item agreed to.

Postponed item 152 (*Stripper-harvesters*).

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [8.28].—This item and the next two items relating to strippers and to metal parts of stripper-harvesters and strippers, depend a good deal upon certain matters taking place which the Government will probably be able to submit to Parliament within a few days. I am very anxious about these duties, and in consequence of that state of things I propose to ask the Committee to defer the consideration of the three items until we dispose of the remaining items in this division.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Surely the honorable gentleman will give the Committee some reason for taking this course!

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I have given the reason, namely, that there is certain information which the Prime Minister will probably lay before the House within the next few days, and which may affect these duties. I do not want to lose the duties through the absence of any information which the Prime Minister may be able to give.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [8.29].—I think that the Committee is entitled to a more definite statement from the Treasurer than has been made. We are asked to postpone the consideration of the item, and coolly told that within a few days the Prime Minister will enable some information to be afforded to the House.

Mr. CHANTER.—Hear, hear.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Might not the Government have indicated from what direction the information is to come? Has it to do with the collection of the Exercise duty? Has it any reference to representations which are being made by the makers of harvesters? We ought to be furnished with specific information on those points. We should not consent to a postponement unless the Minister is able to give some clear and intelligent reason for his proposal. Is the Prime Minister under an obligation to consider something which has been placed before him by makers of harvesters; or where is the information to come from?

Mr. DEAKIN.—It is information to be laid before honorable members in a memorandum relating to the question of the new protection.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Is that what we are to wait for?

Mr. DEAKIN.—Part of it; in addition, I am obtaining from the Attorney-General other information, in order to show honorable members exactly what the proposals of the Government will be.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—In regard to new protection?

Mr. DEAKIN.—Yes; and the object is to save two debates.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Why should we wait for an outline of the new protection before we deal with stripper-harvesters? The new protection, I apprehend, will apply to all the items in the Tariff on which the duties have been increased, and I cannot see, since we imposed the Excise so lately—

Mr. HUTCHISON.—Is the honorable member sure that the new protection is constitutional?

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I do not see what that question has to do with this duty.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—We can see what it has to do with the duty.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I suggest that we might very well deal with the duty now, and, if there is anything which the Prime Minister has to communicate which materially affects the matter, the item can be recommitted.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—If we go on recommitting items, we shall never get through the Tariff.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Are my friends in the Labour corner in this arrangement then? Have they had something to do with the proposal to postpone the items? There is a very suspicious chorus of approval from that quarter; and, strange to say, the chorus is joined in by old free-traders, who are anxious to reduce this duty in the interests of the farmers. I well remember, during last Parliament, excellent speeches, of three hours' duration, that were made by the honorable member for Calare on the question of stripper-harvesters. This duty has always been that honorable member's pet aversion; and yet he desires this item to be postponed.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—I desire this item to keep company with wire-netting.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Then the honorable member had better assist to reduce the duty at the earliest possible moment. Is he willing and anxious that the duty of £16 per machine should continue to be collected? I ask the Prime Minister whether there is some notion that there may be a reduction of this duty when we consider it, or is the postponement proposed with the possibility in view of increasing the duty to, say, £20. If the latter, I shall oppose the proposal most strongly. What is the object?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I desire to see whether the duty cannot be increased.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—So I should have thought. I hope, however, that the postponement is not intended to lead to a review of the item in connexion with the Excise Act—I mean a review of the price at which these machines are supplied to the public.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Certainly not, so far as I am concerned. It is not going to alter the price if I can help it.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Then I should like to know—

Mr. HUTCHISON.—Put another bait on the hook!

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—One has to adopt some attitude of inquiry when we see the Labour corner solidly behind the Government in their proposal for postponement. I should not have thought so much of protectionists in the corner concurring in the proposal, but when I see staunch free-traders, like the honorable member for Calare and the honorable member for Grey, in its favour, I wonder what is behind. I apprehend that the real reason has somewhat to do with the question of Excise. I invite the Prime Minister to say now what he has in contemplation; and if he is able to furnish a satisfactory reason, other than the bald statement which has been made by the Treasurer, I shall not oppose the postponement. But I do not intend to agree to the proposal unless something more is vouchsafed in the way of explanation.

Mr. WILKS (Dalley) [8.36].—The honorable member for Parramatta has made a strong appeal to the Government. We know that in the last Parliament Sir Langdon Bonython, after several days

debate, rose on behalf of the Government, and proposed a duty of £12, subject to the Excise provisions. From that day until now those Excise provisions have not been carried into effect.

Mr. KING O'MALLEY.—It was the honorable member for South Sydney who put that proposal through.

Mr. WILKS.—But the proposal for the reduced duty was submitted by Sir Langdon Bonython. It is most ominous that the Treasurer should now suggest a postponement. We are told, in a hazy way, that the postponement is in view of the production of a memorandum which the Prime Minister promised me three or four weeks ago would be laid on the table. We are now talking only of stripper harvesters, but the question really affects the whole of the items which will come under the new protection. Had I had my own way, a vote of censure would have been moved against the Government ten days ago, for the non-collection of Excise; and I should have looked to honorable members in the Labour corner for support. I think that the honorable member for Parramatta is losing an opportunity in not insisting on the postponement, not only of these items, but of the whole of the Tariff.

Mr. DEAKIN.—Anything to postpone the Tariff!

Mr. WILKS.—No; we desire to see carried into effect the law we passed long ago. I came here prepared to do work; and the Treasurer started off by giving us wrong information. However, the honorable gentleman seems to be in a better temper after dinner, and I think he must have been rambling round in the meantime. My own opinion is that the honorable gentleman is afraid to push these items to a division—that the true reason for the postponement is not concern for the general public who use stripper harvesters, but a fear, in view of the non-collection of the Excise, that the Government may not find the numbers with them. When the duty of £12 was imposed twelve months ago we were promised that the benefits of the protection would be shared by the employés, and we know what has been the result. This Excise law is either a farce or it is not. I said earlier in the debate on the Tariff that I should be inclined to vote for higher duties, in view of the new protection, than I would other-

wise have supported. Are we to be kept waiting, not until Christmas, but until the Tariff comes back from the Senate before we know what the new protection proposals are? I can understand the difficulty of drawing up a memorandum, and, more particularly, the difficulty in presenting a schedule of the industries affected. All the industries which seek the assistance of the Tariff ought to come under the new protection. I remember hearing members of the Labour Party say that they were not much in favour of giving Tariff assistance, unless the benefits were shared by the employés and also by the consumers. The honorable member for Parramatta is justified in resisting the proposed postponement; and, as I have already said, I am sorry that the leader of the Opposition, ten days ago, did not take the opportunity presented in the fact that the Government were quite open to challenge. Had this step been taken, the Government and their supporters would have been very awkwardly placed in explaining their position. I trust that the deputy leader of the Opposition will resist the motion until he receives further information.

Mr. DEAKIN (Ballarat—Minister of External Affairs) [8.41].—I think the honorable member for Parramatta, as deputy leader of the Opposition, is entitled to the information for which he asks. Let me assure the honorable member that I have spent a great part of to-day and a good deal of other time, with the Attorney-General on the one hand, and with officers of the Departments on the other, in connexion with the memorandum referred to which is to contain a full general statement of the proposals of the Government in regard to the new protection. I remitted a first draft to the Department a fortnight or more ago, and have not yet received it back. But to-day, when pressing for it, I received the very reasonable reply that, under the circumstances caused by their preoccupation with the Tariff, the officers are so pressed with fresh matters brought before them day by day, that they find the greatest difficulty in supplying the desired information. Having spent the greater part of to-day, when able to be absent from the Chamber, in consultation with the Attorney-General, the Acting Parliamentary Draftsman and others, in this connexion, I appreciate their tasks. The Government feel that if this had been simply

a retention of the existing duties, it would not have been necessary to depart from the usual procedure on the Tariff. But, as we are repeating proposals which were originally submitted two years ago proposing an increase in the duty, honorable members might reasonably ask for justification of the change. Those who have supported the present rates on the ground that without them, the fair and reasonable wages which have been defined by Mr. Justice Higgins cannot be paid, were also entitled to some assurance. We have found, owing to the pressure on the officers, a difficulty in obtaining the information we desire; but I have been pressing for it, and in the shortest possible time it will be laid before the House. Then, we trust, and perhaps not until then, that we shall be able to deal with the question at a sitting. If the proposals were made to-night, we should be met with requests for information which could be given only in part. The Committee are entitled to have the complete case; and a postponement will save its time at a period of the year when it is important that every hour should be spent to the best advantage.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Will the Prime Minister state whether the selling price is to be affected?

Mr. DEAKIN.—My colleague the Treasurer, who is better informed than I am on that head, answers that question in the negative.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE (Flinders) [8.45].—I do not think that we can possibly resist the desire of the Government to conduct the business in the way in which they themselves prefer, but I do not think that I understand the position that the Prime Minister has put. Is it intended that some statement with regard to the new protection shall be made without the House having an opportunity to discuss it, and then to proceed on that statement to discuss the remaining items of the Tariff?

Mr. DEAKIN.—That is the proposal.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—At present I should be sorry to say anything in anticipation of the statement, but I can see that there will be great difficulty if a statement of the intentions of the Government in regard to some future policy—some policy on which there is a desire to receive the sanction of the House at some later date—is to be made, and then we are to proceed to discuss the remaining items of the Tariff. For one, I should be extremely sorry to suggest that there should be any

delay at all in discussing the remaining items of the Tariff. I quite agree with the Government that we ought to go on with the Tariff. But I question whether a statement of the intentions of the Government in regard to the new protection will be of much assistance to the Committee before it proceeds to deal with the items.

Mr. DEAKIN.—It should be of much assistance.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—However, it is impossible to discuss the proposals until we know what they are; and, in the meantime, we cannot resist the desire of the Government.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [8.47].—I am afraid the explanation of the Prime Minister has not quite cleared the matter up.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I am glad that the honorable member makes that statement about some one else. He always says it about me.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—The Prime Minister has made a statement with the object of clearing the matter up; but the Treasurer never does.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Both Ministers have made statements, and it is because of that that confusion has arisen. I understood the Prime Minister to say a moment ago that he was awaiting information concerning some allegations which had been made by the makers of these implements.

Mr. DEAKIN.—No; not by the makers of any implements.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The honorable gentleman referred to their representations that they could not pay the scale of wages which has been fixed by Mr. Justice Higgins.

Mr. DEAKIN.—No; I quoted the officers and letters. A general statement seems a simple thing to make; but we desire to make it after hearing all that can be said.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Is that statement to be concerning Mr. Justice Higgins' award?

Mr. DEAKIN.—We have to make proposals which will be consistent with the application of his scale.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Does that mean this—that the Prime Minister is trying to find out whether we have to increase the duty to meet the terms of the award?

Mr. DEAKIN.—Before the duty is dealt with, that will have to be one of the matters taken into consideration.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I see. That practically amounts to this—that the honorable gentleman wishes to postpone this item to determine what will be the final attitude of the Government, that final attitude being based solely on the consideration of the effect of the award of Mr. Justice Higgins.

Mr. DEAKIN.—No.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—We shall have to wait until we hear the statement.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I am afraid we shall. The matter is by no means clear. But I want to point this out: If Mr. Justice Higgins' award is to come in, I do not see how it can be affected by these duties. The present duty on harvesters is £16. Suppose we increased that duty to £20 to-morrow. That would not make the slightest difference in the ability of the makers of these harvesters to pay the wages prescribed.

Mr. DEAKIN.—It would make a difference to the public, though.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Not at all. The price to the public has been fixed by Statute. The Prime Minister forgets that.

Mr. DEAKIN.—Not as to whether that is a just price or not.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—In any case, we have fixed the price.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—The proposal of the Government is to alter the price, undoubtedly.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The Treasurer did not lead us to believe that at all. I asked him whether the price was to be reviewed.

Mr. DEAKIN.—The honorable member said "reduced."

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The Treasurer said that he would not permit it to be raised.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—If I can stop it, I will not.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—But in the next breath, the Prime Minister says that that is one of the matters to be reviewed.

Mr. DEAKIN.—One of the matters is the price, and it is a most important consideration.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—That is the reason, I suppose, for the postponement of this item?

Mr. DEAKIN.—I did not say that the price would be increased. My colleague says no.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—So far as I am concerned, it will not be.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I am not misrepresenting the Prime Minister at all.

Mr. DEAKIN.—Oh, no.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The honorable gentleman is going to see whether the price as fixed is a fair one, and whether it will permit the wages award to be carried out.

Mr. DEAKIN.—Price, wages, duty—all three things have to be considered.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—In connexion with that, it is a pertinent question to ask whether Mr. Justice Higgins has made any suggestion on the matter.

Mr. DEAKIN.—No.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Why? Surely that is a matter that came within his purview. He had to find out how these people were getting on, and surely he had to make some reference to the question whether they could afford to pay these wages. If the Prime Minister is going to allow this matter to be re-opened, it seems to me that the policy of the new protection in reference to harvesters is a long way off realization, and I warn honorable members who vote for the postponement of the item with this end in view, that they have nothing to gain from the postponement.

Mr. CHANTER.—How will the postponement injure them?

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—How will it do otherwise? There is a condition—a bargain—that has been made with them. As part of that bargain we have already passed duties. Why cannot this bargain hold with regard to harvesters? Why this motion? Why cannot the new protection be enforced as to harvesters as well as on these other agricultural implements? Why this special protection for harvesters? That is what I should like to know.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The honorable member is laughing all the time.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The Treasurer with his sinuosities and his ridiculousness makes me laugh. He is a perfect provocation to laughter the whole day through. I again ask why are harvesters being treated differently from other agricultural machinery? Why is part only of the bargain to be carried out? I apprehend that there is no question of refusing to carry it out in regard to other machinery. Why is there an exception in regard to harvesters—the best paying concern of the whole lot of them, as has been proved over and over again in this House—the one item of manufacture which it has been

shown beyond the possibility of cavil gives a handsome return to those engaged in the industry? But here we are, with the men engaged in the industry declining, twelve months after the duty was imposed, to comply with the conditions imposed upon them, and asking—and apparently getting—a further postponement of the whole matter. And here is the point: if we are going to review this matter—if we are going to postpone this legislation—if we alter the conditions one iota—will they not put in a very urgent and a good plea, that the back money shall not be collected at all? I tell honorable members who are interested in this matter that all they are going to get out of it is to furnish a way of escape for these very men that they have been trying so hard to compel to toe the mark, in conceding good conditions to their employés. I do not mind saying this—that if ever there were a set of individuals in this community who ought to pay decent wages to their employés it is those who make these harvesters. The price they get for their goods, the protection which they have, and everything concerning the industry, is sufficient to enable them to pay good wages. There ought to be no hesitation in enforcing this award, since it was loyally and cordially accepted twelve months ago when the old protective duty on agricultural machinery was put through this House. Why the Government should show so much hesitation and create so much delay about this matter, I am quite at a loss to understand. I hope sincerely that we shall not only hear in a few days from the Prime Minister some reason for this unconscionable delay in the enforcement of this new protection policy in its entirety, but that also he will be able to convince the House that the makers of these harvesters have some justification on their side in thwarting this legislation for so long.

Item again postponed.

Postponed items 153 (Strippers), and item 154 (Metal parts of strippers, &c.), again postponed.

Postponed item 155. Agricultural, Horticultural, and Viticultural Machinery and Implements, viz.:—Cream Separators; Testers and Pasteurizers, Cotton Gins; Fibre Scutching Machines; Hand-worked Rakes and Ploughs combined; Hay Tedders; Horse Rakes; Lucerne Bunchers; Maize Harvesters; Maize Binders; Milking Machines; Mouldboard Plates in the rough and not cut into shape; Potato Raisers or Diggers; Potato Sorters; Root Cutters, Pulpers, and Graters; Sheep Shearing Machines; Straw Stackers; Sub-surface Packers; Threshing Ma-

chines; Winnower Forks (wood and steel) ad val. (General Tariff), 10 per cent.; (United Kingdom), free.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) proposed—

That the words "Sheep Shearing Machines" be left out.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [8.58].—I wish to know under what item sheep shearing machines are to be included when they are left out of item 155.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—They are to go under item 164.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Will the Treasurer explain how much he includes in the term "sheep-shearing machines?"

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The whole of the machine, from the beam down to the comb.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I understood that the Treasurer had agreed to free some portion of these machines. Does he remember making such a statement? I think it is necessary to know what portion is to be freed from duty.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The whole machine is included. Does the honorable member know anything about the working of these machines?

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—A machine has been placed in position in the building. The honorable member said that one part of the machine would not be dutiable.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I was referring to the combs.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—No; I understood the honorable member to refer to the over-head brackets.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—No. I want the brackets to be included with the machinery.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I wish to know to what part of the complete machine this duty will apply.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [9.3].—Those who are familiar with the working of shearing machines will know that they are attached to shafting and driven by motive power.

Mr. PAGE.—But the shafting is no part of the machine.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—It is only part of the machine. Then there is the cutter.

Mr. PAGE.—That is the machine.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—It is not the complete machine. I intended before last week to propose that shearing machines should be placed on the free list; but when in Sydney a few days ago, I was

approached by a gentleman who urged that it was very unfair that they should be so treated. I learned from him, for the first time, that these machines were being made in Sydney, and at great inconvenience to myself, I accepted an invitation to visit his factory a photograph of the internal workings of which I produce. It is one of the best equipped factories that I have seen. I was very much surprised on learning that the firm in question was making the complete machine, with the exception of the comb and the cutter, which they informed me they were not likely to be able to make for some time. The factory was a revelation to me.

Mr. HUGHES.—Are the manufacturers settled here?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Yes; their works are at the foot of the Domain, on the boundary of Woolloomooloo. I have here a photograph of the premises, as well as of the internal fittings, and I was so impressed by what I saw there that I suggested that a machine should be sent to Melbourne so that honorable members might inspect it. One has been erected in the north lobby. I was told that this firm could manufacture the whole machine, with the exception of the comb and cutter.

Mr. PAGE.—What about the tension?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I cannot speak as to that. The firm did not ask for protection on combs and cutters, and probably they did not include the tension screws in their request; but as for the rest of the machinery, I never saw anything better.

Mr. HUGHES.—Has the honorable member seen the machine at work?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—It is in use in many sheds; and I may say in passing that I can shear as well as most people. This firm has invested £10,000 or £12,000 in the industry, and I think it should receive some protection. I happen to be a very small shareholder in the Wolseley Shearing Machine Company, which carries on operations in London.

Mr. McDUGALL.—Was not the Wolseley machine invented in Australia?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—It was invented by a station-owner, I believe, on the Darling. The machine is made in England and other places—including perhaps Germany—and is sold largely in Australia.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—I dare say that it has been patented in the United Kingdom.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—And probably patented here.

Mr. PAGE.—That is no great crime.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Certainly not. After the way in which the honorable member has been raking me, I was pleased to have his assurance this afternoon as to the support he intended to give to anything that could reasonably be made in Australia. Had I not seen these works myself, I should not have thought that they were so successful.

Mr. HEDGES.—If they are so successful, why do they need protection?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The firm is not making any money. It is struggling to secure a sound footing for its invention on the market, and I hold that the manufacturers of the Wolseley and other shearing machines ought to manufacture them here.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—The honorable member sees no objection to an English patent being worked in Australia by the patentees.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—No. I should rejoice to see anything of the kind. Some of the representatives of the Canadian manufacturers of harvesters said some time ago that if I insisted upon my proposals, I would compel them to commence operations in Australia. I said that I should rejoice at their doing so. If they did, it would mean increased employment, and the distribution of more capital in Australia. It would be far better to have manufacturers from abroad setting up local factories than to continue the old system of importing their manufactures.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The Treasurer will agree to combs and cutters being free?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Yes. The firm to which I have referred was very fair. I put many questions to the gentlemen whom I interviewed, and they candidly stated that they did not ask for a duty on combs and cutters, since they did not think they would be able for sometime to manufacture them. I do not know whether or not they can make the tension, but I wish to give them a chance to develop the industry which they have so pluckily started.

Mr. SPENCE (Darling Downs) [9.13].—I found recently that there was some confusion in the Department of Trade and Customs as to the interpretation of the term "shearing machines." For some time, they have been classing as a shearing machine, not only the comb and cutter, but portion of the driving gear up to the shafting.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I propose to include everything up to the shafting.

Mr. SPENCE.—The shearers classes as a shearing machine the instrument that he holds in his hand, and which has been exhibited in this chamber, but the Department of Trade and Customs includes within the term the rod that guides the machine and the bevel wheel which drives it. The shafting and the brackets are classed with the motive power under the heading of machinery. There is no reason why all the driving power and shafting should not be made in Australia, but I would impress upon honorable members the fact that we should consider the probable effect of this duty on the man who has to make his living by taking the wool off the sheep by one of these machines. All machines are not equally effective. The Wolseley machine has long held sway as the best; but there is one make which the shearers will not touch. I am not prepared to say that the brand of machine to which the Minister has referred, has not given some satisfaction.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I have been informed that it has.

Mr. SPENCE.—I have heard favorable accounts of the Australian invention to which the Treasurer has referred; but the duty will not cause the manufacturer to turn out a good article. Unless the invention itself is good, the duty will not help it. It will merely have the effect of raising the price of the Wolseley machine, which I should like to see manufactured in Australia. The combs and cutters come within the category of cutlery, in the sense that certain firms specialize in their manufacture, and in most machines they are interchangeable. They should be made free.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I shall take care that that is done.

Mr. SPENCE.—If combs and cutters are not placed on the free list, the duty will be a tax upon the industry. We have to remember that the local manufacturers have been handicapped by a duty on their raw material, and I think that, in accordance with the policy of the Government, they ought to have some encouragement. They could continue to import the combs, the cutters, and the tension. The manufacturers of the Wolseley machines have long held most of the Australian trade, and if they wish to keep it they should commence operations here.

Mr. POYNTON (Grey) [9.18].—It is all very well for the Treasurer to spring a

new sheep-shearing machine upon the Committee, and to assure us that it works well.

Mr. PAGE.—It is not a new machine.

Mr. POYNTON.—As a matter of fact, nobody knows better than does the honorable member for Darling, that the shearers depends chiefly upon the Wolseley machine. Now, it is proposed to levy a duty upon sheep-shearing machines, combs and cutters, which the shearers will have to pay. The shearers buy the shearing machines.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—They can refuse to do so.

Mr. POYNTON.—The Secretary of the Shearers' Union in South Australia informed me some time ago that the shearers purchased the majority of these machines. From my own experience, I know that these men are reluctant to abandon the class of machine to which they have grown accustomed. We are being asked to sanction a serious experiment, and one which may be attended with disastrous consequences if the machine of which the Treasurer has spoken should not prove to be what it is represented to be. But I wish to know why the shearers' tools of trade should not be placed upon the free list? The Treasurer does not hesitate to place the tools of trade of manufacturers in that category. The sheep-shearing machine is about the last article upon which I would impose a duty, especially in the light of the meagre information which has been forthcoming to-night. I do not know whether the Treasurer has made any announcement concerning his intentions in respect of cream separators. He stated the other day that he gathered that there was a consensus of opinion on the part of honorable members in favour of placing these articles upon the free list. I find that the annual value of our imports under this heading is £144,032, of which only £14,000 worth are of British origin. Cream separators to the value of £13,700 are annually imported from Belgium, and £3,900 worth come from Denmark. From Knibbs' statistics, I learn that cream separators are the only articles specified in the item which have paid any duty. I would further point out that the most popular separators are imported from Sweden and Denmark. Recently I noticed that the United States had ordered 25,000 of these machines from Sweden, notwithstanding all their protection. In m-

judgment, they ought certainly to be placed upon the free list, and, in the absence of the honorable member for Indi, who a few days ago gave notice of his intention to move in that direction, I intend to move—

That the words "Cream Separators" be left out.

Mr. WILKS (Dalley) [9.26].—The Treasurer has moved to eliminate sheep-shearing machines from this item, with the intention, I presume, of including them in item 164. The honorable member for Grey has declared that he is not prepared to tax the tools of trade of the shearer any more than the tools of trade of other industries. I intend to support the industry which manufactures these tools of trade. The sheep-shearing machine which has been exhibited to the Committee, is exceedingly well made, and, seeing that £12,000 has been invested in the industry, it is certainly deserving of encouragement. The hat industry has received substantial assistance, and I shall support the Treasurer in his desire to include this article in another item, and to impose a high duty upon it. The local shearing machine is the Moffat-Virtue patent, and it might be given the benefit of a duty in view of the duties agreed to on woollens and hats.

Mr. HUGHES (West Sydney) [9.30].—The Treasurer is asking the Committee to do business in a very unbusinesslike way when he comes forward at the last moment with inside information with respect to this shearing machine which should certainly have been placed before honorable members a long time ago. We should be told what is the output and the capacity of the company in order that we may know to what extent the pastoralists are to be taxed for their benefit. I heard one person say that these machines run hot, and that the Wolseley machine has a better joint. If honorable members will examine the machine, they will find that the principal patent is in the joint as the combs and cutters are a very old device. I have here a list of the sheds in which the local machine is used, and it includes about 200 in New South Wales and a smaller number in Victoria. If we assume that it is used in 400 sheds altogether, that would represent not more than 10 per cent. of the total number of sheds in Australia. So that the Treasurer asks the Committee to tax 90 per cent. of the pas-

toralists of the Commonwealth for the benefit of the makers of this particular machine.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The pastoralists can look after themselves.

Mr. HUGHES.—The Treasurer knows nothing about the machine. The maker probably said in the most straightforward way, "I cannot make the combs and cutters, but if you put a tax on the other parts of the machine, I shall be very much obliged to you," and the Treasurer appears to have said, "Very good, that seems a straightforward proposition. I will do it." I should be prepared to agree to a duty if it could be shown that the local company can turn out a sufficient number of good machines. With regard to cream separators, they are on an entirely different footing. They are purchased by people who, in many cases, are far from being in good circumstances. The 10 per cent. duty amounts to about 15 per cent. to the consumer, and means something like £3 on each machine. That is a pretty heavy tax. Cream separators of English make are no good, and as the honorable member for Grey has said, the Danish or Swedish separators are almost universally used. For the same reason as that for which the Treasurer proposes to put a duty on shearing machines, he should take the duty off cream separators. The honorable gentleman would do well either to lower the duty proposed on cream separators or to put them on the free list.

Mr. SPENCE (Darling) [9.35].—I have here the hand-piece of the shearing machine made locally, and I am somewhat surprised to find that it was not made in the Commonwealth at all. There is no difficulty in the manufacture of the gearing which has been exhibited here, but the manufacturer is not making the hand-pieces of these machines, which are their most important part, and the part by which the shearer must make his living. I do not think in the circumstances that we are justified in imposing a tax on these machines. It would be far better to postpone the decision on the question. I have no wish to record a vote against giving any manufacturer a chance to enter upon the manufacture of shearing machines. There is one shearing machine which has a practical monopoly as it has become a favorite for the work, and gives every satisfaction. It has yet to be proved that the local ma-

chines would give equal satisfaction, and as I have already said, the hand-pieces of the local machines are not made here.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Some have been made here.

Mr. SPENCE.—There must be hundreds of thousands of these machines used in the Commonwealth, since there are a couple of thousand sheds in New South Wales alone. Shearing by machinery has now so largely displaced shearing by hand, that it is very important that the machine used should be a good one. I do not think we should be justified in agreeing to the Treasurer's proposal, since the local manufacture of these machines would be only in the experimental stage. The matter has been sprung upon the Committee rather hastily.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I am always springing something upon the Committee hastily! If I waited until the proper time in the opinion of some honorable members I should wait until doomsday.

Mr. SPENCE.—I am not complaining of the Treasurer. I think it is a pity that the manufacturer of these machines did not appear before the Tariff Commission. The matter certainly comes before the Committee rather suddenly. I admit that the local firm deserves as much encouragement as we can afford to give them in keeping with the policy adopted, but we should know exactly the effect of what we are doing. I think it would be better to include these machines under division VI.A. That would be in keeping with the course previously adopted in dealing with manufactures in an experimental stage. I see no reason why the local manufacturers should not have protection for the part of the machine which they make. But that should be defined. Shearing machines, as at present understood, cover both the driving part and the hand-piece of the machine, and the duty, if imposed, should apply only to the part of the machine which is manufactured here.

Mr. JOHN THOMSON (Cowper) [9.40].—I understand that the honorable member for Grey has moved an amendment on this item, to exclude cream separators.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I have an amendment before the Committee.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. WILKS).—The position is that the Treasurer has moved that sheep-shearing ma-

chines be omitted. No amendment prior to that can be taken unless the Treasurer temporarily withdraws his amendment.

Mr. JOHN THOMSON.—Does that mean that if the Treasurer does not withdraw his amendment, and it is carried, the opportunity to deal with cream separators will have passed?

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN.—Yes.

Mr. JOHN THOMSON.—Then I shall do my best to prevent the Treasurer's amendment being carried.

Mr. SPENCE.—The Treasurer will withdraw his amendment.

Mr. JOHN THOMSON.—I want the Treasurer to give me his assurance that he will do so. I am not going to be trapped in this way. I propose to vote against a duty on cream separators, no matter what happens. I am not accustomed to being trapped, and I shall be prepared to vote against the Government proposal in connexion with every other item in the schedule if I am to be treated in this way with respect to cream separators.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN.—The Committee is dealing with sheep-shearing machines, and not with traps.

Mr. JOHN THOMSON.—I did not say we were dealing with traps. I do not think that such an attempt at humour comes well from the Temporary Chairman of the Committee.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN (Calare) [9.43].—I have been very much surprised to find that since this item was submitted the Minister has indicated that he proposes to transfer sheep-shearing machines to another item, under which they will carry a higher duty. After all the representations which have been made to the effect that these machines should be placed on the free list, or made dutiable at a very low rate, I am the more surprised at the action taken by the honorable gentleman. This implement is an Australian invention. It was invented by the late Mr. Wolseley. When he was working at the invention he lived in the vicinity of the place where I resided, and I remember that he was looked upon as an idealist, who was attempting to accomplish the impossible. However, he completed his invention for shearing by machinery, and though he endeavoured to have the machines made in Australia, he was compelled to take his invention to the Old Country, and have the manufacture of the different parts specialized because

of their intricate nature. Others have since endeavoured to copy the Wolseley machine, but in the opinion of shearers generally it is, for all-round efficiency, far above all other shearing machines. I have here the hand-piece of a shearing machine of the Moffatt-Virtue patent. One might be led to believe that, with the exception of the combs and cutters, it was made in Australia, but the card attached to it says—

Not yet manufactured in Australia, although only a question of a little time when it can also be made at the works in Sydney.

Mr. CHANTER.—That refers to the hand-piece only.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—That is so, but it includes the intricate mechanism. On such slight evidence as has been put before the Committee, the Treasurer proposes that this particular piece of mechanism, which is of great importance to the pastoral industry, shall be transferred from an item under which it would be dutiable at 10 per cent., to another, under which it would be dutiable at 30 per cent., with a view to encourage the manufacture of the article in Australia at some future time. The Minister, in the case of almost every piece of machinery that is not made here, will always find some one who says that he is ready to make it, provided that it is put upon the high Tariff list. In the meanwhile, the industry which uses the machine has to suffer. That is a way of getting revenue out of the primary industries that I do not care for. Should this firm demonstrate that they can make the machine, and are making it, and putting a good workable article upon the market, they may reasonably ask for consideration from this Chamber; but it is preposterous to come along with the statement that in a little while the machine will be made here, and with a request for a 30 per cent. duty. I hope the Committee will not agree to the removal of the article from this item, with a view to making it dutiable at that high rate. If the Committee wants to benefit the primary industries concerned, it will make the article as nearly free as possible.

Mr. HUGHES.—Does the honorable member say that it is not made here?

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—Yes; but it is said that it may be made here if the duty asked for is imposed.

Mr. CHANTER (Riverina) [9.47].—This is history repeating itself. The inventor of this machine happened to be a

constituent of mine. He was the late Mr. Wolseley, of Cobram station, now owned by Janet Lady Clarke. He had to meet the same prejudice, which existed then in a more modified form, as, I am sorry to say, exists in Australia to-day. With his practical knowledge, as a sheep-owner, of shearing and sheep grazing, he tried his best in Australia to induce Australians to take up his invention, but he absolutely failed, because, then as now, there were in Australia those who said, "You cannot invent anything in Australia." Like Brennan, Whitehead, and almost every other Australian inventor, Mr. Wolseley was driven out of Australia by the prejudice of free-traders. These gentlemen had to go to England and the Continent to place their inventions which, when they are in the hands of monopolists, are brought back and foisted upon the people of Australia at an enhanced price.

Mr. POYNTON.—Did England put a duty on that invention?

Mr. CHANTER.—That is an irrelevant remark, because, as the honorable member knows, England puts no duty on that or any other machine.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Then why did the honorable member accuse the free-traders of driving Mr. Wolseley out of Australia?

Mr. CHANTER.—Let the honorable member possess his soul in patience. He has spoken to-day about 500 times to my once. We speak here of the primary producer. His so-called friends here agitate day after day. They put the primary producer in the unfortunate position that his brother Australians cannot make a machine to take the wool off the sheep's back, and they have to send to England for it. They have also to send their wool to England to be made into clothes, which are brought back to Australia. They have to send backwards and forwards all the time, and when Australian patriots ask that their fellow Australians, who are pioneering the industries of Australia, should have a chance, the cry is, "Oh, the poor unfortunate primary producer cannot stand it!"

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—How can the machines be made in England when there is no duty there?

Mr. CHANTER.—Simply because the honorable member is one of the type of men who, if I or any other man happened to have an invention which in years to come would mean untold wealth, and asked

them to put a few pounds into it, would say, "No chance. It cannot be any good." But if I were to come from England, with spats on my boots, and a high collar, and a "haw haw" manner, the honorable member would dive his hands deep into his pockets, saying, "This is a good thing; it comes from the grand Old Mother Country." Let us have a little patriotism. The honorable member for Grey says, "Wait till Australians make the machine, and then come down to the House and ask for assistance." Australians ask the House now to assist them against the importer and the importers' monopoly, to enable them to do the work. When Australians are in a position to make the Wolseley sheep-shearing machines, those who are "rigging" it and charging the pastoralists of Australia what they like for it, will have to reduce their price to meet the Australian competition.

Mr. JOHNSON.—All this pretence about Australian patriotism is based on £. s. d.

Mr. CHANTER.—There is no pretence. The honorable member's sympathy, in this case as always, is with the foreigner. Mine is always with my brother in Australia. I want to assist him and to build up Australia. How shall we build Australia up if we drive Australian inventors away to Germany, France, and America? It is time the Committee took a pull upon itself, and that the rubbish we hear about hurting this man or that man, was put an end to. Every Australian is benefited by industries in Australia, but who in Australia benefits by industries outside Australia, except a few importers and agents, and the agents' riggers? Many mis-statements have been made about these machines. An appeal was made for the poor unfortunate shearer. We were told, "You are going to put another burden into the shearer's swag, to bear his shoulders down." The honorable member for Maranoa, the honorable member for Darling, myself, and every other member who knows anything about the industry, is aware that the pastoralists provide these machines, and that the shearers are not charged for them at all. The appeal from the other side is really not for the poor man, but for the other man. I say: Down with this false business! Stand up for Australia and Australian industries! Stand by the firm who want to make machines in Australia to take the wool off the sheep's back! Help other Australians to convert

that wool into Australian clothing, and make Australia self-reliant and self-sufficient.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [9.54].—This ardour is really astonishing, especially coming from an honorable member who, not long ago, urged that the duty on wire-netting used by these very same people, manufactured in Australia, and giving employment far exceeding any that the manufacturer of sheep-shearing machines would give, should be reduced to a low level.

Mr. CHANTER.—The honorable member is entirely wrong. I advocated the suspension of the duty for six months.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—And the honorable member voted for the low duty which is now operative.

Mr. CHANTER.—Because I could not get the suspension.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Because those very people who the honorable member is now saying should not be benefited, could not be benefited by the suspension of the duty on wire-netting, he voted against giving protection to an industry which employs more hands than the sheep-shearing machine manufacturing industry would ever employ. Could inconsistency further go than to advocate the suspension of the duty on wire-netting, and vote for its reduction to 5 per cent., and then to make this great outcry against the reduction of the duty now before the Committee?

Mr. MALONEY.—But the honorable member for Riverina does fight for Australia.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—If he was fighting for Australia then, he is not fighting for it now. If he is fighting for it now, he was not fighting for it then.

Mr. GROOM.—He is one of the most consistent protectionists in the House.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—He may be. I am not accusing him of being an inconsistent protectionist, but the "hi-falutin" which he indulged in to-night is contradicted by his own previous vote.

Mr. CHANTER.—It is not "hi-falutin." It is solid fact.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The honorable member has taken credit to himself for all the patriotism in the Chamber. He thinks that anybody who does not agree with him, and who will not insist on a high duty on sheep-shearing machines, can have no patriotism. By so doing he accuses himself, as he voted

against the high duty on wire-netting, and in favour of a very low duty, of the same want of patriotism. I do not accuse him of it.

Mr. CHANTER.—The honorable member should be fair. He must know that I had to vote against that duty in order to get an opportunity to vote for the suspension.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The honorable member did not get the suspension.

Mr. CHANTER.—I did not get a chance. I had to vote against the duty first.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Surely the honorable member is thinking of the suspension of the fodder duties?

Mr. CHANTER.—No. I had a notice of motion on the paper regarding the wire-netting duty.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I accept the honorable member's statement. At any rate, I am not accusing the honorable member of want of patriotism. I do not think that he does want it, but honorable members on this side of the Chamber have an equal patriotism, and if they vote to reduce duties, they do so because they think that, in the interests of Australia, in the case of those industries which, when high duties are imposed, are a tax on the community and on other industries, it would be better for the duties to remain at a lower level. It is not because they object to local manufactures being established. They wish to see all local manufactures established that will be profitable to Australia, and are willing to support them, but they hold that many of the industries for which high duties are demanded are simply parasites on and not beneficial to Australia. It is not at all necessary to indulge in the personalities that have been indulged in. The honorable member for Riverina accuses honorable members on this side of want of patriotism, and in that accusation he would have to include himself, in view of his vote on a previous occasion.

Mr. CHANTER.—My failure is an exception. Yours is all the time.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I think that, if we liked to debate that question, we could justify our attitude, and show that from our stand-point our action is as patriotic as the honorable member's. The honorable member said that the inventor of the Wolseley machine had been driven out of Australia. He was not driven out of Australia.

Mr. CHANTER.—He was for his capital.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I do not know about that; but he was not driven out as regards manufacturing here. He had the patent in Australia, and could have manufactured here if he chose. No one else could have manufactured here in competition with him. He went elsewhere for his capital, and manufactured elsewhere. In one respect, if these machines could be advantageously made here, and if, by a high duty, we were not excluding other and better machines, to the injury of a large body of workers—

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—It does not affect those workers at all.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—It would injure them if the machine manufactured locally, and which they were compelled to use because there was a duty against imported machines, was inferior.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—If this duty is imposed we shall have the Wolseley Company here in six months.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The Treasurer is not a success as a prophet. I do not know whether the locally made machine is as good as is the imported or not.

Mr. CHANTER.—Has the honorable member seen the list of stations which are using it in his own State?

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I am not saying a word against the machine. I know nothing against it. I am willing to accept it as the best machine. But if it were not, and better machines were excluded, the worker would be injured by the likelihood of his employer buying, and compelling him to use, a cheaper machine, when better machines were obtainable at higher prices. From the Minister's stand-point, if this machine can be manufactured here successfully, it stands on the same footing as other machines. While, personally, I shall not object to it going on the other list, when we come to that list I shall try to reduce the rates, not because of this article alone, but because I think that on the other articles as well they are too high. The Minister has stated that the combs and cutters, which are tools of trade, are to be made free, which I think is right. One question which I raised has been satisfactorily answered.

Mr. POYNTON (Grey) [10.1].—I wish to ask the Treasurer if he will withdraw his amendment, so that the feeling of the Committee may be tested in regard to the proposal to put cream separators on the free list.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [10.3].—I do not know much about cream separators, and have, therefore, to rely to a great extent upon the knowledge of others. The honorable member for Cowper represents a constituency where a large number are used, and he assures me that they are imported, I think mostly from Germany.

Mr. JOHN THOMSON.—From Sweden. They are covered by foreign patents.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I understand that scarcely any come from Great Britain, and that it will be a tax on the people of the dairying districts if they are retained in the item. Although I am loth to withdraw any tax which might have a protective incidence, in deference to the view of the honorable member and others I move—

That "Cream Separators, on and after 26th November, 1907, free," be made a new sub-item.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN (Indi) [10.5].—I wish to know what it is proposed to do in regard to the other articles mentioned in the item. The Treasurer said, when I proposed to make these articles free, that a good many of them could be manufactured here, and he promised to tell us which they are.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Quite so; but I am not prepared to do so now.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—I have not known the Minister to be prepared with information on any item since we commenced the consideration of the Tariff. Apparently he gets through it all the better by not knowing anything about it.

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) proposed—

That the words "Sheep Shearing Machines" be left out.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN (Indi) [10.7].—I wish to point out that testers and pasteurizers, and fibre scutching machines, cannot be made here. Hand-worked rakes and ploughs combined, and hay tedders, can be made here; but all these things were formerly on the free list, and I think they should be made free again. They are all of great importance to the agricultural industry.

Mr. STORRER.—They can be obtained free from Great Britain.

Mr. HUGHES (West Sydney) [10.8].—I think that the Committee should have some explanation from the Treasurer of his statements regarding sheep-shearing machines. He told us of an interview with certain manufacturers, and laid on the

table a sample of one of these sheep clippers. This provoked the honorable member for Dalley to deliver a most interesting address about the employment given to moulders and finishers. It now appears that his eloquence was misapplied, because these machines are not made in Australia. The transmitting gear is not necessarily part of a sheep-shearing machine; it could be used to operate a dozen other machines. The sheep-shearing machine itself has never been made in Australia. The ticket attached to the sample which I have speaks of it as not yet manufactured in Australia, but says that it is only a question of a little time when it will be made here. It is not only a question of time, but also of money and of fools. I do not feel annoyed when the Treasurer gives us no information, although that seems to irritate members of the Opposition; but I protest most emphatically against statements which are absolutely misleading. I admire good workmanship, and, on the strength of what he told the Committee, I was prepared to protect the industry, and so, too, was the honorable member for Dalley. Now it appears that the machine is not made here at all. When I asked how many were made here, the Treasurer, or some one else, handed me a list of stations in New South Wales.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I did not hand the honorable member a list.

Mr. HUGHES.—I think that the list came from the honorable member for Bourke, whom I assumed to be acting in the matter as agent for the Treasurer. If the information put before us is tainted, we shall not be able to get on at all. I asked in how many sheds was the machine fitted up, and was handed a list containing the names of about two hundred stations in New South Wales. The Treasurer said that it was all right, but apparently it was all wrong. I am prepared to stand anything within reason; but I do not propose to stand this sort of thing. If an article of this kind were being made here, I would vote a duty of 20 or 30 per cent. to protect its manufacture, but I do not propose to vote duties like that to start a factory. The Treasurer emphasized the fact that the combs and cutters are not made here; but he gave us to understand that the rest of the machine was.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I said that they could not be made here, but that the other parts could.

Mr. HUGHES.—Given sufficient protection, and high enough prices, anything can be made here. No extraordinary skill would be required for the manufacture of this machine. Many more delicate instruments are made here. Any first-class cutler in Melbourne could make these combs and cutters.

Mr. MALONEY.—Are they not covered by patent rights?

Mr. HUGHES.—The Minister said nothing about patent rights. He led most of us to believe that, bar the combs and cutters, the machines are being made here, when, as a matter of fact, they are not.

Mr. WILKS (Dalley) [10.14].—The impression created in my mind by the Treasurer's speech was that he had been to a workshop in New South Wales where he had seen these machines, with the exception of the cutters and combs, made.

Mr. JOHNSON.—He conveyed that impression.

Mr. WILKS.—Yes. I do not know whether he intended to do so. He said that the people concerned were very enterprising, and had put £12,000 into the industry. Surely that amount was not expended on plant to make gear for transmitting power or to make the friction wheel illustrated in the document which has been put before us? Looking at the machine itself, I found that it was a well-finished piece of work, and thought that it would be a fair thing to give 30 and 25 per cent. protection to the moulders and others engaged in making it, allowing the cutlery to come in free. If these machines are not made here, I have been rather fooled. I should like the Treasurer to explain whether the fact is that the firm in question manufactures only the transmitting gear and the friction wheel, importing the sheep-shearing machines. Will the Treasurer explain to us whether it is the instrument itself which is made here.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The honorable member would not try to understand if I did explain.

Mr. WILKS.—Now the honorable gentleman is trying to make an enemy of one who wants to be a friend. I openly said that I would support him to secure the deletion of the item.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not want any one to support me, unless he can do so honestly.

Mr. WILKS.—I cannot support the proposal unless it is honest.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—My information was absolutely true, and the manipulation of what I said is scandalous.

Mr. WILKS.—I am not trying to manipulate what the honorable gentleman said. What I understood him to say was that, with the exception of the cutter and the comb, the rest of the instrument was manufactured here. Is that so?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I did not say anything of the kind, and to prove that I did not, there is the instrument with the attached ticket, showing where it was made.

Mr. WILKS.—I heard no statement of that kind.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Does the honorable member think that the ticket would have been left on the instrument if it had been intended to deceive him? Let him be a man, and not a monkey.

The CHAIRMAN.—Order!

Mr. WILKS.—The honorable member was more of a monkey this afternoon when he could not tell the truth with regard to another item. He tried to monkey that out, and we knocked him out. I can understand the honorable member for West Sydney being annoyed. So am I. The impression I formed was that the body of the instrument was made at a workshop in Woolloomooloo.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I certainly got the same impression.

Mr. WILKS.—So completely did I accept the Minister's statement, that, although I had the instrument in my hand, in common with other honorable members, I did not attempt to look at the label.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Nor did I.

Mr. WILKS.—I was not the only member of the Committee who was taken in. There were other honorable members—fully half-a-dozen—who examined the instrument, and admired its general workmanship. I did not look at the label. It was only when the honorable member for Calare was speaking, sir, and when I was occupying the chair in your absence, that I was astonished to read what was on the label. I tell the Treasurer—and it is of no use for him to get warm on the matter—that the impression I had was that the body of the instrument was made at a factory in Woolloomooloo, and that the comb and the cutter were the only imported parts. I dealt with that when I said that it was Moffitt and Virtue's patent, and I used the illustration that one could not go into a barber's shop which was well fitted without seeing similar cutlery. I shall have to re-

consider my promise with regard to the item, and to vote with a view to make it liable to a higher duty later on.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [10.18].—The honorable member for Dalley and other honorable members have deliberately tried to twist what I said this afternoon. I do not go by crooked ways or round about like some persons do. I held this instrument in my hand, and said that all the parts but the comb and cutter could be made here.

Mr. WILKS.—That is right.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I said that the manufacturers had told me that for some time they could not make the comb and cutters.

Mr. WILKS.—That is true.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—They said that they had made some of the hand pieces, and so they have.

Mr. WILKS.—The impression I got was that they were making the hand piece.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Here is the card, which is attached to the instrument. I know that in the gallery there are persons who are trying to influence honorable members, and who should not be allowed to come here. It is very improper.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Why not? The manufacturers of this instrument have tried to influence the honorable member in its favour.

Mr. JOHNSON.—The Minister only wants those who are on his side to be admitted.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—We do not want any one here. I do not want untrue statements to be put into the mouths of honorable members by men who are in antagonism to these manufacturers.

Mr. WILKS.—I have not been out of the chamber.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I had the instrument in my hand with the card, showing in detail where it was made. I repeat that some of these hand pieces have been made here, but I also said, in answer to, I think, the honorable member for Maranoa, that the manufacturers were not making them generally in their factory. They have found it very difficult to manufacture them without some protection. But some of them have been made here. I exhibited the instrument with the attached card, showing the particulars as to where it was made, and then I am accused of trying to mislead honorable members. I have had enough of this crooked conduct.

Mr. WILKS.—The Committee have had enough of it, too.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I have had enough of this crooked conduct, instigated by persons who should not be allowed to come here to influence honorable members.

Mr. JOHNSON.—All the manufacturers are sitting in the gallery.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I informed one man that I did not want him to tell me anything, and he told me that he was the representative of the Wolseley machine. I know all about that machine just as well as does that man or any member of the House, as I am a shareholder in the company. I have used the machine very considerably, and therefore I know what its quality is. The Wolseley Company ought to be compelled to manufacture their machines here instead of sending their orders to other parts of the world. They could do it, too. That is the cause of the fat being in the fire.

Mr. DEAKIN.—That is what the Germans do.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Of course, they do. I do not like reflections to be made upon my straightforwardness, for if there is one thing upon which I have always prided myself, and challenged the world, it has been that no person can accuse me of having done a crooked thing. I may not do a thing in the most bland manner, but I defy the world to accuse me of having done a crooked thing. When honorable members are instigated to make such charges against me I resent both the charges and their authors. I have stated exactly the position. I repeat that every part of the instrument but the comb and cutter can be made here. Like the honorable member for West Sydney, and the honorable member for Dalley, I believe that the combs and the cutters could be made here, but then, probably, for a time, the cost would be so great that it would be a very high protection which would enable the manufacturers to make them. Surely, in Sydney, Melbourne, Adelaide, and Brisbane, we have men who could manufacture the articles at a price. The manufacturers of this instrument seem to me to be exceedingly straightforward. I did not ask them to attach the card. They brought the instrument here, and of their own motion attached the card so that honorable members should not be mistaken.

Mr. WILKS.—I took the Minister's word, and did not read the card.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—They gave me the information about the combs and cutters in the most straightforward way. I did not

ask them to tell me. To my mind, they acted with more straightforwardness than I have known some manufacturers to do. The firm have invested a large sum of money in the industry, and according to their list their machines are in use in an immense number of sheds in Australia, as honorable members will see if they read it. We shall not be true to Australia, to ourselves, and to the manufacturers unless, when the circumstances warrant it, we give help to those who help themselves in the matter of industrial development.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [10.21].—Now the Treasurer has got that out. I hope that he will not die of apoplexy to-night. It is a fact that most members of the Committee had the same impression as the honorable member for West Sydney and the honorable member for Dalley. I know that, after hearing the Treasurer, I said to the honorable member for North Sydney, "I think we shall have to vote for a reclassification of this item." I believed that the Treasurer had told us that the machine could be made in Australia.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—So it can. I did say that.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I remember the honorable gentleman holding the instrument in his hand, and saying: "This was made here, and the other was not." But it appears that we have all been under a delusion.

Mr. WILKS.—He did not contradict me when I said it was a well-finished article.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The Treasurer will recollect that he did not say then anything such as he has said since. When the honorable member for Darling said he had been misled, and would have to reverse his vote, there was not a word from the Minister. It is only when honorable members on this side make a similar announcement that the Minister attacks them in what I can call nothing but a silly way. There is no need for any anger.

Mr. McDougall.—One thing is certain, and that is that free-traders have no right to be lobbying about the House.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I should like to challenge the Government to have the galleries cleared of everybody who is here on business connected with the Tariff. It seems to be the correct thing for the maker of this instrument to erect it in Parliament House; at any rate, the other day I saw it being erected in the passage-way.

Mr. McDougall.—That was not right. According to my view, there is just as much against lobbying on one side as there is on the other.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Then let all these people be outside, where they ought to be, when we are considering this Tariff.

Mr. MALONEY.—The representative of the Standard Oil Trust has been in one of the rooms of Parliament House.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I know nothing about that.

Mr. MALONEY.—I do not say the honorable member does. I do not think the honorable member would allow that gentleman to lobby him.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I know nothing of the individuals who get into the lobby; somehow or other, they do not come near me. The only gentleman who has been near me in connexion with the Tariff is one of my own constituents, who is visiting Melbourne at the present time. I hope that gentleman has a right to come to see me; at any rate, he has a good case, which I shall represent when we arrive at the proper item. Since the matter of lobbying has been raised, I think some steps should be taken, even to asking Mr. Speaker to exclude all those persons from the precincts of Parliament, so that we may discuss the Tariff free from influences which no doubt have effect. I think that that is a very fair challenge from those on this side to those on the other side. But, whoever may be excluded, we have the Secretary of the Protectionist Association of Victoria always in his place here.

Mr. MAUGER.—The honorable member is wrong; I am not Secretary of that Association.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Has the honorable member resigned? Has the headquarters been removed from 66 Bourke-street, and, if so, where is the new address, and what is the name of the new secretary? At any rate, I can congratulate the Postmaster-General on the propriety of his action since he became Minister; it is just the action I should have expected him to take. This lobbying has been a very sore point with honorable members on this side.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE. — I do not like lobbying at all; I do not want any lobbyist to come near me.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Then why not get the whole of those persons removed from the precincts of Parliament? The

Treasurer told us to-night that he suggested that the maker of this machine should erect it in Parliament House.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Just because it has been the custom to permit of such exhibits.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—And the Treasurer gets red in the face just because there happens to be somebody here who is interested in a rival machine. Let us decide to ask the Speaker to remove lobbyists from both sides, not only from the House, but from Ministers' rooms, where they are to be found most frequently.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—They have never been in my room.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Lobbyists on one side may come only into the House, but lobbyists on the other side may go into Ministers' rooms, and do so consistently.

Mr. DEAKIN.—I have never seen them there.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Nor have I.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—They have been seen there.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not think I have ever had any stranger in my room talking over these matters.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The Prime Minister, only last year, when the harvester duties—

The CHAIRMAN.—I must ask the honorable member to confine himself to the item.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—To-morrow, when the Speaker takes the chair, I shall have this matter out, and see what can be done.

Mr. FRAZER.—It would be as well to have a clearing up.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The matter ought to be cleared up, because what is a crime on one side is encouraged on the other.

The CHAIRMAN.—Order!

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I see that part of this item consists of "cotton gins," which, I suppose, are machines for ginning cotton. To begin with, we do not produce any cotton here.

Mr. DEAKIN.—Oh, yes.

Mr. GROOM.—Cotton is produced in Queensland.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Very little; at any rate, we have recently decided to give a good bonus on its production. Does it not seem absurd that we should seek to encourage an industry by means of a bonus, and then, at the same time, place

the tools of that industry on a dutiable list? There is no pretence that these gins are made in Australia.

Mr. MALONEY.—They can be made here.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Then why are they placed on the free list, so far as the Mother Country is concerned, with a 10 per cent. duty against the foreigner. It seems clear that these gins cannot be made here under present circumstances; and, therefore, it is absurd to burden them with a revenue duty while we are seeking to encourage cotton production by means of a bonus.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—This item is practically free.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I think all these articles ought to be free.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN (Calare) [10.36].—I should not have risen, but for the mysterious hints which the Treasurer has thrown out with reference to certain influences in and around this Chamber. I was the first to call attention to a false impression that the whole of this piece of machinery, with the exception of the comb and cutter, was made in Sydney.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I never said that.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—I did not happen to be in the chamber when this item was introduced. I was writing a letter outside, and was informed that the Minister intended to put these machines upon the 30 per cent. list. I then came into the chamber, and was told that the Minister had represented that the piece of mechanism exhibited by him had been made in Australia, with the exception of the cutter and comb. I took the opportunity to correct that statement, and to point out that the people whose property the article was did not claim that it was made here.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I did not say that it was.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—The honorable gentleman complained of the Wolseley influence. If there is a representative of the Wolseley firm present, he has not approached me. No one has approached me with reference to this subject. But I happen to be a country representative, whose district is interested in this matter, and I have to make myself acquainted with the needs of my electors. I had information which I was able to give to the Committee. If there is any objection to lobbying it ought not to be made by protectionists, but by free-traders.

Mr. FOWLER.—There was even a public notification that members of the Protectionist Association would be waiting in the lobbies to give information to honorable members.

Mr. MAUGER.—When was that made?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I know nothing about it.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—I am here to get all the information I can from all sources. If a protectionist gives information to me, I will not refuse it; nor will I refuse it if it comes from a free-trade source. I do not claim to have technical knowledge in regard to these matters, and am willing to learn all I can. It comes with a very bad grace from the Treasurer to take exception to any person representing the Wolseley interest being present when the representatives of the Moffat-Virtue patent have been here, and have even been allowed to erect one of their machines in the precincts of the chamber.

Mr. SPENCE (Darling) [10.40].—I was well aware the Messrs Moffatt and Virtue had made hand pieces.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I see that they have their machines in 600 sheds.

Mr. SPENCE.—What surprised me was that when the firm which I have mentioned sent a machine for exhibition here, they did not produce one of their own make, but an American machine. They have been perfectly straightforward in their conduct, though they have not shown much courage in not exhibiting a machine of their own make. I have been informed that they are putting up a plant for making hand pieces. If they had sent for inspection one of their own machines I think that it would have made a considerable difference in the feeling of the Committee. I have suggested to the Treasurer that as hand pieces are not being properly made here they ought not to be dutiable. I do not feel quite prepared to support an industry if it has not been fairly started. If hand pieces were eliminated the case would be very well met.

Mr. JOHNSON (Lang) [10.44].—I do not think that the Committee is quite clear now as to which part of these machines is made locally and which is imported. The Treasurer accused honorable members of misrepresenting what he said. Some of us were under the impression that he stated that the whole of this machine was made here with the exception of the comb and the cutter. The honorable member for Calare pointed out how misleading that

statement was. Then the Treasurer asserted that he had said nothing of the kind; but, nevertheless, he subsequently repeated exactly the same statement, and I took his words down. They were, "Everything but the cutter and comb can be and has been made here."

Mr. SPENCE.—That is a fact.

Mr. JOHNSON.—But the Treasurer denied in the beginning that he had said such a thing, and immediately repeated what he denied having previously said. From the statement of the honorable member for Darling, it appears that there is some truth in the statement that the machines, excepting the comb and cutter, have been made in Australia, but those made appear to be so clumsy that the people chiefly concerned did not think it desirable to show their own but an American model.

Mr. SPENCE.—I did not say anything of that kind.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—On their label they say, "Hand made; not yet made in Australia."

Mr. SPENCE.—I said that the firm in question had made some of these machines, and I expected that they would have exhibited one of their own make. I was surprised when I found that it was not so.

Mr. JOHNSON.—On the card attached to this machine it is stated that the hand-piece is not yet made in Australia, but that it is only a question of time before it can be made at the works in Sydney. That is in conflict with the statement of the Treasurer.

Mr. SPENCE.—It means that it is not yet commercially made in Australia.

Mr. JOHNSON.—What is the meaning of the words "Not yet made in Australia?"

Mr. STORRER.—They are used in a general way.

Mr. JOHNSON.—They are used without qualification.

Mr. MAUGER.—The models are made here, and are sent to America, and after they have been proved the machines are brought out here.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Then they are not made here, although the Treasurer in his first statement to the Committee said that they had been made in Australia, and he repeated the statement after just denying that he had made it before.

The CHAIRMAN.—The honorable member must accept the statement by the Treasurer that he did not use the words attributed to him.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Quite so, Mr. Chairman, but almost immediately after his denial—in his second speech on the subject—he repeated the statement, saying, “everything but the cutter and comb can be made here.” I took a note of his words at the time. In view of these conflicting statements, I think that we should oppose the Minister’s proposal, and that we may safely allow this machine to come in free.

Question—That the words “Sheep Shearing Machines” proposed to be left out stand part of the item (Sir WILLIAM LYNE’s amendment)—put. The Committee divided.

Ayes	14
Noes	21
<hr/>			
Majority	7

AYES.

Atkinson, L.	Sinclair, H.
Brown, Tilley	Smith, Bruce
Brown, Thomas	Spence, W. G.
Cook, Joseph	Thomson, Dugald
Fowler, J. M.	
Hedges, W. N.	
McWilliams, W. J.	
Poynton, A.	

Tellers:

Hutchison, J.
Johnson, W. E.

NOES.

Bamford, F. W.	Mauger, S.
Carr, E. S.	McDougall, J. K.
Chanter, J. M.	Page, J.
Chapman, Austin	Storrer, D.
Coon, J.	Thomas, J.
Ewing, T. T.	Thomson, John
Fisher, A.	Tudor, F. G.
Frazer, C. E.	Wise, G. H.
Groom, L. E.	
Lyne, Sir William	
Mathews, J.	

Tellers:

Cook, Hume
Maloney, W. R. N.

PAIRS.

Kelly, W. H.	Kingston, C. C.
Palmer, A. C.	Watson, J. C.
Glynn, P. McM.	Crouch, R. A.
Fysh, Sir Philip	Harper, R.
Reid, G. H.	Hall, D. R.
Bowden, E. K.	Webster, W.
Wilks, W. H.	Deakin, A.
Willis, Henry	Foster, F. J.
Wilson, J. G.	Batchelor, E. L.
Archer, E. W.	Salmon, C. C.
Livingston, J.	Sampson, S.
Liddell, F.	Watkins, D.
Hughes, W. M.	Catts, J. H.
Mahon, H.	O’Malley, King
Fuller, G. W.	Quick, Sir John
Edwards, R.	Wynne, A.

Question so resolved in the negative.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. POYNTON (Grey) [10.55].—When we were dealing with item 148, the Treasurer moved the omission of the words “feed grinders,” and a number of honor-

able members were under the impression that he intended to include those articles in item 155.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I did not say that. They are to be embodied in item 164.

Mr. POYNTON.—I admit that the Treasurer did not say that, but, nevertheless, several honorable members were under that impression. I therefore move—

That the words “Feed Grinders” be inserted after the word “steel.”

Question put. The Committee divided.

Ayes	11
Noes	22
<hr/>			
Majority	11

AYES.

Brown, Tilley	Sinclair, H.
Brown, Thomas	Smith, Bruce
Cook, Joseph	Thomson, D.
Fowler, J. M.	
McWilliams, W. J.	
Poynton, A.	

Tellers:

Atkinson, L.
Johnson, W. E.

NOES.

Carr, E. S.	Mathews, J.
Chanter, J. M.	Mauger, S.
Chapman, Austin	McDougall, J. K.
Coon, J.	Page, J.
Ewing, T. T.	Quick, Sir John
Fisher, A.	Storrer, D.
Frazer, C. E.	Thomson, John
Groom, L. E.	Tudor, F. G.
Hedges, W. N.	
Hutchison, J.	
Lyne, Sir William	
Maloney, W. R. N.	

Tellers:

Cook, Hume
Wise, G. H.

PAIRS.

Kelly, W. H.	Kingston, C. C.
Palmer, A. C.	Watson, J. C.
Glynn, P. McM.	Crouch, R. A.
Fysh, Sir Philip	Harper, R.
Reid, G. H.	Hall, D. R.
Bowden, E. K.	Webster, W.
Wilks, W. H.	Deakin, A.
Willis, Henry	Foster, F. J.
Wilson, J. G.	Batchelor, E. L.
Archer, E. W.	Salmon, C. C.
Livingston, J.	Sampson, S.
Liddell, F.	Watkins, D.
Hughes, W. M.	Catts, J. H.
Mahon, H.	O’Malley, King
Edwards, R.	Wynne, A.

Question so resolved in the negative.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [11.4].—When this item was previously before the Committee, I mentioned that the honorable member for Angas had given notice of an amendment to include in it the words “hand-worked cultivators.” These articles were free under the old

Tariff, and there is no reason why they should be dutiable under this Tariff. At an earlier stage of the debate the Treasurer stated that he wished to eliminate sheep-shearing machines from this item, and to insert the hand-worked cultivators.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—That was at an early stage of the evening. I then intended to submit a number of proposals which, in consequence of what took place, I abandoned.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The Minister was evidently satisfied as the result of his inquiries that hand-worked cultivators should be admitted free.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I proposed to include a whole list of implements.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—If the honorable gentleman will move the insertion of hand-worked cultivators I shall sit down at once.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [11.6].—Earlier in the evening I explained that I proposed to delete certain articles, and to include feed grinders and a number of other machines, including hand-worked cultivators. The debate which took place, however, led me to believe that to attempt to do so would be to provoke a very long and, perhaps, an unpleasant debate, and I therefore refrained from doing so. As the honorable member for North Sydney presses me to include hand-worked cultivators in this item, I move—

That after the word "steel" the words "Hand-Worked Cultivators" be inserted.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. FRAZER (Kalgoorlie) [11.8].—Dealing with the item as amended, I should like to say that the arguments advanced show that we ought not to allow a preference of 10 per cent. in this case. It will be admitted that the proposed duty will not operate in the direction of protecting any Australian industry, because if any of the machines referred to in the item were made in the Mother Country they could be exported to Australia and admitted free. The bulk of these machines are made in America, and in the circumstances we might agree to give considerable assistance to those engaged in the primary industries of the country to whom these machines are of great value.

Mr. STORRER.—The free-trade section of the Tariff Commission recommended a duty of 10 per cent.

Mr. FRAZER.—That is so, but the honorable member will admit that the pro-

tectionist Government did not accept their recommendation.

Mr. TUDOR.—The protectionist section of the Commission recommended that these machines should be free.

Mr. FRAZER.—It cannot be claimed that the duty proposed by the Government will operate as a protective duty, and it will probably be admitted that British manufacturers, on account of the limited Home market for these machines, will have no inducement to enter upon their manufacture. In all the circumstances, a duty of 5 per cent. should be sufficient to meet the case. I move—

That after the words "10 per cent." the words "and on and after 26th November, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 5 per cent.," be added.

Question put. The Committee divided.

Ayes	16
Noes	20
Majority			
	4

AYES.

Brown, Tilley	Poynton, A.
Carr, E. S.	Quick, Sir John
Cook, Joseph	Sinclair, H.
Fowler, J. M.	Smith, Bruce
Frazer, C. E.	Thomson, Dugald
Hedges, W. N.	
Johnson, W. E.	<i>Tellers:</i>
Liddell, F.	Atkinson, L.
McWilliams, W. J.	Brown, Thomas

NOES.

Chanter, J. M.	Page, J.
Chapman, Austin	Spence, W. G.
Ewing, T. T.	Storror, D.
Fisher, A.	Thomson, John
Groom, L. E.	Tudor, F. G.
Hutchison, J.	Watkins, D.
Lyne, Sir William	Wise, G. H.
Maloney, W. R. N.	
Mathews, J.	<i>Tellers:</i>
Mauger, S.	Cook, Hume
McDougall, J. K.	Coon, J.

PAIRS

Kelly, W. H.	Kingston, C. C.
Palmer, A. C.	Watson, J. C.
Glynn, P. McM.	Crouch, R. A.
Fysh, Sir Philip	Harper, R.
Reid, G. H.	Hall, D. R.
Bowden, E. K.	Webster, W.
Wilks, W. H.	Deakin, A.
Willis, Henry	Foster, F. J.
Wilson, J. G.	Batchelor, E. L.
Archer, E. W.	Salmon, C. C.
Livingston, J.	Sampson, S.
Hughes, W. M.	Catts, J. H.
Mahon, H.	O'Malley, King
Edwards, R.	Wynne, A.

Question so resolved in the negative.

Amendment negatived.

Item, as amended, agreed to.
Progress reported.

SUPPLY BILL (No 4).

Assent reported.

PAPERS.

MINISTERS laid upon the table the following papers—

Excise Tariff (Agricultural Machinery) Act, 1906—Judgment of Mr. Justice Higgins, President of the Commonwealth Court of Conciliation and Arbitration in the matter of the application of H. V. McKay for an order in terms of section 2 (D)—(in substitution for Paper presented on 19th November instant).

Audit Acts—Transfers of amounts approved by the Governor-General in Council—Financial Year 1906-7 (dated 22nd November, 1907).

SPECIAL ADJOURNMENT.

Motion (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) proposed—

That the House, at its rising, adjourn until 11 o'clock to-morrow morning.

Mr. PAGE (Maranoa) [11.18].—I wish to protest against the number of hours for which the Treasurer is keeping us here. I, for one, am not going to stand it. I have been in this House and the precincts for nearly fourteen hours to-day. It is not a fair thing. The Treasurer promised us last week, if we agreed to the motion which he then proposed, that we should meet at 10.30 a.m., and adjourn at 11 p.m. at the latest. It will be 12 o'clock before I get home. Does he think that that is fair?

Mr. TILLEY BROWN. — And is it any good?

Mr. PAGE.—It is no good at all. The blood is on his own head. I will stand no more of it.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [11.19].—I really moved that the hour of meeting should be 11 o'clock a.m. to-morrow in consequence of the honorable member complaining just now that he could not be here before 11. I should have liked to make the hour of meeting 10.30 a.m., but I know that some honorable members require a little respite in the morning. The other night, when I was asked by the honorable member for Kalgoorlie to agree to an adjournment at 11 every night, I said that I would if it were possible, and if a fair amount of work had been done; but I declined to pledge myself absolutely to do it. I have moved to meet half-an-hour later to-morrow, because it is now a little past 11 o'clock, and I want to keep as near to the bargain as possible.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

House adjourned at 11.20 p.m.

House of Representatives.

Tuesday, 26 November, 1907.

Mr. SPEAKER took the chair at 11 a.m., and read prayers.

PETITION.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN presented a petition from the Wilberforce Gold Dredging Company, of Stanley, Victoria, praying the House to grant an exemption from or rebate of Customs duty on a portable engine.

Petition received and read.

BUTTER BOXES: BOND.

Mr. JOHN THOMSON.—I beg to ask the Minister of Trade and Customs whether, in view of the fact that the drawback on timber used in the making of butter boxes is not always participated in by the persons who have originally paid the duty on such timber, and also that some of the boxes are not exported, he will make provision for the making of butter boxes in bond, so that all persons purchasing boxes may participate in the exemption intended by the Minister?

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN. — The whole question of rebate in connexion with butter boxes and fruit cases is now under consideration. We desire to give every possible help to the primary producer. At the same time, we are anxious that if it is to be done in the form of a rebate, the money shall go into the proper pockets. We have also to give due consideration to the timber industry. I am hopeful that, with the information I have at hand, we shall evolve something which will be satisfactory to all parties concerned. Immediately I am in a position to give any information to the House I shall be glad to do so.

PARLIAMENT HOUSE.

EXHIBITS: LOBBYING.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Mr. Speaker, I desire to address to you a question affecting the privileges of honorable members. On the door of a room adjoining the Opposition room there is posted a notice "Strictly private. For members only," and signed under order by the Serjeant-at-Arms. In

that room there has been erected by some strangers a machine with the object of influencing the votes of honorable members in regard to the duty on that particular machine. What I desire to know, sir, is whether it has been erected there with your authority or with your permission, and, if so, will importers of machinery be accorded a like privilege if they should desire it?

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—We want a sample room here apparently.

Mr. JOHNSON.—In the corridors and passages between members' rooms and the chamber there are posted notices requesting honorable members not to introduce strangers into the lobbies and corridors during the sitting of the House. Yet time after time, while the House is sitting, when honorable members desire to pass to or from their rooms, they have to pass through what seems like a public thoroughfare, in which they are intercepted and importuned by strangers in regard to different items in the Tariff. I desire to know, sir, if that is not in contravention of your order; also whether you gave permission for a machine to be erected in a private room; and, further, whether similar permission will be given to other persons if desired? I have asked these questions because the honorable member for Hume last night professed great indignation at the alleged fact that the representative of an importing firm had been seen in the precincts of the House; though he appeared to regard it as quite proper that local manufacturers should be present in battalions.

Mr. SPEAKER. — I presume that the room to which the honorable member refers is that which is commonly known as the north lobby.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Yes.

Mr. SPEAKER.—About ten days ago the Treasurer asked me whether a room could be spared in that part of the building for the erection of an Australian-made sheep-shearing machine. I asked the honorable gentleman as to the amount of space required, and, having ascertained what it was, I said that the machine might be stood in the room, which is not strictly a private room, but really the entrance to that side of the building. I may mention, although it has not been referred to by the honorable member for Lang, that I found that the machine was being placed in the corridor immediately opposite the

door. Of course, it was impossible to allow that. I, therefore, gave instructions that it should be placed where it was intended to be placed—in the north lobby. I do not think that any inconvenience will be caused to honorable members by the exhibit. So far as space may permit in that room, but not in the corridors, which are reserved for the use of honorable members only, I shall be prepared to give leave for the placing of any exhibit of a similar kind. With regard to the presence of strangers in the corridors, I may say that six weeks or two months ago I called a meeting of the House Committee because of the lobbying which was taking place, not only in the Queen's Hall, but in the immediate precincts of the Chamber—lobbying which seemed to me most objectionable, and to which the members of any party in the House ought not to be subjected by strangers. The House Committee resolved that for the convenience of those persons who might desire to see honorable members, tables and chairs should be placed in the Queen's Hall. The Committee thought that was the nearest place to the Chamber where such intercourse ought to be allowed. At the same time notices were posted in the corridors asking honorable members not to introduce strangers to those portions of the building reserved for their own use. If, in spite of the request of the House Committee, honorable members have introduced strangers I am very sorry. That is a matter for honorable members themselves to consider. I cannot accept, and I am sure that the House Committee cannot accept, responsibility for the introduction of strangers in such circumstances, because it is impossible for the officers of the House to know for what purpose an honorable member may be bringing a friend into a corridor.

Mr. MALONEY. — Mr. Speaker, following upon the question of the honorable member for Lang, I think it is only fair for me to ask you whether you are aware that the Standard Oil Trust of America have sent out a special commissioner, namely, Mr. Campbell, and that he has been taken into one of the corner rooms in order to lobby honorable members who sit on the same side of the House as does the honorable member for Lang?

Mr. SPEAKER.—I never heard of the matter before.

Mr. JOHNSON.—I have not heard of it either.

CLOSURE.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—I desire to ask the Prime Minister whether, with a view to hasten the progress of the Tariff, he will consider the propriety of adopting the suggestion of the *Age* newspaper, and apply the closure to the Opposition?

Mr. DEAKIN.—So far as the rules of the House have permitted, we have been applying the closure of common-sense and sound judgment to the Opposition, and we propose to continue that practice.

CHINESE HELMETS FOR POSTAL OFFICIALS.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—I desire to ask the Postmaster-General, without notice, whether it is true that the new head gear supplied to the Post and Telegraph Department in Adelaide consists of helmets made in China; and, if so, is it because there is no suitable head gear of Australian manufacture?

Mr. MAUGER.—If the case is as the honorable member states it, there will be trouble. I am not aware that it is so. But I will make inquiries, and, if the facts are as related, will have the order cancelled, if that be possible.

CRIMEA AND INDIAN MUTINY VETERANS.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—I wish to ask the Prime Minister a question, without notice. I observed, with very much pleasure, that on Saturday last an entertainment was given to veterans who had taken part in the Crimea War and the Indian Mutiny. I was sorry to learn that several of those veterans are now in charitable institutions, where they have to spend the evening of their days. I know that this is rather a State than a Commonwealth matter, but I wish to ask the Prime Minister whether he will make inquiries as to how many of these veterans are resident in indigent charitable institutions, and whether he will take into consideration the desirableness of doing something—either in co-operation with the States or in some other way—to make the evening of their lives as pleasant as possible for them? I should be glad, and I am sure the country would be glad too, to see these old soldiers, who have fought the battles of the Empire, properly provided for. I shall, therefore, be very pleased if the Prime Minister will make inquiries as to how many of them in all the States of Australia are in receipt of aid in charitable institutions.

Mr. DEAKIN.—I shall have much pleasure in endeavouring to obtain the information asked. My colleague, the Minister of Defence, who organized the festival for the veterans on Saturday, found, on inquiry, that a certain number of them were in charitable institutions, nearly all of whom were able to come. But, in addition, there were some bed-ridden or otherwise incapable of attending. Provision was made for them to be entertained in the institutions where they reside.

Mr. MALONEY.—Arising out of the Prime Minister's answer to the question of the honorable member for Swan, I should like to ask him whether he is aware that it was discovered in England some years ago that many of the Balaclava veterans were in workhouses, and that an organized effort was made to better their condition, and to make a more worthy exhibition of Christian kindness towards them?

Mr. DEAKIN.—I remember the fund being raised to which the honorable member refers.

JAPANESE IRON INDUSTRY.

Mr. McDOUGALL.—I should like to ask the Prime Minister, without notice, whether his attention has been called to the following paragraph published in the *Age* of 9th April last—

There is a probability that a Japanese-Australian iron and steel industry will be brought into existence very soon. The *Investors' Review* stated in a recent issue, "A large steel plant, to cost some 35,000,000 dollars, is reported to be about to be erected in Japan, and all the machinery has been contracted for in the United States by Japanese agents. The greater part of it is to be delivered before the end of the present year." From another source we learn that recently the Japanese Government sent emissaries to Australia to report on the iron deposits, with a view to their utilization in Japan. We are informed that these agents are now negotiating for supplies with the Blythe River iron mines of Tasmania.

I desire to know whether, so far as the Prime Minister is aware, there is any truth in that statement?

Mr. DEAKIN.—In regard to the first statement I have only the authority which the honorable member has quoted; but owing to information received from the honorable member for Laanecoorie I made some inquiries last year, which did go to show that Japanese Commissioners were travelling, one might say, all the world over, in order to study the undeveloped iron resources of various countries. They spent

a considerable time in Australia, made careful inquiries into our iron resources, and, as I understood, obtained quotations for the supply of crude iron ore—that is to say, iron ore untreated and fresh from the mine.

MANUFACTURES ENCOURAGEMENT BILL.

Mr. PALMER.—I should like to ask the Prime Minister, without notice, if, in view of the fact that the Manufactures Encouragement Bill was carried by a large majority in this House, it is assumed by the Government that it is the intention of the House to carry all the clauses in that Bill, including clauses 8, 9, and 10, which are objectionable because of their socialistic tendency?

Mr. DEAKIN.—The confirmation given on the second reading of any Bill is to its principle. No House of Parliament has ever parted with its right to criticise freely and if necessary to amend in detail, in Committee the provisions of any measure. I have no doubt that, after the honorable member hears further explanations, he will be so satisfied with the wisdom of the proposals in the measure to which he refers that he will not seek to alter them.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR— PROMOTION OF OFFICERS.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I should like to ask the Minister of Defence, without notice, whether, while paying all proper attention to the requirements of humanity, justice, and human sympathy generally in relation to the veterans of the Crimean war and the Indian Mutiny, he will also take steps to see that the barest justice is meted out to those men in Australia who fought in South Africa a few years ago. Will he take steps to have confirmed in their rank, attained in South Africa, those men who won that rank fairly on the field of battle?

Mr. MALONEY.—And whose rank is recognised by the Imperial authorities.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Hear, hear.

Mr. EWING.—I have the fullest sympathy with the desire of the honorable member, and I feel that any step of the kind to which he refers would meet with the approval of the House. The difficulty with regard to the matter, as I have explained previously, is this: On returning from South Africa, men who had won certain

positions of responsibility, after being subject to the best test that could be applied, were granted only honorary rank in Australia.

Mr. PAGE.—And yet they had full rank in the Imperial service! By Jove! that is re' hot!

Mr. EWING.—It was local rank to which they attained.

Mr. PAGE.—What better test could there be than that they had to endure on the battle field?

Mr. EWING.—I quite agree with the honorable member. It has appeared to me that these men, having passed the best of tests up to the rank which they hold—being placed by competent officers in the discharge of duties pertaining to those ranks—might well have been allowed to dispense with any further test. But their cases were decided several years ago.

Mr. MALONEY.—By Major-General Hutton.

Mr. EWING.—It was decided that the rank which they held on returning from South Africa could only be honorary rank. That decision has obtained from then till now. A number of the men in question have since passed the specified examination. A difficulty has therefore been created which it is hard to deal with. I have informed the House previously that I feel that it is in conformity with right and equity that their case should be considered. I will give further consideration to the matter. I do not care to say any more at present. It will be understood that in a large service like the military service—as in every other service—it is not possible to deal with individual instances on their own merits. We must have a general principle and must endeavour to treat all cases alike. I agree with the honorable member who has asked the question as to the general principle, and will endeavour to bring about the result which I am sure he desires.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—If equity and good conscience demand it, why not make a principle to fit these cases?

Mr. EWING.—I shall endeavour to deal with the matter as promptly as possible.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, SYDNEY.

Mr. J. H. CATTS asked the Treasurer, upon notice—

1. What was the amount paid to the New South Wales Government Printing Office for

printing the report of the Colonial Conference and the report of Mr. Beale in connexion with Patent Medicines, respectively?

2. What is the value of Commonwealth printing executed by the New South Wales Government Printing Office from 1st January to 31st October of the current year?

3. Is he aware that in many cases boys are engaged doing men's work in the Government Printing Office, Sydney?

4. Is he aware that a married man with a wife and two children and ten years' service, is being paid 25s. per week, and another, 30 years of age, with a large family and sixteen years' service, is in receipt of 35s. per week, and that in many instances wages are being paid which are not fair and reasonable?

5. Under such circumstances, will he consider the advisability of withholding any Commonwealth work from the Government Printing Office, Sydney, until the State Government see that existing sweating is abolished?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The Secretary to my Department has again written for an answer to these questions, and as soon as a reply has been received I shall be glad to put it before the honorable member. Perhaps it would be as well for him to repeat his question about four days hence.

LIGHT HORSE BRIGADE CAMP.

Mr. STORRER (for Mr. HARPER) asked the Minister of Defence, *upon notice*—

1. What was the attendance of the commissioned officers from each regiment in the Light Horse Brigade Camp, which concluded on the 8th inst.?

2. What was the total number of commissioned officers in each regiment?

3. What was the cost of the Brigade Camp?

4. Was the camp held during the shearing season?

5. Had commanding officers concerned reported in favour of the date selected for the camp? or, if not,

6. Had they been given an opportunity of doing so?

7. Does the Minister consider that it is keeping faith with the militia to prescribe an annual list of parades and training, with pay based on the number of parades attended, and then to deprive them of any pay for the twelfth month, with the result that a man, instead of serving 36 months, only serves 33—or serves 36, and is paid only for 33?

8. Is the Minister aware that the Light Horse Regiments are deprived of their Instructional Staff during June each year, as no travelling can be incurred during that month?

Mr. EWING.—The answers to the honorable member's questions are as follows—

1. No Light Horse Brigade Camp has been held since May last, but a voluntary School of Instruction, in accordance with Standing Orders, paragraphs 244 to 260, for officers and non-

commissioned officers of the 3rd Light Horse Brigade, was held at Seymour from the 29th October to the 8th November, inclusive.

Attendance of commissioned officers was as follows:—

7th Australian Light Horse Regiment ...	3
8th Australian Light Horse Regiment ...	3
9th Australian Light Horse Regiment ...	5

In addition, two officers, Instructional Staff, and one officer, 6th A.I. Regiment, attended.

2. The number of officers in each regiment is as under:—

7th Australian Light Horse Regiment ...	20
8th Australian Light Horse Regiment ...	18
9th Australian Light Horse Regiment ...	17

3. Cost of the voluntary School of Instruction, as set out in paragraph 1, was approximately £160. This includes cost for twenty-one N.C. officers and the "C" Instructional Cadre (24 men, 27 horses), and, in addition, the cost of railway transport for officers' and N.C.O.s' horses to and from the school, all allowances, rations, &c., also the return of the "C" Instructional Cadre to Melbourne by rail.

4. Some of the officers of the 3rd Light Horse Brigade might have been engaged in shearing during the currency of the school, but the time of holding the school was evidently justified by the numbers who attended, which were as many as could be individually instructed and supervised at one time as prescribed by Standing Orders. The number who attended was greater than at any previous Light Horse School.

5. No. See answer to 6.

6. Yes. The proposals for the school were published in District Orders some time prior to the date of holding it, and ample opportunity was thereby afforded to Commanding Officers to make any representations as to the date being unsuitable if they so desired, but none were made.

This school was first proposed to be held in September last, prior to the shearing season, but owing to the small numbers who signified their intention of attending, it was postponed until October.

The Commanding Officer, 3rd Light Horse Brigade, visited this school, and expressed himself as satisfied with everything in connexion with it.

7. I am informed it has been the custom, in order to comply with the instructions of the Treasury Department, that all accounts are to be settled before the 30th June of each year, not to hold parades during June, and to devote that month to the compilation of financial and other returns required to be rendered before the close of the financial year.

No hardship is involved by these arrangements. Ample opportunities are given to earn the maximum pay allowed, during the remaining eleven months, and no complaints have been received at District Headquarters regarding this matter.

No day parades are held in June owing to the short duration of daylight in that month.

8. Consequent upon (7) no parades being held during June, the Instructional Staff are employed during that month in supervising the preparation of the various returns referred to in (7).

Further inquiries will be made, and the matters referred to dealt with.

TARIFF.

In Committee of Ways and Means
(Consideration resumed from 25th November, *vide* page 6590):

Postponed item 159. Nails, viz. :—

- (A) Horse-shoe nails, per cwt. (General Tariff), 8s. 3d.; (United Kingdom), 7s. 6d.
- (B) Brads (including moulders' and glaziers'); Picture Nails; Rail-dogs or Brobs; Spikes; Staples n.e.i.; Tacks n.e.i.; Wire and other Nails n.e.i., per cwt. (General Tariff), 5s. 6d.; (United Kingdom), 5s.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney [11.25].—The duty on horseshoe nails is higher than was proposed under the original Kingston Tariff. When that Tariff was under consideration, the Committee decided, after a long debate, that there was no justification for the proposed duty, and reduced it from 7s. to 5s. per cwt. The Government now propose that the duty on horseshoe nails from the United Kingdom be 7s. 6d. per cwt., and that the imports from foreign countries shall be dutiable at 8s. 3d. per cwt. Those imposts are, to my mind, out of all proportion. Although it was said that the industry would be destroyed by the reduction of the duty from 7s. to 5s. per cwt., the evidence given before the Tariff Commission by the sole manufacturer in the Commonwealth, was that in a late year he had an output of 15,000 boxes, which constituted a record for him, and that additions had also been made to his factory. Thus even from the protectionist stand-point, the old rate of duty ought to be ample.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—What is the percentage?

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The former duty was equal to 20 per cent., whilst that now proposed is equivalent to 30 per cent. Import and other charges amount to 12 per cent., so that the total protection proposed to the industry is equal to about 42 per cent. The evidence of the one manufacturer of horseshoe nails in Australia was that he desired a duty in order that he might be able to increase the price, and that if he could raise his selling price by 2s. 6d. per cwt., or £2 10s. per ton, he would be satisfied. Such an increase would fall entirely upon the farriers of Australia, who would not be able to charge more than they do at present for shoeing.

Mr. WATKINS.—Are these nails made chiefly by machinery?

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Yes. In answer to question No. 68,852, the manufacturer, when before the Commission, said that he employed twenty hands, and were the whole of the horseshoe nails used in Australia locally made employment would be found for only from sixty to seventy men and boys. If an increase in the old duty is required, then the industry is not worth maintaining. I am satisfied, however, that, according to the evidence given before the Commission, the old rate of duty will be sufficient to support the industry. The local factory has been increased in size at least once since the imposition of the first Federal Tariff.

Mr. HUME COOK.—Not the nail-making part of the factory. This manufacturer produces other goods.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I can only say that, according to the evidence, the factory has been increased on five different occasions, and once since the imposition of the first Federal Tariff. It is very questionable whether we should increase the cost of these nails to all the users in Australia for the sake of so small an industry. It is doubtful whether even a duty of 5s. per cwt. is justifiable, but, recognising that the local manufacture is in existence and supplying about one-third, or a little more, of the horseshoe nails required in Australia, I, for one, would not go back upon it. Such an impost, however, is quite as much as the users of these nails should have to bear. I propose to move—

That, after the figures "8s. 3d.," paragraph A, the words, "and on and after 26th November, 1907, per cwt. (General Tariff), 5s.," be inserted.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [11.30].—I hope that honorable members will not agree to such an amendment. Honorable members will notice that we have practically adopted the recommendation of the protectionist section of the Tariff Commission.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—Its members constituted only one-half of the Commission.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I prefer to accept the recommendation of that section of the Commission whose members desire to protect local industries. Although the horseshoe nail industry is not a very large one, I would remind the honorable member for North Sydney that our annual imports under this heading total about 108,000 cwt. Why should not these nails be made in the Commonwealth from the product of our native ores? My own impression is that if

we adopt the recommendations of the A section of the Tariff Commission we shall probably induce another competitor to embark upon the industry, so that we shall not have to rely upon one firm. The moment that we impose a protective duty upon these articles, we shall practically manufacture the whole of the horseshoe nails used within Australia, because it will provide somebody with an opportunity to compete with the existing establishment and will thus prevent an increase in the price. I am informed that since the industry was started in the Commonwealth the average price of imported nails has been reduced from 11d. to 4½d. per lb. I trust that the Committee will agree to the Government proposal.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN (Indi) [11.33]. When the Manufactures Encouragement Bill was under consideration a few days ago, I mentioned that there is an establishment in South Melbourne which is in readiness to start manufacturing horseshoe nails and which does not desire the aid either of a bounty or a duty. The Treasurer was good enough to say that he would pay a visit of inspection to it.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I have not had time to do so.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—I am quite aware of that. I venture to say that the old duty of 5s. per cwt. upon horseshoe nails was ample to protect the industry.

Mr. HUME COOK.—It very nearly ruined it.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—I have not seen any evidence of its threatened ruin. In fact, I have not discovered any struggling industries except those which have been struggling for higher rates of duty.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [11.34].—The honorable member asked me the other day to go down to South Melbourne, and inspect some wonderful invention there. He gave as his reason for requesting me to do so the fact that the author of this invention would sell it to another Government if the Commonwealth did not purchase it. I have not seen the machine in question; but the honorable member described it as a wonderful piece of mechanism, which was capable of turning out horse shoes by the million.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—I did not blame the Treasurer.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I said to the honorable member, "If this gentleman has such a wonderful machine, and if he de-

sires the Government to keep it here, had he not better take some action in that regard?" The honorable member replied, "Oh, he will not run after the Government, but will sell his invention to some foreign Government." I then said, "If he thinks so little of his own country, let him do it."

Mr. FRAZER.—Is not the Treasurer referring to a machine for the manufacture of horseshoes, and not of horseshoe nails?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—But I presume that it will also produce horseshoe nails. If the gentleman in question has an invention, such as has been described, and if he desires to bull-doze the Government into buying it by threatening to take it elsewhere, I say that he had better dispose of it some where else.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN (Indi) [11.37].—The Treasurer has not told the Committee the whole story of this machine. I pointed out to him some days ago that the inventor had an objection to being interfered with by any new protection proposals—that he is a believer in personal enterprise. I may add that he employs about 130 men, to some of whom he pays as much as £9 per week. I took the Minister of Trade and Customs down to see the invention.

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—To inspect a machine for the manufacture of horseshoes.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—The Minister also saw the place where the horseshoe nails can be manufactured. I should like to see the duty retained at the old rate. When we reach item 171 I shall be glad to give the Committee some more information with reference to this matter.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH (Parkes) [11.38].—Yesterday we heard what subsequently proved to be a fairy story about a visit of the Treasurer to Woolloomooloo. He went there for the purpose of inspecting an industry—

The CHAIRMAN.—Order. The honorable member must not re-open that question.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—I do not propose to do so. I intend to connect my remarks with the item under consideration.

The CHAIRMAN.—If the honorable member is going to traverse the statements made by the Treasurer last evening, it is obvious that the Treasurer must reply, and that will cause a re-opening of the debate.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—You, sir, are anticipating my remarks a little. As an illustration of how little importance can be

attached to the Treasurer's statements, I propose to merely refer to the account which he gave us of his visit to Woollloomooloo. The Treasurer had previously given us one version of a visit which he was requested to pay to an establishment in South Melbourne. But he neglected to mention the matter until it was brought forward by the honorable member for Indi. He told us that the increased duty on nails was proposed because the industry could not succeed under the present duty. From what the honorable member for North Sydney has told the Committee it appears that a duty of 5s. per cwt. was deliberately arrived at in 1902 after a proposal to fix the duty at 7s. had been contended for. We do not wish to make of Australia a charitable institution for various invalid industries. I understand that even the most rabid protectionists desire merely to support these industries.

Mr. McDougall.—To give them a chance to support themselves.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—That is even better for my argument, because I propose to show that a duty of 5s. per cwt. has not only enabled those engaged in this industry to support themselves but to considerably increase their business. According to the statement of the honorable member for North Sydney, based upon evidence given before the Royal Commission, they are at present producing nearly one-third of the whole of the horseshoe nails used in Australia.

Mr. STORRER.—They commenced operations with a 14s. duty under the Victorian Tariff.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—I am not going back to antedeluvian times. Five years is a fair period within which to judge whether an industry is going to be a success. The present duty, with charges, is equal to 30 or 35 per cent.

Mr. HUME COOK.—Nonsense.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—I shall read the part of the Commission's report which shows that. It says—

The net cost f.o.b. in England of horseshoe nails is about £25 per ton.

Mr. HUME COOK.—No invoice can be produced to substantiate that.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—The honorable member should not go back upon his statement when he finds that mine can be supported.

Mr. HUME COOK.—It was the B section of the Tariff Commission who said that, and they knew nothing about it.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—The Minister of Trade and Customs just now referred to the A section as the Royal Commission, and the B section is at least entitled to claim to be described in the same way.

Mr. SALMON.—The honorable member is reading only an opinion. Is it evidence?

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—No, but it is based on evidence. The honorable member must be aware that I could read evidence on both sides with respect to all the items; and if I read the evidence from one side only he would say "What about the evidence on the other side"? I am trying to give the Committee the benefit of the Commission's conclusion as to what the existing duty amounts to, as explained by the evidence. The report says—

The net cost f.o.b. in England of horseshoe nails is about £25 per ton. The landed cost with all charges added is from £32 15s. to £34. The present duty amounts to 20 per cent. of the invoice price and the present duty and charges together amount to an increase on the English cost of from 30 to 35 per cent.

The honorable member for Laanecoorie asked me for the evidence, and this evidence will be found at page 2366 of the Tariff Commission's Report. On the 27th March, 1906, Benjamin George Paddle, manufacturers' representative, of 418 George-street, Sydney, sworn and examined, said—

The laid-down cost of imported horseshoe nails averages £34 per ton; and a similar assortment of Victorian nails would cost £42 per ton. Importing charges amount to from 30 per cent. to 35 per cent. on the invoice value; and if horse nails cannot be made properly under these circumstances, it would appear that the existence of such an industry was not justified.

I have noticed that the honorable member for Laanecoorie did not listen to the evidence which he asked me to read. I have now read not only the conclusion drawn by the B section of the Tariff Commission, but the evidence on which they based that conclusion. I have established the statement I made, and have shown that the B section of the Tariff Commission told the truth at least once, although their statements are regarded so sceptically by the honorable member for Laanecoorie. The existing duty of 5s. per cwt., with charges added, thus represents from 30 to 35 per cent. upon the invoice price. It is now proposed to raise the duty to 7s. 6d. per cwt., which with charges added would represent 45 or 50 per cent. on the invoice price. This Tariff is likely to remain in operation for some considerable time; and at the end of three years, when a duty on

iron is to be imposed, this industry will have the benefit of that duty and also of a duty on horseshoe nails, representing 45 or 50 per cent. I recognise that the Committee is, and has been, in the mood to pass reasonable duties. I do not propose to resist the inevitable, but every free-trader has cast upon him in these matters the duty of pointing out from time to time what is reasonable, because, while there may be some rabid protectionists in the Committee who are willing to put a Customs wall of the Chinese order round Australia, the majority are inclined to apply to these questions some degree of reason. If this industry has succeeded so well that those engaged in it have been able to considerably enlarge their establishments since 1902, with the advantage of a duty of 5s. per cwt., representing, with charges added, from 30 to 35 per cent., any reasonable and sane protectionist might ask why we should throw upon the owners and users of horses an obligation to pay 50 per cent. more duty upon their horseshoe nails than they have to pay at the present time. We have been told by the honorable member for Indi that, in addition to the establishment that has been shown to be succeeding so well, there is another in Melbourne, the proprietors of which deliberately say that they do not want any higher duty or any bounty.

Mr. HUME COOK.—They have never made a nail.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—The honorable member for Indi says that he invited the Treasurer to go to this factory. We know the ease with which the Treasurer went to another factory, and was so misled that he unconsciously misled this Committee as to the results of his visit.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I did not do anything of the sort. The honorable member persists in repeating misstatements.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—I cannot go into that question, because of the Chairman's ruling, but the Treasurer represented to the Committee that a machine in this building was an Australian machine.

The CHAIRMAN.—The honorable member must accept the Treasurer's statement.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—The honorable member for Indi not only invited the Treasurer to go to the factory, but actually took the Minister of Trade and Customs to it, and showed him not only horse shoes, but horse-shoe nails being produced.

Mr. HUME COOK.—He did not, because he could not. I will stake my reputation that they never made a nail there.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—The honorable member for Indi told us so in as plain terms as he could, and I believe him.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—Ask him if he saw the nails being made.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—I did not see the nails were being made. Everything was ready to make them.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—According to the honorable member for Indi, the machinery was there.

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—We saw the shoes being made, and they told us that they had the machinery for nail making.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—We remember how, on another occasion, after being told that certain things were being made, we were told that they were ready to be made at Woolloomooloo, and that was supposed to be a sufficient inducement to impose a duty, because the Minister said "They cannot make them until they have the duty."

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Who said that?

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—A Minister. I know that he will deny it, because he will contradict anything that I say. Do honorable members want us to raise the duty from 30 and 35 per cent. to 45 or 50 per cent., in face of the fact that there is a factory ready in Melbourne to make these nails? They are practically a domestic article. Being used by carters, cabmen, carriers and men in a hundred and one occupations, they are not a rich man's commodity. I ask the Committee therefore merely to balance the evidence. In view of what the honorable member for North Sydney said as to the progress the industry has made, how can we raise the duty from £5 to £7 10s. a ton?

Mr. HUTCHISON.—They will be able to undersell the imported article.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—They are now making only one-third of what is required in the Commonwealth. The honorable member for Hindmarsh is not one of those who wish to put up a sort of prohibitive wall, because he knows that one advantage about the importation of articles from great communities like Great Britain and the United States is that now and then the local producer gets hints as to improvements and machinery. If the honorable member for Hindmarsh believes that the existing duty has led to the increase of the industry up to the present, why should he support the sudden raising

of it, seeing that he is not one of those who desire prohibition? We, on this side, have already done some heroic things in the consideration of this Tariff, but all that we can do now is to put before the Committee what appear to be facts established by good authority and leave the Committee to do what is fair by the consumer, because we are not here merely to consider the manufacturer.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [11.54].—The bulk of the imported nails come through Germany from Norway and Sweden. A good quantity comes from the United Kingdom, but very few from America. The real trouble is that in Norway and Sweden there are peculiarly rich and valuable deposits of iron ore, eminently suitable for making steel. I venture to say, without knowing anything of the particulars, that it may be found on examination that the peculiar kind of ore found in that part of the world enables the people there to turn out a superior quality of iron for this purpose.

Mr. STORRER.—They are worse nails. The Australian nail is the best.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—That may or may not be the case. If it is, it is very strange that our own people, who get their livelihood by their use, do not seem to appreciate the fact.

Mr. STORRER.—They do.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I assure the honorable member for Bass that they do not, according to the evidence of the maker here. He alleges, as has been done many times before by Australian manufacturers, that it is simply owing to prejudice, and nothing else, that his nails do not come into general use. He told the Commission—

It would appear that the users in that State—New South Wales—

had become so accustomed to the imported nails and satisfied as to their quality that they were not prepared to do more than give the Victorian nail a trial. They did not to any extent give repeat orders, notwithstanding the inducement offered by a price lower than that charged under like conditions in Victoria.

It appears, therefore, that that man cuts the price in New South Wales, and yet they will not take his nails.

Mr. FULLER.—He cut the price lower in Tasmania, where he used to dump them.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—He adds—

Endeavours were made by the witness to deal direct with farriers by means of a traveller from the works and a local agent, but still the trade did not come, and the cost of distribution by that method was found to be too heavy.

Apparently, therefore, he has tried every conceivable plan to get the people in the other States to use his nails, and, for the most part, they still prefer those which come from Norway, Sweden, and Great Britain. Honorable members will see from the evidence that there really is a very substantial reason for the preference which is given to some nails over others. As a rule, there is no accounting for tastes, but in this case there appears to be a solid basis for the preference. It relates to the process by which the nails are manufactured. It seems there is a new process in the Old Country and on the Continent, known as the cold process, whereas in Australia, I understand, Mr. Pender simply employs the hot-forge method. There would seem, therefore, to be nothing more than preference or inclination of the users to account for the placing of orders sometimes in Australia and sometimes abroad.

Mr. HUME COOK.—The hot-forge method produces the superior nail.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I should like to know whether the Government Whip, even as a protectionist, would deprive people of the opportunity of obtaining a good article or from indulging their preference? Does the honorable member desire to shut out altogether nails made by the cold process? If so, where does the liberty of the buyer come in? We must not forget that there is only one nail-maker in Australia, Mr. Pender; and he told the Tariff Commission, in plain language, that he hoped to secure from the increased duty an additional profit of 2s. 6d. per cwt.

Mr. HUME COOK.—Not by increasing the price, but by getting increased trade.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Does the honorable member suggest that increased trade will give him an advantage of 2s. 6d. per cwt. in price?

Mr. HUME COOK.—There would be no additional cost for the factory or hands.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—At any rate, Mr. Pender was very frank with the Committee.

Mr. HUME COOK.—He was quite right in what he said.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—If Mr. Pender was quite right, what becomes of the honorable member's repeated statement that protection cheapens articles to the consumer?

Mr. COON.—So it does; and that has been the effect in the case of nails.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—From that I gather that the Australian manufacturer is to get a bigger price by selling his nails at a cheaper rate?

Mr. COON.—Let the honorable member read the evidence.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Mr. Pender told the Commission that he expected to get 2s. 6d. per cwt more. Where from?

Mr. HUME COOK.—Profit; a man can make 50 cwts. at a proportionately cheaper rate than he can make 1 cwt.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—But if purchasers be confined to the goods of one manufacturer, is the price likely to be made lower or higher? Has Mr. Pender some superior kind of human nature? Is he the one man in Australia who is prepared to make nails on purely philanthropic lines, or is he not likely to do what every other business man does, namely, get as much profit as the market will permit? At any rate, the fact remains that Mr. Pender makes only one-third of the nails consumed in Australia; and, clearly, if we increase the duty we shall increase the price of two-thirds of the nails which cannot be produced here, or which are not produced here at the present time.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—That is better.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK. — I should imagine that if a local manufacturer can meet one-third of the total requirements, there is room for competition. If I could see competition, there would not be so much to say, but there does not appear to be any on the horizon. Mr. Pender has all the local manufacture to himself, and if we put a ring fence around one man, then, as day follows night, the price will be increased to the consumer, there being no motive to so shape the manufactures as to meet the tastes and preferences of the people. If a man desires nails which have been made by the cold process no legislation under heaven ought to prevent him from obtaining them.

Mr. MATHEWS.—Not if he pays for them.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—But, at what rate? If the price be too high, the purchaser must sink his preference, and accept nails which he thinks are not suitable for his purpose. We have no right to interfere with purchasers in that way. This is not a matter of fiscalism—it goes beyond fiscalism. All we have a right to do is to so order our protective arrangements as to give the

purchaser a fair preference between one class of nails and another. It is significant that Mr. Pender could not be got to say one word about the wages cost of his production, and, so far as I can see, his evidence appears to have been that of a very unsatisfactory witness.

Mr. MATHEWS.—That is perhaps because Mr. Pender did not give evidence to suit the honorable member.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The honorable member for Melbourne Ports ought not to make a remark of that kind. Mr. Pender refused, as I have said, to give any evidence regarding the wages cost of his production, but he, at the same time, volunteered evidence as to the wages cost in other countries.

Mr. McDougall.—What is the use of a Royal Commission unless witnesses are compelled to give evidence?

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—A Royal Commission cannot compel a man to give evidence against his will. Of course, a witness, under such circumstances, may be fined or sent to gaol; but I apprehend that a Royal Commission takes a sensible course when the matter is not pressed. We know that in a Court of Law, when a man refuses to give evidence because he thinks it may injure his case, the fact is certainly not counted in his favour. The refusal of Mr. Pender is significant, in view of the fact that he was prepared to give evidence which was not wanted in regard to the wages cost elsewhere. He would not give the amount of work done on piece-work in Victoria, or any other data, on which the Commission might have arrived at the wages cost; but he went on to say that the labour cost in Canada, which is not a competing country, is 5s. 10d., as compared with 8s. 10d. in Victoria. Is not that absurd evidence? What did the Commission require to know about a non-competing country? No more unsatisfactory evidence could have been furnished to the Commission by any man; and, therefore, I think that Mr. Pender's statements then made ought to be dismissed. There is already a substantial protective duty on horseshoe nails, and the duty, added to the cost of importation, is a very heavy imposition. Under the circumstances, the only local manufacturer ought to be able to compete; and an increased duty would only inflict an unnecessary penalty on users throughout Australia.

Mr. SALMON (Laanecoorie) [12.9].—The honorable member for Parkes, when quoting from some documents, said that he

was reading evidence; and I challenged him on the point. For a long time, the honorable member would not give me any satisfaction.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—I gave the honorable member the page.

Mr. SALMON.—I asked whether the honorable member was reading evidence or a portion of the report of the Commission; and when I pressed the matter he appeared to be somewhat disturbed. I can assure the honorable member that all I desired to know was what document he was reading from.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—It would take a better man than the honorable member to disturb me!

Mr. SALMON.—Then I have been judging by appearances again, and may have been deceived. In reference to what was read by the honorable member, there are, in my opinion, a few brief sentences in the report of the A section of the Royal Commission which I think the Committee should hear. On page 27 of Progress Report, No. 9, section XVII., having reference to horseshoe nails, there is the following—

The Victorian manufacturer intimated that he was induced to leave Canada and start the industry in Victoria by the then existing duty of 12s. per cwt. That duty was increased in 1893 to 14s. per cwt., and remained in force until Federation took place. His business increased under the old Tariff, and his factory was enlarged four times. Under that Tariff prices had been as low to the consumer in Victoria as elsewhere; but they were higher than the rates now ruling.

He asserted that the present low duty of 5s. per cwt. had so affected the industry that one-fifth of his nail-making plant had never been started. Although he had not lost trade, he had reduced his price list on two occasions, amounting in all to 1½d. per lb., and his profits had been thereby reduced by about 1d. a lb. According to the statement of the witness, it was owing to the assurance of the first Prime Minister of the Commonwealth that he would favour raising revenue without destroying local industries, that the witness enlarged his buildings, plant, &c., to nearly double their former proportions.

Surely the honorable member for Parkes believes in a man getting interest upon his capital?

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—Hear, hear.

Mr. SALMON.—In regard to the price of nails, Mr. John Pender gave the following evidence, reported on page 2364—

69220. If this protective duty which you ask for is put on, would the price of nails in Australia for the consumer then be at the lowest down-cellar price?—They would to a very great extent.

69221. Now, what do you mean by a very great extent?—I mean this: At the present time we are not making fair interest on our capital. We require a little more profit than we are getting. If we can, by increasing the manufacture, reduce our cost, we are prepared to guarantee the consumer those prices, provided we have the market.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK. — Does he define what fair interest is?

Mr. SALMON.—No.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Does he say what the cost of labour is?

Mr. SALMON.—I know that no honorable member who has anything to do with manufacturing could view with equanimity the fact that four-fifths of his plant was lying idle, or assert that in such circumstances he was making interest on his money, especially when he was selling his product at a lower price than that of the imported article.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I should say at once that he had made a very serious mistake somewhere.

Mr. SALMON.—The honorable member for Parkes has made an appeal, not on behalf of the "poor widow," but on behalf of the poor people of Australia.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—I made no appeal, but endeavoured to bring a little logic to bear upon honorable members.

Mr. SALMON.—The honorable member made an appeal on behalf of the poor people of Australia, whom he was attempting to defend.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—I did not say so. I said that the duty on horse-shoe nails would fall more on the poorer classes than on the rich. I did not talk about the poor man at all.

Mr. SALMON.—The honorable member referred to the duty falling on the poorer classes; he would not, apparently, call them men. I shall use the same term. It is on the poorer classes of Australia he says that the duty will fall. Any one who has had anything to do with horses which are doing hard work knows that they require to be shod once a month. Will the honorable member be astonished when I tell him that a horse can be shod twelve times in a year, and that the horse-shoe nails will not cost more than 2s. 6d.? Where, then, comes in the plea of the honorable member, which has been made so pathetically on behalf of the poorer classes? With regard to the importation of horse-shoe nails, I want honorable members to realize that since the last Tariff was

framed, the importation has materially increased, notwithstanding the fact that the local manufacturer is selling his horse-shoe nails at a lower price than that at which the imported article can be bought.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—But under the late Tariff the manufacturer has increased his output.

Mr. SALMON.—The honorable member knows that prior to Federation the local manufacturer's output was for only Victoria, but that under the late Tariff it was for all Australia.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—No; for years he exported the nails successfully.

Mr. FULLER.—He exported nails to Tasmania and New South Wales.

Mr. SALMON.—He did not export a great quantity. We know that previous to Federation nearly the whole of his output was absorbed by Victoria, and the increase since that event is, of course, due to the fact that he has a market throughout Australia.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—He would not sell if the market were not profitable.

Mr. SALMON.—The honorable member, with his commercial knowledge and experience, knows that a great many persons sell considerable quantities of goods at a loss.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—Dumping. That is what he did in the case of Tasmania.

Mr. SALMON.—How can a man dump in his own country? We do not call it dumping when a man sells his goods in his own country.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—Not when it suits the honorable member. When the manufacture comes from other countries it is called dumping.

Mr. SALMON.—I do not think that the honorable member, who has marvellous capacity for twisting words and sentences, will assert that the term "dumping" can be applied to goods which are placed on the market in the country of origin.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—But it is.

Mr. SALMON.—The honorable member apparently does not want to hear the figures. In 1902 Australia imported 6,511 cwt. of horse-shoe nails. The quantity increased until in 1906 we imported 7,809 cwt. The average value of these goods in 1902 was 35s. per cwt., and in 1906, 31s. 3d.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—And the local manufacturer says that his own production increased, too.

Mr. SALMON.—That production was due entirely to internal competition. I feel sure that had the local manufacturer not been in existence we should have had to pay the old price for horse-shoe nails.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—But he said that his own production went up at the same time.

Mr. SALMON.—With regard to the price to the poorer classes, about whom the honorable member is so solicitous, in 1903 it was 9½d., and in 1905 it was reduced to 4½d., which, of course, is a very substantial reduction.

Mr. McDUGALL.—Prior to Federation horse-shoe nails were sold at 1s. 2d. per lb.

Mr. SALMON.—Mr. Pender gave the following evidence as reported on page 2365—

69276. Do you remember what was the price paid for horse-shoe nails before you commenced to manufacture?—The common price that was charged for horse-shoe nails, when we started, to manufacture, was 1s. and 1s. 2d. per lb.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Has not the price gone down all over the world?

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—How long is it since the price was 1s. 2d. per lb.?

Mr. SALMON.—It is not stated in the evidence, but that was the price before Mr. Pender commenced to manufacture. It is realized by those who have anything to do with the metal trades or trades involving the use of metals that the price of raw material has increased materially during the last five years. The horse-shoe nail industry was started in Victoria under a duty much higher than that which is now proposed, and carried on with a certain amount of success for a considerable period.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Then why propose to coddle it now?

Mr. SALMON.—When a man has erected an up-to-date plant under a distinct promise from a Prime Minister of the Commonwealth, and had four-fifths of that plant lying idle since the day it was erected, does the honorable member call it coddling the industry to give that man an opportunity to put into operation the whole of his plant and thus employ labour, especially when he is our only defence against monopolists on the other side of the world. He is the only one who has kept down, and is capable of keeping down, the price.

Mr. LIDDELL.—It must be a miserable industry if it can support only one man.

Mr. SALMON.—Surely the honorable member would not apply an argument of that sort to any industry or any calling?

Mr. LIDDELL.—Of course I would.

Mr. SALMON.—There are many towns that would support only one medical man, but I am sure that the honorable member for that reason would not call them miserable towns. Surely the fact that this industry is run by one man and in one State should not weigh with honorable members. The fact that it is capable of producing all that we require is what should weigh with them, especially when we know that the article will be produced not at a price higher than that which we now pay but, if there is any alteration, at a lower price.

Mr. FULLER (Illawarra) [12.22].—I have been wondering at the amount of heat imported into this debate by the honorable member for Laanecoorie, and also at the assertive bumptiousness—I can characterize it in no other way—of the Government whip. I have been puzzled to know in what Victorian constituency Mr. Pender's nail factory is located. It is a remarkable thing that those who agree with us that, at the outside, the industry employs only twenty men, including five boys, talk heatedly and excitedly in support of this excessive duty, whereas, when the Treasurer is imposing heavy duties on the backs of the masses they sit silently in their places and vote with the Government without a word to say on behalf of the people. It is disgraceful conduct on the part of those honorable members. I wish to correct one or two statements which have been made. When a manufacturer asks the members of a Royal Commission to believe that his industry is in a strangled condition, that unless he is able to secure the higher duty which he asks for he will be ruined, it is only fair that they should be supplied by him with all possible information in connexion with his position. When Mr. Pender came before the Tariff Commission he refused to state the cost of his raw material, the cost of labour and the other charges in producing a ton of horse-shoe nails. I consider that honorable members are entitled to know the exact position of this manufacturer before they should be asked to grant him this excessive rate of duty, amounting to 50 per cent.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—I notice that the honorable member for Laanecoorie does not listen to the arguments on the other side.

Mr. FULLER.—No; the honorable member for Laanecoorie replied to an interjection about dumping by this Melbourne manufacturer. I feel satisfied that there is not a representative of Tasmania

who does not know that for years and years Mr. Pender, after paying freight and all expenses, sold his nails in that State at a rate very much less than that which he charged in Victoria.

Mr. SALMON.—Does he do that now?

Mr. FULLER.—The people of Victoria were paying a very much higher rate for his nails than were the people of Tasmania. In New South Wales he was selling his nails at a reduced rate, but not at such a reduced rate as he charged to people in Tasmania. That is why the honorable member for Bass is so appreciative of the horse-shoe nail industry. He says that in Tasmania the people appreciate Mr. Pender's horse-shoe nails.

Mr. STORRER.—That statement is not correct.

Mr. FULLER.—And the reason is because he lets the Tasmanians have the nails at a reduced rate.

Mr. STORRER.—That is not so.

Mr. FULLER.—It is of no use for the honorable member to say that it is not so, because what I say is correct. The honorable member for Bourke, with a cheap sneer at the free-trade members of the Tariff Commission, said that we did not base our report on facts, and he challenged the honorable member for Parkes to produce an invoice to show that the charges on imported nails amounted to from 30 to 35 per cent.

Mr. HUME COOK.—I said that the Commission did not get at the facts in regard to the matter of 25s. per cwt. f.o.b.

Mr. FULLER.—It did; and, in addition to that, we had produced before the Tariff Commission an original invoice by Mr. Rupert Clarke, manager for Messrs. Holdsworth, Macpherson, and Company, of Sydney. In the course of his examination I put certain questions to him, the answers to which show clearly that the charges connected with the importation of nails into New South Wales amount to the percentage stated in the report of the free-trade section of the Commission. The original invoice is copied in the evidence of the witness. I assume that the honorable member for Bourke, and the honorable member for Laanecoorie, have not taken the trouble to read that evidence.

Mr. SALMON.—I never said a word about that.

Mr. FULLER.—It is a great pity that the honorable member should pick out little bits of evidence to suit his own purpose

in bolstering up a certain factory in Melbourne, whilst he will not pay any attention to other parts of the evidence which clearly show that under the old Federal Tariff the manufacturer in question has been enjoying very great advantages.

Mr. SALMON.—The honorable member is making a great mistake about the price of nails in Tasmania. If he looks at page 2351 of the evidence he will find that.

Mr. FULLER.—I propose to quote from the evidence to substantiate the position of free-trade members of the Commission, and that of the honorable member for Parkes. I quote from the evidence at page 2373, question 83742.

Can you tell us what the freight is on the importation of a ton of nails from London to Melbourne?—When I said that we principally imported Hamilton nails, I ought to say that we also import Globe and Capewell nails, both of which are of English make.

Do you import those in large quantities?—Yes.

Can you tell us what the freight and other charges are on a ton of those nails from London to Sydney?—I refer to some figures that were given in the *Sydney Evening News* and the *Telegraph* on the matter—figures which were set out in the *Evening News* on 9th February, and I find they are practically correct. I have an original invoice here from London, showing that the figures are substantially correct.

Have you any objection to our seeing that invoice?—Not the slightest, although I do not think it ought to be published in the newspapers. The invoice, which is dated London, 27th October, 1905, and was sent to our London house, is as follows:—

I do not propose to weary the Committee by reading the items in the invoice. It simply shows that the maximum discount for large quantities is 70 per cent. and 5 per cent. The invoice shows a net London cost of £24 11s. 9d., which is half the quantity booked. The cost here would be about £32 15s. The evidence goes on:—

Does that include freight and insurance?—Yes.

And what else?—Wharfage, duty, cartage, and exchange.

How much per cent. does that come to on the invoiced cost?—Practically between 30 and 35 per cent.

That was under the old duty. So that the position of the one nail manufacturer of Victoria was that in addition to the duty he had this protection in connexion with freight, charges and insurance of 33½ per cent. I remind honorable members that Mr. Rupert Clarke is well known to be one of the most experienced business men in the city of Sydney. I point out further that for years and years the local firm has

exported nails, not only to Tasmania and New South Wales, but also to New Zealand; they are at the present time, and have been ever since the Federal Tariff came into existence, exporting nails to New Zealand, where they pay duty and sell in competition with nails imported from other parts of the world.

Mr. SALMON.—Did the honorable member read Mr. Rupert Clarke's statement that he had not worked out the figures exactly?

Mr. FULLER.—His statement was:—

I would point out that I have not worked out these figures exactly, having received notice to attend only last night.

The members of the Commission did work them out exactly, in order that we might justify our position before we made a recommendation. The evidence of other witnesses whose names appear in other parts of the report shows that the natural protection varies from 30 to 35 per cent. So that speaking generally we can say that it amounts to about 33½ per cent. It is perfectly clear that the want of success of Mr. Pender, in New South Wales, is due to the fact that people who have tried his nails there, in many instances, came to the conclusion that it was better for them, in their own interest, to pay a higher price for imported nails than to use Mr. Pender's. Though Mr. Pender went to all sorts of trouble, taking orders direct from various small blacksmiths throughout New South Wales, many of them did not repeat their orders to him. They found that it paid them very much better to use imported nails.

Mr. HUGHES.—How many factories are there in Australia?

Mr. FULLER.—One, employing at the time this evidence was taken twenty hands, of whom five were boys. Something has been said in relation to dumping. Absolutely no dumping was proved in connexion with this industry before the Commission, although statements were made to that effect. There was no specific case of nails being dumped in Australia with the object of wiping out the local industry.

Mr. MAHON.—Would it not be difficult to prove in any case?

Mr. FULLER.—We were not able to get from Mr. Pender a statement of the cost of raw material or of the wages paid by him. But he went out of his way to quote the wages paid in Canada, from which country there is no competition. One

would have thought that when he came before a Commission he would have been able to give information about the hours of labour and the wages paid in Sweden, Norway and Great Britain, from which the principal competition comes. But instead of that he was able only to give us facts about Canada, from which no horse-shoe nails were imported.

Mr. STORRER.—He came from Canada, and knew the conditions there.

Mr. FULLER. — One would have thought that he would know the conditions in countries that were competing with him.

Mr. McDougall.—What are the labour conditions in Scandinavia?

Mr. FULLER.—I do not know. But if I were engaged in a business and came before a Royal Commission asking for higher duties, I should set myself to master the facts as to the industry in competing countries. It shows how gullible some people thought the members of the Commission were when it was expected that we should be prepared to swallow evidence of this character. The fact is that some years ago a Tariff Commission sat in Victoria, and all that manufacturers had then to do was to attend before it, and make out a sorrowful tale. No questions were asked, and the duties were readily granted. But we on the Federal Tariff Commission were very dubious about the claims of some manufacturers. Witnesses were submitted to rigid cross-examination. I think we were absolutely justified in doing that. It was our business to ascertain the exact position in which manufacturers stood. In a case like this where a manufacturer refused to give us the necessary particulars in connexion with his industry—to tell us what his wages were, and what the cost of material was—we were justified in being a little bit doubtful about his evidence. Of course, we had not only to consider the manufacturers who came before us, and who are only a small proportion of the people of Australia, but also the great consuming public of this Commonwealth. It was our business to see that, while we did a fair thing to the manufacturers, we allowed nothing unfair to be done to the people generally. We had to take into consideration how the great consuming public were being affected. I do not wish to repeat what has been said by other honorable members, but will refer the Committee to the report of the free-trade section of the Commission. I sub-

mit most respectfully to this Committee that there is no justification whatever for the proposed increase of duty. It has been clearly shown that Mr. Pender has increased his business largely since the Federal Tariff came into existence. At the present time he is the monopolistic nail manufacturer of Australia. Under these circumstances, I hope that the Committee will not increase the duty.

Mr. STORRER (Bass) [12.39].—I was rather surprised at the honorable member for Illawarra attacking me because I happened to interject that the Australian nail was the best. He said that it was because Tasmania got horse-shoe nails cheaper than Victoria did.

Mr. FULLER.—That is right.

Mr. STORRER.—I did not know that. But I have been in the habit of visiting blacksmiths' shops occasionally in different parts of Australia and seeing the nails used, and I have also kept horses for the last twenty-five years. Therefore, I know a little bit about this industry. In my opinion the Australian nail is better than the imported nail. I was at a blacksmith's shop in Victoria a few weeks ago. He showed me two nails, and said, "Which of those two is the better?" I picked out the one which I thought the better, and he said, "That is an Australian-made nail." He showed me different nails in different cases.

Mr. FULLER.—What was the brand on the other one? Much depends upon the brand.

Mr. STORRER.—I do not remember. The statement that Tasmania is now getting her horse-shoe nails cheaper than she did before is not borne out by the facts. I would remind the Committee that the local manufacturer experiences great difficulty as compared with the importer in distributing his nails. In various parts of Australia blacksmiths enter into agreements with iron-mongers to supply them with iron and nails, and in many cases to give them three, six, or twelve months' credit. A man who has only one article to sell is thus placed at a disadvantage. When the States decided to federate it was determined that public servants, on their transfer to the Commonwealth, should lose none of their existing or accruing rights, and I think we should also take care that the manufacturers and the people of Australia generally do not suffer as the result of the union. I do not know the local nail manufacturer, but according to his own statement he was

induced to set up business in Victoria by the fact that there was in operation a duty of 12s. per cwt. That duty was subsequently increased to 14s. per cwt., and he was able to do a flourishing business. It was only because by means of that Tariff he had built up a business on a sure foundation that he was able to carry on when the duty was reduced under the Federal Tariff to 5s. per cwt.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—What about the rights of the people in those States where no duty prevailed on horse-shoe nails?

Mr. STORRER.—I do not suppose that this increased duty will add one 6d. per annum to the cost of shoeing a horse; but, on the other hand, it means a great deal to the one manufacturer of horse-shoe nails in Australia, a large proportion of whose machinery remained idle during the operation of the old duty.

Mr. LIDDELL (Hunter) [12.44].—The honorable member for Bass has told us that when he enters a blacksmith's shop he uses his powers of observation and compares the imported with the locally produced horse-shoe nails. He says, however, that he does not know the local manufacturer. Had he made better use of his powers of observation and his reasoning faculties during this debate he would have learned a good deal of the industry. When I entered the House this morning I did not know the name of the manufacturer, but I have gathered from the debate that he is evidently a Scotchman, since his name is Pender, that he is a Victorian manufacturer who gave evidence before the Tariff Commission, and that he is evidently biased. His interests are being supported by two honorable members who happen to be his representatives.

Mr. SALMON.—His factory is 150 miles from my constituency.

Mr. LIDDELL.—The honorable member for Laanecoorie talks about this unfortunate man having to sell his nails at a loss. That statement reminds me of the story of the Hebrew gentleman who, when serving a young woman with a small quantity of merchandise, assured her that he was practically letting her have the goods below cost. When she inquired how he managed in the circumstances to live, he replied that he got a little profit on the string which he used to tie up the parcel. It has been said that so far as this Tariff is concerned the free-trade party have no "sand" in them; I think we have shown, in dealing

with this item, that we can put up a good fight. The report of the protectionist section of the Tariff Commission states that—

A Victorian witness, who informed your Commission that he was the only horseshoe nail manufacturer south of the Equator, complained that importers—

apparently all Victorian manufacturers so complain—

had great facilities under the Commonwealth Tariff, to the detriment of his business. Although his output had not been materially affected, the imported article is admitted under such favorable conditions, as he had been compelled to cut down prices to the extent of 1½d. per lb.

This shows that it is the competition of the importers, and not the establishment of a local factory, that has kept down prices. Surely that is one of the strongest arguments we could have in favour of free-trade. For the sake of this paltry industry, employing only twenty hands, the whole Commonwealth is to be taxed. The sound of the blacksmith's hammer is to be heard in every village, and, in opposing this duty, I am speaking, not for one individual, but for thousands of men whose interests I have at heart.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [12.53].—I move—

That, after the figures "8s. 3d.," paragraph A, the words, "and on and after 26th November, 1907, per cwt. (General Tariff), 6s.," be inserted.

If this amendment be carried I shall move that the duty, in the case of imports from the United Kingdom, be 5s. per cwt. I think that my proposal should, to some extent, meet the views of honorable members opposite.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [12.54].—I hope that the amendment will be rejected. The very lowest duty that we should impose is 7s. 6d. per cwt., but if honorable members wish to grant a preference to Great Britain, that suggested by the Government is a fair and reasonable one.

Question—That after the figures "8s. 3d.," paragraph A, the words "and on and after 26th November, 1907, per cwt. (General Tariff) 6s.," be inserted—put. The Committee divided.

Ayes	13
Noes	39

Majority

AYES.

Archer, E. W.	Poynton, A.
Brown, Tilley	Smith, Bruce
Brown, Thomas	Thomson, Dugald
Cook, Joseph	Wilks, W. H.
Edwards, R.	<i>Tellers:</i>
Liddell, F.	Fuller, G. W.
McWilliams, W. J.	Johnson, W. E.

NOES.

Bamford, F. W.	Mathews, J.
Carr, E. S.	Mauger, S.
Catts, J. H.	McDougall, J. K.
Chanter, J. M.	O'Malley, King
Chapman, Austin	Page, J.
Coon, J.	Palmer, A. C.
Ewing, T. T.	Quick, Sir John
Fairbairn, G.	Salmon, C. C.
Forrest, Sir John	Spence, W. G.
Groom, L. E.	Storror, D.
Harper, R.	Thomas, J.
Hedges, W. N.	Thomson, John
Hutchison, J.	Tudor, F. G.
Irvine, Hans	Watkins, D.
Irvine, W. H.	Wilson, J. G.
Knox, W.	Wise, G. H.
Livingston, J.	Wynne, A.
Lyne, Sir William	<i>Tellers:</i>
Mahon, H.	Cook, Hume
Maloney, W. R. N.	Frazer, C. E.

PAIRS.

Bowden, E. K.	Webster, W.
Glynn, P. McM.	Crouch, R. A.
Willis, Henry	Foster, F. J.
Fowler, J. M.	Deakin, A.
Reid, G. H.	Hall, D. R.
Fysh, Sir Philip	Foxton, Colonel
Kelly, W. H.	Kingston, C. C.
Hughes, W. M.	Watson, J. C.

Question so resolved in the negative.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. WILKS (Dalley) [12.55].—I move—

That after the figures "8s. 3d.," paragraph A, the words "and on and after 26th November, 1907, per cwt. (General Tariff), 7s.," be inserted.

If this amendment be carried I shall subsequently move in favour of fixing the duty for the United Kingdom at 6s. per cwt. A little while ago, when an industry in New South Wales in which only one man was interested was under consideration, the honorable member for Flinders warned us that we ought to look very carefully into the matter. But we have heard no such warning from him in reference to the horse-shoe nail industry in which only one man is interested, and it is somewhat significant that this is a Victorian industry. A duty of 7s. per cwt. would represent an increase of about 40 per cent. upon the rate operative under the old Tariff. Surely such an increase ought to at even for a Victorian industry.

Question put. The Committee divided.

Ayes	14
Noes	36
Majority	22

AYES.

Archer, E. W.	Smith, Bruce
Brown, Thomas	Thomson, Dugald
Cook, Joseph	Wilks, W. H.
Edwards, R.	Wilson, J. G.
Fuller, G. W.	<i>Tellers:</i>
Mahon, H.	Johnson, W. E.
McWilliams, W. J.	Liddell, F.
Poynton, A.	

NOES.

Bamford, F. W.	Mathews, J.
Carr, E. S.	Mauger, S.
Catts, J. H.	McDougall, J. K.
Chanter, J. M.	O'Malley, King
Chapman, Austin	Page, J.
Coon, J.	Palmer, A. C.
Ewing, T. T.	Quick, Sir John
Fairbairn, G.	Salmon, C. C.
Forrest, Sir John	Spence, W. G.
Frazer, C. E.	Storror, D.
Groom, L. E.	Thomson, John
Harper, R.	Tudor, F. G.
Hedges, W. N.	Watkins, D.
Irvine, Hans	Wise, G. H.
Irvine, W. H.	Wynne, A.
Knox, W.	<i>Tellers:</i>
Livingston, J.	Cook, Hume
Lyne, Sir William	Hutchison, J.
Maloney, W. R. N.	

PAIRS.

Bowden, E. K.	Webster, W.
Glynn, P. McM.	Crouch, R. A.
Fowler, J. M.	Deakin, A.
Fysh, Sir Philip	Foxton, Colonel
Reid, G. H.	Hall, D. R.
Hughes, W. M.	Watson, J. C.
Kelly, W. H.	Kingston, C. C.
Willis, Henry	Foster, F. J.

Question so resolved in the negative.

Amendment negatived.

Amendment (by Mr. JOSEPH COOK) put—

That, after the figures "8s. 3d.," paragraph A, the words "and on and after 26th November, 1907, per cwt. (General Tariff), 7s. 6d.," be inserted.

The Committee divided.

Ayes	20
Noes	30
Majority	10

AYES.

Archer, E. W.	McWilliams, W. J.
Brown, Thomas	Palmer, A. C.
Cook, Joseph	Poynton, A.
Edwards, R.	Smith, Bruce
Forrest, Sir John	Thomson, Dugald
Fuller, G. W.	Wilks, W. H.
Hedges, W. N.	Wilson, J. G.
Irvine, Hans	<i>Tellers:</i>
Irvine, W. H.	Johnson, W. E.
Knox, W.	Mahon, H.
Liddell, F.	

NOES.

Bamford, F. W.
Carr, E. S.
Catts, J. H.
Chanter, J. M.
Chapman, Austin
Coon, J.
Ewing, T. T.
Fairbairn, G.
Frazer, C. E.
Groom, L. E.
Harper, R.
Hutchison, J.
Livingston, J.
Lyne, Sir William
Maloney, W. R. N.
Mathews, J.

Mauger, S.
McDougall, J. K.
O'Malley, King
Page, J.
Quick, Sir John
Salmon, C. C.
Spence, W. G.
Storrer, D.
Thomson, John
Tudor, F. G.
Watkins, D.
Wynne, A.

Tellers:
Cook, Hume
Wise, G. H.

PAIRS.

Bowden, E. K.
Glynn, P. McM.
Fowler, J. M.
Willis, Henry
Fysh, Sir Philip
Reid, G. H.
Hughes, W. M.
Kelly, W. H.
Edwards, R.

Webster, W.
Crouch, R. A.
Deakin, A.
Foster, F. J.
Foxton, Colonel
Hall, D. R.
Watson, J. C.
Kingston, C. C.
Sampson, S.

Question so resolved in the negative.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. MAHON (Coolgardie) [1.10].—
The proposal of the Government involves
an increase of 50 per cent. upon the old
rate of duty. Personally, I think that
the duty under the general Tariff should
not exceed 8s., and, consequently, I
move—

That, after the figures "8s. 3d.," paragraph
A, the words "and on and after 26th Novem-
ber, 1907, per cwt. (General Tariff), 8s.," be
inserted.

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment (by Mr. JOSEPH COOK)
put—

That, after the figures "7s. 6d.," paragraph
A, the words "and on and after 26th Novem-
ber, 1907, per cwt. (United Kingdom), 7s.," be
inserted.

The Committee divided.

Ayes	16
Noes	34
Majority	18

AYES.

Archer, E. W.
Brown, Thomas
Cook, Joseph
Fuller, G. W.
Irvine, Hans
Liddell, F.
Mahon, H.
McWilliams, W. J.
Palmer, A. C.

Poynton, A.
Smith, Bruce
Thomson, Dugald
Wilks, W. H.
Wilson, J. G.

Tellers:
Brown, Tilley
Johnson, W. E.

NOES.

Bamford, F. W.
Carr, E. S.
Catts, J. H.
Chanter, J. M.
Chapman, Austin
Coon, J.
Ewing, T. T.
Fairbairn, G.
Forrest, Sir John
Frazer, C. E.
Groom, L. E.
Harper, R.
Hedges, W. N.
Hutchison, J.
Irvine, W. H.
Knox, W.
Livingston, J.
Lyne, Sir William

Maloney, W. R. N.
Mauger, S.
McDougall, J. K.
O'Malley, King
Page, J.
Quick, Sir John
Salmon, C. C.
Spence, W. G.
Storrer, D.
Thomson, John
Tudor, F. G.
Watkins, D.
Wise, G. H.
Wynne, A.

Tellers:
Cook, Hume
Mathews, J.

PAIRS.

Bowden, E. K.
Glynn, P. McM.
Fowler, J. M.
Willis, Henry
Fysh, Sir Philip
Reid, G. H.
Hughes, W. M.
Kelly, W. H.
Edwards, R.

Webster, W.
Crouch, R. A.
Deakin, A.
Foster, F. J.
Foxton, Colonel
Hall, D. R.
Watson, J. C.
Kingston, C. C.
Sampson, S.

Question so resolved in the negative.

Amendment negatived.

Amendment (by Mr. MAHON) put—

That, after the figures "7s. 6d.," paragraph
A, the words "and on and after 26th Novem-
ber, 1907, per cwt. (United Kingdom), 7s. 3d.,"
be inserted.

The Committee divided.

Ayes	19
Noes	31
Majority	12

AYES.

Archer, E. W.
Brown, Tilley
Brown, Thomas
Cook, Joseph
Forrest, Sir John
Hedges, W. N.
Irvine, Hans
Irvine, W. H.
Liddell, F.
Mahon, H.

McWilliams, W. J.
Palmer, A. C.
Poynton, A.
Smith, Bruce
Thomson, Dugald
Wilks, W. H.
Wilson, J. G.

Tellers:
Fuller, G. W.
Johnson, W. E.

NOES.

Carr, E. S.
Catts, J. H.
Chanter, J. M.
Chapman, Austin
Coon, J.
Ewing, T. T.
Fairbairn, G.
Frazer, C. E.
Groom, L. E.
Harper, R.
Hutchison, J.
Knox, W.
Livingston, J.
Lyne, Sir William
Maloney, W. R. N.
Mathews, J.

Mauger, S.
McDougall, J. K.
O'Malley, King
Page, J.
Quick, Sir John
Salmon, C. C.
Spence, W. G.
Storrer, D.
Thomson, John
Tudor, F. G.
Watkins, D.
Wise, G. H.
Wynne, A.

Tellers:
Bamford, F. W.
Cook, Hume

PAIRS.

Bowden, E. K.	Webster, W.
Glynn, P. McM.	Crouch, R. A.
Fowler, J. M.	Deakin, A.
Willis, Henry	Foster, F. J.
Fysh, Sir Phillip	Foxton, Colonel
Reid, G. H.	Hall, D. R.
Hughes, W. M.	Watson, J. C.
Kelly, W. H.	Kingston, C. C.
Edwards, R.	Sampson, S.

Question so resolved in the negative.

Amendment negatived.

Sitting suspended from 1.25 to 3 p.m.

Mr. JOHNSON (Lang) [3.0].—These duties, like many other high protective duties in the Tariff, have already led to the combination of local manufacturers for the purpose of increasing prices. I find that although the actual importations of the nails included in paragraph B from the United Kingdom increased between 1903 and 1906, the percentage of the British importations to the total importation decreased. In 1903 the importations from the United Kingdom were 22,752 cwt., about 28.3 per cent. of the total importations, which were 80,340 cwt., Germany sending 28,847 cwt., the United States of America 20,482 cwt., and all other countries 8,259 cwt. In 1906 the importations from Great Britain were 28,104 cwt., 25.8 per cent. of the total importations, which were 104,967 cwt., Germany sending 42,120 cwt., the United States of America 23,472 cwt., and all other countries 10,271 cwt. The exports from Australia, however, increased from 361 cwt. in 1903 to 720 cwt. in 1906, that is, they almost doubled themselves within three years. While in 1906 the importations were 104,967 cwt., the total output of eight factories was about 300,000 cwt.

Mr. TUDOR.—Where does the honorable member get those figures?

Mr. JOHNSON.—Mr. Gold, giving evidence before the Tariff Commission—page 2393—questions 69423-4—said—

Of the eight factories, one alone, by no means the largest, has an output of 50,000 cwt. a year. The total output of the local factories, therefore, is about 300,000 cwt., while the imports for 1906 were 104,000 cwt.

The local output is constantly increasing. The industry is carried on by the labour of men and youths who are more or less unskilled workers; but the number employed in it has more than doubled in the three years period with which I am dealing. According to the reports of the

Chief Inspector of Factories, appendix C, in 1903, there were employed in this industry forty-two adult males, at an average wage of £2 5s. 4d., and thirty-one boys and youths, at an average wage of 13s. 9d.; while, in 1906, 106 adult males were employed at an average wage of £2 1s. 6d.; and sixty-two boys and youths at an average wage of 14s. 5d. The total number of hands employed in 1903 was seventy-three, at an average wage of £1 11s. 11d., and in 1906, 168, at an average wage of £1 11s. 6d. It must be remembered, however, that these figures include those who are engaged in the manufacture of horse-shoe nails, who number twenty, all told. According to the evidence given before the Tariff Commission, the proposed duty is more than two and a half times as great as the labour cost of production. The labour cost of a ton of nails was stated in evidence to be from 36s. to 40s., or 16 per cent. on the total cost. That information was given by Mr. MacDougall—page 2381, questions 68480-5—and confirmed by a Sydney manufacturer, Mr. Hill, who said that his weekly wages were about £30, and his average monthly output between 50 and 60 tons. Mr. Gold, a Melbourne maker, put the wages cost at 14 per cent.—page 2393, question 69424. Mr. MacDougall, in the course of his evidence, stated that wire nails, on the average, cost local makers 12s. per cwt. Therefore the old duty of 3s. per cwt. was equivalent to 25 per cent. on the total cost, and over 50 per cent. above the wages cost, whereas the proposed duty of 5s. is equal to 41 per cent. of the total cost, and more than two and a half times the labour cost. It has been stated that the object of protective duties like these is to create local competition which will reduce prices; but the manufacturers are striving to have the rates made so high that they will have a practical monopoly of the local trade, although, at present, they have about two-thirds of it. One of the reasons why they asked for an increase of rates was that they wished to increase prices, because, they alleged, the present prices are not sufficiently profitable. Yet the old duty was admitted to be equivalent to 40 per cent. on the invoiced cost of American nails, and the proposed duty will be 63 per cent. That was stated in evidence by Mr. Hill, page 2398, question 87143, and Mr. MacDougall admitted—question 68540—that the effect of the higher duty

would be to increase prices. Therefore, in spite of what honorable members opposite say about the effect of duties in reducing prices, here is evidence, not only that they really result in increasing prices, but that one of the objects sought by the local manufacturers in asking for the duty is to enable them to raise prices. We have in evidence the sworn statement of interested protectionist manufacturers that they ask for higher duties to enable them to increase their prices, because the present prices are not sufficiently remunerative. There is a combine among local manufacturers in this, as well as in other protected industries, whereby the consumers are put at their mercy, and the reduction of prices is prevented. Mr. MacDougall stated in evidence that such a combine exists, and that the makers agree to sell at the same prices, each having allotted to him a certain proportion of the trade. When they know that these combines do exist, and that the persons engaged in these manufactures are engaged in a conspiracy in restraint of trade, to prevent the consumers getting the articles they require at a lower price, I wish to know how it is that some steps have not been taken by the Government to put in force the provisions of an Act, which we spent some time in passing, for the purpose of preventing conspiracies of this kind. I suppose that when that legislation was before the House those responsible for it had in mind only importers and those outside the Commonwealth engaged in sending goods to this country.

Mr. WATSON.—What has this to do with nails?

Mr. JOHNSON.—It has everything to do with nails, because I have pointed out that it was sworn in evidence that there is a combine in the nail manufacturing industry. If we have any right to object to outside combines in restraint of trade, we should certainly see that there are no similar combines formed within the Commonwealth. Local combines are really the most dangerous, because they are given a practical monopoly of the Australian market, and being relieved of outside competition, can put their prices up to whatever figure they like. With a knowledge of these facts, which must be as well known to the Treasurer and other members of the Government as they are to other people, I ask why the Govern-

ment do not put in force the provisions of the law we have passed for the purpose of suppressing combines.

The CHAIRMAN.—Order. The honorable member should not enter upon a general discussion of combines.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Nor do I propose to do so. Am I to understand, sir, that in objecting to the duties proposed in this case, I am not at liberty to give, as a reason for my objection, that in this industry a combine has been formed, which already has a monopoly of the market, and is keeping up the price to the consumer?

The CHAIRMAN.—The honorable member was going beyond that. He was discussing certain legislation passed by this Parliament, and asking why the Government did not take certain action. That was going beyond the incidental reference to the subject which the honorable member was entitled to make.

Mr. JOHNSON.—The Committee are, I think, entitled to some information when the Treasurer comes down with a proposal for an increased duty, knowing that this combine is in existence.

The CHAIRMAN.—The question before the Committee is not whether a combine exists, but whether the duty proposed should be agreed to.

Mr. FULLER.—I submit, in connexion with this matter, that when it is definitely stated by the honorable member for Lang, and has been clearly proved by the evidence submitted to the Tariff Commission, that an arrangement or a combine is in existence between the principal makers of these goods in Australia to regulate prices in the industry, the honorable member is justified in referring to the fact in commenting upon it, and in showing that the combine is fleecing the public in the way referred to.

The CHAIRMAN.—The honorable member would be quite in order in referring to those facts, but he would not be in order in discussing the question of combines generally.

Mr. FULLER.—Not this special combine?

The CHAIRMAN.—If the honorable member were allowed, even in connexion with the special combine referred to, to enter upon an elaborate argument, I should have to allow the question of combines generally to be discussed, and we should lose sight of the item altogether.

Mr. JOHNSON.—I have no intention to traverse the general question of combines, or to say whether they are right or wrong. I wished merely to direct the attention of the Treasurer to the fact that we have passed legislation to prevent the operation of combines acting in restraint of trade, and that there is a combine in connexion with this particular industry whose operations are injurious to the public. I put that forward as one of my objections to the proposed increase of duty. I have no wish to enable the combine in this industry to be more injurious to the public by becoming more firmly entrenched in the monopoly which it at present enjoys. For the reasons I have given, I move—

That, after the figures "5s. 6d.," paragraph B, the words "and on and after 27th November, 1907, per cwt. (General Tariff), 3s. 6d.," be inserted.

It is my intention, should the amendment be passed, to move that the duty be 3s. on imports from the United Kingdom.

Mr. HEDGES (Fremantle) [3.21].—I do not complain of the inclusion in this item of such articles as picture nails, tacks, and wire nails, or that they should be dutiable at the rates proposed; but I think it is not fair to include in the same item such articles as bridge spikes and rail-dogs. I point out that several packets of tacks might be made from the material in one bridge spike or rail-dog. In the circumstances, it is almost ridiculous to propose that the same duty should be imposed on bridge spikes and rail-dogs as on tacks and picture nails. I wish to move, as an amendment, the omission of the words "rail-dogs or brobs, spikes," with a view to moving the insertion of the following new item—

Rail-dogs or brobs, and spikes, per cwt. (General Tariff), 3s. 3d.; (United Kingdom), 3s.

Amendment (Mr. JOHNSON's), by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment (by Mr. HEDGES) proposed—

That the words "rail-dogs or brobs; spikes," be left out.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [3.25].—I do not rise to oppose the amendment submitted by the honorable member for Fremantle, but to point out that while there may be justification for the amendment, there is certainly justification for a reduction of the proposed duty on the whole line of goods included in this item. It does not stand on the same footing as the item with which

we have just dealt. In connexion with the last item there was only one maker, and it was difficult, if not impossible, to obtain information as to what profit he was making. There are many makers of wire nails. There are at least eight factories in the Commonwealth, and there is evidence that they employ at the present time nearly three times the number of hands engaged in the industry when the 1902 Tariff was passed. That is evidence that the industry is successful, and is paying under the duty imposed by the last Tariff. As a matter of fact, since the last Tariff came into operation, two factories have been started in New South Wales.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—And the owners of both are complaining. At least one of them came to me as a deputation, complaining that importers were dumping wire nails from Germany at a lower price than that at which the local manufacturers can import the material to make the articles in Australia.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON. — The Treasurer speaks as if a request from a manufacturer for an increased duty were a proof that the increase is necessary. With the present Government, it is altogether too much a case of "Ask and ye shall receive." Apparently no inquiry is made, the Treasurer does not require to be satisfied as to the real need for an increased duty, and it is sufficient merely that a request for an increase should be made. Two factories were started in New South Wales since the Tariff of 1902 was imposed, and another is just about to be started. One was started in South Australia under the same Tariff, and one is about to be started in Western Australia. That is pretty good evidence that profits are being made in the industry. I have a balance-sheet here—and I believe it is not by any means the best that could be shown in the industry—which shows that one concern engaged partly in the manufacture of wire nails and partly in the manufacture of barbed wire, made a profit of £2,092 on a capital of £12,250. That represents a profit of over 16 per cent.

Mr. TUDOR.—What is the name of the company?

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I do not care to mention names. The honorable member can see the balance-sheet if he wishes. I think that the names of companies and individuals are mentioned too freely in this Chamber. The rush of

people into this business is an evidence that there is profit to be derived from it.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The enormous importations do not suggest that.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—More than double the quantity is made locally. The fact that the number of hands engaged in the industry has been increased three-fold since the Tariff of 1902 came into force is the best possible evidence that the duties imposed by that Tariff were ample to bring about an increase in the business, to secure more and more of the local trade, and to give profitable returns to those engaged in the industry. The Treasurer referred just now to dumping in connexion with this item, but we hear a great deal about dumping that is altogether inaccurate. I should like to refer the Committee to a statement concerning dumping in connexion with some of these local companies, given in sworn evidence before the Tariff Commission in answer to question 68589. A witness was asked—

Are you selling cheaper here or in Sydney?—In New South Wales.

By nearly 2s. per cwt., are you not?—No.

I am speaking of the run of the gauges, not of any particular gauge?—We sell at 1s. per cwt. f.o.b., less for Sydney than we do for Melbourne.

Then you have done with them, when they have left Melbourne?—Yes.

There is an illustration of dumping. In the answers given to other questions, it is shown that the companies engaged in this industry have combined to fix selling prices. Question 68604 was—

Have you a schedule price with the other makers here?—

The answer was—

Yes, we all sell at the same price.

What I have said is good evidence that the business was a very profitable one under the 3s. duty. Whatever doubts honorable members may have had as to whether the industry of horse-shoe nail-making was profitable or not under the old duty, there is strong evidence that we ought not to increase the duty in this case. As the honorable member for Fremantle is in favour of the exclusion of some of the items, I hope that he will also see his way to vote for a more reasonable duty on the whole item than that proposed by the Government.

Mr. COON (Batman) [3:31].—The strongest argument in favour of the increased duty is the fact that last year £71,890 worth of nails came from Great

Britain, where the wage in connexion with the industry is about 15s. a week. In giving evidence before a Commission appointed in the Old Country, one witness said that the duty they required was the same as obtained in Germany and the United States in order to keep foreign nails from entering. That is what they are asking for in free-trade Great Britain, where they are paying 15s. a week against our 41s. 6d. a week wage. It is clear proof that the extra duty is required when we have to compete under those conditions.

Mr. FULLER (Illawarra) [3:32].—I should like to hear something from the Minister on this question.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I want to get to a division.

Mr. FULLER.—Honorable members are entitled to know reasons why the Minister's proposal for an increase of duty should be adopted. It has been clearly proved that the old duty amounted to about 40 per cent. on the invoice value of the goods. To that must be added the insurance, freight, and other charges on bringing goods to Australia. When, therefore, it is proposed to about double the old duty, the Committee is entitled to some explanation. The honorable member for Lang drew attention to the existence of a combine in order to fix the price amongst the Australian nail manufacturers. Evidence to that effect was given, not by one manufacturer only, but by several. The first to give evidence was Mr. MacDougall, who stated distinctly that they had a schedule, and all sold at the same price. The next witness was Mr. Gold. On page 2392 of the Tariff Commission's Minutes of Evidence, appears the following—

69413. I am talking about the ordinary wire nail. Cannot the Austral Nail Company turn them out?—I am not going to let them have all the trade.

69414. Are you underselling them?—No, we practically sell at the same price.

Further on he was asked more specifically about this matter as follows—

69450. As to this arrangement between the Austral Nail Company and yourself, how do you arrange to get five-elevenths of all the trade in Victoria, and they get six-elevenths?—Our books are inspected by an accountant. If I have done more than my share, I have to give the difference to the Austral Company, and if they have done more than their share they have to give the difference to me.

Evidently, according to that question, the whole of the trade of Victoria was divided

between Mr. Gold and the Austral Nail Company.

69451. How is that done?—We pass on the orders.

69453. Does that arrangement you have with them in regard to the output extend to price?—We all sell at about the same price.

69454. When do you fix prices?—Every time there is a reduction or a rise in wire we have to raise or drop our prices accordingly. It is arranged according to the raw material. The raw material has gone up 30s. a ton during the last two or three months. We have had to raise our prices, therefore.

Therefore, so far as Victoria is concerned, practically the whole trade is a matter of arrangement between the gentlemen interested in the industry, who fix the price that the Victorian people have to pay. Is this the sort of article upon which the Committee should practically double the duty? Are we to give those men a further opportunity of raising the price? It has been clearly proved that since the imposition of the first Federal Tariff the production of the industry has largely increased. Other establishments have been formed in Victoria and New South Wales, and another is about to be started in Western Australia. In Victoria, while there has been a large increase of production, there has been a big decrease of importations. Protectionists always say that all that they ask for in connexion with their "strangled industries" is to have the conditions of labour equalized as between the Commonwealth and competing countries. That is always alleged as the basic principle of the protectionists' claims. But in this industry skilled labour forms a very small proportion of the labour employed. The proportion of artisans does not exceed one-fifth. It was stated by a Victorian witness that the proportion of wages and incidental expenses in his factory to the value of the output was 14 per cent. Yet, under the old Tariff, the duty was about 40 per cent., or, roughly, two and a half times as much as the proportion of the whole labour cost to the value of the output. Then what justification is there for attempting to double the duty? It has been clearly proved that there is a combine, that the percentage of manufacturing cost is small, production has increased, new factories have been opened under the old Tariff, and the imports have largely decreased. We are therefore entitled to have facts and figures put before us before we vote to increase the duty. There is no doubt that the Combine have been able, for a long time past, to adjust their own

Mr. Fuller.

prices and to bring them up just under the price covered by the duty. When manufacturers are in a position to do that, surely we ought to hesitate to impose a higher duty, which would give them a further opportunity of raising their price to a point just below it. It is marvellous that the great majority of the complaints about the Federal Tariff, made to the Tariff Commission, came from the Victorian manufacturers, who have had the benefit of high protective duties in the past. If there is anything in the protectionist principle that it is only necessary to give an industry a duty in its infancy in order to encourage it to start and grow, one would have thought that these Victorian industries, having had thirty years of high protection, would by now have had a fair opportunity of getting on their legs. Yet in connexion with all the industries which have had to feel the effects of Inter-State competition, it is from Victoria that the larger number of complaints have come.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [3.41].—There are one or two other facts which the Committee should know before a division is taken. If there is one industry more than another that needs no further fostering, it is the nail industry. All the facts show that it is a very prosperous industry, which is subject to no disabilities that it cannot meet and overcome. The volume of trade is increasing and its profitable nature is undoubted.

Mr. FAIRBAIRN.—It will mean more local competition than ever, and prices will go down.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I should think that that was the ideal condition of things which every protectionist wishes to bring about. At any rate, the protectionist always alleges that internal competition will reduce prices. If that has been the case in regard to nails, what further proof is needed that no further duty is required? I take it that the protectionist does not pile on duties for the fun of the thing. A case must be made out for them. It must be shown that they are needed in order to prop up some industry which cannot stand by itself against the competition of the world. This industry has shown that with the prop already under it, in the shape of the old duty, it was well able to hold up its head against the breezes that blow from all quarters of the globe. Since Federation there have been very few imports indeed under this heading, but the Inter-State trade has quadrupled, clearly

showing the great advantage that has accrued to this industry through the throwing down of the Inter-State barriers and the command of the Australian market. Production has increased in the same ratio as imports have declined. Additional factories, as the honorable member for North Sydney said, have come into operation and are doing well to-day. I heard the other day that one of these companies had paid an 18 per cent dividend. Is the honorable member for Batman listening? The directors of that company said straight out that they did not want any further duty, but were satisfied with that at present imposed.

Mr. McDougall.—The honorable member for Parramatta does not object to fat dividends, does he?

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I object to fat dividends at my expense. I like the monopolists just as little as does the honorable member who interjects. There is nobody, so far as I know, on this side of the House who desires to build up monopolies; but monopoly is the objective of the honorable member when he votes for prohibitive duties, and the consequent freedom from the ordinary competition of the world.

Mr. COON.—What dividend did the importer pay last year?

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—May I say that I believe I know less about importers than does the honorable member.

Mr. WATSON.—Importers make 50 per cent. profit sometimes; some of the published balance-sheets show enormous profits.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The honorable member cannot show anything of the kind.

Mr. WATSON.—I can.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—If importers asked for assistance they would not get it, no matter how small their profits might be.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—It is the greatest joke in the world to hear protectionists always girding at the importers.

Mr. WATSON.—The honorable member is always girding at the poor manufacturer, even if he makes only 10 per cent.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—But I am speaking of a company, the dividend of which was 18 per cent. last year. I venture to say, however, that the bulk of the large importers are not averse to protection of a very high character, so long as it is not prohibitive. High duties mean the crushing of the small importers, who cannot afford to pay down thousands of pounds in duty. As one large importer

said to me the other day, "We have nearly all become protectionist since we have had a taste of what it means; in Sydney, high protection has driven the small men out of the field, and the large importers have practically the monopoly." The same may be said of Melbourne; and that is why importers on a large scale are doing so well.

Mr. CHANTER.—Have not some Sydney importers started to manufacture?

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Some of them. Why protectionists should gird at importers I do not know, seeing that they are the friends of, at any rate, the large importers. It has been shown in evidence that the wages cost in this industry is 16 per cent. of the total value, and that the duty, before this further imposition, was more than sufficient to cover the cost of manufacture. It is true that the business was not very profitable under the old Victorian Tariff, owing to cut-throat competition, but the manufacturers formed a sort of union or combine, and so arranged prices as to enable them to do business at remunerative prices.

Mr. McDougall.—Importers cannot be beaten at the game of combining!

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The importer!—"King Charles' head."

Mr. TUDOR.—The manufacturer!—"King Charles' head."

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—There is not an honorable member on this side who does not wish well to the manufacturers of Australia; but, at the same time, some regard must be paid to the consumer, of whom some protectionists seem to lose sight altogether. I should like to show how these duties will adversely affect some of our mining industries and ventures. In a statement of the case which comes from Ballarat, the constituency of the Prime Minister, a gentleman states that steel rails, steel raildogs, and wrought spikes are items which are most affected under this heading, and they are all used in the mines of Australia.

Mr. WATSON.—They are used during the equipment of a mine but never afterwards; and they do not cost much.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The honorable member is entirely wrong, because roads are constantly being pulled up and put down.

Mr. WATSON.—The same spikes are used over and over again.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Certainly not.

Mr. WATSON.—I have seen them put in.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—And so have I many thousands of times; and I have seen them pulled out and thrown away. In any case only the wrought spikes are manufactured here.

Mr. WATSON.—There is no reason why steel spikes should not be made here.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Although steel spikes are not being made here, there is no discrimination made in the Tariff; and the cost is thrown on the consumer, for whom there seems to be no consideration. The proposed duties will be a great tax on the mining community; and the statement to which I have already referred says that steel raildogs, under the old Tariff, paid a duty of 3s. per cwt., equal to 20 per cent., and under the new duty pay 5s. 6d. per cwt., equal to 36½ per cent.; steel rails, under the old Tariff, paid 25 per cent., and under the new Tariff pay 45 per cent.; while the duty on wrought-iron spikes has been increased from 32 per cent. to 58 per cent., in addition to all the charges on importation. That is not protection, but prohibition.

Mr. CHANTER.—The importation charges will not apply when the spikes are made in Australia.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Exactly; it means prohibition. It would have been much more straightforward to have proposed to build a wall round Australia, and altogether decline to do business with the outside world. I hope the Committee will abolish the proposed duty, since it does not appear to be required, in view of the fact that, so far as can be ascertained, the industry is a flourishing one.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [3.55].—I find that the protectionist section of the Tariff Commission recommended that nails, wire and other, and spikes, staples, brads, and tacks should bear a duty of 5s. per cwt. I do not know how raildogs or brobs got into the Government schedule; and I feel I should be justified under the circumstances in supporting the proposal of the honorable member for Fremantle to omit them.

Mr. WATSON.—Does the honorable member, as a protectionist, say that steel spikes cannot be made in Australia?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—I do not know; there is no suggestion made in reference to them.

Mr. WATSON.—That is a nice confession to make.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—I am quite capable of deciding how to decide in regard

to this question without the assistance of the honorable member. In reference to nails, wire and other, I shall support the increased duty, which I may say is supported, not only by protectionists in Victoria, but also strongly by Mr. Symon Hill, of 99 York-street, Sydney, the representative of the Acme Manufacturing Works, Pyramont. In his evidence, Mr. Hill said—

The pioneers of the industry were brought to a standstill through lack of capital, and the extensive import of nails from Germany and the United States of America.

We have not paid a dividend, and I cannot see any prospect of our doing so while the present Tariff obtains. The market is flooded with nails made in other countries, and exported here at about 11s. per ton higher than the raw material costs in these countries, as this difference of 11s. per ton would not cover the cost of casing, cartoning, labelling, and weighing even in these countries.

The quantity of nails imported into New South Wales is about 3,000 tons per annum. Our present capacity is equal to about 1,000 tons when the machines are fully employed. With a Tariff of £5 per ton we would at once put up the necessary plant and engage the requisite labour to meet the demand consequent upon the stoppage of imports.

I do not think that the assertion that this is solely a Victorian industry is justifiable. It is now carried on in New South Wales, and, I understand, that factories have recently been established in Western Australia and in South Australia. With nail factories growing up, an increased duty ought to be imposed. In reference to railway material, the Commission did not receive any evidence on the subject; and I do not feel justified in supporting an increased duty.

Mr. WATSON (South Sydney) [3.57].—I must say that the honorable member for Bendigo is one of the most remarkable protectionists I have come across for a good while. He first intimated that he was not going to take any dictation from me as to how he should vote. I should be the last to dictate to him; and when the honorable member says he is content to rely on his own recommendations without giving reasons, we cannot suppose that he has not sufficient intelligence to form a recommendation. We must therefore fall back on the idea that he has not sufficient confidence in the mechanical ingenuity of the people of Australia to think that they can succeed in making spikes. This reminds one of the

famous utterance, during the last Tariff debate, in favour of the exemption from duty of three-legged glue pots. Here we have an honorable member who says that Australian engineers and manufacturers, who can turn out the most complex machinery, cannot make steel spikes.

Mr. HEDGES.—But the duty proposed is equal to 50 per cent.

Mr. WATSON.—The question of how much protection it means has nothing to do with the point I am discussing.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Yes, it has.

Mr. WATSON.—The point I am arguing is that the honorable member for Bendigo, who as a declared protectionist is willing to grant a protection of 25, 30, and 40 per cent., and even more in the case of specific duties, in respect of complicated pieces of machinery, gets up here and says calmly that we in Australia cannot make spikes to attach a rail to a sleeper.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—I did not say that. What I said was that the old duty was sufficient.

Mr. WATSON.—The honorable member evidently takes up that attitude.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—I mentioned that no increase in the duty was asked for.

Mr. WATSON.—The proposal is to exempt spikes from duty.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—No; to allow them to remain subject to the old duty.

Mr. HEDGES.—Which was equal to 30 per cent.

Mr. WATSON.—If that is the case I am quite satisfied.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [4.2].—The honorable member for South Sydney has been barking up the wrong tree. From the manufacturing point of view this is one of the simplest and most elementary of the industries, and if 25 per cent. is a sufficiently high duty in the case of articles which in their manufacture require the application of extraordinary skill, surely a duty of 30 per cent. ought to be ample in the case of an article which is of so simple a character that it is made chiefly by boy labour.

Mr. WATSON.—In what direction is boy labour employed?

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—In the making of nails.

Mr. WATSON.—I was talking about spikes, not nails.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The two articles come under the same item.

Mr. CHANTER.—But the manufacturing processes are different.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The only difference is in regard to the material.

Mr. WATSON.—And the method too.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I know how a spike is made, because many thousands are made every day at Eskbank. It is a very simple process indeed. The work is all done by machinery, which is attended to by boys. Honorable members on the other side do not know what they are talking about. If a duty of 25 per cent. is sufficient protection for the complicated, skilful work which is requisite to the making of machinery, how much more than sufficient ought it to be in the case of the nail-making industry?

Mr. HEDGES (Fremantle) [4.5].—I desire to say a few words in reply to the honorable member for South Sydney. The proposed duty on spikes is equal to more than 50 per cent. on the invoice value in England, whereas the duty I have proposed of 3s. per cwt. is equal to 30 per cent. Surely that is enough to permit of the articles being made here. If our manufacturers can make an intricate engine surely they can make a dog-spike, and if they cannot they had better close up their factories.

Mr. FAIRBAIRN (Fawkner) [4.6].—I hope that the Treasurer will fall in with the suggestion of the honorable member for Fremantle. It must be obvious to any one that there ought to be a difference between the duty on rail-dogs or spikes, and the duty on high-priced articles like picture nails.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—If the duty proposed is equal to 30 per cent., I shall not object.

Mr. FAIRBAIRN. — It is practically equal to 30 per cent.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [4.7].—The proposal of the honorable member for Fremantle, I understand, is to delete these words with a view to proposing a new item.

Mr. HEDGES.—Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON. — To impose a higher duty.

Mr. HEDGES.—No; a duty of 3s. per cwt.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I shall not object if it approximates to 30 per cent. I wish to mention, in reply to the honorable member for Bendigo, that rail-dogs and spikes were included in this item, because it was thought by the Department that they were fairly dutiable articles, and could be easily made here to any extent. A few minutes ago a telephone message was sent to the Austral-Otis works to ascertain whether they are made here, and a reply has been received to the effect that they make a large quantity of them. We ought not to import these articles, but to make them here, as their manufacture is very simple indeed.

Mr. CHANTER.—The old Victorian duty was 7s. 6d. per cwt.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—With a protection of 30 per cent. I think that the local manufacturers ought to be able to make the articles.

Mr. CHANTER.—We ought to have a fixed duty.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The proposal is to have a fixed duty of 3s. per cwt. I do not want to prolong the discussion on the subject of wire nails, but I wish to mention that last year, before this Tariff was prepared, the representatives of a company in Sydney came to me with their invoices, and showed me that nails were being imported from Germany at a cheaper rate than that at which they could import the material for making them.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—How is it then that the local manufacturers have supplied two-thirds of the nails used in Australia?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I am only telling the Committee that these persons produced their invoices and gave me full particulars. I asked the Department to see if they could find the invoices, but they have not been able to do so. I forget the name of the company, but their representatives convinced me at that time that it was a crying shame that wire nails should be dumped into Australia at a price less than that at which the material to make them could be obtained.

Mr. HANS IRVINE (Grampians) [4.11].—I desire to inform the Treasurer that a director of a Melbourne Wire Nail Making Company has assured me that for years, under the old duty of 3s. per

cwt., they have been paying dividends of from 15 to 18 per cent. Does the honorable gentleman mean to tell me that in those circumstances it is necessary to fix the duty at 5s. 6d. per cwt. in the general Tariff, and at 5s. in the preferential Tariff? This director, who is known personally to many honorable members, told me that his company do not want an additional duty, but are quite satisfied with the old duty.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—What are a couple of shillings per cwt.?

Mr. HANS IRVINE.—It is a lot of money, especially when it has to be paid by poor persons. In this country everybody more or less uses nails. No matter where a man may go he will find that nails are used as commonly as shoes are used. It is the working man who has to pay the duty on these articles. Some honorable members are apparently trying to build up a monopoly. The proposal of the Government means not protection, but prohibition. I am utterly opposed to it, because I think that it will be quite sufficient to revert to the old duty. In any case I would not support a duty of more than 5s. in the general Tariff, and 4s. in the preferential Tariff, and that is 1s. per cwt. more than I think ought to be paid.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN (Indi) [4.14].—I agree with the last speaker who has corroborated the statement I made at an earlier hour to-day that the South Melbourne factory does not want a duty imposed at all. It is quite clear to me that now we have got into the division relating to metals and machinery, there is a deliberate attempt to impose duties upon the people for the purposes of revenue. We have clear evidence to the effect that the bulk of these manufacturers are doing well and do not need an additional duty.

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment (by Mr. JOHNSON) put—

That, after the figures "5s. 6d.," paragraph 2, the words, "and on and after 27th November, 1907, per cwt. (General Tariff), 3s. 6d.," be inserted.

The Committee divided.

Ayes 17
Noes 41

Majority ... 24

AYES.

Atkinson, L.
Brown, Tilley
Brown, Thomas
Cook, Joseph
Edwards, R.
Fuller, G. W.
Fysh, Sir Philip
Hughes, W. M.
Liddell, F.

McWilliams, W. J.
Poynton, A.
Smith, Bruce
Thomson, Dugald
Wilks, W. H.
Willis, Henry
Tellers:
Archer, E. W.
Johnson, W. E.

NOES.

Bamford, F. W.
Carr, E. S.
Catts, J. H.
Chanter, J. M.
Chapman, Austin
Coon, J.
Deakin, A.
Fairbairn, G.
Fisher, A.
Forrest, Sir John
Foster, F. J.
Groom, L. E.
Hall, D. R.
Hedges, W. N.
Hutchison, J.
Irvine, Hans
Irvine, W. H.
Knox, W.
Lyne, Sir William
Maloney, W. R. N.
Mathews, J.

Mauger, S.
McDougall, J. K.
Page, J.
Palmer, A. C.
Quick, Sir John
Salmon, C. C.
Sinclair, H.
Spence, W. G.
Storrer, D.
Thomas, J.
Thomson, John
Tudor, F. G.
Watkins, D.
Watson, J. C.
Webster, W.
Wilson, J. G.
Wise, G. H.
Wynne, A.
Tellers:
Cook, Hume
Frazer, C. E.

PAIRS.

Bowden, E. K.
Glynn, P. McM.
Reid, G. H.
Fowler, J. M.
Mahon, H.
Kelly, W. H.
Livingston, J.

Sampson, S.
Crouch, R. A.
Ewing, T. T.
Harper, R.
O'Malley, King
Kingston, C. C.
Foxton, Colonel

Question so resolved in the negative.

Amendment negatived.

Amendment (by Mr. JOHNSON) put—

That after the figures "5s. 6d.," paragraph B, the words "and on and after 27th November, 1907, per cwt. (General Tariff), 4s.," be inserted.

The Committee divided.

Ayes	17
Noes	41
			—
Majority	24

AYES.

Archer, E. W.
Atkinson, L.
Brown, Tilley
Brown, Thomas
Cook, Joseph
Edwards, R.
Fysh, Sir Philip
Hughes, W. M.
Johnson, W. E.

Liddell, F.
McWilliams, W. J.
Poynton, A.
Smith, Bruce
Thomson, Dugald
Willis, Henry
Tellers:
Fuller, G. W.
Wilks, W. H.

NOES.

Bamford, F. W.
Carr, E. S.
Catts, J. H.
Chanter, J. M.
Chapman, Austin
Coon, J.
Deakin, A.
Fairbairn, G.
Fisher, A.
Forrest, Sir John
Foster, F. J.
Frazer, C. E.
Groom, L. E.
Hall, D. R.
Hedges, W. N.
Hutchison, J.
Irvine, Hans
Irvine, W. H.
Knox, W.
Lyne, Sir William
Maloney, W. R. N.

Mathews, J.
Mauger, S.
McDougall, J. K.
Page, J.
Palmer, A. C.
Quick, Sir John
Salmon, C. C.
Sinclair, H.
Spence, W. G.
Storrer, D.
Thomas, J.
Thomson, John
Tudor, F. G.
Watson, J. C.
Webster, W.
Wilson, J. G.
Wise, G. H.
Wynne, A.
Tellers:
Cook, Hume
Watkins, D.

PAIRS.

Bowden, E. K.
Glynn, P. McM.
Reid, G. H.
Fowler, J. M.
Mahon, H.
Kelly, W. H.
Livingston, J.

Sampson, S.
Crouch, R. A.
Ewing, T. T.
Harper, R.
O'Malley, King
Kingston, C. C.
Foxton, Colonel

Question so resolved in the negative.

Amendment negatived.

Amendment (by Mr. FULLER) proposed—

That, after the figures "5s. 6d.," paragraph B, the words "and on and after 27th November, 1907, per cwt. (General Tariff), 4s. 6d.," be inserted.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [4.25].—I desire honorable members to know what relation the duty proposed by the Government bears to the number of hands employed in the industry, and the wages paid. The consumption of Australia is about 15,000 tons, of which about 7,000 tons are imported. At the duty now proposed—5s. per cwt.—the cost to the consumer amounts to £5 per ton, or £75,000. At the duty of 3s. which was previously imposed, the taxation amounted to £45,000. That duty was pretty fully taken advantage of because the makers were combined, and just under-quoted the imported article. The increase we propose to give—that is, an increase of 2s. per ton—means an additional payment of £30,000. The whole of the wages paid in the State of Victoria, according to the Factory Inspector's return, amount to £13,700 odd per annum—that is to say, 168 hands at 31s. 6d. per week. If we take it that Victoria makes only a third of the whole manufacture of Australia, though I believe she makes more

than half, the total wages paid in the Commonwealth would amount to not more than £40,000. As the makers took advantage of the previous duty of £3 per ton, we may take it that they will go practically up to the English price at the increased duty. That is to say, they will take advantage of the consumers to the extent of about £45,000, whilst the whole of the wages paid in Australia do not exceed £40,000.

Question—That after the figures "5s. 6d.," paragraph B, the words "and on and after 27th November, 1907, per cwt. (General Tariff) 4s. 6d." be inserted—put.

The Committee divided.

Ayes	18
Noes	38
Majority	20

AYES.

Archer, E. W.
Atkinson, L.
Brown, Thomas
Brown, Tilley
Cook, Joseph
Edwards, R.
Fuller, G. W.
Fysh, Sir Philip
Johnson, W. E.
Liddell, F.

McWilliams, W. J.
Poynton, A.
Sinclair, H.
Smith, Bruce.
Thomson, Dugald
Willis, Henry

Tellers:

Hughes, W. M.
Wilks, W. H.

NOES.

Bamford, F. W.
Carr, E. S.
Catts, J. H.
Chanter, J. M.
Coon, J.
Deakin, A.
Fairbairn, G.
Fisher, A.
Foster, F. J.
Frazer, C. E.
Groom, L. E.
Hall, D. R.
Hedges, W. N.
Hutchison, J.
Irvine, Hans
Irvine, W. H.
Knox, W.
Lyne, Sir William
Maloney, W. R. N.
Mathews, J.

Mauger, S.
McDougall, J. K.
Page, J.
Palmer, A. C.
Quick, Sir John
Salmon, C. C.
Spence, W. G.
Storrer, D.
Thomas, J.
Thomson, John
Tudor, F. G.
Watkins, D.
Watson, J. C.
Webster, W.
Wise, G. H.
Wynne, A.

Tellers:

Cook, Hume
Wilson, J. G.

PAIRS.

Bowden, E. K.
Glynn, P. McM.
Reid, G. H.
Fowler, J. M.
Mahon, H.
Kelly, W. H.
Livingston, J.

Sampson, S.
Crouch, R. A.
Ewing, T. T.
Harper, R.
O'Malley King
Kingston, C. C.
Foxton, Colonel

Question so resolved in the negative.

Amendment negatived.

Amendment (by Mr. WILSON) put—

That after the figures "5s. 6d.," paragraph B, the words "and on and after 27th November, 1907, per cwt. (General Tariff), 5s.," be inserted.

The Committee divided.

Ayes	15
Noes	37
Majority	22

AYES.

Archer, E. W.
Brown, Thomas
Brown, Tilley
Cook, Joseph
Edwards, R.
Hughes, W. M.
Irvine, Hans
Poynton, A.

Sinclair, H.
Smith, Bruce.
Thomson, Dugald
Willis, Henry
Wilson, J. G.
Tellers:
McWilliams, W. J.
Wilks, W. H.

NOES.

Bamford, F. W.
Carr, E. S.
Catts, J. H.
Chanter, J. M.
Chapman, Austin
Coon, J.
Deakin, A.
Fairbairn, G.
Fisher, A.
Foster, F. J.
Frazer, C. E.
Groom, L. E.
Hall, D. R.
Hedges, W. N.
Hutchison, J.
Irvine, W. H.
Knox, W.
Lyne, Sir William
Maloney, W. R. N.

Mathews, J.
Mauger, S.
McDougall, J. K.
Page, J.
Palmer, A. C.
Quick, Sir John
Salmon, C. C.
Spence, W. G.
Storrer, D.
Thomas, J.
Thomson, John
Watkins, D.
Watson, J. C.
Webster, W.
Wise, G. H.
Wynne, A.
Tellers:
Cook, Hume
Tudor, F. G.

PAIRS.

Bowden, E. K.
Glynn, P. McM.
Reid, G. H.
Fowler, J. M.
Mahon, H.
Kelly, W. H.
Livingston, J.

Sampson, S.
Crouch, R. A.
Ewing, T. T.
Harper, R.
O'Malley King
Kingston, C. C.
Foxton, Colonel

Question so resolved in the negative.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. JOHNSON (Lang) [4.39]. — I move—

That after the figure "5s.," paragraph B, the words, "and on and after 27th November, 1907, per cwt. (United Kingdom), 3s.," be added.

Three shillings per cwt. was the duty under the old Tariff, and I wish to give those honorable members who are pledged not in any way to interfere with that Tariff an opportunity to redeem their promise when on the hustings.

Amendment negatived.

Amendment (by Mr. WILSON) put—

That after the figure "5s.," paragraph B, the words, "and on and after 27th November, 1907, per cwt. (United Kingdom), 4s.," be added.

The Committee divided.

Ayes	17
Noes	37
Majority	20

AYES.

Brown, Thomas
Brown, Tilley
Cook, Joseph
Edwards, R.
Fysh, Sir Philip
Hughes, W. M.
Irvine, Hans
McWilliams, W. J.
Poynton, A.

Sinclair, H.
Smith, Bruce.
Thomson, Dugald
Wilks, W. H.
Willis, H.
Wilson, J. G.
Tellers:
Archer, E. W.
Johnson, W. E.

NOES.

Bamford, F. W.
Carr, E. S.
Catts, J. H.
Chanter, J. M.
Chapman, Austin
Coon, J.
Deakin, A.
Fairbairn, G.
Fisher, A.
Foster, F. J.
Fraser, C. E.
Groom, L. E.
Hall, D. R.
Hedges, W. N.
Hutchison, J.
Irvine, W. H.
Knox, W.
Lyne, Sir William
Maloney, W. R. N.

Mathews, J.
Mauger, S.
McDougall, J. K.
Page, J.
Palmer, A. C.
Quick, Sir John
Salmon, C. C.
Spence, W. G.
Storrer, D.
Thomas, J.
Thomson, John
Watkins, D.
Watson, J. C.
Webster, W.
Wise, G. H.
Wynne, A.
Tellers:
Cook, Hume
Tudor, F. G.

PAIRS.

Bowden, E. K.
Glynn, P. McM.
Reid, G. H.
Fowler, J. M.
Mahon, H.
Kelly, W. H.
Livingston, J.

Sampson, S.
Crouch, R. A.
Ewing, T. T.
Harper, R.
O'Malley, King
Kingston, C. C.
Foxton, Colonel

Question so resolved in the negative.

Amendment negatived.

Amendment (by Mr. HEDGES) agreed to—

That the following new paragraph be inserted:—"And on and after 27th November, 1907, C. Rail-dogs or brobs or spikes, per cwt. (General Tariff), 3s. 3d.; (United Kingdom), 3s."

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Postponed item 160. Tanks containing goods, or empty.—For every 100 gallons capacity or part thereof (General Tariff), 3s.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [4.47].—I should like an explanation from the Treasurer in respect of this item. The Government propose to levy a duty upon tanks—irrespective of whether or not they contain goods—of 3s. for every 100 gallons capacity or part thereof. In other words, there will be a tax on the ordinary 400-gallon tank of 12s. I should like to know whether this is the only duty that will be collected upon tanks when they are the outside packages of goods, or whether it is intended to charge also a higher duty upon them under item 444?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Does the honorable member wish to know whether they will be subjected to a double duty?

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Does the Treasurer mean the letters n.e.i. under item 444 to exclude tanks?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Certainly. This is the only duty that will be levied upon tanks.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Will the Treasurer assign his reasons for adopting the new duty?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [4.50].—In framing this Tariff, I have, as far as possible, adopted the recommendations of the A section of the Tariff Commission. I take it that the tanks upon which that section of the Commission have recommended the imposition of this duty, are tanks which are ordinarily filled with malt. Under the old Tariff, these articles were admitted free, but both sections of the Tariff Commission have recommended the imposition of a duty upon them.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [4.51].—I would point out that this item is by no means a small one, seeing that in 1905, no less than 6,000 of these tanks were imported, of an estimated value of approximately £15,000. Sometimes they are made of black iron, and sometimes of galvanized iron. Their dimensions are usually 4 feet by 4 feet, and 3 feet by 3 feet, and they are generally used for the importation of goods. They are rivetted with a manhole, which can be hermetically sealed. They are of a considerable marketable value, and are sold here for less than their cost value in the port of export.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I purchased some last year for £2 16s. each.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—As a result, they are brought into competition with a corresponding class of tanks of local manufacture. They come into competition with galvanized iron tanks, and consequently they ought to be subject either to a revenue duty or to a protective duty, or to a combination of both.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—Do not the contents pay duty?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—But they are not exclusively used as outside packages, because, after they have performed that function, they still have a marketable value. Therefore, they should be rendered liable to a duty. The free-trade section of the Tariff Commission have recommended a

duty of 15 per cent. upon these tanks, and the protectionist section of that body, an impost of 3s. per 100 gallons cubic capacity. It is for the Committee to determine which of these rates shall be adopted.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN (Calare) [4.53].—The honorable member for Bendigo has informed the Committee that these tanks are usually imported as the outside covering for a certain class of goods, and that they are afterwards brought into use locally. As a matter of fact, they are chiefly imported by brewers as the outside covering of material that is used for brewing purposes.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—They are generally filled with malt.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—After they have been landed here, they frequently prove very useful for conveying water to out-of-the-way places. For this purpose they are utilized by farmers, squatters, and miners.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—And they are also used for house tanks.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—Not to the same extent that they are employed for conveying water long distances. The galvanized iron tanks which are used as house tanks, are composed of much thinner material, and cannot withstand the jolting that is inseparable from transit over rough roads. The proposed duty will therefore fall heavily upon our producing interests, which can derive no direct benefit whatever from protection.

Mr. CHANTER.—The farmers use fifty corrugated iron tanks for every one of these square tanks, because they are cheaper, and because they hold twice the quantity of water.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—In my own electorate the farmers have to convey water for a considerable distance, and galvanized tanks are not sufficiently strong to withstand the jolting associated with their transit over rough roads.

Mr. CHANTER.—The honorable member is referring to the ancient type of farmer, not to the modern one.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—If the honorable member visits the remote portions of his electorate he will discover that the farmers there are using these square tanks. Further, as a result of the destruction wrought by bush fires during recent years, bush-fire brigades have been established, and these tanks are largely used for conveying water from place to place to pre-

vent the spread of these outbreaks. So that all these interests are involved. If we impose a duty upon iron tanks, which have hitherto been admitted free, our producers will be required to pay an additional 12s. for the ordinary 400-gallon tank, and 24s. for the 800-gallon tank.

Mr. SALMON.—One does not see many 800-gallon tanks nowadays.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—That is so. The 400-gallon tanks are easier to move from place to place. But there are localities in which the larger-sized tanks are used. These articles do not enter very largely into competition with corrugated iron tanks. The fact that these tanks are used for the special purposes to which I have referred will, I hope, induce the Committee to vote against this attempt to increase the burdens upon the pioneers in our primary industries, who can derive little or no benefit from protection.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [5.1].—As the honorable member for Calare has pointed out, this duty will fall wholly on the people in the country districts.

Mr. POYNTON.—That would appear all the more reason, according to the protectionists, for imposing it.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Yes; judging by some of the votes which have been recently given. Apparently, the primary industries are the last to be considered by the Committee.

Mr. HANS IRVINE.—Quite true.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—This is a Tariff framed in the interests of the towns and cities, and greatly in the interest of the two chief cities of Australia. The tanks on which it is proposed to put a duty will continue to be imported, however much we may tax them, and the impost will be passed on to those who purchase them here. Thus, by agreeing to the duty, we shall be increasing the burdens of those who are least able to bear taxation. Although this is a protectionist Tariff in some respects as it affects the large cities, it is a crushingly heavy revenue Tariff as it affects the country districts, and will make a fine inroad into the earnings of the poor.

Mr. HANS IRVINE.—They are the poor persons who will be taxed by the present duty.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Yes; these tanks all find their way into the country.

Mr. SALMON (Laanecoorie) [5.4].—Had the honorable member for Parramatta

followed the speech of the honorable member for Bendigo, he would have learnt that the protectionist section of the Tariff Commission was satisfied by the evidence which it took that these tanks are sold here for less than the cost of making them.

Mr. POYNTON.—Is it a crime that the farmer in the back country should obtain a cheap tank?

Mr. SALMON.—The honorable member is not justified in putting that interpretation on my statement. I was going to apply the fact in an altogether different line of argument. The Tariff Commission found that these tanks are sent out as coverings for packages of goods of a certain value which it is necessary to keep dry, and to protect from pressure. They are not being sent out for philanthropic purposes, in order to give the people of Australia a cheap means of conserving water.

Mr. POYNTON.—No one has suggested that.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—They are sent out to protect the foodstuffs which the people consume.

Mr. SALMON.—Yes. Cadbury's chocolates and Coleman's mustards, for instance, are two of the foodstuffs which the honorable member had in his mind. The tanks are not sent here to compete against the tanks made in Australia. They come out merely as coverings for packages, and, having served their turn, are sold at what would be a loss, were it not for the fact that they have done the work for which they were made. Those who make them, and those who send them to Australia, get full value for them, their primary use being to enable goods to be landed here in proper condition. An importer having got this use out of the tank is not entitled to expect anything more. As soon as the tanks are done with they must be got rid of somehow. It would not pay to break them up, and therefore they are usually sold for about £2 each.

Mr. HUME COOK.—I wish I could have got them at that price.

Mr. SALMON.—That is what they are generally sold for in Melbourne; but the price depends upon the number in the market.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Is there anything to prevent the importers from emptying the tanks in bond, and then tipping them into the sea?

Mr. SALMON.—No; but, of course, they would not do that. When the tanks

are brought here they are used for purposes for which they were not constructed.

Mr. HEDGES.—That is not so.

Mr. SALMON.—They are not constructed primarily to hold water; that is, they would be made in exactly the same way if there were no possibility of selling any of them in Australia to be used for holding water. At a time when the United States of America desired to develop the mining industry of the country, the Government placed a duty on imported lead, but importers got over the difficulty by bringing in solid leaden busts of General Washington, which, of course, were not dutiable, though they were afterwards melted down and used for quite other purposes than architectural adornment. Similarly these tanks are used locally for purposes other than those for which they were first constructed.

Mr. ATKINSON.—For what are they used?

Mr. SALMON.—As I have explained, they are sent out full of packages of chocolate, mustard, and similar goods,

Mr. HANS IRVINE.—For what are they used when resold in Australia?

Mr. SALMON.—To hold water, or tar, and for a number of other purposes.

Mr. HANS IRVINE.—Are not the farmers and the men who live out back the only persons who use them?

Mr. SALMON.—No. They are used for all sorts of purposes, by all sorts of persons, in the towns as well as in the country. They are virtually waste material.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—I wish that the honorable member would have a few tipped into my yard.

Mr. SALMON.—When they get here they have served the purpose for which they were primarily constructed. Therefore, if a duty is placed on them, it will not be added to their regular price. The honorable member for Grampians laughs at that.

Mr. HANS IRVINE.—Because the statement is such utter rubbish.

Mr. SALMON.—I do not know whether the honorable member uses these tanks.

Mr. HANS IRVINE.—I use them, and so does every person who lives out back. In comparison, they are used very little in the cities. They are made at Home purposely to hold water out here. They are a cheap package, but good, strong, flat-iron is used in their construction, so that they will hold water, and have a saleable value out here.

Mr. SALMON.—That is worth considering. The honorable member, as a protectionist, must see that on being sold here they displace the locally-made tanks; but does he think that the ingenuity and industry of the people of Australia are not sufficient to allow them to make tanks as good as those imported?

Mr. HANS IRVINE.—We could make similar tanks if we had the material; but we have not.

Mr. SALMON.—I claim the honorable member's vote as a consistent protectionist.

Mr. HANS IRVINE.—The honorable member will not get it. The farmer will get it.

Mr. SALMON.—I did not expect to get it. After the first two or three divisions, I knew how the honorable member would vote. But, as protectionists, we are justified in placing a duty on an article which could be made here as well as it is made in any part of the world, and which, on being sold here, displaces locally-made articles. Honorable members have said that the duty will be a revenue duty. I deny that. I think that it will be a protective duty. It is not the fact that those who buy these tanks will have to pay more for them because of the duty. They will continue to be sold at prices bearing a direct relation to the number in the market at any given time, and the demand for them.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—That argument will not hold water.

Mr. SALMON.—If the honorable member will go to a certain yard in Melbourne, where these tanks are sold at auction, and he will find that the prices paid for them depend entirely on the number for sale, and the demand at the time. If these tanks were brought out to be sold here, and had something like a fixed price, there might be something in the argument which honorable members are advancing, that a duty would increase the price. But honorable members who have bought these tanks know that the prices vary according to the conditions to which I have referred, and they are not justified in saying that the duty will make each 400-gallon tank cost 12s. more.

Mr. BATCHELOR (Boothby) [5.13].—I move.—

That the words "and on and after 27th November, 1907, free," be added.

I do not find fault with the Ministry for having adopted the recommendations of

the Tariff Commission in this matter, but I am surprised that the protectionist section of that Commission came to the decision which it did.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The free-trade section recommended a duty of 15 per cent.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—For revenue purposes.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Yes, and in conjunction with a general scheme, which was not adopted.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—I am not going to defend the free-trade section of the Tariff Commission. I think that they made a gross mistake in recommending such high revenue duties. I merely wish to point out that, whatever duty is placed on these tanks will be added to the cost of the articles which they contain, while the impost will be absolutely inoperative from the protectionist point of view.

Mr. SALMON.—The honorable member does not contend that the duty will be added to the cost of the tanks?

Mr. BATCHELOR.—It will not be added to the cost of the tanks. They are constructed primarily to furnish damp-proof cases for the protection of certain goods, and will continue to be sent here, whatever duty may be imposed on them. A duty of 3s. will not prevent the introduction of these tanks where they can be conveniently used for the importation of goods requiring to be protected from damp. As the duty cannot possibly have any protective effect, I suggest that the Government should withdraw their proposal.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Let us have a division.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—If the Treasurer will say that he is prepared to withdraw his proposal, I shall sit down at once. If the honorable gentleman is not yet convinced, I should like to convince him that these tanks cannot be made here at a price that will pay if they are to be imported—as they will be—as a means of conveying various kinds of goods. They are not generally used for the purpose for which galvanized iron tanks are used. They are more often used for carrying water during a time of drought. At one time Broken Hill was supplied with water carried in these tanks. I am satisfied that there will not be an additional galvanized iron tank made in the Commonwealth as the result of the imposition of this duty. I hope the Treasurer will not press the proposal to a division.

Mr. HEDGES (Fremantle) [5.19].—These square tanks will be imported whether we put a duty on them or not. The Treasurer said that they come into competition with locally-made galvanized iron tanks, and I point out that the only way to prevent that is to see that these square tanks are destroyed on arrival, because they will continue to be introduced as casing for other goods. They are used throughout Australia for carting water. They are often taken into the interior as a casing for various kinds of goods, and but for this practice many people in remote districts would be unable to obtain a tank at all. I have no hesitation in saying that these square iron tanks have largely assisted in the opening up of the back blocks of Western Australia. They have been used in that State for condensing salt water containing 26 per cent. of solids. Waggon might often be met on the roads there carrying a few lengths of galvanized piping and some 400-gallon iron tanks for condensing purposes, and used in this way they have been of great assistance in opening up salt districts in Western Australia. I have before now said that the man who first conceived the idea of condensing water with these tanks should have had a monument erected to him. We have had engineers proposing huge schemes for condensing water, in connexion with which hundreds of thousands of pounds have been spent in a month, and yet many people go back to the use of the 400-gallon tank, which can be bought cheaply, and is no great loss when it becomes unfit for use. These tanks have been of great use in the opening up of districts where the pioneers have had to take water with them. If honorable members had been on the old Coolgardie track in the early days, they would have seen thousands of these tanks in use there. They were used at every soak, and every team met with carried one. I ask the Treasurer to withdraw the proposal, and if he does not, I shall support the amendment proposed by the honorable member for Boothby.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN (Indi) [5.24].—I feel that I need say no more in connexion with this item, than that the honorable members for Calare and Boothby have made two intelligent speeches upon it, and I intend to support the amendment.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS (Robertson) [5.25].—I have not yet heard any one make the point that the square iron tanks are dearer than the corrugated galvanized

iron round tanks, but, as a matter of fact, they are. They are more useful for a thousand and one purposes than are the round tanks. I agree with the honorable member for Boothby that they will continue to be introduced, no matter what duty is imposed upon them; but I differ from the honorable member for Laanecoorie, and say that I think the duty will be passed on to the consumer. As water tanks, these square tanks are better than the ordinary round galvanized iron tanks, since they rust, and in this way the iron which is so necessary for soft water is obtained. I think the Treasurer should accept the suggestion to put these tanks on the free list, and if he does, I am satisfied that there will be quite as many galvanized iron tanks made in the Commonwealth as there have been hitherto.

Mr. POYNTON (Grey) [5.28].—The only reason advanced by the honorable member for Bendigo why these tanks should be dutiable, was that the farmers can get them cheaply. That is a good reason from the stand-point of certain members of the Committee, with whom it is a crime to allow the farmers to obtain anything cheaply. Another reason advanced in support of the duty, is that these tanks are necessary to people in the back country, to the pioneers who have to cart water from one end of the year to the other. A further reason suggested is that they are not required about towns. These reasons will, no doubt, be sufficient to induce certain honorable members to support the proposed duty. That anything which will be of use to the farmers should be put on the free list, would be something quite unusual in this Committee. These tanks would not come into competition with galvanized iron tanks locally-made to the extent suggested. They are very useful for carting water; and who would think of carting water in a galvanized iron tank? As I believe that the numbers are up in favour of the amendment, I need say no more.

Mr. SPENCE (Darling) [5.30].—Amongst all the by-products of commerce—to use the term quoted by the honorable member for Laanecoorie—I should say that the square iron tank is one of the most valuable that comes to Australia. It competes with the galvanized-iron tank only to a very small extent indeed. I look upon these tanks as a necessity in the back country. A fact which impressed me, and which I think should impress the Treasurer, is that at one time of drought in

New South Wales, the whole of the water supply for Cobar had to be brought by rail. I represented the district in the New South Wales Parliament at the time, and I know that if it had not been for the use of these tanks, the Railway Department would have been unable to supply the water required. Water was carried in these tanks a distance of 120 miles. It was a case of life and death when a wire was sent at the last minute that water was required, and it was conveniently carried by the Railway Department in these square iron tanks. They do not come into competition with the galvanized iron tanks, and there is no substitute for them throughout the country districts. At Cobar these square tanks are used to carry water from the taps to the outside portions of the town where the water is not laid on. On pastoral properties they are used as fire appliances, and I have seen them used on sleds for bringing water up to the house. The Treasurer will see that this is purely a revenue duty. It will not be protective. It will not cause any more galvanized iron to be used. If the duty is added to the cost, it will mean an extra tax on people in the country who must use these tanks.

Mr. WYNNE (Balaclava) [5.33].—The view I take with reference to these tanks is the same as I hold regarding packages in which goods come. Let us have whatever duty we think fit on the articles themselves, but let us not charge the packages or coverings. These malt tanks are very useful. We should regard it as a very petty tax if people in England put a tax on our butter boxes, our wheat or flour bags, or wool bales.

Mr. SALMON.—England is a free-trade country.

Mr. WYNNE.—Take any other country the honorable member likes.

Mr. SALMON.—Other countries do put a duty on.

Mr. WYNNE.—If a package of crockeryware comes into this country, I am told that the Customs Department actually assesses the straw in which the goods are packed, and imposes a duty on it. That sort of thing is too small, and ought to be beneath the dignity of this country.

Question.—That the words "and on and after 27th November, free" (Mr. BATCHELOR's amendment) be added—put. The Committee divided.

Ayes	36
Noes	19
			—
Majority	17

Archer, E. W.
Atkinson, L.
Brown, Tilley
Brown, Thomas
Carr, E. S.
Catts, J. H.
Cook, Joseph
Fairbairn, G.
Forrest, Sir John
Foster, F. J.
Frazer, C. E.
Fuller, G. W.
Fysh, Sir Philip
Hall, D. R.
Hedges, W. N.
Irvine, Hans W.
Irvine, W. H.
Johnson, W. E.
Knox, W.

Bamford, F. W.
Chanter, J. M.
Chapman, Austin
Coom, J.
Deakin, A.
Ewing, T. T.
Groom, L. E.
Hutchison, J.
Lyne, Sir William
Maloney, W. R. N.

Kelly, W. H.
Reid, G. H.
Glynn, P. McM.
Bowden, E. K.
Mahon, H.
Fowler, J. M.

AYES.

Liddell, F.
Livingston, J.
Palmer, A. C.
Poynton, A.
Sinclair, H.
Smith, Bruce
Spence, W. G.
Storrer, D.
Thomas, J.
Thomson, Dugald
Watkins, D.
Watson, J. C.
Webster, W.
Willis, Henry
Wynne, A.

Tellers:
Batchelor, E. L.
McWilliams, W. J.

NOES.

Mathews, J.
McDougall, J. K.
Page, J.
Quick, Sir John
Thomson, John
Tudor, F. G.
Wise, G. H.
Tellers:
Cook, Hume
Salmon, C. C.

PAIRS.

Kingston, C. C.
Manger, S.
Crouch, R. A.
Sampson, S.
O'Malley, King
Harper, R.

Question so resolved in the affirmative.

Amendment agreed to.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Postponed item 161. Weighing Machines; Weighbridges; Scales, n.e.i.; including Adding and Computing Machines, and all attachments; Cash Registers; Chemists' Counter Scales; Spring Balances and Steel-yards; Weights n.e.i., ad val., 20 per cent.

Mr. JOHNSON (Lang) [5.40].—I desire to move the adoption of a duty of 15 per cent. as regards the United Kingdom.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [5.41].—I have a prior amendment. I move—

That after the figures "20 per cent.," the words "and on and after 27th November, 1907 (General Tariff), 25 per cent.," be added.

I propose afterwards to move for a duty of 20 per cent. in the United Kingdom column.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—The duty in the Kingston Tariff was 20 per cent.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I know. I propose to retain that duty in the second column; but I wish to have a duty of 25 per cent. in the first column, thus giving a 5 per cent. preference to Great Britain.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—How much comes from Great Britain?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Of British goods we imported in 1905 £10,694 worth, and in 1906 £15,033 worth; while of foreign goods we imported in 1905 £6,281 worth, and in 1906 £8,801 worth.

Mr. FRAZER.—What is the value of the preference under those conditions?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—It is not a very large amount; but I desire, as far as possible, to keep up the preference in this case in unison with other items, and I do not wish this rate to go below what we had before. If we fixed the duties at 20 per cent. and 15 per cent. respectively, we should be imposing a lower rate than obtained previously.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE (Flinders) [5.43].—I hope the Committee will not agree to the Treasurer's amendment. In the first place, all these articles form part of equipment which is necessary for a number of industries in the country. Representations were made to me months ago that these scales and weighing machines are necessary in every butter factory.

Mr. WATSON.—Cannot they be made here?

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—They may possibly be made here.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Of course they can be made here. The honorable member for Flinders wants to reduce the duty below the old rate in the Tariff.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—I have no desire to do anything of the kind. The Government ought to stick to the Tariff which they have introduced. The rate first proposed by the Government was the same as in the old Tariff. It was recommended by the protectionist section of the Tariff Commission, after hearing the whole of the evidence.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Does the honorable member want it to remain without any preference to Great Britain?

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—Yes; without any preference in this case. Let it stand as it is. The preference in this case is practically worthless. I do not like to be a party to any proposal to increase the cost of the equipment of butter factories, for example, which ought to be supported as much as possible.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS (Robertson) [5.45].—It is a most extraordinary proceeding on the part of the Minister to "stone-wall" his own Tariff. He gave the public to understand, through a newspaper interview, that he placed the duties high in order that they might be reduced.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The honorable member is not fair in saying that.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—The Treasurer was brought face to face with the newspaper report of the interview.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The Treasurer revised the interview.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I did not do anything of the sort; and the reporter has never dared to come near me since.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—The Treasurer, when in New South Wales, made the statement that he had placed the duties high in order that they might be reduced.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I rise to a point of order. I ask the honorable member for Robertson to accept my denial.

The CHAIRMAN.—I must ask the honorable member for Robertson to accept the denial of the honorable member.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—It is parliamentary to accept an honorable member's denial, and, of course, I do so. But I should like the Treasurer to say whether, when he made the remarks reported, they were not submitted to him by the reporter, and marked as correct?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—It is not correct to say that I corrected them.

The CHAIRMAN.—Has this anything to do with the question before the Chair?

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—I propose to connect my remarks with the question. The Treasurer, first of all, proposes in the Tariff that the duty shall be 20 per cent.; but on consulting the returns, and finding that the imports are chiefly from foreign countries, he asks us to make the duty 25 per cent., leaving an impost of 20 per cent., as against Great Britain, the country from which very few of these scales are sent. Is that statesmanship? This really does convey an impression that there was something in the statement of the newspaper reporter who said that it was part of the policy of the Treasurer to propose high duties in order that they might be reduced.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I suppose I have put this duty low, in order that it may be put up.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—Here is another admission; but the Treasurer has the faculty of being unstable. If the duty remain at 20 per cent., I am prepared to support it; and it will be fixed at that figure whether the Treasurer approves or not.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Do not say that; we can fight a little.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—Let the Treasurer throw the gauntlet down! Here we have the spectacle of the Treasurer wasting the time of the House. We have been the whole of this afternoon considering the duty on tacks; and now, as I say, we find the Treasurer "stone-walling" his own Tariff, knowing very well that he must accept a duty of 20 per cent. Honorable members in the Opposition corner are crying "divide"; and, that being so, as we cannot depend on them for five minutes, I shall no longer keep the Committee from coming to a vote.

Mr. COON (Batman) [5.50].—I suggest to the Treasurer that measuring machines ought to be included in the item.

Mr. THOMAS (Barrier) [5.51].—Is the Treasurer prepared to withdraw his amendment, and revert to the duty of 20 per cent.? I should also like to know whether cash registers are being made in Australia, because, if they are, I am prepared to support a duty of 20 per cent. on them? But if this is merely intended to be a revenue duty, I think that cash registers ought to be placed on the free list.

Mr. SALMON.—Cash registers can be made here.

Mr. THOMAS.—I suppose we could build a £10,000,000 warship if we chose to face the expenditure.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not think that cash registers are generally made here, but I believe they are made.

Mr. THOMAS.—Cash registers are being made here now.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—So I am told.

Mr. HARPER (Mernda) [5.52].—I should also like to suggest that computing and calculating machines might be omitted from the item. Those machines, which are not made here, are very necessary and useful in certain businesses.

Mr. LIDDELL (Hunter) [5.53].—I notice that amongst the scales included are chemists' counter scales. Under the old Tariff, chemical scales were free, and I ask whether, under this particular item, it is proposed by the Treasurer to make them subject to a duty of 25 per cent. I am alluding to scales which weigh below half a grain, and are used in laboratories, and so forth.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The intention is to make such scales free under a subsequent item.

Mr. LIDDELL.—Then I think that chemists' counter scales should also be free, because they have to weigh very small quantities of drugs. I see that the protectionist section of the Tariff Commission recommends that chemical scales shall be free.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—They are free under item 212. I ask leave to withdraw my amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [5.55].—I intend to move that measuring machines be inserted in the item. I understand that these machines are made here to a considerable extent. But I was not made aware of the fact until within the last few days.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—What are these machines?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—They are used in connexion with the measurement of leather. In answer to the honorable member for Barrier I may say that I understand that cash registers are not made here, at any rate, not in any payable quantity; and the same may be said of computing machines.

Mr. THOMAS.—Is the Treasurer prepared to omit adding and computing machines and cash registers from the item?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I shall ask the Committee to strike the articles mentioned out of this item, but I think that I shall move that they be inserted in an item making them subject to duties of 10 per cent. and 5 per cent. I now move—

That the words "adding and computing machines, and all attachments; cash registers," be left out.

Mr. FULLER (Illawarra) [5.58].—The Treasurer has told us that chemists' counter scales are included in item 212, but I think that that item embraces a different class of scales altogether.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I did not say anything of the kind. I said that the kind of chemical scales referred to by the honorable member for Hunter are free.

Mr. FULLER.—Is it proposed to make chemists' counter scales free?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—No.

Mr. FULLER.—I submit that they ought to be free as tools of trade; if one class of scales be free, so ought the other.

Mr. HEDGES (Fremantle) [6.0].—I wish that the Treasurer would include in his proposition automatic weighing machines and weighbridges.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I think that they are made here to a large extent.

Mr. HEDGES.—They cannot, and are not being made in Australia.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—No; but of course they can be made in Carlton.

Mr. HEDGES.—Like a watch or a clock, they could be made here at a price. I know that last year we required a Fairbanks, Pooley, or Avery weighbridge. I received from the Chamber of Mines, of Kalgoorlie, a very strong protest against the inclusion of automatic weighing machines and weighbridges in this term.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not always take the recommendation of a Chamber of Mines.

Mr. FULLER.—No, but the honorable member takes the representation of any man who interviews him on the Sydney railway station.

Mr. HEDGES.—Perhaps when I mention that these weighbridges are used for weighing coal at Newcastle it may influence the mind of the Minister. I can assure him that these machines, especially for railway work, are very much used throughout Australia. They cannot, and are not being made here.

Mr. WATSON.—Why not?

Mr. HEDGES.—Whether we are short of brains or material I do not know, but the articles are not being made in Australia.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Does not the honorable member think that automatic weighing machines are brought here for the purpose of making a profit?

Mr. HEDGES.—Is anything brought to Australia without the intention of making a profit?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—That is quite a different thing.

Mr. HEDGES.—Machines are not imported out of mere fun. I hope that the honorable gentleman will include in his proposition automatic weighing machines and weighbridges with a view to their being placed under another item.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I will not do it.

Mr. HEDGES.—I propose to move an amendment to that effect.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. BATCHELOR).—The honorable member may propose that amendment after the Treasurer's amendment has been dealt with. There can be only one amendment before the Committee at the one time.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [6.6].—I hope that weighbridges will not be eli-

minated. The honorable member for Fremantle has said that they are not made in Australia. Mr. John Felix Martin, of James Martin and Company, Gawler, gave the following evidence before the Tariff Commission—

49160. What have you to say about weighbridges, on which you suggest a duty of £2 10s. per ton of carrying capacity?—They can be made in Australia. They have been made for some time by Hawke and Co., at Kapunda; but I believe the firm have lately been driven out of the market by the cutting of prices. The machines are made in Victoria. Any engineering firm can make them.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. HEDGES (Fremantle) [6.7].—If I am in order, I propose to move—

That the following words be inserted, "except automatic weighing machines and weighbridges."

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN.—Will the honorable member bring up his amendment?

Mr. STORRER (Bass) [6.8].—I hope that automatic weighing machines will not be included in the free list, or subjected to a reduced duty. A monopoly import the machines, place them in different places and collect the money, but very often they do not weigh correctly. At the present time they will not sell a machine. Previously they did sell a few machines, but the sale was made on the condition that if required the machines would be returned, and the money refunded. This monopoly are operating their weighing machines all over Australia.

Mr. HARPER.—The honorable member is referring to the penny-in-the-slot machines, but there are many other weighing machines.

Mr. STORRER.—I hope that whatever is done with the other machines, these automatic weighing machines will be subjected to a substantial duty.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [6.9].—The Committee has agreed to the omission of certain articles from this item, on the understanding that they shall be made free.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I am not quite sure that I shall not move that they be made liable to duties of 10 per cent. and 5 per cent. respectively.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Either the items must be inserted in the Tariff elsewhere, or they will come under a higher duty. If their insertion elsewhere is to

be moved, then, on that motion, the honorable member for Fremantle will be able to submit his proposal.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—No; he wants first to strike weighing machines and weighbridges out of this item.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—No; the honorable member, I understand, wishes to strike out "automatic weighing machines."

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—They are not mentioned in this item.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—No; but they are covered by the phrase "weighing machines."

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not know.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—What I want to elicit is whether the honorable gentleman proposes subsequently to make free the articles which, on his motion, have been omitted from the item before the Committee, or to subject them to a lower duty.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I intend to make the latter proposal.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—When the honorable member for Fremantle proposes to except automatic weighing machines and weighbridges from this item, he is departing from our practice. What he ought to have moved was to insert a new item, making automatic weighing machines free.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN.—Owing to a misunderstanding for which I was responsible, it is rather difficult for the honorable member for Fremantle to submit his amendment now. I understand that the honorable member desired to move the omission of some words that followed the words which the Treasurer proposed to omit; but now it appears that he proposes to insert after the words "weighing machines," the words "except automatic weighing machines," and to strike out the words "weighbridges." It is obvious that the Committee cannot go back, except by general consent. There will be no opportunity for the honorable member to test the feeling of the Committee as regards weighbridges, unless it allows me to accept an amendment now. But, so far as automatic weighing machines are concerned, he can submit a proposal.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [6.14].—If that course were taken in this case, it would create a precedent which hereafter might be found to be inconvenient. I do not object to a test vote being taken, but I submit that after a line and a half have been deleted from the item it is too late to move the omission of prior

words. What I suggest is that the honorable member should move the insertion of a new paragraph, or an addition to a motion which probably I shall move presently, to bring the deleted articles under a lower duty. If I were to take no further action, those articles would be liable to a higher duty than they were under this item, but that I did not and do not intend. I have a note to propose that they should be made dutiable at 10 per cent. and 5 per cent. respectively. Have we arrived at the stage, sir, when I can move in regard to tanners' measuring machines? I want to get them included in this item.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Some honorable members want to speak first.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—I submit, sir, that it would be very unfair if the amendment of the honorable member for Fremantle were ruled out of order, because I called to you, "Will he not be too late?" You did not hear what I said; but I heard you distinctly tell the honorable member that he could move his proposal afterwards; and, relying on that direction from the Chair, he deferred taking any action until after the Minister had moved. I submit, sir, that the Committee ought to offer no objection to the honorable member moving his proposal now, seeing that he was misled by what you said.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I wish to suggest that there is a very easy way out of the difficulty, and that is to pass this item as it is, with an addendum that on and after a certain date, automatic weighing machines shall be free.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN.—If the honorable member for Fremantle desires to move that on and after the 27th November, automatic weighing machines and weighbridges shall be free, he may do so when the item before the Committee has been dealt with.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) proposed—

That after the word "including" the words "Tanners' Measuring Machines" be inserted.

Mr. FRAZER (Kalgoorlie) [6.16].—There is a misunderstanding on the part of some honorable members as to the extent to which the honorable member for Fremantle wishes to go. I do not think that he desires his proposed amendment to apply to penny-in-the-slot weighing machines.

Mr. HEDGES.—No.

Mr. FRAZER.—The object which the honorable member has in view is to exempt automatic machines used for weighing coal and various ores. As the trucks run along the lines they pass over automatic scales which record their weight as they cross them. Those machines are patented, and despite what has been said by the honorable member for Bendigo, I do not think that they have ever been made in Australia. If the honorable member will accept, a proposition which, I understand, the honorable member for Newcastle intends to make, he will have my support, since it will enable a specific proposal to be put before the Committee.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS (Robertson) [6.20].—Tanners' measuring machines are designed to measure the surface of leather. Leather is sold by measurement instead of by weight, and these machines, which are made in Fitzroy, are very ingenious. I have lately had an opportunity to test them, and think that if we are to give the protection of a 20 per cent. duty to any machine made in Australia, we ought certainly to do so in this case.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. LIDDELL (Hunter) [6.22].—I move—

That the words "Chemists' counter scales" be left out.

My desire is that these scales shall be included in item 212, under which chemical analytical and assay scales are free. A great deal depends upon the accuracy of dispensing scales, for a slight defect in one of them might lead to the loss of valuable lives. These scales, I understand, are not made in Australia.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I am advised that they are.

Mr. LIDDELL.—No reputable chemist would think of using any other than Avery's scales.

Mr. CHANTER.—That is an anti-Australian statement.

Mr. LIDDELL.—The honorable member knows as well as I do that I put the interests of Australia before those of any other part of the world. I hope that my amendment will be agreed to.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [6.25].—I should think that item 212, which deals with—

Scales, viz., chemical, analytical, and assay, including weights; and precision and physical balances

covers the scales which the honorable member has in view. The scales included in

this item are used on counters in the ordinary way, and the amendment would make them free.

Mr. WILSON (Corangamite) [6.26].—The scales which the honorable member for Hunter desires to have placed on the free list are not covered by item 212. They are small dispensing scales balanced in the hand, and they weigh quantities of from half-a-grain upwards. I do not think they are made in Australia.

Mr. HUME COOK.—Are not dispensing scales referred to in item 212 as "precision balances"?

Mr. WILSON.—No. The object which the honorable member for Hunter has in view would be met by inserting in item 212 the words "dispensing scales."

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—Surely the chemists can stand 20 per cent. on their scales.

Mr. WILSON.—Dispensing chemists work longer hours for a poorer return than do men in any other profession. Very few chemists in the retail trade make fortunes. Counter scales are larger than dispensing scales, and are used for measuring from a dram upwards. So far as they are concerned, the Tariff should not be altered, but I hope that dispensing scales will be included in item 212.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I dare say that they would be classed as coming under that item.

Mr. WILSON. — No; chemical and analytical scales are usually kept in a glass case; they have to be protected from any draught, in order that they may weigh correctly. The passing of the amendment will do justice to a profession that deserves consideration.

Mr. LIDDELL.—By leave, I wish to withdraw my amendment, in order that I may again bring forward this question when we are dealing with item 212.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [6.31].—I wish the question "that the words ad val., 20 per cent." stand part of the item, to be put.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN.—The honorable member for Fremantle has a prior amendment.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—It can be dealt with subsequently.

Mr. FISHER.—I rise to a point of order. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that you must leave the chair and suspend the sittings at 6.30, unless leave be obtained to continue.

Sitting suspended from 6.32 to 7.45 p.m.

Mr. FRAZER (Kalgoorlie) [7.46].—I should like to understand what the position now is. If the question, that the item as amended be agreed to, be now put, it will dispose of the whole item. Would it not be advisable that the amendment to be proposed by the Minister should be submitted before the submission of the question that the item be agreed to?

Mr. JOHNSON (Lang) [7.47].—If the question, that the item be agreed to, is now put, I point out that it includes a duty of 20 per cent. If the item be agreed to, it will preclude any honorable member from moving a lower rate of duty.

The CHAIRMAN.—I understand that an amendment is to be moved by the Treasurer which will take the form of a new item.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) proposed—

That the following new item be inserted—
“161A. Adding and Computing Machines and all Attachments, Cash Registers, Automatic Weigh-bridges and Automatic Weighing Machines, except Coin-Freed Automatic Weighing Machines, on and after 27th November, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 10 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 5 per cent.”

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—Shall I be in order in moving an amendment in the second column of item 161?

The CHAIRMAN.—No. The item has now been dealt with, including the second column. It has been our custom to take amendments upon the second column before the item as a whole is put. The honorable member did not take advantage of his opportunity in that respect, and he is now too late.

Mr. FRAZER (Kalgoorlie) [7.54].—I fail to follow the reasoning of the Government in regard to this new item. It was well enough to take the machines in question from the original item, but I do not agree with the duties now proposed to be levied, in view of the fact that up to the present time Australia has not been able to produce them. Many reasons might be advanced as to why the machines have not been manufactured in Australia, but the principal reason is that there are patent rights in regard to some of them. This cannot be said to be a protective duty. Where there is no reasonable chance of producing articles in Australia, we ought not to impose revenue duties.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The honorable member has voted for scores of such duties already.

Mr. FRAZER.—I deny that statement.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—It is a fact, all the same. I mean that revenue duties have been covered up in items which were supposedly protective.

Mr. FRAZER.—In my belief, each item which I have supported has been framed with the object of giving protection to an Australian industry. That, at all events, has been my intention. Whether I have been misled in some cases by the multitude of figures, I am not able to say, though I do not think I have been. At any rate, I shall not willingly be led into supporting high revenue duties. I fail to appreciate the desire of the Government to impose a duty of 10 per cent. upon these machines, which are so desirable and necessary in the conduct of many businesses within the Commonwealth. If there is an argument in favour of a revenue duty, I shall be pleased to hear it, but none has been advanced so far. I congratulate the Minister on appreciating the arguments which were urged in favour of removing these machines from the original item. He would have done good service if he had seen his way to place them on the free list.

Mr. STORRER.—This is a very fair compromise.

Mr. FRAZER.—I do not think that it is a compromise at all. The amendment is the result of certain information which has been pressed upon the Minister, and I do not think it is fair to the users of such commodities that they should have to pay revenue duties upon them.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [7.58].—I understood that the Treasurer had agreed to take these articles out of the item in which they were originally included in order to put them on the free list.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I never said so; I said the reverse.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I accept the Treasurer's statement, although I was under that impression. I think the goods ought to be free. The Minister is not aware how widespread is their use. Every coal-mine must have one of these machines; so must every gold-mine. There is scarcely a mine in Australia employing any number of hands that has not one of these automatic machines. Since they are not manufactured in Australia, but are protected by strict patent rights, it seems to me absurd to tax them. It means a

tax upon the primary industries of Australia.

Mr. McDougall.—Is this a tax upon the poor working man, then?

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Every man employed in a coal-mine has to have the result of his work passed over one of these automatic machines. My honorable friend may be quite certain that the capitalists will not pay this taxation themselves. They will pass it on to the poor working man, to whom the honorable member ironically alludes. There is nothing surer under the sun than that the working man will have to shoulder his proportion of the burden, which is ostensibly imposed upon the employer. There is no pretence that we make the machines in Australia. I therefore move—

That the amendment be amended by inserting after the word "machines," line 5, the word "free."

Question put. The Committee divided.

Ayes	15
Noes	30

Majority	15
----------	-----	-----	----

AYES.

Brown, Thomas
Carr, E. S.
Catts, J. H.
Cook, Joseph
Edwards, R.
Frazer, C. E.
Hutchison, J.
Livingston, J.

Poynton, A.
Sinclair, H.
Spence, W. G.
Thomson, Dugald
Watkins, D.
Tellers:
Johnson, W. E.
Willis, Henry

NOES.

Archer, E. W.
Bamford, F. W.
Batchelor, E. L.
Brown, Tilley
Chanter, J. M.
Coon, J.
Deakin, A.
Ewing, T. T.
Fisher, A.
Forrest, Sir John
Foster, F. J.
Groom, I. E.
Harper, R.
Hedges, W. N.
Irvine, Hans
Knox, W.

Lyne, Sir William
McDougall, J. K.
Palmer, A. C.
Quick, Sir J.
Storror, D.
Thomson, John
Tudor, F. G.
Watson, J. C.
Webster, W.
Wilson, J. G.
Wise, G. H.
Wynne, A.

Tellers:

Cook, Hume
McWilliams, W. J.

PAIRS.

Kelly, W. H.
Fysh, Sir Philip
Smith, Bruce
Fowler, J. M.
Atkinson, L.
Reid, G. H.
Bowden, E. K.
Glynn, P. McM.
Fuller, G. W.
Hughes, W. M.
Mahon, H.
Wilks, W. H.

Kingston, C. C.
Salmon, C. C.
Chapman, A.
Maloney, W. R. N.
Mathews, J.
Mauger, S.
Sampson, S.
Crouch, R. A.
Fairbairn, G.
Hall, D. R.
O'Malley, King
Page, J.

Question so resolved in the negative.

Amendment of the amendment negatived.

Proposed new item agreed to.

Postponed item 162. Marine engines, boilers, and machinery; and fittings and mountings n.e.i., for such engines, boilers, and machinery; shafts, propellers; winches; liners for cylinders; windlasses; steering gear; feed water heaters; feed pumps; evaporators, auxiliary condensers; feed water fillers; and ash ejectors, ad val. (General Tariff), 25 per cent.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [8.10].—I ask the Committee to negative this item, with a view to the insertion of the following new item:—

"Motive power machinery and appliances (except electric), viz.:—

- (A) Gas producers; flue-heated economizers; mechanical stokers; steam traps; steam turbines; superheaters; water purifiers, ad val. (General Tariff), 5 per cent.; (United Kingdom), free.
- (B) N.E.I. ad val. (General Tariff), 30 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 25 per cent."

As I informed honorable members a week or ten days ago, officers have been employed to effect a re-arrangement in respect of some of the items in this division. It will be observed that the new item which I have placed before the Committee does not include electrical machinery and appliances, which will be embodied in item 178. But in respect of the articles enumerated in the item under consideration, I have endeavoured to meet the wish of the Committee, and I hope that I have been successful. I admit that when I have previously attempted to do the same thing, I have been told that I have not succeeded. The articles originally specified in item 162, with the exception of those which are specifically mentioned in the new item, are covered by paragraph B. I hope that the course which I have adopted will have the effect of shortening debate.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—But the Treasurer has raised the duty, which was originally imposed, by 5 per cent.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I am anxious to extend a preference of 5 per cent. to Great Britain, and I hope that the Committee will assist me to do so. Two experts have been employed in re-arranging this item, one of whom is connected with the University, and the other with the Commonwealth public service. The instructions which I gave to them were to divide the articles specified in the amendments I have circulated into two groups, one of which was to include machinery and appliances, which it was possible to profitably manufacture in the Commonwealth,

and the other articles which we cannot profitably manufacture for some time to come. The machinery and appliances contained in the former group have been subjected to a higher rate of duty than the articles comprised in the latter. Of course, it is quite impossible to obtain absolute accuracy in regard to what is likely to be made in the Commonwealth with commercial success. Therefore, I have had recourse to experts for information which will enable me to devise a scheme that would be just and acceptable to the Committee.

Mr. FRAZER (Kalgoorlie) [8.16].—The item whose discussion we are now beginning, is one of the most important, if not the most important, in the Tariff. I am not sure that the Minister's proposal will be accepted by the Committee. I have heard it said that there will be a lot of debate upon it, and I think that it will be well to discuss the whole item at once, instead of having a discussion on each of its two paragraphs.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I do not think that there need be any debate on paragraph A.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—I have an amendment on that paragraph.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—So have I.

Mr. FRAZER.—I cannot conceive of there being no debate on a proposal in regard to which two amendments are to be moved. No doubt the re-arrangement of items which the Minister has submitted is intended to make the Tariff clear, and to facilitate its administration. Paragraph A covers several kinds of machinery, all others being dutiable as "n.e.i.," at a higher rate, under paragraph B.

Mr. HARPER.—The item deals with motive power only.

Mr. FRAZER.—The item deals with motive power other than electrical; the Minister has made that clear.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—It is so stated at the beginning.

Mr. FRAZER.—I may reasonably claim that those who live in the constituency of Kalgoorlie will gain fewer advantages from the Tariff, in the immediate future, at all events, than those who live in any other constituency in the Commonwealth. But, in framing a Tariff for Australia, we should endeavour, while giving as much consideration as possible to manufacturing, to avoid unduly harassing the great primary industries upon which the secondary industries must depend. Up to the present time, the mines of Australia

have produced £650,038,766 worth of gold, of which those of Western Australia have yielded over £73,000,000.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—Therefore a great deal of gold has been obtained from places other than Kalgoorlie.

Mr. FRAZER.—I do not dispute it. I do not contend that all the gold produced in Australia comes from Kalgoorlie, though, if one State is to be compared with another, it is worthy of mention that at the present time the Western Australian gold yield is nearly half that of Australia.

Mr. WILSON.—The Western Australian gold-fields saved Australia.

Mr. FRAZER.—The discovery of gold in Western Australia did a great deal for Victoria at the time of a big financial crisis.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—I understand that the yield of gold in Western Australia is now falling off, which makes it all the more necessary to give assistance to those interested in mining there.

Mr. FRAZER.—Like all well-established gold-mining centres, Kalgoorlie begins to feel the need for reducing costs, in order that the mines may continue to be worked profitably. While accidents sometimes occur in connexion with gold-mining, making the occupation of a miner somewhat dangerous, gold-mining is one of the best wage-paying industries in Australia.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The Minister has explained that "n.e.i." in paragraph B means only not elsewhere included in item 162.

Mr. FRAZER.—The Minister did not tell us that paragraph B does not cover all motive power machinery other than that specifically dealt with in paragraph A. If the honorable member will turn to the proposed new item 177, he will see that mining machinery, n.e.i., is omitted from it. I think that paragraph B covers all motive-power machinery not specifically dealt with by paragraph A.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The Minister has explained that the letters "n.e.i." in paragraph B refer merely to the machinery covered by item 162 as it stands in the schedule.

Mr. FRAZER.—If the motive power machinery to which I wish to refer is not covered by paragraph B, in what part of the Tariff is it dealt with?

Mr. WILSON.—It comes within the new item 164 as "n.e.i."

Mr. BATCHELOR.—This item deals with motive-power machinery and appliances only.

Mr. HARPER.—Yes. Item 164 deals with all other machinery.

Mr. FRAZER.—The proposals have been submitted in such a way that possibly some of the machinery to which I wish to refer is not covered by this item, although I think that it is.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—To what machinery does the honorable member wish to refer?

Mr. FRAZER.—To mining machinery of all descriptions, except electrical. If honorable members doubt whether general mining machinery comes under this item, I ask them to look at item 177. Perhaps the Minister will explain what machinery comes under paragraph B of this proposed new item? I do not wish to speak without knowing that. Apparently the Minister is not in a position to inform the Committee, and I defy any one else to say authoritatively whether the machinery to which I wish to refer comes under proposed new item 162, or under proposed new item 164, though I think that it comes under the former. What does the honorable member for Flinders say?

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—I think that the new item 162 covers machinery for motive power only.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—In my opinion, the new item 162 deals only with machinery for generating power, such as boilers, cylinders, engines, and air compressors, and does not cover such machinery as smelters, furnaces, and conveyors.

Mr. FRAZER.—Would they come under "n.e.i." in the proposed new item 164?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—Probably they would.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—What does the honorable member for Kalgoorlie wish to know?

Mr. FRAZER.—I wish to know whether the Treasurer proposes to include in paragraph B n.e.i. any machinery other than that which would be used for the purpose of generating motive power?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—In item 162 of the old Tariff we dealt entirely with marine engines and pumps. The item now before the Committee deals with motive power generally, and the whole of the machinery included will be found in item 162 and part of item 164, with the exception of electrical machinery, which is not dealt with in these items at all.

Mr. FRAZER.—Will items 162 and 164 include mining machinery?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—They will include some mining machinery, but not very much, I think.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Engines and boilers?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Yes, of course, they are motive power.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—And all that is left is in the new item 177?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—All that is not found in these items will be found in a later item 177 or 178. Honorable members will understand that it is motive power machinery that is included in the item under discussion at the present moment. They will see exactly what is included if they look at items 162 and 164.

Mr. FRAZER.—I think it is rather unfortunate that it should have been considered necessary to have two divisions in regard to motive power. The new item 162 includes steam turbines. I suppose that they are now used as frequently as the ordinary piston engines where that can be done conveniently, and as their value becomes more fully recognised they will be still more widely used in Australia. I wish to say that I am particularly satisfied with the course adopted by the Government in giving special consideration to that particular line. I was proceeding to say in regard to the main division that although there seems to be a tendency on the part of a few honorable members to conclude from the recorded proceeds of various mines that every man engaged in mining is doing pretty well, the very opposite is the real position with respect to nearly every mining proposition in Australia at the present time. It is true that there are a few Bonanzas, a few Great Boulders, Ivanhoes, and other such mines returning tremendous dividends to their lucky shareholders, but the number of big dividend-payers in the Commonwealth at the present time can be counted on the fingers of both hands. The returns from most mining propositions in the Commonwealth at the present time are such that any considerable increase in the cost of working them, whether in the matter of machinery or stores, might involve either a reduction of wages or the closing down of the mines. Where an additional price can be charged for a protected commodity, and the duty thus passed on to the consumer, a protective Tariff can be operated, but in dealing with mining propositions honorable members

must remember that if additional duties were imposed, which would have the effect of increasing mining charges, they would not at the same time increase the value of the ores which are being mined.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—We cannot increase the price of gold.

Mr. FRAZER.—We cannot, unless we are prepared to attach an additional schedule to the Manufactures Encouragement Bill and give a bounty upon the production of gold in Australia, a proposition which is not likely to commend itself to this House. In making these remarks I do not wish to say that anything should be done contrary to the general policy of protecting the industries of the country, but I am endeavouring to show that, with the exception of the few rich mines to which I have alluded, mining in Australia at the present time is in such a condition that reductions in the cost of working must be the first consideration of those controlling our mines. In order to secure that reduction of working cost, tools manufactured by specialists for the mining and treatment of ores must be used in every case. The manufacturers of general machinery in Australia, and in other parts of the world, are unable to compete in the manufacture of special tools of trade required in the mining industry. Those engaged in the industry must look to specialists in the manufacture of machinery whose machines have command of the world's markets to enable them to get their work done at a business cost. Mining men admit that Australian manufacturers can supply satisfactory mining machinery for several purposes, but in respect of other purposes, and for the treatment of refractory ores, they have to look to German, American, and English specialists for different classes of special machinery. It will be admitted that the present demand in Australia would not justify manufacturers in laying down the plant that would be necessary for the manufacture of machinery required to deal with various mining processes on a commercial basis. A great deal of the machinery used in the mining industry throughout Australia can be satisfactorily manufactured in the Commonwealth, and it is certainly the duty of the Government, by means of duties imposed under a Tariff, to give those who require to use that class of machinery an inducement to use the Australian article.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—What duties?

Mr. FRAZER.—That is a question with which I shall deal in a moment. I wish to say, in justice to a number of men engaged in mining in Western Australia, and whom I know personally, that the suggestion that British or foreign machinery is preferred to Australian, because the men who are working the mines are foreigners, or have come from Great Britain, is, in my judgment, without foundation. I know a number of men engaged in the mines of Western Australia who are Australians by birth, have spent most of their time and gained their experience in Australia, and are now managing Australian mines. They are Australian in sympathy, and are prepared to give every consideration to the use of Australian machinery, where it can be successfully employed. But in some cases they find that they are unable to work their mines at a reasonable cost by using Australian machinery. In connexion with machinery *n.e.i.*, the necessity of giving consideration to the Australian manufacturer would be met, in my opinion, by a duty of 20 per cent. under the General Tariff, and of 15 per cent. on imports from the United Kingdom. I mention these rates because I have it on the best authority that on general items 26 per cent. represents the difference between the *f.o.b.* cost and the cost *f.o.r.*, Fremantle, which would include freight, loading, insurance, and other charges associated with shipping. I am told that on the average freights now being paid to Western Australia, it works out at from 25 per cent. to 26 per cent. There is therefore a very considerable geographical protection to the Australian article.

Mr. TUDOR.—What would be the charges to Victoria?

Mr. FRAZER.—The freights to Victoria would be slightly less.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Is the 26 per cent. exclusive of the duty?

Mr. FRAZER.—No, it represents the difference between the cost *f.o.b.* London, and *f.o.r.* Fremantle, when, of course, the goods would have passed through the Customs. That is a considerable natural protection, but Victoria gets it to a less extent because the shipping ring up to the present have imposed higher charges in relation to goods coming to Western Australia than on goods coming to eastern Australia. I do not know why that should be, and I understand that the beautiful

mail contract which we passed recently is going to remove it for the future. The greatest consideration will have to be given to the schedule now proposed by the Minister. I am particularly desirous of handing over to the Australian manufacturer those works which experience has taught us he is eminently adapted to perform. But I am also desirous of insuring that one of the greatest producing industries of this country, which is also one of the best employers of labour, shall not be unduly harassed by the application of the Tariff.

Mr. WILKS (Dalley) [8.46].—The honorable member for Kalgoorlie wishes to debate the question of mining machinery, but he could do that later on. The heading of this item, as revised, is "Motive power machinery, and appliances." That covers marine engines and fittings, propellers, and boilers and fittings. This opens up the whole general question of the manufacture of motive power machinery. I desire to say a few words in support of the Government on this item. During the three months of consideration of the Tariff, they have given 150 per cent. protection on hats, and 40 per cent. on woollens, and to-day they fought most strenuously for protection upon nails. The nail industry employs not more than about twenty hands, whereas the engineering industry employed 15,000 odd hands in Australia in 1904—that is the latest return which I could get for the whole of the States—and in 1899 there were 16,400 hands employed, so that the industry has lost ground. I wish to show that the original duty of 12½ per cent. has not assisted the engineering establishments of Australia.

Mr. POYNTON.—How many men are employed in mining?

Mr. WILKS.—This item does not deal with mining machinery. I am speaking of motive power machinery. When I saw so many mushroom industries getting assistance, I thought that at least we could put up a fight for the engineering industries. Had I been a protectionist all my life, I should not have rested until the iron and engineering trades had received first consideration. I could never understand why the subsidiary or auxiliary trades were assisted at the expense of what are really the main trades which protection should help. I make no secret of my object on this occasion. I am simply fighting, like many other honorable members are, for the interests of my constituents. A few days

ago the Victorian members desired to give a lot of consideration to the question of whether the New South Wales iron industry should be assisted, because they said there was only one employer concerned, before they voted any sum of money, although that was for a venture for the production of iron, of far-reaching importance to the whole of Australia. But to-day, in the case of the nail industry, they did not show the slightest hesitancy in supporting an increase of the old duty of 25 per cent.—twice the duty that there has ever been upon machinery—up to 40 per cent. Surely any man, unless he is a most rabid free-trader can put in a claim for the engineering establishments, when all these favours are being handed out all round. I say openly that not only one engineering establishment, but probably the largest as well as a lot of others, are in my electorate. I make that statement in order that honorable members may thank me, if they wish, for my brutal candour. When I see others making their best efforts for their electorates, I feel that it is my bounden duty to do the best I possibly can for my electorate. All the workers in my electorate have to pay heavy duties on every thing they eat, wear, and use, and I am prepared to see whether I cannot do a little for them in return by means of Tariff assistance. One of the troubles of the trade in the past was that it had to rely upon repairs only. That meant a most precarious existence for the engineering firms. What they required was a chance of new work. I appeal to the Labour Party, who sink the fiscal issue, to sink it very deeply on this occasion, because they will never raise up a sturdy body of apprentices in the iron trades of Australia until they give those large firms an opportunity of doing work other than repairs. I am a new protectionist in more ways than one. I am going to support the new protection, not only in the case of this industry, but in the case of all others which receive Tariff assistance. I have always said that, if manufacturers would share the improved conditions with their employes, and also with the users of the articles which they produce, any man who resisted the imposition of a duty to build up an industry of that character, must be essentially a foreign trader. I am not, and never have been, a foreign trader. The only reason why I opposed the imposition of duties in the past was that the assistance which the public were compelled to give to industries

under the Tariff did not percolate to the proper channels, but went only into the pockets of a few master manufacturers. Now that we have a promise of new protection, I give my support to the Government on this occasion subject to that being carried out. If the Government fail to carry their new protection, I shall be the first to ask the House to revert to the old Tariff, because I do not believe in imposing upon the users of machinery, any more than of any other article, heavy duties, if there are not compensating advantages for those employed. Although I am a theoretical free-trader, if, for practical purposes, a class of legislative machinery is provided that will share the benefits all round, I say that any man who does not wish to go to the other extreme should readily accept it.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—Can the benefits be shared all round?

Mr. WILKS.—I believe so. I committed myself to that six or eight weeks ago.

Mr. WILSON.—How would the honorable member treat the case of the consumer?

Mr. WILKS.—The honorable member had better ask the Treasurer that question. I am not responsible for the Bill.

Mr. HUGHES.—Will the honorable member differentiate between the different kinds of machines? Is he satisfied with paragraphs A and B?

Mr. WILKS.—I am satisfied with paragraph A, because it includes articles for the production of which in Australia at present, I would not press, but the "n.e.i." part covers motive power machinery, marine boilers, and fittings, steam winches, and other machines, which surely any engineering establishment in Australia can produce. I wish to show the Committee the difficulties which the Australian engineering firms have had to face up to the present. I will probably be twitted with the fact that there is an engineering establishment in my electorate. There are many in it. Those in the largest are not, and never have been, political supporters of mine.

Mr. HUGHES.—They will be after to-day.

Mr. WILKS.—I do not know about that. They are supporters of the Labour Party.

Mr. THOMAS.—The honorable member is making a very fair bid for their support.

Mr. WILKS.—The honorable member will do the same for the support of men in his constituency in the case of the timber duties.

Mr. THOMAS.—I am not blaming the honorable member.

Mr. WILKS.—My answer to the honorable member for Barrier is that I am making a bid in the interests of thousands of men, whom I have known for years, and have always fought politically, but who to-day have to carry a heavy burden of taxation upon their food and clothing. It is all up with the free-traders in this House. They are done already, so far as a low Tariff is concerned, although there are some items which I thank the Committee for imposing low duties upon, or even making free. Cotton is an instance. But in this case, I should be recreant to my trust as a representative of my electorate, if I did not fight for those men to get a small return out of the Tariff, seeing that in other directions, under the Tariff they have to carry new burdens. The Treasurer on some occasions says that this House is free-trade, and on others, that it is protectionist. I hope that on this occasion, in the case of the engineering trade, which must be considered the most important when protection is being given, in view of the great return from it, he will find that this is a protectionist House. He has been twitted on many occasions with the fact that no evidence had been given before the Tariff Commission regarding industries which he desired to protect. My old free-trade friends on this side of the chamber, have often rightly asked, "Where are the witnesses who stated that increased protection was required? We have read the report of the Commission, and cannot find any evidence from them." The Treasurer is, in this case, in the very happy position of being able to say that witnesses from the whole of Australia asked for an increased duty, and stated that their establishments were falling back under the old 12½ per cent. duty. They came, not from New South Wales and Victoria alone, but from the whole of Australia; not singly from each State, but in groups; and not only master manufacturers, but representatives of the various iron trades throughout the Commonwealth. The Commission had a splendid opportunity of cross-examining them, and cannot say that they were unable to come to any conclusion in this case for want of information and

evidence. Any one who reads their report on the engineering industries, will be astonished at the amount of evidence, and at its overwhelming character. There is one great difficulty which the engineering establishments suffer under to-day that they did not have to face a few years ago. Then they did not have the competition that they have now. The existing competition, strange to say, is caused by Australia's increased export trade of primary products. Vessels now take enormous cargoes of our exports, and invite what is called back loading. The old style of trade between the United Kingdom and Australia has been changed. In those days, ships came out in ballast for our wool. To-day they leave here heavily laden with our butter, wool, and other staple products, and are able to bring here as back loading bulky machinery, particularly motive power machinery, at a much cheaper rate than they did a few years back. Another consideration is that the vessels that trade to Australia to-day are four and five times greater in tonnage than those which came here then. Transit and freightage have become cheaper, on account of heavy cargoes being carried in large bottoms. This has proved a serious handicap to the engineering industries of Australia. In Australia, owing, of course, to the assistance of the trades unions, the men employed in engineering receive a higher rate of wage per hour than is paid in any other part of the world, even in the United Kingdom.

Mr. MATHEWS.—And still the wages are not high enough.

Mr. WILKS.—I quite agree with the honorable member.

Mr. HUGHES.—I think the wages are higher in America.

Mr. WILKS.—Without discriminating between the different branches of the trade, I should say that, generally speaking, the wage paid here is 1s. 3d. per hour.

Mr. HUGHES.—I think that fitters in America receive a higher wage than that.

Mr. WILKS.—That may be so in the case of goods of very fine finish, such as cutlery. I am now speaking, however, of heavy marine engines and so forth, in respect of which our greatest competitor is Great Britain.

Mr. HUGHES.—Some of the fitters in America receive 3.50 dol. and 4 dol. a day.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—The wages of the locomotive fitters govern the whole trade.

Mr. WILKS.—Not the branches of the trade of which I am speaking.

Mr. HUGHES.—Yes; the whole of the engineering trade.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—The hours are longer in America and England.

Mr. WILKS.—That is so; and it is of no use speaking of the wages in America being higher by 2s. a day if the men there work two hours longer. On the basis of an eight-hours day, I repeat that the wages here are higher, generally speaking, than anywhere else in the world, and certainly higher than the wages paid in Great Britain and on the continent of Europe. An interested witness before the Commission estimated that the labour cost is at least 87 per cent. higher here than in the Old Country.

Mr. FOWLER.—That is absolute nonsense!

Mr. WILKS.—I agree with the honorable member; but I should say that the difference is certainly 40 per cent.

Mr. FOWLER.—That is not so.

Mr. WILKS.—I happen to know that it is.

Mr. FOWLER.—Not over all the trade.

Mr. WILKS.—The honorable member for Perth is forgetting that in the old world piece work is the rule, whereas in Australia there is a fixed wage.

Mr. HUGHES.—In the Old Country the wages are something like 36s. a week.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—And here they are £3.

Mr. WILKS.—No doubt instances may be given of very high wages being earned on piece work, but that system has never been favorably received here by the workers. We ought all, I am sure, to be proud of that extensive establishment known as Mort's Dock and Engineering Works, which can by no means be regarded as a mushroom institution. In 1900, the company paid, in round figures, £149,000 in wages, as compared with £94,000 paid in the year 1903. That, of course, is a very serious reduction, and it shows that under the old Tariff the output was not increased. No man regrets that fact more than I do; but in order to put the case fairly, I may say that, in my opinion, the firm has suffered as much from want of proper administration as from any effects of the Tariff. The best proof of that statement is found in the fact that in and around Port Jackson, where, a few years ago, there was only this one engineering establishment, there are now, I am pleased to say, many. I have no desire to see engineering confined



to any one State; on the contrary, I should like to see the engineering industry flourishing throughout the Commonwealth. I am putting in no plea on behalf of this large firm, but merely stating the facts in order to impress honorable members who earlier in the day were so keenly advocating Tariff assistance for an industry which employs only twenty men. As a matter of fact, in the free-trade days of New South Wales, Mort's Dock was busier than it is to-day.

Mr. MATHEWS.—There were more ships arriving here then.

Mr. WILKS.—Exactly; and the business thus lost must be replaced in some way. If protectionists are showering favours all round, some assistance ought certainly to be rendered to the engineering industry. In the case of vessels built in England for the Australian coastal trade, the engines with which they are fitted were admitted duty free under the old Tariff. Why should the Australian engineering industry be under this disability? This is the very class of machinery with which the Australian industry has to compete; and now that there is to be a bonus on iron, I hope to see a bonus on ship-building. I am with the Treasurer in regard to the duty that he proposes; but I must point out that Mr. Franki, the manager of Mort's Dock, when before the Royal Commission, said that if there were no countervailing duty of 10 per cent. on angle and other iron, he would be satisfied with a protective duty of 25 per cent. After we have imposed duties representing 150 per cent. on hats, 40 per cent. on nails, and 40 per cent. on woollens, the request made on behalf of a permanent institution like Mort's Dock appears to me a very mild one. Of course, if a bonus on iron is agreed to, the difficulties of the engineering trade here will be to a great extent minimized; but I hope that if the general Tariff is fixed at 25 per cent., that will not be used as an argument for a reduced duty in favour of the Mother Land. In the case of the necessities of life, I have availed myself, in the most innocent manner, of that cute device. But I do not want the Committee, on this occasion, to follow the example, because I believe that a protection of 25 per cent. in this case cannot be said to be extortionate, when compared with the duties which have been imposed on other items. I intend to support the proposal of the Minister, subject to the application of the

policy of new protection. I am not prepared to extend to our engineering firms high rates of duty, if their employes are not to share in the protection which they themselves receive. For years that has been the cause of my strong opposition to the policy of protection.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—Do not the men receive good wages in these establishments at Sydney?

Mr. WILKS.—The men do not receive as good wages as they ought to get.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—In Western Australia they receive very good wages.

Mr. WILKS.—In answer to question 84555, Mr. Franki said that the value of engines, boilers, and machinery imported during the four years 1900-3 into New South Wales was £2,411,467, equal to about £600,800 per annum. I have quoted the figures in regard to one State in order to bring home to honorable members the volume of the imports. In asking for the imposition of these duties, I am not in the position of many honorable members who have voted for a bounty upon the production of rice or other product. There is no question about the class of labour which will be employed in the engineering establishments. I trust that when the Government initiate their immigration policy, at an expenditure of £200,000 or more, the main proportion of the immigrants will be drawn from the United Kingdom, and that the greater number of the British immigrants will be men engaged in the engineering and kindred trades. Everything points to the necessity of building up this industry in preference to all others. The men who are employed in the iron trade do not work at a low rate of wages, but rather at a high standard, and certainly they produce articles which are of great utility to Australia. I admit that the new proposal of the Minister includes some articles, such as electrical appliances, which it may not yet pay Australia to produce, and for that reason I see no necessity to make them dutiable. I believe that this is not, by a long way, the last that we shall hear of the Tariff.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not think so.

Mr. WILKS.—I believe that if the Treasurer had been allowed to have his own way from the start, we should have found that the Tariff was full of anomalies, and even if we accept the new proposals he has submitted, I anticipate that anomalies will hereafter be discovered. It is only experience that will teach us how to

frame the Tariff on satisfactory lines. It seems to me most absurd on the part of a public man to say, "If you settle the fiscal issue, it is settled for all time." I admit that the main question may be settled, but practically every third year the Tariff will require to be amended; the particular item before the Committee, if adopted, will require to be amended at the end of that period. I shall vote with the Treasurer on the items to which I have referred. I do not intend to deal with other articles, such as traction engines, because they come under a different item. I do not think that they deserve such strong support as do some of the items to which I have referred. I recognise, sir, that the mere fact of a member addressing you has very little influence on debate, with the exception that he can point out that certain honorable members have not sound grounds for their advocacy of an item. If it can be shown that the institution on whose behalf I have been pleading is of mushroom growth, I do not suppose that the Committee will extend to it any sympathy or support. But honorable members will be able to estimate its value when I quote the following passage from the report of the protectionist section of the Tariff Commission:—

The representatives of Mort's Dock and Engineering Company alleged that, with the view of giving the 12½ per cent. Tariff a trial, and of instituting a comparison between the cost of local production and that of importation, his firm had during 1900 and 1904 built several sets of engines and boilers, aggregating about £18,000 in value, but, instead of profit, there had been a loss of about £2,000, or 11 per cent. on the cost of production.

I do not like to hear of that loss, sir, but I do not wish the Committee to be influenced by that fact too much, as it may have been due to want of administration. We certainly are confronted with this position, that fewer men are employed in engineering establishments in Australia to-day than in 1899; and, so far as New South Wales is concerned, less men are employed to-day than was the case prior to Federation. That should appeal to every one who has any consideration for the welfare of Australia. I desire to give an illustration of the difficulties against which local manufacturers have to contend. Referring to Mr. Franki's evidence, the protectionist section of the Tariff Commission said—

As an illustration of the difficulties against which local manufacturers contended he mentioned one case where his firm tendered for the

construction of a boat of about 1,700 tons for the Newcastle trade. His company was prepared to execute all the work in connexion with the hull, but were, he alleged, handicapped to the extent of about £20,000 at the outset. The work, as a whole, was estimated to be worth nearly £70,000, of which labour represented £23,000. The difference between labour here and in England would be about £12,000 in favour of the latter country. About £16,000 worth of patented machinery would have been required, the freight and charges on which would total £4,000. The duty on these importations would be about £2,000, and on the framing, &c., for the ship, which would have to be imported, an additional £2,000.

The report is full of illustrations respecting the difficulties or anomalies which existed in the old Tariff. The greatest anomaly was that it allowed ship fittings to come in duty free, when they could be made in Australia. I shall not pursue the subject any further, but conclude by saying that I intend to vote with the Government for the imposition of duties of 30 and 25 per cent. respectively.

Mr. BATCHELOR (Boothby) [9.19].—I must congratulate the Treasurer, and whoever was responsible for the rearrangement of these items. It is certainly a more scientific arrangement than was the original one, and is much clearer. But I am rather afraid that it may tell against the desire of the honorable gentleman, because many honorable members have a special kind of motive power or special machinery applicable to a particular industry which they desire shall be admitted at a reduced duty. The whole of the speech of the honorable member for Kalgoorlie was devoted to showing the necessity for a reduction in the duties upon mining machinery. If honorable members generally indorse his view, the Treasurer must recognise that all the opponents of a high duty upon any particular line of machinery will be arrayed against him for the purpose of defeating it.

Mr. FOWLER.—Why should not they? Does the honorable member advocate the mutilation of the Tariff in order that the Treasurer may gain a technical advantage?

Mr. BATCHELOR.—I am merely pointing out that whilst the grouping of the articles comprised in this item is exceedingly good, if the Treasurer had desired to bring about a defeat of his own proposals he could not have presented them in a better form.

Mr. FOWLER.—For once he is sacrificing expediency for the sake of principle.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—But he is also sacrificing the duties which he proposes. I fear that the effect of his proposal will be that, if the duty upon mining machinery is reduced, the imposts upon all other motive power and machinery will also be reduced.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—Is not the mining industry entitled to as much consideration as is the woollen industry?

Mr. BATCHELOR.—I ask the honorable member if that statement has anything whatever to do with the question? From some points of view the mining industry may be entitled to special treatment. The whole of the speech of the honorable member for Kalgoorlie was in that strain.

Mr. FRAZER.—All the articles enumerated in this item were previously subjected to a duty of $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—Yes, and it practically ruined the industry. Whatever real agitation has taken place in favour of an increased Tariff is the result of the ridiculously low duty of $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. which we imposed upon motive power and machinery. As the result of the present rearrangement of these articles, the Treasurer must expect to be placed in a difficulty. I am informed that gas heaters, flue-heated economizers, and mechanical stokers can be manufactured in Australia.

Mr. SPENCE.—Patent rights prevent that.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—The superheater is a very simply-made contrivance, and the same remark applies to flue-heated economizers. That the latter can be manufactured in the Commonwealth, the following letter from Messrs. White and Hosier, mining and general agents, at Broken Hill, to the Austral Otis Engineering Company, Melbourne, shows—

Re economiser. I thank you for your wire of yesterday in reply to my inquiry for a Green's, or same type Economiser, but regret that I was unable to do business at your figure as against the imported quotation.

That document demonstrates that the old duty was insufficient to enable the Austral Otis Engineering Company to manufacture these economizers at a sufficiently low price to enable it to compete successfully with the imported article.

Mr. SPENCE.—We cannot make the same machine here.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—We can manufacture the same type of machine. In

most of these machines the part that is patented is a very small one. The balance is made locally. In considering this matter, I ask honorable members to divorce from their minds the idea that this item refers to anything other than motive power engines and their appliances. Some honorable members have been under a misapprehension. The item includes ordinary engines and their appliances. It does not cover machinery generally. Take a mine. This item covers the machinery that would usually be employed in the engine room, but all the other machinery outside, comprising nine-tenths of the machinery on the mine, would not come under this item at all.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—It would not include the battery.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—It would include the pumps, but not any of the articles mentioned in item 177. Most mining machinery would come under item 164. So that we are not dealing with much of the patented machinery, but chiefly with steam, gas, and oil engines as generally understood. No electrical appliances are included. So far as motive power goes, the engines used on mines do not differ materially from engines used on other works. Amongst other things that would be included are boilers. Surely we are not going to turn out this Tariff with a duty of 15 per cent. on boilers. If so, we might just as well throw the Tariff under the table for all the value it will be to the producing interests of Australia. In regard to articles as to which there are no patent rights and no special difficulties in construction, there is every reason for hoping that we can establish a successful industry by means of a substantial duty. We have imposed large duties in regard to many industries which afford very little employment. In this case nearly the whole cost is labour cost. Notwithstanding the denial of the honorable member for Perth, we must not forget that the labour cost in Australia is very much greater than in Great Britain. In regard to unskilled labour, the difference may not be very great, but in the case of engine fitters, boiler-makers, pattern-makers, and blacksmiths, whereas the wages paid in Great Britain run from about 36s. to 38s., which are the recognised union rates; in Australia the standard union wage is 60s. a week. So that there is a difference of labour cost amounting to over 60 per cent. We have

to face that fact. It is no use for honorable members to think that a sufficient duty is being imposed to enable the industry to be successfully conducted unless this difference in labour cost be taken into account.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—That is a lively thing for the consumer.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—What is the natural protection in freight and charges?

Mr. BATCHELOR.—It is fairly heavy. But for that fact there would be no such industries in Australia at all.

Mr. FOWLER.—The labour cost is only about one-third the value of the product.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—Not in the line with which we are now dealing. In regard to very many of these motive power engines the labour cost is very much higher than 50 per cent. of the total.

Mr. FOWLER.—That can only be in workshops that are not properly equipped.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—We have to take into consideration the whole cost of production, included in which is the cost of labour.

Mr. FOWLER.—These articles are mostly made by machinery, which does not depend on men's wages.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—Even in regard to machinery, very much depends upon the wages paid to those who tend the machines.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—If we make machinery very expensive we lessen the opportunities for men to get good wages.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—Of course if we were to impose such taxation that industries would not be able to prosper, and external competition was prevented, the honorable member would be perfectly right. Speaking as one who is just as anxious to see that the producer is not handicapped as is the honorable member, I point out that unless the duty is sufficiently high to encourage local production, there will be no local competition with the imported article, and, consequently, the foreigner will put up his price far beyond what it would be if there was internal competition. The best results are obtained when we have the foreigner and the local manufacturer into competition. This industry is well worth protecting, so that we may have healthy local competition with the imported article. Anything like a reduction to 15 per cent. would lead to a repetition of the trouble we have experienced in regard to the manufacture of iron and steel. By making such an amendment, we should disregard the mandate which protectionists in

this House have received from Australia, and deal a heavy blow at one of the best industries that we could preserve.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [9.47].—I should like the Committee to agree at once to the omission of the old item so that I may move the insertion of the proposed new item, and thus afford the Committee a better opportunity of dealing with the Government proposal.

Item negatived.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) proposed—

That the following new item be inserted—

"Item 162. On and after 27th November, 1907, Motive Power Machinery and Appliances (except Electric), viz. :—

(A) Gas Producers; Flue-heated Economizers; Mechanical Stokers; Steam Traps; Steam Turbines; Superheaters; Water purifiers, ad val. (General Tariff), 5 per cent.; (United Kingdom), free.

(B) N.E.I., ad val. (General Tariff), 30 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 25 per cent."

Mr. KNOX (Kooyong) [9.43].—I do not suppose that in any other part of the Tariff we have so wide a drag-net as is paragraph B of the proposed new item. I still adhere to the belief that it is necessary to specify more fully than has been done the machinery and appliances that are to come within this item, and then to allow B, n.e.i., to stand.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—That would not reduce the drag-net effect of paragraph B.

Mr. KNOX.—But the Committee would then know exactly what machines and appliances came within the item. Although before the honorable member for Boothby spoke, most honorable members were inclined to think that this item applied more particularly to motive power machinery used in the mining industry, we must recognise that it will affect all industries. That being so, the Treasurer might with advantage have made a further segregation of the item by differentiating between mining and other industrial machinery. I hope at a later stage to secure his co-operation in a proposal to differentiate between electrical machinery and appliances and other machinery. Although the speech made by the honorable member for Boothby was a forcible one, he must recognise that those who address themselves more particularly to this item as having a special bearing upon the mining industry are justified in the belief that in relation to the machinery employed, that industry has not received such special consideration in

other parts of the Tariff as have other industries. This is one of the most important items in the Tariff. It is estimated that there are directly engaged in the mining industry of Australia over 100,000 men.

Mr. SPENCE.—Over 112,000.

Mr. KNOX.—I quoted round numbers. It is said that there are dependent upon every one of those directly employed in the mining industry at least five others. On that computation, it will be seen that the proposed duties directly affect about 500,000 persons. In addition, it may be pointed out that nearly every person in Australia is or has been interested, more or less directly, in some mining enterprise. The honorable member for Kalgoorlie told us of the immense amount of gold which Australia had yielded; but the proposed duties affect, not only gold-mining enterprises, but also copper, silver, tin, lead, and other mines. Those connected with such ventures ask, not so much for help, as for relief from unduly heavy burdens. The timber duties and other proposals which will come before us, as well as the duties immediately under discussion, press very heavily on the mining community. Honorable members have said that they wish to see all the machinery used in Australia manufactured locally. I, too, should like that to come about. But those who have special knowledge know that there are many appliances, protected by patents, or manufactured in accordance with special methods, in Europe, Great Britain and America, which cannot be made here. Our manufacturers, given a regular turn-out, and no labour difficulties, can make ordinary machinery as good as any made elsewhere. While machinery made in the older manufacturing countries may have a better finish than is given to Australian machinery, our workmen have turned out magnificent machinery. It has been said that gold has a fixed value; but that is not true of other metals. The metal market is subject to great fluctuations, the value of our output being determined entirely by prices abroad. During the last twelve or eighteen months there have been enormous increases in the values of copper, lead, tin, and other metals; but of late prices have fallen considerably, and the present depression is having a serious effect on the mining industry. Therefore, I ask the Committee, while giving consideration to local manufacturers, not to impose too heavy duties on mining requisites. Let

me show what the proposed duties on machinery mean to some of the larger mining enterprises. I am informed the Cobar Company has ordered a plant, to cost £71,225, on which the Customs duty will be the enormous sum of £25,978, the higher rates of the present Tariff being responsible for an increase of £17,000. Six of the more important Broken Hill mines have been affected to the extent of £33,581, while the increase in the duty on machinery under order to the Mount Lyell Company, of Tasmania, is £4,086. The Western Australian Chamber of Commerce has informed me that the new Tariff has affected the Kalgoorlie mines to the extent of over £50,000. The Golden Horseshoe has ordered a new compressor upon which, on an f.o.b. cost of £5,651, the duty will be £2,175. Then the Great Fitzroy mine, a property in Queensland which has recently been developed, will have to pay a duty of £657 on a compressor costing £1,725 f.o.b. Although excellent compressors have been made in Australia, those required in these particular instances are of a special class, and could not be successfully made here. Surely the Minister, in proposing rates of 30 and 25 per cent., wished to have something to give away in expectation of reductions being moved. I gave notice yesterday of my intention to ask the Committee to agree to rates of 20 and 15 per cent., but I am only too glad that the honorable member for Kalgoorlie has moved in the matter. He represents one of the great mining centres of Australia.

Mr. FOWLER.—Of the world.

Mr. KNOX.—And of the world. Although the Kalgoorlie mines do not compare in extent with the great Rand mines, whose reefs run through many miles of country, what is known as the Golden Mile, Kalgoorlie, is probably the richest area of that extent in the world. The letters "n.e.i." mean so much, that I venture to suggest that the Treasurer would do well to consult with the officers of the Department upon the suggestion made by the honorable member for Boothby, that while some industries might fairly be expected to pay a higher duty for their motive power, the machinery providing the motive power required in the mining industry might be admitted at a lower duty.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Why should I make special provision for wealthy mining companies?

Mr. FOWLER.—What about the people who are dependent upon the industry?

Mr. KNOX.—I have tried to explain to the Treasurer the magnitude and importance of the mining industry.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The honorable member might explain the magnitude of the wealth taken out of this country by those engaged in the industry.

Mr. KNOX.—The honorable gentleman will permit me to say that, whilst we very frequently hear of the profits made from mines, very little is heard of the enormous amount of money contributed week by week and month by month by mining shareholders throughout Australia to carry on the industry. The Treasurer must have some knowledge on that point. He has, no doubt, been interested in some mining properties, and I am sure I hope that his investments in that direction have been successful. If mining were reduced to an exact science, and was not subject to so many risks, and associated with so many unfulfilled expectations, it would be a marvellous industry in which to invest one's money. I assure the Treasurer that the prizes of the mining industry are very few indeed. The honorable gentleman could count on his fingers the mining properties throughout the Commonwealth that are at the present time paying anything like large dividends to their shareholders. It is true that there is an enormous number of mines, that may be said to be existing between life and death, in connexion with which wages are being paid to thousands of men, and to which shareholders are regularly contributing, in the hope of ultimate advantage.

Mr. THOMAS.—There are more philanthropists in the mining industry than in any other.

Mr. KNOX.—The honorable member for Barrier speaks with considerable knowledge on this subject. He is aware of the comfort which the mining industry has brought to thousands of people resident in the great city of Broken Hill, which he represents in this House. Honorable members owe the presence of the honorable member in this Chamber, and I was going to say my presence in the Chamber also, to the existence of the great mines in that district. May I hope that for years to come the possibilities of the district may be considerably improved, and the honorable member for Barrier be here to represent it. There are no new developments of any great importance in the mining in-

dustry of the Commonwealth at the present time, and those who control mining operations must study the utmost economy in equipment and working cost in order to secure success. As the greater depths are reached on mining fields, we have to deal with refractory sulphide ores, which require for their successful treatment appliances included in these items, the increased cost of which, due to excessive duties, might represent the difference between profit and loss.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The honorable member proposes a distinction between mining and other machinery. In the case, for instance, of an imported pump, who is to know in what industry it is going to be used?

Mr. KNOX.—The honorable member will remember that when we were dealing with the first Tariff, I succeeded in inducing the Committee to adopt a uniform rate of 15 per cent. That rate was subsequently altered in the Senate, and a compromise was arrived at, fixing the duty at 12½ per cent. I then saw the difficulty to which my honorable friend now refers, as well as the desirableness of a uniform rate in connexion with machinery. I was led to make the suggestion I made to-night, in view of the business-like address delivered by the honorable member for Boothby, who pointed out that while the Minister, in common with many members of the Committee, desired to see subordinate industries assisted under the Tariff, the mining industry, in view of the disabilities and difficulties with which those engaged in it have to contend, is unable to afford to pay high duties on the articles included in these items.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The difficulty is that we cannot tell the destination of much of this machinery.

Mr. KNOX.—I admit that the honorable member for North Sydney has suggested a practical difficulty which did not at the moment occur to me, or possibly to the honorable member for Boothby. The question is whether the Committee is prepared to deal fairly by manufacturers in affording them some additional consideration under the Tariff, in view of the proposals made to attach certain conditions requiring the payment of sufficiently high wages to the workers in these industries. We are entitled under those new conditions to assume that the old duty would not compensate for the new obligations placed upon the manufacturer.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—What additional duty does the honorable member propose to give the manufacturer?

Mr. KNOX.—I propose duties of 20 per cent. and 15 per cent.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Does the honorable member call an increase of 2½ per cent. ample?

Mr. KNOX.—It means 7½ per cent. I have been quite frank with the Government in the desire to indicate to them the feeling of the Committee on this item, so far as I could gauge it. The Treasurer knows that I have suggested this as a fair and reasonable compromise.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Fair compromise!

Mr. KNOX.—If the Treasurer expects the Committee to pass the high duties which he has proposed, in connexion with the mining industry, I assure him that if I am any judge of the feeling of the Committee, he is very much mistaken. I urge him to lessen the duration of the debate by accepting the compromise.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I would not if I stopped here for fifty years. It is an absurd proposal.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN (Indi) [10.12].—I presented a petition this morning on this very subject. The honorable member for Kooyong has presented the facts in connexion with the larger mining companies of the Commonwealth. My petition dealt with a very simple company at Stanley, which employs some fifty men, and has been struggling ever since its birth. The company could not get a thirty-horse power portable engine here, and had to send to the Old Country for it. It has just come out, and a 25 per cent. duty means the payment of a sum of £250 and the bursting up of the company. That is not the kind of legislation that we were sent here to pass. I will read one of the numerous letters which I have received—

Beechworth, 20th November, 1907.

My dear Brown,—Kindly do the best you can for us in this matter. We have been staggering under innumerable difficulties from the start, and there have been six calls lately in quick succession. This 25 per cent. duty threatens to be a crusher. How can it be for the good of the country to discourage enterprise and to throw fifty men out of employment?

Certainly there is a Minister at the table, but the Minister who should be attending to these matters is nearly always absent when some important point is being discussed.

Mr. HUME COOK.—That is not correct. He sits here more than does any other Minister.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—That may be, but honorable members are asked to sit from 10.30 a.m. until all hours of the night. It is very difficult for a member to do his duty under these circumstances, especially when crushing imposts are put on nearly every industry that I have had any connexion with since I have been in Victoria. I understand that the Treasurer does not mean even to consider the suggestion of the honorable member for Kooyong, for duties of 20 per cent. and 15 per cent. Under the old Tariff the duty was 12½ per cent. on certain machinery, but portable and traction engines were free. We know that they cannot be made here.

Mr. MAUGER.—Rubbish!

Mr. FAIRBAIRN.—They are not in this item.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—I know that, but I understand that a general discussion is now being allowed on the items 162, 163, and 164, which the Treasurer proposes to group in another way. The honorable member for Kooyong very wisely suggested that instead of using the expression "n.e.i.," which is a drag-net of the worst possible character, the individual articles should be specified. I desire on this occasion to place upon record the necessities of the small mine which I have mentioned. To my knowledge, there are hundreds of mines in Victoria in a similar position. I said in this House some time ago that certain proposed legislation would diminish mining investment in this country, and that that diminution would mean a loss of employment for a very large number of men. Honorable members sitting in the Ministerial corner were good enough to jeer at the observation, and to say that they had heard it before. They will hear it still oftener if these heavy duties are to be put on struggling industries. The mining interest made this country. It is infinitely more important than is even the woollen interest, to which we have given a duty of something like 40 per cent. We have also given large protection to the hat manufacturers. Under a special line in the Tariff, a rebate of the full duty paid is allowed on "machinery and parts thereof, used in the manufacture of fibrous materials and felt, and felt hats, when installed for use in a woollen mill or hat factory." If those industries are allowed a rebate of the whole of the duty paid on their machinery when it is erected, we can surely afford to do the same for the great mining interest of the Commonwealth. I believe

that that would give a greater impetus to the mining industry than would any other legislation which we could pass. I shall be prepared on the next item to make a proposal by which some of the money, at any rate, may be saved to the company at Stanley, and to assist the honorable member for Kooyong in reducing this duty within reasonable limits. In the old days the late Sir Graham Berry, who over and over again rallied his party in this very House against overwhelming odds, told the farmers of Ballan and Bacchus Marsh that no higher duties than 10 per cent. would ever be required, and that when the cities had accepted the policy of protection he would see that the farmers were considered in this connexion. Well, we know how little benefit the farmers have received from protection. In the amendment which I have foreshadowed, I hope that I shall do something to assist the great mining interests of Australia.

Mr. STORRER (Bass) [10.22].—This may be called the miners' "night-out," seeing that so many special pleas have been made on behalf of the mining industry. When the honorable member for Kooyong was speaking I asked, by way of interjection, why any difference should be made between mining and other machinery, and he promised to inform me later. It is true that the honorable member explained why the duty should be reduced in the case of mining machinery, but he said nothing about the machinery required for other industries. No one denies the benefits of mining to Australia; but a similar special plea could be made on behalf of many other industries, for instance, saw-milling. The man who goes out into the back-blocks, and there prepares the timber for sale in the towns, performs work just as important as that in any other industry; and I could, therefore, urge that the machinery required by him is necessary to the well-being of the community, and ought not to be unduly taxed. The Tariff Commission was appointed with the object, amongst others, of assisting the engineering industry out of its difficulties. In Queensland and other places the industry was found to be suffering very much owing to the anomaly presented by the duties on the raw material and on the finished article. Hundreds of men were out of work, and it was considered necessary that something should be done to place the industry on

a sounder footing. There may be a reduction made in the particular duty under discussion; but I do not think it right that a distinction should be made between industries. There are many mines in my electorate, but I make no special plea on their behalf.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—Is not a duty of 20 per cent. sufficient?

Mr. STORRER.—That is another question; at present I am contending that all industries should be placed on the same footing.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—Does not mining take precedence of all those minor industries?

Mr. STORRER.—I think not, seeing that I have heard the honorable member earnestly advocating the claims of agriculture and other primary industries.

Sir JOHN FORREST (Swan) [10.25].—I am very loth to prolong the discussion, but I am compelled to do so at this late hour, in view of the fact that the mining industry is so important in the State of which I am one of the representatives. I am altogether opposed to the duty on mining machinery being made so high as the Government propose; and I do not think it is satisfactory to this House that the Government have proposed such high duties when they are willing to greatly reduce them in Committee. The Tariff should have been fully and fairly considered beforehand. The Government know the difficulty there was in fixing this duty on mining machinery in 1902, when the Government proposed a duty of 25 per cent., and Parliament decided to make it 12½ per cent.

Mr. MAUGER.—If the duty had been made 25 per cent. it would have been a great thing for Australia.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—Mining machinery, especially that necessary to deal with refractory ores, is, in many cases, not made in Australia, and many kinds of machinery from other countries are preferred by those who have to work it. To obtain gold and other minerals machinery is, of course, necessary. If the gold-fields were all alluvial diggings, and men could work without machinery, there would be a different tale to tell; but, especially in Western Australia, nearly all the gold is in reefs, and much scientific knowledge is necessary for its extraction. Machinery is as necessary to obtain gold from ore as are the tools of trade of any artisan. It is generally regarded as impolitic to tax

raw materials required by manufacturers; and I regard the machinery necessary for the treatment of refractory ores as really the raw material of the industry. Without machinery it is impossible to obtain gold; and it does not seem to me to be wise to place any difficulties or impediments in the way of procuring the necessary machinery. We all desire to encourage and stimulate manufactures, which afford employment for large numbers of people, who are consumers; and we desire Australia to be self-contained as far as possible. But we must be careful not to "kill the goose that lays the golden egg." We must be careful that, in trying to help one industry, we do not injure another. I am afraid, however, that the proposed heavy taxation on this necessary adjunct—the necessary tool—of gold-mining will very seriously hamper the industry. It is not every mining centre which is successful. In very many cases mining enterprises are unsuccessful. Those who are speculative and enterprising embark upon gold mining because of a great reward which may be in store for them; but a great many of them lose their money. It is not right to say to an enterprising man who desires to embark on this speculative work which, if successful, has such great result to the country and himself, "The materials by which alone you can win this reward for yourself and your country, shall be taxed, notwithstanding the fact that your venture may be unsuccessful." That, I think, is not defensible. I do not advocate it, but I think it would be more reasonable to place a tax on the product obtained, rather than put difficulties in the way of obtaining it. Very many of those who embark on gold mining get nothing; while others are very successful. Those who get nothing have not only lost their capital, but have also had to contribute large sums to the revenue, whereas the successful ones have not perhaps had to pay more to the revenue. I think that to impose a burden on a great industry is a suicidal policy. Why should those who embark on gold mining and mining generally, have burdens placed upon their industry for the benefit of another class of persons who have the same object in view, viz., to promote the welfare of the country? After all, mining is to a very large extent a wages question; it is a workers' question, as five-sixths of the value of the gold obtained is paid away

in wages and other local expenses. Those who embark on mining, whether they are successful or not, employ an immense amount of labour. Those who are unsuccessful, equally with those who are successful, are employers, and we know that in any case the employes have to be paid. If honorable members place extra burdens on the mining tools, for that is what they are, they will prevent prospecting and check enterprise. Gold mining and mining generally is a splendid industry, because it helps every one, and does no one else any injury. Many industries are, in a way, in competition with other industries; but that is not so with the mining industry. It helps every other industry, and injures none. Take, for instance, the Kalgoorlie, Broken Hill, and Murchison fields. At one time, these were uninhabited wildernesses, but now, owing to the mining industry, they are great hives of industry, supporting large populations, and affording excellent markets for all the producers of Australia. If it were proposed to tax only those who are making a profit out of the industry, there might be a little more sense in the proposal. But it is proposed to tax those who are unsuccessful, those who are struggling, and those who are losing their money equally with those who are successful. I do not see why any other industry should be treated in a better manner than the mining industry. In this Tariff, we see proposals for remitting taxation in regard to the woollen and hat industries, but no proposal to do the same thing in regard to the mining industry. Does any one dare say that the hat industry is as important to Australia as is the mining industry? There is no reason why any industry—I do not care what it is—should be treated in a better or more liberal manner than the great mining industry. I think that honorable members will do a great wrong if they hamper the mining industry. I hope that this desire to assist one section of the community, and not the most important section either, at the expense of a far more important industry will be unsuccessful. I would vote for the duty as it is now if I had the opportunity, but I shall certainly vote for the proposal which was outlined by the honorable member for Kooyong, and I think that even then we will have placed a far larger burden on this most important industry than is justifiable.

Mr. KING O'MALLEY (Darwin) [10.38].—It is very strange to hear honorable members pleading so hard for the poor miner. I represent the greatest mining district on this earth.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—Nonsense.

Mr. KING O'MALLEY.—I represent a district which is permanent. Year by year the population increases, the product increases, and the power of intelligence increases. They are the most intellectual people on this earth else they would not have voted for me to represent them. I have faith in the young Australian. Honorable members who sit in opposition have no faith in this country. In their opinion things can be made splendidly everywhere except in Australia. They love to wear and use goods which have been made out of Australia. I am making this remark in the best spirit of Christianity. A number of free-trade miners have come to me and urged me to vote for the imposition of high duties so that their sons may have a chance of getting something else to do than engage in mining. Many and many a time I have heard the Honorable Frank Hurd, of Toledo, pleading at Washington for free-trade, and saying, "You cannot make this or that in America." I have often heard the Honorable William McKinley say: "Give us a chance." I have also heard Garfield say: "Give us a chance." Honorable members have never given the Australians a chance to prove what they can do. How can the chance be secured if they do not take some step to stimulate industries, and give encouragement to people to invest their capital in the development of manufactures. I desire to encourage Australians to aspire to be something more than "hewers of wood and drawers of water." The primary producer requires to possess no very great amount of intellect. He has merely to sow the seed and Nature does the rest. Before Whitney invented the cotton gin in the southern States of America, cotton was valueless there. Yet a blackfellow was producing it—he was the primary producer.

The CHAIRMAN.—Order.

Mr. KING O'MALLEY.—I think that my remarks are germane to the question. As soon as the cotton gin was invented, cotton became an article of great commercial value. In exactly the same way we cannot expect capitalists to invest their money in industrial enterprises if we offer them no encouragement. Some honorable

members have said that the mining companies in Australia send their orders for machinery to Europe. But do they adopt that course because we cannot manufacture it in the Commonwealth? Why is it that orders for mining machinery are so frequently sent to Europe? It is simply because the mining managers wish to get commission upon the orders.

Mr. ATKINSON.—That is not a fair statement to make.

Mr. KING O'MALLEY.—The honorable member is very green in politics. He is in his swaddling clothes. I know a little more than he does about this question of commission. When I was in Western Australia a few years ago, mining managers repeatedly told me that they would place their orders for machinery with Australian manufacturers but for the fact that they could obtain a higher commission elsewhere.

Mr. HEDGES.—Give us a single instance.

Mr. KING O'MALLEY.—The honorable member for Fremantle is also green in politics. I am speaking of a matter of which I have absolute knowledge. I have no objection to the payment of commission upon orders. The practice is associated with almost every business enterprise in Australia. But I do hope that the Treasurer will stick to his guns and thus afford our Australian industries—and the iron industry in particular—a chance of proving that they are able to manufacture the best machinery in the world. Why should they not do so, seeing that we have the best managerial talent available? I suppose that I own one of the biggest antimony mines in the world, and I hope shortly to erect upon it machinery made in Australia.

Mr. HEDGES.—Where is it situated.

Mr. KING O'MALLEY.—Its name is the "Grizzly Anaconda." I have more faith in this country and its resources than have many persons who were born here. Some honorable members who are possessed of affluence, have been singularly blessed in Australia. In short, it is a country which they ought never to forget.

Mr. FOSTER.—They have not seen other countries, and consequently do not appreciate how good a place Australia is.

Mr. KING O'MALLEY.—I trust that the Treasurer will adhere to his proposals.

Mr. SPENCE (Darling) [10.47].—I think that the Treasurer has acted wisely in remodelling this portion of the Tariff.

But, to my mind, he has not gone far enough in the direction of making a number of articles dutiable under the general Tariff at 5 per cent., and admitting them free under the Tariff for the United Kingdom. So far as the engineering industry is concerned, I maintain that its chief requirement is a market for its manufactures. That market is provided by other manufacturing industries, which need to employ machinery, and by the big field of mining enterprise. If we study the interests of all these industries, we shall be doing the right thing. The old Victorian Tariff, despite the operation of heavy protective duties, and a big free list, yielded a large revenue. One of the difficulties about an n.e.i. item is this: When we are framing a Tariff, we place a number of articles in the free list. But if, in the course of years, fresh inventions are made in other parts of the world, and they are necessary for the mining industry, they are compelled on being imported to pay duty at the n.e.i. rate. That is one of the ways in which the mining and other industries are unnecessarily handicapped. It ought to be possible to make an arrangement to prevent that kind of thing, without injuring the protectionist policy of the country. This is, without intending to be, distinctly a revenue item. We have in various parts of the Commonwealth, notably in New South Wales, a considerable number of mines in which, though the formations are large, the ores are of a very low grade. When machinery is invented that enables these low-grade ores to be profitably treated, the result is to create a market for numbers of people who are not connected with mining at all. At Cobar, £50,000 per annum is paid by one company for ordinary supplies to its mine. It employs 700 men, all of whose wants have to be attended to. In this way mining creates a market for numbers of other industries. Consequently, whatever can be done to assist in its development is beneficial to the whole country. We have a good deal of inventive talent in the Commonwealth, but the world is larger than Australia, and in the United States of America, and other countries, busy brains are constantly devising improvements in the handling of large bodies of ore. Fresh processes and machinery are patented, and these can be made in Australia. It is not a question of asking for favours, but of necessarily taxing an industry that

Spence.

is important to very many other industries. It is extraordinary to me that some honorable members will insist on looking at this matter solely from an engineer's point of view. I never heard of an engineering manager who would admit that he could not make anything. Honorable members have seen some correspondence which has taken place between the manager of the Cobar Copper Mine and the manager of the Otis Engineering Company, a very fine firm that has done extremely good work. Mr. Blakemore challenged the manager of the Otis Company to say that he could make a particular machine. If honorable members look at the reply, they will see that the Otis Company's manager practically admitted that he could not make that machine. He said: "If the plans are supplied to us, we can make it." But what is the fact? The machine in question is made in the United States of America. I am assured personally by Mr. Blakemore that when the company bought the machine it tried to get the plans, but the American firm wanted £500 for copies of them. So that it is very easy to say: "We will make this machine if you give us the plans," when the plans cannot be procured except at a prohibitive price. These are facts that cannot be overlooked. The question of making many of these machines is simply one of money. The shareholders of mining companies will not permit their money to be wasted. Hence it is that a considerable number of items ought to be put upon the free list. There is one machine in particular, the Babcock and Wilcox tubular boiler, which should be put upon the free list. The Otis Company say that these boilers can be made here, and it is urged that if the duty were sufficiently high, the patentees would make them here. But that is a speculative thing. It would be an excellent thing if the Babcock and Wilcox patentees would do their work in Australia, but, in the meantime, their boilers are required for mining and other purposes. I am opposed to putting a tax unnecessarily upon industries. When matters affecting city firms have cropped up, it has been noticeable how much consideration has been given to their raw material, but honorable members do not seem to be disposed to pay so much attention to the machinery of our mining industry, which stands in the same relation to it as does raw material to many of our city industries. Mining is yielding £24,000,000 a year to

this country. An immense number of mines employ labour, and get little or no return. It is an industry that develops the country. If our Northern Territory is developed, we shall have to encourage mining there. Let us have a scientific Tariff, under which those goods which can be made in Australia will be protected, whilst those which cannot be made here will be put upon the free list. I am utterly opposed to industries being needlessly taxed. There are certain kinds of machinery that are made perhaps by only one firm in the world. It would not pay to make them here. It does not pay to make in Australia a machine which, perhaps, is only required by one mine. The question is whether it is reasonable to expect certain lines to be made here. I wish to impress upon honorable members the fact that instead of endeavouring to make it possible for engineering firms to manufacture machinery required only in exceptional cases, we should seek to encourage the development of other industries that provide a market for their general manufactures and will keep them going. The honorable member for Koovong has referred to the imports of the Great Cobar Company, and some honorable members have said that since it is an English corporation it is more likely than are local companies to import its machinery. The manager of the Otis Engineering Company, in a letter addressed to honorable members, has asserted that some mining managers select from catalogues the machinery they require. The suggestion that machinery is selected at random in this way shows that the gentleman in question knows very little about mining. The mine manager who adopted such tactics would not long retain his position. Mining managers and mine engineers, before placing an order for a machine, know exactly what it is capable of doing. The great English companies have inspectors, who travel all over the world and examine every new mining invention that is likely to be useful in the development of their property. They are never influenced by mere *ex parte* statements. Many of our mining propositions to-day—and more especially those employing the most labour—work on a very narrow margin of profit, and it is absolutely necessary for them to use the most up-to-date machinery. It has been stated that substitutes for patents are often employed; but, as a matter of fact, the sales of a machine are in many instances due largely

to a new patent that has been attached to it, and substitutes are generally inferior. The Treasurer is on the right track so far as the general framing of the item is concerned, but we should enlarge the scope of paragraph A. Later items covering machines and machinery are unlimited in their scope, and I think the mining industry should be taxed as lightly as possible. As has been said, we cannot protect the miner; we cannot control the prices of metals. Unfortunately, the prices of many metals have fallen, and a number of mines have been shut down. In my own electorate, the Nymagee Company is leaving untouched a great field of low grade ore, because in present circumstances it does not pay to work it. It is simply picking out the higher grade ores, but if it had railway communication, it would work a larger area and, with improved machinery, would treat ore that is now being passed over. A high duty on mining machinery would prevent the working of low grade propositions, and the engineering industry would be deprived of many orders that it would otherwise receive. I know something of the mining industry, and have no hesitation in saying that mining managers prefer, if possible, to obtain their machinery in Australia, since they can have it made under their own personal supervision. I have known imported high-priced engines on arrival to be found unsuitable. Experiences of that kind have caused most mining managers to endeavour, as far as possible, to obtain their machinery locally. I think that it would be well to add to paragraph A Babcock and Wilcox tubular boilers—the evidence is that they are not made here—and the Connorsville blower, which is patented. With those additions, the paragraph, so far as I am concerned, might be allowed to pass. I wish the tax on the mining industry to be as light as possible consistent with our desire that the engineering industry shall be so protected that it will be able to make most of the machinery that we require.

Mr. POYNTON (Grey) [11.9].—I hope that the Treasurer will agree to progress being reported.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—No. If we do not carry this item to-night, there will be no duty on machines and machinery of this kind.

Mr. TUDOR.—We can put it on again.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The Department cannot hold anything back. Another point is that we have done nothing to-day.

Mr. WILSON.—We have sat from 11 a.m. till 11 p.m.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—But we must make a fair advance. We have had nothing but talk to-day.

Mr. POYNTON.—I do not wish to put the Treasurer in an awkward position by leaving the blank unfilled to-night.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—But the old resolution is still in force.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—No, it has been struck out.

Mr. POYNTON.—While there is something to be said for the new proposals submitted by the Government, inasmuch as they reduce the rates of duty on some machinery, I take great exception to a drag-net arrangement such as that in paragraph B, whereby everything not specifically mentioned is dutiable as n.e.i. This classification, while probably extremely convenient to the Customs House authorities, is very dangerous to the public interest. It means that everything for which we do not specifically provide, including new processes and inventions, is to be dutiable at high rates. In the district which I represent there are miles of arid country, containing large quantities of low-grade ores. This country is useless for pastoral or agricultural purposes, its future depending upon its mining possibilities; and its ore reserves cannot be exploited profitably except by the use of the most up-to-date machinery. When 3 per cent. ores have to be dealt with, nothing but the best machinery and the most economical processes will make operations profitable. At the present time the Broken Hill mines are getting fairly good prices for their metals; but if there were a fall in lead, many of the properties there could not continue to be worked unless every effort were made to reduce the cost of production, and that can be reduced only by employing the latest machinery, or by cutting down wages. We have heard about the 16,000 men interested in the engineering trade whom these duties will benefit; but over 120,000 men are employed in the mines, and they are as a rule fairly well paid.

Mr. McDougall.—What about the tributaries of Ballarat?

Mr. POYNTON.—Unfortunately, they are badly paid; but that is greatly their own fault.

Mr. FOWLER.—The duties on mining machinery will not improve their positions.

Mr. POYNTON.—That is so. Next to the agricultural and pastoral industries,

mining is the greatest industry in Australia, and those engaged in it cannot obtain any benefits from a protective policy. It may be argued that if you establish industries you create consumers for the produce of the farmer; but that does not hold true of the mining industry. The output of our mines has to be sold in the markets of the world. While it may be well to consider the proposals of the Government from the stand-point of the engineering industry, it must not be forgotten that the mining industry in its various ramifications gives more employment than all our factories. But if you go through the manufacturing establishments in Melbourne, you will find that, although their market is protected by high duties, most of the machinery which they use has been imported free of duty. The manufacturers say, "We must have the best machinery, and what we need is not in large demand, so that it will not pay to make it locally." The same thing is to be said for the machinery requirements of the miner and of the agriculturalist. I regret that those who have expressed so much anxiety for the interests of the miner, and advocate the reduction of duties on mining machinery, slavishly followed the Government in voting for high duties on agricultural machinery and the implements which are the farmer's tools of trade. The farmer, like the miner, especially in poor country, must have the latest and best appliances for the saving of labour and expense. But while I feel bound to draw attention to this inconsistency, I should not be justified in voting out of pique for high duties on mining machinery. The honorable member for Darwin has told us that the miners want openings for their sons. That was a stock protectionist argument when I was a boy. Many years ago the miners of Victoria were being told that new avenues of employment would be provided for their sons. The miners believed that statement, but it is a sad commentary upon it to have to say that during a decade no less than 120,000 of the prime young men of the State had to leave it to enter the mining industry in other States. I should mention further that by some of the duties imposed we are creating industries that do not give a great deal of employment to labour. It is not much consolation to the head of a family to know that his daughters may find work in a factory, if his sons are obliged to walk about the streets looking for work.

On this item I propose to vote for duties of 20 and 15 per cent. I confess that I do not like the n.e.i. division as at present framed. It affords a cloak for a lot of sin in the shape of high duties. The finest machinery invented by the most ingenious brain, if not definitely set out in one or other of the items of the Tariff comes under the n.e.i. provision, and must pay the highest duty. I would much prefer that all articles subject to the highest duties should be specifically defined, and that the lowest duties should apply to the n.e.i. division. If that course were followed in the arrangement of the Tariff, new appliances intended to reduce the cost of treating our low-grade ores might be admitted free, or at a duty of not more than 5 per cent. I will not take up time in referring to the burden imposed upon the mining industry by the duties levied under the old Tariff. We can give no relief to those who have already imported their machinery, and while we might protect industries carrying on recognised lines of manufacture, we should permit the introduction of new inventions at the lowest duty possible.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [11.27].—This is the most important item in the Tariff, and in the circumstances I think that the Government should consent to adjourn at this hour.

Mr. GROOM.—No.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I venture to say that the haste with which the Ministry are pushing this matter through is absolutely indecent. If I remember rightly, when we dealt with the first Tariff, the duties proposed on mining machinery occupied the attention of the Committee for nearly a week. I am in favour of the proposal contained in paragraph A of this item, but I wish to include an additional article. I wish to have hot-air engines included.

Mr. WATSON.—They are very easily made.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—That may be so, but it is complained that the demand for them in the Commonwealth is not sufficiently large to make it worth the while of any one to manufacture them, otherwise I should not ask the Committee to make an exception in their favour.

Mr. WATSON.—They are extremely simple in construction.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Quite so, but they are engines of small power. They do not compete with ordinary engines.

They are used, I understand, only in places where it does not pay to use an ordinary engine, and because of their simplicity and cheapness. They are used for special purposes by agriculturalists in the far-back parts.

Mr. GROOM.—Are they much in use; and in what parts?

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Yes; in many parts. Two or three honorable members of this House use them, because of their cheapness and portableness. They serve the purposes of a windmill for pumping water in places where a windmill cannot be used. There is not sufficient demand for them to make it worth while to manufacture them here.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Will the honorable member help me through with this item to-night if I agree to his suggestion?

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—If that is the case I will sit down. I decline to make a bargain of that sort with the honorable member.

Mr. HUTCHISON (Hindmarsh) [11.32].—No protectionist in this House desires to injure the mining industry. The honorable member for Grey twitted honorable members with slavishly following the Government in regard to harvesters and other agricultural implements, but there is a great difference between them and mining machinery. It has been proved that we can make any kind of agricultural machinery and implements in Australia. It has not been equally demonstrated that we can make all kinds of mining machinery, but we can make most kinds of mining machinery. The honorable member's suggestion was a wise one—that we ought to come to some conclusion as to what mining machinery we cannot make in Australia, and what is covered by patents, and put those in a line by themselves. I for one am willing to allow them to come in free.

Mr. FULLER.—Let the Government supply the list.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—That should be done by those who are asking that these duties should be reduced. The Government seem to have come to the conclusion that all classes of mining machinery enumerated by them can be made in Australia.

Mr. FOWLER.—They say that a horse-rake cannot be made here, and put it on the free list.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—The honorable member for Perth, ^{as a member of the} Tariff Commission, should be able to give

valuable information as to what classes of mining machinery cannot and will not be made here for some time. I am willing to reduce the duties in this case, but not to 15 per cent. Rather than vote for 15 per cent., we ought to allow the whole of the mining machinery to come in free, because that would be purely a revenue duty. I do not object to a 20 per cent. duty in the two columns, so that mine-owners, if they could not get it here, should be able to get the best machinery either from the Continent or Great Britain. If those who object to the proposed duty draw up a list of mining machinery that cannot be made in Australia, I promise to vote for admitting it free.

Mr. FULLER.—And what about the other?

Mr. HUTCHISON.—In the case of the other machinery that we can make, I shall be satisfied with a duty of 20 per cent. in both columns, but I shall not vote for a 20 per cent. duty in the general Tariff, and then agree to a proposal for a 15 per cent. duty in the second column, on the argument that we should give a preference to Great Britain. While recognising that the mining industry employs a large number of hands, we must give some consideration to the engineering industry, where there is room for enormous expansion. It is all very well to say that there are so many thousand men engaged in mining, but many of those are employed where there is no machinery of any consequence at all used. In the case of some mines producing enormous quantities of minerals, huge dividends are paid, and the duties proposed by the Government will not hurt them at all. If the matter is narrowed down in that way, it will be found that the engineering trade gives far more employment than does the mining industry in those cases where machinery is used.

Mr. WATSON.—In a number of mines, Australian machinery is used, and it is good machinery, too.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—That is quite true. Many miners who are tributing at Ballarat and on other fields use little or no machinery, but they are counted among the thousands of miners quoted here tonight. A good deal of first-class mining machinery is made in South Australia. I have seen some splendid work of that kind turned out in Australia, and I am not going to vote for a duty that will shut up the whole of the foundries that are making this class of machinery.

Mr. WILSON.—They are already flourishing with the present duty.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—They are not flourishing. A few years ago there were thousands of men employed at South Melbourne in the iron trades. How many are employed there to-day? Last year I was in a building devoted to experiments in the iron industry, where something like 600 men were once employed, but not one man was to be seen there. In another place, where 400 or 500 men were at one time employed, no one was to be found. While prepared to assist the mining industry, I think it is only fair to extend some consideration to the engineering industry. The mining industry will not be prejudicially affected to anything like the extent which honorable members have attempted to show, even though we impose the duties proposed by the Government; because, as a matter of fact, there is only a very limited class of mining machinery which cannot be made here. There are the engineering works of Martin and Company, Forwood and Company, and May Brothers, in South Australia, the last mentioned of which make a large quantity of mining machinery, including some recent inventions suitable to the country. In Victoria and New South Wales, there are other engineering firms; and in Queensland there is a firm which used to make a large amount of first-class machinery.

Mr. WATSON.—Some of which went to Western Australia.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—That is so. It has been said that portable engines are not in such demand as to justify their manufacture here. Only the other day, however, I saw a magnificent piece of machinery in the shape of a road roller which had been manufactured here; and we know that for this class there is, I suppose, the least demand of any. The honorable member for Barrier asked what was the price that had to be paid for this road roller; and I admit that the price was high, owing to the limited demand. For mining machinery, however, there will be a larger demand in the future than there has been in the past. If it could be arranged by the House to reduce the duty to 20 per cent. in both columns, I should be prepared to support a proposal to that end. I am not prepared, however, to vote for a duty of 20 per cent. in the general Tariff, and then to give a preference to Great Britain. My idea is to start with

a proposal of duties of 25 per cent. and 20 per cent., and then, if the Opposition see their way to make the first duty 20 per cent., I shall vote for it.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [11.45].—I move—

That the amendment be amended by inserting after the word "Economizers" the words "Hot Air Engines."

Those engines are in a class by themselves, and do not come into competition in any way with engines made in Australia.

Mr. WATSON.—They are about the simplest engines ever made.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—That is quite true; but, owing to the extremely limited demand, there is no inducement to local manufacture, or they would have been made here long ago; and in New Zealand and other places hot air engines are on the free list. If these engines were being produced here, I should not propose any differentiation.

Mr. THOMAS (Barrier) [11.46].—I am sorry that the Government are not prepared to consent to an adjournment.

Mr. FRAZER.—But if we adjourn, it will not be possible to collect the duties to-morrow.

Mr. THOMAS.—I am sure that if the Government were to move the re-insertion of the duty with the idea of resuming the discussion to-morrow, no objection would be raised. We have been here since 11 o'clock this morning, and it is only fair that at nearly midnight we should be permitted to go home. I move—

That the Chairman do now leave the chair.

Motion negatived.

Mr. WATSON (South Sydney) [11.51].—I can see no possible reason why any distinction should be made between hot-air engines and other engines. Their construction is extremely simple.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Are they made here at all?

Mr. WATSON.—I do not think so, nor do I expect that with a duty of 12½ per cent. they will be made here. No one expects a revenue duty to encourage in any material way local manufactures. Any reason which can be urged for putting hot-air engines on the free list is, in my opinion, a ground why no duty should be imposed on any class of engine. The honorable member for Parramatta was not correct when he said that hot-air engines do not enter into competition with locally-made engines, because I know that they

compete with oil engines and windmills which are made here.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK. — The honorable member is quite wrong. Hot-air engines are only used where a windmill cannot be used.

Mr. WATSON. — I know of my own knowledge that persons are using hot-air engines in places where a windmill could be used. But some persons prefer to use a hot-air engine, because in their localities it is more reliable than is a windmill. Wind cannot always be got in a country district as well as it can be obtained, for instance, in Parliament House. For that reason some persons prefer to use a hot-air engine. So far as I know, it is a very good engine, but as regards difficulty of manufacture there is no difference between it and any other class of engine. I trust that it will be treated in just the same way as other engines.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [11.54].—I am prepared to admit all that the honorable member for South Sydney has said. There is not sufficient demand to make it worth while for any one to manufacture hot-air engines. They are not made here at the present time, and I am told on the best authority by those who use them that they do not, and are not likely to, compete with any other kind of engine.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN (Calare) [11.55].—I hope that the Committee will agree to the amendment of the honorable member for Parramatta. The hot-air engine has very small power. It does not enter into competition with any large engine power.

Mr. WATSON.—The cost of a hot-air engine runs into nearly £200 sometimes.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—The only purpose for which I know it is used is lifting water out of shallow wells and tanks for watering stock. As a rule, windmills are used for that purpose, but where these are not suitable, usually a hot-air engine is called in to do the lighter and easier kind of work. Where heavy work is required to be done, a hot-air engine is out of the question. It is not sufficiently strong and reliable to compete with oil or steam power. So far as I know, the only hot-air machines that enter into competition with other engines are Ericsson's machines, which are turned out in fairly large quantities in America, I think, and which previously were on the free list or subject to a low duty. The proposal of the Minister, if accepted, means that farmers and squatters

will have to instal a steam or oil engine to do the work which the cheaper forms of engine have been doing. The great point is that hot-air engines are not made in Australia.

The CHAIRMAN.—Order! Honorable members are conversing around me in such loud tones that I cannot hear what the honorable member is saying. I again ask them to discontinue their conversations.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—That ought to be an indication to the Minister that it is time to report progress. Certainly the Committee is not in a condition to hear a question argued out in a reasonable way, and therefore I content myself with stating that I shall support the amendment.

Mr. WILKS (Dalley) [11.57].—The last speaker has really upset the position. From the remarks of the honorable member for Parramatta one would have thought that a hot-air engine was a cheap engine worth about 25s. when, as a matter of fact, the cost runs as high as £200. I am in favour of putting the £200 hot-air engine on the same footing as any other engine.

Question—That the words "Hot-Air Engines" proposed to be inserted be so inserted (Mr. JOSEPH COOK's amendment)—put. The Committee divided.

Ayes	22
Noes	31

Majority	9
--------------	-----	---

AYES.

Archer, E. W.
Brown, Tilley
Brown, Thomas
Cook, Joseph
Forrest, Sir John
Fowler, J. M.
Frazer, C. E.
Fuller, G. W.
Irvine, W. H.
Liddell, F.
Mahon, H.
McWilliams, W. J.

Palmer, A. C.
Poynton, A.
Smith, Bruce
Spence, W. G.
Thomas, J.
Thomson, Dugald
Willis, Henry
Wilson, J. G.

Tellers:

Fairbairn, G.
Johnson, W. E.

NOES.

Bamford, F. W.
Batchelor, E. L.
Carr, E. S.
Catts, J. H.
Chapman, Austin
Coon, J.
Ewing, T. T.
Fisher, A.
Foster, F. J.
Groom, L. E.
Hall, D. R.
Hedges, W. N.
Hutchison, J.
Irvine, Hans
Knox, W.
ne, Sir William

Mathews, J.
Mauger, S.
McDougall, J. K.
Quick, Sir John
Salmon, C. C.
Sinclair, H.
Storrer, D.
Thomson, John
Watkins, D.
Watson, J. C.
Webster, W.
Wilks, W. H.
Wise, G. H.

Tellers:

Cook, Hume
Tudor, F. G.

PAIRS.

Kelly, W. H.
Fysh, Sir Philip
Edwards, R.
Atkinson, L.
Reid, G. H.
Bowden, E. K.
Glynn, P. McM.
Wynne, A.
Foxton, Colonel
Livingston, J.

Kingston, C. C.
Harper, R.
Maloney, W. R. N.
Chanter, J. M.
Hughes, W. M.
Sampson, S.
Crouch, R. A.
O'Malley, King
Page, J.
Deakin, A.

Question so resolved in the negative.

Amendment of the amendment negatived.

Amendment (by Mr. SPENCE) proposed—

That the amendment be amended by inserting in paragraph A the words "Babcock and Wilcox tubular boilers."

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [12.2 a.m.].—There are the very strongest reasons why this amendment should not be adopted. The representative of the Austral Otis Engineering Company, when questioned about the tubular boilers manufactured by Messrs. Babcock and Wilcox, stated that they had made such boilers in their works in Melbourne. He added that if a sufficiently heavy duty were imposed, Messrs. Babcock and Wilcox would either establish works in Australia, or would open negotiations with a concern such as that which he represented, with a view to seeing whether their boilers could not be locally manufactured. Similar evidence was given by iron-founders in other parts of the Commonwealth.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [12.3 a.m.].—In this instance we have a repetition of what we frequently witness in our Tariff debates. A plea has only to be set up that in future some article may possibly be manufactured locally, and it is at once seized upon as a sufficient justification for the imposition of as high a rate of duty as the Committee can be induced to sanction. There are boiler-makers in Australia who say that they can produce these particular boilers. What they really wish to do is to compel the people to use an inferior boiler simply because it is of Australian make.

Mr. WISE.—Why should it be inferior?

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Because there are patent rights attached to the tubular boilers manufactured by Messrs. Babcock and Wilcox. That is why these boilers cannot be manufactured here. Only the other day, in connexion with the erection of the huge works at Lithgow, Mr. Sandford had to import Messrs. Babcock and Wilcox's boilers.

Mr. FRAZER.—If there are not patent rights attached to them, why are they not manufactured in Australia?

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—There are patent rights.

Mr. SALMON.—The patent rights to which the honorable member alludes expired a few years ago.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I am surprised that the Committee should be misled by these specious arguments. The proceeding is on a par with what was done when the former Tariff was under consideration. An endeavour was then made to place tanning machines upon the free list, and we were told that because a certain individual was producing an obsolete machine, all the science and skill of the world should be excluded from the Commonwealth. I trust that the Committee will place these articles on the free list.

Mr. SPENCE (Darling) [12.6 a.m.].—In the quotation which he made, the honorable member for Bendigo completely gave away his whole case. He stated that the Austral Otis Engineering Company declared that they had made these boilers. He then went on to say that Messrs. Babcock and Wilcox themselves were prepared to come here and manufacture them. The fact is that if we could make them here, all the engineering firms would be manufacturing them, because they are so superior to other boilers. But we cannot make them in the Commonwealth, because of the patent rights attached to them.

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—If the honorable member will look at item 183, he will see that the tubes are admitted free.

Mr. SPENCE.—That does not get over the patent rights.

Mr. WATSON.—Those rights have expired. Other firms are manufacturing these boilers in Sydney.

Mr. SPENCE.—I am aware that tubular boilers are made within the Commonwealth, and have been manufactured here for a very long time. But Messrs. Babcock and Wilcox's boilers cannot be made in Australia because of the patent rights attached to them.

Mr. WISE.—Is the honorable member sure of that?

Mr. SPENCE.—Yes. The evidence taken before the Tariff Commission proves it.

Mr. WISE.—It does not.

Mr. SPENCE.—If our manufacturers were at liberty to make them, why would

they say that Messrs. Babcock and Wilcox themselves would come here and manufacture them?

Mr. WATSON.—I have seen similar boilers in Sydney.

Mr. SPENCE.—The persons who desire to obtain the best article will have these boilers, irrespective of their cost.

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—The officers of the Department state that the patent rights have expired.

Mr. SPENCE.—I am aware that the Minister declared just now that the tubes were admitted free. That, however, does not dispose of my objection. They are certainly not being made here now.

Mr. WATSON.—A duty of $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. will not permit them to be made here; that is a certainty.

Mr. SPENCE.—That is not the reason given by the firm. They did not mention the smallness of the duty as a reason why the boilers were not manufactured here. They stated that if a higher duty were imposed Babcock and Wilcox would make them in this country. I think that the whole of the evidence goes to prove that the boilers cannot be made here by the local makers, no matter what the duty may be. They would not be allowed to make them even if they were capable of doing so.

Mr. WATSON (South Sydney) [12.11 a.m.].—It has been suggested that because other boilers have been made in Australia under a duty of $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., therefore boilers built on the principle of Babcock and Wilcox's boilers ought also to be made here at that duty. But I wish to point out in that relation that on Cornish and Lancashire boilers there is a very heavy freight charge. They are very bulky. But the tubes of Babcock and Wilcox boilers can be taken to pieces and packed separately, when they occupy much less space than do either Lancashire or Cornish boilers.

Mr. FRAZER.—How are they fitted together at this end?

Mr. WATSON.—The tubes are packed separately, and are put into position when the boilers are erected.

Mr. FRAZER.—Are they screwed in?

Mr. WATSON.—The point is that they come out separately. There is proportionately, therefore, a much lower freight charge on boilers of that type.

Mr. THOMAS.—What percentage does the honorable member think that the freight charge bears to the value?

Mr. WATSON.—There is a considerable difference in this respect between Babcock and Wilcox's boilers and other boilers. I wish to observe also that those honorable members who state that Babcock and Wilcox are the only people who manufacture this particular type of boiler are mistaken. At the Sydney Show last Easter I saw a boiler made, I think, by an English firm named Hornsby, which was exactly like the Babcock and Wilcox boiler.

Mr. HEDGES.—Has the honorable member seen the two kinds of boiler together?

Mr. WATSON.—I have taken a great interest in this matter, and at all big works where I have had an opportunity of inquiring, I have asked the people in authority their opinion as to the Babcock and Wilcox and other boilers. Amongst those who are acquainted with different types of boilers there is much controversy as to whether the Babcock and Wilcox boiler is better than others. A number of people prefer other types. On the other hand, I admit that I have met a great many people who say that the Babcock and Wilcox boiler is very much superior. But if the amendment now under consideration were carried we should be in this extraordinary position—that Babcock and Wilcox would get their boilers in free, whilst if any other firm put on the market a similar type of boiler duty would have to be paid. That would be a most ridiculous position for any Parliament to take up. To exempt the manufacture of one particular firm would be a most unfortunate thing to do.

Mr. SPENCE.—Our object could be achieved if we could define the type of boiler.

Mr. WATSON.—If we are to have any exemption at all, it should be for the type. But let us see what that would mean. Are we to exempt a type of boiler that is alleged to be superior, and encourage the Australian manufacture of an inferior type? That would not be a wise thing to do. I think that a duty of 12½ per cent. would lead to no likelihood of the manufacture in Australia of those boilers that do not admit of a very heavy freight charge. The older type of boiler can be manufactured here largely because of the heavy freight. But once you get a boiler that could be put into a small compass for packing purposes, a duty of 12½ per cent.—which would be merely a

revenue duty, and would not encourage manufacture—would be useless. Therefore, it is not wonderful that these newer kinds of boiler are not manufactured here. I understand, from the Chairman of the Tariff Commission, however, that some have been manufactured in Australia.

Mr. FULLER.—They have not.

Mr. WATSON.—That is what we have been informed.

Mr. FULLER.—I am going to correct the Chairman of the Commission.

Mr. WATSON.—Anyhow, that does not set aside the argument I am advancing. As a duty of 12½ per cent. has not been sufficient to encourage the manufacture of the particular class of boiler which does not bear the same freight charges as other types do, it would be a very unwise thing to differentiate in favour of this type.

Mr. SALMON (Laanecoorie) [12.19 a.m.].—The honorable member for Parramatta worked himself into a state of violent indignation when it was stated that the patent rights of the Babcock and Wilcox boiler had run out. I understand that the Tariff Commission took certain evidence regarding this matter.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Which confirms all that I said.

Mr. SALMON.—I have been to the Library and tried to lay my hand upon a book bearing upon this matter, but have not been able to find it. But I believe that the patent rights ran out many years since.

Mr. FULLER.—They had not run out on the 15th February, 1906, according to the evidence of Mr. Rigby, the manager of the Austral Otis Engineering Company.

Mr. SALMON.—Is it not possible that he may have made a mistake in that regard? I am quoting from the records of the Patent Office in Melbourne, and can assure honorable members that my statement is correct. If I am unable to confirm it later in the day, I shall apologize to the honorable member for Parramatta; but I object to his describing as a specious argument, or an attempt to mislead the Committee, a statement made in good faith.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—I rise to a point of order. The honorable member for Laanecoorie has accused the honorable member for Parramatta of attempting to mislead the Committee.

Mr. SALMON.—I have not; I was simply quoting the honorable member for

Parramatta. The honorable member for Parkes sits with his thumbs in the arm holes of his waistcoat, looking like a second-hand draper, and after attempting to dictate to others as to what they should do, rises to a point of order, which is a gross misrepresentation.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. BATCHELOR).—This cross firing must cease.

Mr. SALMON.—In England, as in Australia, patent rights are of fourteen years' duration. Surely the honorable member for Parramatta heard of a Babcock and Wilcox boiler more than fourteen years ago?

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I did not.

Mr. SALMON.—A patent expires after the lapse of fourteen years, and an extension may be obtained only by special petition to the Privy Council. I am assured that no such petition has been presented in the case of the Babcock and Wilcox boilers.

Mr. FULLER.—By whom is the honorable member assured?

Mr. SALMON.—By the Patent Office.

Mr. FULLER.—Has the honorable member been making special inquiries?

Mr. SALMON.—No; but I learned of this when making inquiries about another matter. I intend to obtain during the day the book to which I have referred, which ought to be but is not in the Parliamentary Library, and perhaps honorable members will accept as correct a quotation from it, even if they will not accept my own word. Since every honorable member who has had anything to do with machinery has known of the existence of Babcock and Wilcox boilers for more than fourteen years. I think the Committee should be prepared to accept my statement as being correct, and not as having been made with a desire to mislead the Committee or to advance a specious argument.

Mr. FULLER (Illawarra) [12.25 a.m.].—The honorable member for Laanecoorie has requested the Committee to accept his assurance that the patents appertaining to the Babcock and Wilcox boilers have expired, and says that during the day he will look up the authority on which he relies, and submit it to the Committee. He overlooks the fact that by that time we shall have dealt with this item. I intend to show the Committee that as late as February, 1906, patent rights in connexion with the Babcock and Wilcox boilers were still running. That was the evidence given by Mr. Rigby, manager of the

Austral Otis Engineering Company, when before the Tariff Commission.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—And it was given on oath.

Mr. FULLER.—It was. In his examination in chief—in answer to question No. 71839, he said—

The tubular boilers referred to undoubtedly are the Babcock and Wilcox make, and other tubular boilers of similar shape. We have built such boilers in our own works here. The Babcock and Wilcox tubular boilers can and have been built here.

That definite statement, like many others made by manufacturers in their evidence in chief, was not substantiated on cross-examination. Mr. Rigby was cross-examined—questions 72075 to 72081—as follows—

Is there anything special about the Babcock boiler?—The patents.

Are you able to produce a boiler here free from the patents and of equal steam-raising capacity?—They have patents on portions of their boiler which would prevent you making a Babcock boiler at all without their consent.

But could you make a tubular boiler of approximately the same steam fuel consumption?—Yes.

Then can you tell me how it happens that the patented boiler is chosen by certain protected industries?—Yes, I think I can. It is because of its general excellence and economy effected by it. These advantages are probably due to the patent construction.

Then, as a matter of fact, you cannot make one equal to it here?—You cannot make one equal to it without infringing their patent.

This evidence was given on 15th February, 1906—

I ask you if you could make a similar boiler with the same amount of fuel consumption?—To make a boiler with the same steaming capacity of the same construction without having their patent construction, it would be necessary to make a much more expensive one, that would probably be double the weight and cost more.

So if two or three Babcock boilers were installed in a protected establishment, where there is a local industry, they would be put there in order to save money?—Certainly. Taking a 1,000 h.p. boiler—if you put in one of Babcock's construction, or Hornsby's, or other similar boilers, the first cost would probably be 50 per cent. less for same power.

That was the evidence of the managing director of a very large engineering company in Melbourne, who declared that patent rights in connexion with the Babcock boiler were in existence in February, 1906, and that it could not be made in Melbourne without the special consent of the patentees.

Mr. HEDGES (Fremantle) [12.29 a.m.].—I hope that the Committee will

recognise that those engaged in the mining industry are the best judges of what they require. They surely know more about this question than do honorable members generally. These boilers save labour and fuel, and are more efficient for the purposes for which they are used than any others that come to Australia. At the same time, I think that the amendment ought to apply to all tubular boilers or boilers of a similar type, which, in my opinion, should come in free, or be subject to only a reasonable duty. One of the advantages of the Babcock and Wilcox boiler is that it can be taken to pieces, which enables it to be handled by lighter cranes, and transported with less difficulty than, say, a Lancashire boiler, which would weigh from 16 to 20 tons, and would do the work of two such boilers. Facility in transport is a big thing when mining is being conducted in a remote part of the interior.

Mr. KNOX (Kooyong) [12.32 a.m.]—In my opinion, it would be a mistake to specify the name of any particular manufacturer. The difficulty might be got over by making the amendment apply to water-tube boilers. We should be doing a great injustice if we did not give the same treatment to the Stirling and other boilers that could be named, as it is proposed to give to the Babcock and Wilcox. In confirmation of what has been said of the portability of the last-named boiler, I would mention that within the last few months, it was necessary to send a boiler to a remote part of Gippsland, through almost inaccessible mountain ranges.

Mr. WISE.—Where?

Mr. KNOX.—The boiler was sent to the Crooked River, in Gippsland.

Mr. WISE.—I do not know that that country is inaccessible.

Mr. KNOX.—The place is a very difficult one to get machinery to. The honorable member would not like to take a big Cornish boiler there. One of the great advantages of the Babcock and Wilcox boiler is that it can be taken to pieces, and the makers have given so much attention to the subject of transport that every piece is packed and numbered so carefully that one may be sure that when they arrive at their destination everything will be there for putting the boiler together again. I attach greater importance to that than to the fact that the boiler is patented. As I pointed out earlier in the evening, in not specifying

in more instances the articles on which the duties are to be imposed, we are not making an efficient Tariff. Local manufacturers are not in a position to make Babcock and Wilcox or Sterling boilers. Apart from the patents, the perfection of these boilers is such as we could not obtain here. That is due to the fact that the manufacturers have a large market, not in Australia only, but throughout the world. I think that a case has been made out for giving special consideration to these boilers.

Mr. PALMER (Echuca) [12.36 a.m.]—I suggest to the honorable member for Darling that he should amend his amendment by making it apply to water-tube boilers, the technical name for all boilers of the type to which he has referred. On the general question, I would point out that, although item 162 deals with motive power, machinery and appliances, the only motive power machinery specified as dutiable at 5 per cent. is steam turbines. There is nothing about steam turbines entitling them to different consideration from other kinds of motive power machinery. The same thing might be said of the other machinery which is particularized. The whole item should be recast, if we are to act in accordance with common-sense, reason, and justice. In my opinion, the Minister should report progress, so that the matter may be considered, calmly and deliberately, when honorable members will be in better temper, and in a mood more conducive to its settlement in the best interests of the country. The item as it stands is not as we individually would have it framed, nor what the country would approve of.

Mr. FOWLER.—The honorable member for Echuca, in suggesting that progress be reported, has said what I intended to say.

Mr. SPENCE (Darling) [12.38 a.m.]—When the honorable member for South Sydney spoke, I saw that his objection was a reasonable one, and that it would not be well to name any particular manufacturer. Therefore I wish to adopt the suggestion of the honorable member for Echuca, by making my amendment apply to water-tube boilers, which, I think, covers what we mean better than the word "multitubular."

Amendment, by leave, amended accordingly.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Moreton) [12.40 a.m.]—It appears that an attempt is being made to admit these boilers free in competition

with boilers made in Australia. Under item 183 a large part of these Babcock and Wilcox boilers can be introduced free, and there is therefore no reason why honorable members should attempt to secure their free admission under item 162.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [12.42 a.m.].—I wish to quote, on this question, the evidence of Mr. William Frederick Harrington, manager of Walkers Limited, Maryborough. Referring to these water-tube boilers, he said—

They are all being made abroad, and under the existing 12½ per cent. Tariff they bid fair to oust the ordinary boilers.

In other words, the free admission of these boilers would destroy the boiler-making industry in Australia, which is largely occupied in the manufacture of Cornish and Lancashire boilers. Mr. Harrington added that, in his opinion—

All these water-tube boilers should pay an *ad valorem* duty of not less than 33 per cent.

That is the proposal of the representative of the biggest foundry in Queensland. The representative of the largest foundry in South Australia, Mr. John Felix Martin, speaking of the Heine and Babcock boilers, said—

They can be made in Australia. . . . I do not know that any part of the Babcock boiler is now protected by patent. I think the patent has expired. No boiler is made that cannot be made in Australia. The locomotive boiler stands a higher pressure than any mine boiler.

He contended that if we can make locomotive boilers in Australia we can also make these water-tube boilers. The Government would make a great mistake if they accepted the amendment. It would knock the bottom out of the Tariff altogether.

Mr. MATHEWS (Melbourne Ports) [12.46 a.m.].—I wish just to say that the Babcock and Wilcox boiler has been made in Australia. I could put three journey-men into the witness-box who would be prepared to make affidavit that they had made Babcock and Wilcox boilers in Australia during the last two years.

Mr. FULLER.—Where?

Mr. MATHEWS.—In my electorate.

Mr. FULLER.—In which establishment?

Mr. MATHEWS.—In my electorate.

If we place the Babcock and Wilcox boilers on the free list, we might just as well say that we wish no more boilers to be made in Australia. Such a proposal as has been made would result in the penalizing of those who are compelled to use the cheaper boilers, and, as usual, the "fat man" would be given the advantage.

We have in Australia to-day engines of every capacity, and of all known boilers, and they do work of the most diverse character. Yet to-night we have been told that there is only one boiler made that is fit for certain engines. If that be so, how is it that Lancashire and Cornish boilers are so generally used? If these Babcock and Wilcox boilers are admitted free, there will be but a poor look-out for those engaged in the boiler-making industry in Australia. Those who support the amendment, no doubt mean well, and think they are acting in the interests of the people of Australia, but they forget that the effect of the amendment, if carried, would be to wipe out the Australian boiler-making industry.

Mr. FOWLER (Perth) [12.48 a.m.].—The honorable member for Melbourne Ports no doubt believes he has supplied a very forcible argument, when he refers to these modern water-tube boilers as the "fat man's" boilers. I have to inform the honorable member that it is owing to the ability of employers in the mines in Western Australia to utilize such up-to-date appliances as these boilers that wages are found for thousands of workers in that State, and a good living for thousands of families. If the present proposals of the Government are carried into effect they will work disaster to the mining industry of Western Australia.

Mr. WISE.—We have heard that on every Tariff proposed in Australia.

Mr. FOWLER.—No Tariff of this kind was ever proposed in Australia before, and I believe that if it is adopted it will create such a reaction against protection as to bring about the downfall of the beautiful theories of those who profess that doctrine.

Mr. MAUGER.—Does the honorable member know of any place where such a reaction has set in?

Mr. FOWLER.—I do not wish to enter upon the general question, or I could supply the Postmaster-General with some interesting information. The honorable member for Bendigo has quoted the evidence of Mr. Martin, of Gawler, in connexion with these boilers. The evidence of that gentleman is, in my opinion, worthless. He admitted to the Tariff Commission that he was not an engineer, and it is a fact that, in spite of the long period of protection which his industry enjoyed in South Australia, and the disgraceful sweating of his employes, Mr. Martin has had

to go out of the business altogether. The extraordinary argument has been used that if these water-tube boilers are admitted, the older type of boiler will be pushed out of existence. If that argument were carried to its logical conclusion, we should go back to the wheelbarrow instead of the locomotive, and the trucks behind it. We should revert to the use of the most primitive appliances, and reject those which have done most for the advance of civilization. No doubt boilers of a type have been made here. In the Perth Museum there is a bicycle made by a bushman in the West some years ago, of exactly the type of the best bicycle made nowadays. It is constructed from wire, scraps of myall, and raw cowhide. According to the theory advanced by some honorable members to-night, that article is as good and effective as the machines turned out by the best equipped works in the world. The difference between the alleged water-tube boiler turned out in Australia and those turned out by the large firms mentioned is simply that those firms have spent enormous sums in laying down extensive plant in order to give quality as well as cheapness. They have had large experience, and have brought to bear on the production of their boilers all the skill, money, and enterprise possible. They manufacture for the whole world, and are undoubtedly in a position to commend themselves to buyers by the excellence and value of their product. It is just as though in Australia some enthusiastic believer in Australian industry brought the necessary number of wheels, pinions, and levers to a watchmaker, told him to put them together, and was prepared to regard the result as of equal value to the best work of Rotherham. The way to develop the making of such boilers in Australia is to give opportunities to those who are likely to purchase and utilize them, and when there is a sufficient demand in Australia, then, and not till then, shall we be able to make them in a way that will commend them to buyers for quality and cheapness.

Mr. BATCHELOR (Boothby) [12.53 a.m.].—Whatever may be said for the Babcock and Wilcox boilers, whether the patent rights have run out or not, it is palpable that if we make an exception of water-tube boilers, the prestige which the firm already have, and the excellence of their work, will only accentuate the monopoly, whether we name the firm specifically or not. One type of boiler will have an absolute monopoly of the whole boiler market, and boiler-making in Australia will

go out. What reason can be offered for giving that firm the Australian market for all time? We are passing this Tariff not for a week or a year, but for several years at least. Of all the mischievous proposals I have heard, this strikes me as the most mischievous.

Amendment of the amendment negatived.

Mr. THOMAS (Barrier) [12.55 a.m.].—I oppose the 5 per cent. duty in the general Tariff column for paragraph A, and therefore move—

That the amendment be amended by leaving out the words "5 per cent.," with a view to insert in lieu thereof the word "free."

It is nothing but a revenue-producing item. The revenue from it will be very small, but the cost of the article to the consumer will be increased by 5 per cent. The matter with which we are dealing is one of the most important in the Tariff. It affects the mining industry very seriously. We ought not to penalize that industry unnecessarily. If the Government and the Committee think that it is not worth carrying on, let us say so frankly. Although I represent a mining constituency, when I consider the large number of people that are killed in mining and the amount of ill-health caused by the work, it is an open question to me sometimes whether the ore produced is worth the sacrifice of life and health. If honorable members are desirous that the mining industry should be strangled, let us say so calmly, and not penalize it by imposing unnecessarily high duties. I admit that there are a large number of engineering establishments in Australia which we ought to encourage. We all desire a diversity of industries and employments in Australia; but there is no doubt that the proposed duties will raise the prices of mining machinery.

Mr. COON.—The duties will make mining machinery cheaper.

Mr. THOMAS.—It is peculiar that while manufacturers, when before the Tariff Commission, contended that their products would be made cheaper by protection, they all urged that the articles they required in order to carry on their industries, ought to be free. We ought, as far as possible, to relieve the mining companies from duties which are not of a protective character. Three or four years ago, I proposed that all mining machinery should be admitted free; but that proposal was defeated. On the present occasion. I am merely asking the Government to

admit free all mining machinery which cannot reasonably be made here, and offering, if that be done, to accept a duty of 20 per cent. as against both foreign countries and the United Kingdom. Under a duty of 12½ per cent., a great deal of mining machinery is already being manufactured in Australia; and that is a fact which must be gratifying to all of us. Some time ago, when in the South Mine, Broken Hill, I saw a winding engine, which the manager told me had been manufactured at Maryborough, Queensland, and was the finest in the line of lode. The mining industry is one of the most important in Australia; and is, therefore, entitled to some encouragement. If twenty-five men happen to be thrown out of work in an industry in Melbourne, Sydney, or Adelaide, especially in Melbourne, an extra duty is clamoured for at once in order to find employment for them. In to-day's newspaper, I read that 200 men have been thrown out of work—I hope only temporarily—in Block 14 at Broken Hill, owing to a poppet head having caught fire. Until it can be replaced with a temporary poppet head, those men will be unemployed. When any men are thrown out of work in a mining district, we cannot find employment for them by the mere imposition of a duty. The importance of the mining industry to a community is demonstrated by the effect which the working of the Broken Hill mines has had upon South Australia. If those mines were to cease work to-day, one out of every three of the railway officials in South Australia would have to be dismissed almost immediately, and Port Pirie would cease to be a township. We ought not to interfere unnecessarily with the mining industry. Seeing that I am prepared to agree to a duty of 20 per cent. on those articles which can be made in Australia, I submit that it would be only fair and reasonable on the part of the Government to forego the duty of 5 per cent. on other articles which come from Germany, America, and other places outside England. Unless Ministers are prepared to give way, and allow all the articles mentioned in paragraph A to come in free, it will mean an added cost of 5 per cent. on those articles to the mining industry. Is it fair to unnecessarily tax the mining and other industries of Australia?

Mr. McWILLIAMS (Franklin) [1.12 a.m.].—Judging by the way in which we

are proceeding, I believe that this Tariff will be very much more complicated than the last one. The Government make a proposal, and if one can get a sufficient number of honorable members who are interested in the item to vote with him, the duty is removed or cut down very materially. A great many of the honorable members who to-night have been advocating a reduction in the duty on mining machinery or its removal, were amongst those who last session, without a quiver of conscience, doubled the duties on agricultural machinery, showing very little consideration for the primary producer. I think that there ought to be some consistency with regard to the Tariff, but I do not intend to vote for the imposition of high duties on mining machinery. In some States, a dividend tax is collected. Suppose that a company spend £10,000 in developing a mine. As soon as the first dividend is declared, a dividend tax of 1s. in the £1 has to be paid to the State. Men who have paid calls month after month and year after year, have been called upon to pay that tax to the State as soon as their first dividend has been declared. Of all the people in Australia the miner is the one person who derives no benefit from protective duties. When we can give him no protection, surely it is not fair to tax those things which are practically his tools of trade? It has been said that wealthy companies pay the tax. But machinery is employed in many mines in which working men are very large shareholders. Every tax levied upon mining machinery is a blow to the mining industry.

Mr. COON (Batman) [1.21 a.m.].—I merely wish to say that every item of machinery mentioned by the honorable member for Kooyong can be manufactured in the Commonwealth, and some of it at a cheaper rate than it can be imported. Under these circumstances, I trust that the Committee will agree to the proposed duty.

Question.—That the words "5 per cent." proposed to be left out stand part of the proposed new item—put. The Committee divided.

Ayes	38
Noes	13

AYES.

Archer, E. W.
Bamford, F. W.
Batchelor, E. L.
Brown, Tilley
Brown, Thomas
Carr, E. S.
Chapman, Austin
Coon, J.
Ewing, T. T.
Fairbairn, G.
Fisher, A.
Forrest, Sir John
Groom, L. E.
Hall, D. R.
Hedges, W. N.
Hutchison, J.
Irvine, Hans W.
Irvine, W. H.
Knox, W.
Lyne, Sir William

Mathews, J.
Mauger, S.
McDougall, J. K.
Palmer, A. C.
Quick, Sir John
Salmon, C. C.
Sinclair, H.
Storrer, D.
Thomson, John
Tudor, F. G.
Watkins, D.
Watson, J. C.
Webster, W.
Wilks, W. H.
Wilson, J. G.
Wise, G. H.

Tellers:

Cook, Hume
Foster, F. J.

NOES.

Cook, Joseph
Fowler, J. M.
Frazer, C. E.
Fuller, G. W.
Liddell, F.
Mahon, H.
Poynton, A.

Smith, Bruce
Spence, W. G.
Thomson, Guald
Willis, Henry

Tellers:

Johnson, W. E.
Thomas, J.

PAIRS.

Kingston, C. C.
Harper, R.
Maloney, W. R. N.
Chanter, J. M.
Hughes, W. M.
Sampson, S.
Crouch, R. A.
O'Malley, King
Page, J.
Deakin, A.
Catts, J. H.

Kelly, W. H.
Fysh, Sir Philip
Edwards, R.
Atkinson, L.
Reid, G. H.
Bowden, E. K.
Glynn, P. McM.
Wynne, A.
Foxton, Colonel
Livingston, J.
McWilliams, W. J.

Question so resolved in the affirmative.

Amendment of the amendment negatived.

Amendment (by Mr. FRAZER) proposed—

That the amendment be amended by leaving out the figures "30," paragraph B, with a view to insert in lieu thereof the figures "20."

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [1.32 a.m.].—I shall support the omission of 30 per cent. with a view of imposing a uniform duty of 25 per cent. In my opinion, a duty of 25 per cent. is absolutely necessary in order to be effective. We have heard a great deal about effective protection. Now is the time to show our earnestness in favour of effective protection. So far as concerns the representatives of the engineering industry in Western Australia, the bulk of them are of opinion that unless they get a duty of 25 per cent., the whole of these duties on machinery might as well remain at 12½ per cent. The result of a lower duty will be that instead of settling this Tariff question as we desire to settle it,

we shall leave this great problem outstanding, and the agitation will go on. It is of no use talking about fiscal peace until we have this matter settled on a satisfactory basis. As Chairman of the Tariff Commission, I have had the same application for a duty of 25 per cent. from every State except Tasmania. In Western Australia, in South Australia, in Victoria, in New South Wales, and in Queensland, the representatives of the biggest mechanical industry in the country asked for—almost demanded—a duty of 25 per cent., and said that they could not effectually carry on business with a lower duty. I say again, therefore, that if honorable members agree to a lower duty than 25 per cent., they will simply be leaving this great question unsettled, and the agitation will go on indefinitely. I am in favour of fiscal peace. I want a settlement that will be definite. It is of no use attempting to patch up a temporary peace. We want a permanent one.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—We shall not have a permanent peace with prohibition. That is not the way to settle it.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—This is not a Victorian application. It is an Australian application. Unless it is agreed to the whole settlement will be merely of temporary duration. With reference to the alleged incapacity of the foundries and engineering establishments in Australia I say that they are quite capable of turning out the biggest and most elaborate power-producing machinery required for industrial purposes in Australia. I will take the constituency of the honorable member who has moved this amendment. When the Tariff Commission visited the Great Boulder mine, they saw there a mill engine of 750 horse power. The engine was made in Melbourne by the Austral Otis Company. The manager of the mine gave a certificate to the Otis Company testifying to the satisfactoriness of its work. That is an answer to the charge that this machinery cannot be made in Australia.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—It was made under the old duty.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—There is the motive power in operation at the present time, and it has given satisfaction to the purchasers. Then, again, in the Boulder Perseverance Mine, there is a winding engine which is the most powerful engine of its kind in the Kalgoorlie field. That also is of Australian make. It was manufactured by the Austral Otis Company. It

is a thoroughly satisfactory engine, and the manager of the mine has given a certificate to that effect to the makers. Those are instances in which the local makers had an opportunity to obtain plans and specifications to enable them to compete. But all the mining companies have not given the Australian firms an opportunity of making their machinery. On the contrary, some of them have given orders direct to English and American firms, and others have asked English and American firms to send in prices for machinery without supplying plans and specifications to enable the local makers to have a chance. As to the reason why plans and specifications have not been supplied to the Australian companies, I make no reflection upon the mining managers. They are a splendid lot of men, and I believe they would give fair play to our Australian industries if they had their own way. But most of the companies that are creating this clamour are British-owned, having their head offices in London, the directors being probably interested in other enterprises and inclined to give a preference to British productions. I say that if these mining companies would prepare plans and specifications of the machinery they require, and call for tenders in Australia, they would get the machinery made as well in this country as in any part of the world. It is only a matter of duty and opportunity. What we want is a higher duty to secure fair play for our own manufactures.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [1.39 a.m.].—I congratulate my honorable friend who has just resumed his seat on the triumphant cheers which greeted him from the Government benches.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—He made a very good speech!

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I should like to say to the honorable member just one word—and I think it is time to say it in this House—that he must not expect this fiscal question to be settled on a basis of prohibition.

Mr. WATSON.—A duty of 25 per cent. is not prohibition.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I should like to remind the honorable member, too, that there are other States which must be considered in the settlement of this question than the one which he particularly represents and speaks for. The honorable member has been pleading for Victorian manufacturers, and for none other. These

are Victorian duties, which to-morrow would be scouted if they were referred to all Australia.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—It is a great pity to bring in that sort of consideration.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—It is about time to bring it in. It is being brought in by honorable members constantly.

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—It is a slander on New South Wales to say such a thing.

Mr. HUME COOK. — A slander on Queensland, too.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—We ought to be able to deal with the question on its merits.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I am dealing with it on its merits. The honorable member for Bendigo has said that we cannot have fiscal peace unless we pass practically prohibitive duties. He will find out that that is not the way to secure fiscal peace, and that there are more States than one to be consulted in regard to the question. I am tired of hearing the cry of fiscal peace raised as a reason for voting prohibitive duties. In that connexion the whole of Australia must be considered. I do not believe that Australia to-day is in favour of the fixing of these duties at the high rates proposed by the Government. I should like to make some reference to what I thought was an implied reflection by the honorable member for Bendigo on the management of mines in Western Australia. The honorable member says that the managers, if they were free agents, would be glad to place their orders for mining machinery in Victoria and elsewhere in Australia, but that they are under the domination of directorates having their head offices in London. The implication that these mining managers are not free agents in the control of the mines, is an unworthy reflection upon a body of independent men obtaining their machinery, I believe, where they think they ought to get it.

Mr. WATSON.—The directors have a voice in the determination of where their machinery shall be obtained.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I should like to hear of a London directorate of one of the huge mines in Western Australia which would dictate to its manager on the field where he should obtain his machinery. I do not believe that there is such dictation. No manager with so huge a responsibility upon his shoulders would submit to it.

Mr. HANS IRVINE.—They have an absolutely free hand.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I should think so. If it be true as has been said—and I believe it is—that magnificent mining machines, made in the eastern States, are doing splendid work in Western Australia, what a triumph for the old duty it is. If we were able under the old Tariff to make such machinery, and to ship it to the West, why do we need these high prohibitive duties to foster a strangled industry? Nearly all the mining managers in Western Australia are unanimous in their request that these duties should be lowered. Here are their statements. Does the honorable member for Bendigo suggest that they are not honest, or that the mine managers were acting under compulsion on the part of the London directors in submitting them to us? I do not believe it. We have heard during this debate repeated references to the Austral Otis Engineering Company.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—The Mort's Dock Engineering Company applied for the same duty.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I am afraid that my honorable friend is too ready to listen to all that interested persons have to say. He seems to think that the mere fact that interested persons ask for these duties is conclusive evidence of their need. Who would not ask when he knew that he might receive? Who would not say in such circumstances that he wished to dip into the public Treasury? Such statements have no right to be considered unless they were proved up to the hilt before the Tariff Commission. The Commission was appointed to investigate every statement regarding the Tariff, and to prove or disprove it. I should not have spoken to this question but for the statement made by the honorable member for Bendigo, which, I think, was unworthy of him, in regard to the position of mine managers. In order to buttress up his case, he had to make a reflection upon a body of men as independent and as capable as are any to be found in Australia, and men who above all others would not brook any dictation in the management of their mines. I shall vote for the amendment moved by the honorable member for Kalgoorlie, that the general Tariff be 20 per cent.—and that the duty on imports from the United Kingdom be 15 per cent.—not because I

think that we ought to impose a duty of 20 per cent., but because I believe it is all that we shall be likely to get. If I thought we had the slightest chance of reverting to the old duty I should propose an amendment accordingly, but since I think that there is no chance of our doing so, I shall vote for this compromise.

Mr. FOWLER (Perth) [1.50 a.m.].—Since my night's rest has been broken, I intend now to justify the work that I did as a member of the Tariff Commission on this item and the promises I have made to my constituents in connexion with it. I agree with the honorable member for Bendigo that the engineering firms asked for duties of 25 per cent.; but many of those employed in the industry asked for double that rate. If the honorable gentleman is looking at the matter from the stand-point of the workman, he should advocate duties of not 25 but 50 per cent. We were told by some in the industry that duties of 25 per cent. are of no use to them; that what they want is prohibition. If protection is worth anything at all to the working men of Australia, the protective duties should be raised until they become absolutely prohibitive. A great deal of the equipment of Australian mines has been made by Australian engineering firms. I was glad to see that evidence of the willingness of the managers of those mines to use Australian productions as much as possible. But while much of what they require is made in Australia, they said that it is absolutely impossible to procure within the Commonwealth everything that they need, and they asked to be permitted to import special machinery, without being penalized by duties which would seriously handicap the development of the industry. The honorable member for Bendigo has insinuated that the mining managers are influenced by their directors in London to purchase machinery outside Australia.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I have heard the same thing many times.

Mr. FOWLER.—One after another of the mining managers came before the Tariff Commission, and all swore that they had an absolutely free hand in ordering what they thought necessary for their mines. Nearly all of them are Australians by birth, and expressed the desire to use Australian machinery as much as possible. They said that it is only in cases of absolute necessity that they go outside the Commonwealth. I hold in my hand a letter

which has been sent to me by one of the best-known and most-respected managers in Western Australia, a gentleman who stands as high as any one in the mining world. His reputation for honesty and integrity is unsullied, and his word should be taken absolutely and entirely. He was President of the Western Australian Chamber of Mines when the Tariff Commission visited Western Australia, but was unable to give evidence. At the time I thought that he might have made a special effort to do so, and I was inclined to draw what proved subsequently to be an altogether false conclusion. The gentleman to whom I refer is Mr. Richard Hamilton, the manager of the Great Boulder Proprietary Gold Mining Company. Although he did not come before the Tariff Commission, he sent to the Chairman a letter in which he explained his attitude in regard to duties. I believe I am correct in saying that that letter was not taken into consideration by the Chairman in drawing up his reports, and that it was not placed amongst the papers of the Commission. The letter which I received from Mr. Hamilton, enclosing a copy of a letter which he sent to the Chairman of the Tariff Commission, was as follows—

The Great Boulder Propy. Gold Mines Ltd.,
Boulder, W.A., 17th October, 1907.

The Hon. J. M. Fowler, M.P.,
Parliament House, Melbourne, Victoria.

My dear sir,—

Mr. Kirwan has written me regarding a recent conversation he had with you on the Tariff question, when you expressed a doubt that my published opinions as President of the Chamber of Mines did not correctly reflect my private views. In order to dispel any misconception, I hasten to inform you that there is no divergence between them. Although in favour of a low Tariff for revenue purposes, and to prevent importers' monopolies, I am strongly opposed to duties that will tend to cripple primary industries, in order to maintain manufactories that must eventually entirely depend upon the indigenous industries.

With so small a population in the Commonwealth, the prohibitory duties on high class machinery seem to invite monopoly by a firm that might be induced to undertake the manufacture, for there is not demand enough within the Commonwealth to adequately employ even one firm, if that firm will spend a sufficient amount of money to keep it abreast of the progress made by manufacturers in the older manufacturing countries. The effect would be a great increase in the immediate cost of the machines and inferiority of design and workmanship.

I do not think I can do better than enclose for your perusal a copy of my letter of the 3rd October, 1905, to the Chairman of the Tariff Commission, wherein I have set out at length my private views on the import duties on mining machinery. I also send you a report of an interview published in the *Kalgoorlie Miner* on the 31st August, 1907.

In conclusion, I may add that the opinions expressed by the protectionist section of the Tariff Commission in paragraph 12 of their report are quite in accord with my views, viz.:—That wherever price and efficiency of production will allow them to do so, the mine managers will always give the preference to Australian manufactures.

You are at liberty to make whatever use you deem necessary of this letter.

Yours faithfully,

RD. HAMILTON.

The letter sent by Mr. Hamilton to the Chairman of the Tariff Commission is as follows—

Kalgoorlie,

3rd October, 1905.

The Chairman,
Royal Commission on the Commonwealth
Tariff, Kalgoorlie.

Sir,

I regret that, having been called away on urgent business, I have not had an opportunity of appearing before the Commission to give evidence in support of more favorable treatment in the matter of import duties on machinery and requisites used in connexion with the mining industry of this State.

The reasons which led me to take up the position of advocating a reduction in the duties on machinery—which I think should be classed as "tools of trade" in this industry—and on materials used in the pursuit of mining, are briefly as follows—

We have in this State an enormous area of auriferous country awaiting development. So far only the richer mines are being worked; but the future will entirely depend on the lower grade deposits, of which a large number, almost payable under present conditions, are already known to exist.

If by means of good and cheap machinery we are placed in a better position to open up these low grade mines, it will be to the material advantage of the whole community of this State.

Unlike other industries, the product of gold mining is not of fluctuating value, and having established our mining industry on a wider basis, we need have no fear of the profitable disposal of the product, inasmuch as a standard price is always obtainable. Mining is a natural industry, and in it Western Australia has no fear of outside competition. Every extra man employed directly supports on the average four other persons; this can easily be proved by taking the number of workers in any group of mines in the State, and it will be seen that where 100 workers have found employment a community of about 500 congregates in the neighbourhood.

It seems to me that by encouraging the mining industry we are, by its expansion, creating a greater demand for the manufactured products of subsidiary industries, and that by natural growth the latter can hone for more assistance than the artificial support of protective duties.

I do not wish to discourage the manufacture in Australia of the simpler lines of machinery which the local manufacturers are able to produce in competition with the outside world, but I am convinced that Western Australia's first consideration must be the development of its great primary industry of mining.

This State affords an excellent example of the fact that there is nothing which will open up a new country so quickly as gold mining.

I have no doubt that in the course of time the expansion of the mining industry and the consequent growth of the agricultural and pastoral industries, due to the increase of population, a greater demand will be created for machinery, which Australian manufacturers will be able to make, but in the meantime it is a distinct disadvantage, from a mining point of view, that the industry should pay protective duties to enable local manufacturers to supply us with copies of high class machinery and often, I am sorry to say, very bad copies.

In my opinion, the population of the Commonwealth is too small and too scattered to expect the establishment of manufactories on a sufficiently large scale, and equipped with the costly tools necessary to make high class machinery, either in the field of steam and electricity.

From my intimate knowledge of the gold-bearing country within a radius of 200 miles from Kalgoorlie, I am sure that for generations to come there will be work provided in the opening up of the low grade bodies to which I have referred, and which have not yet been thoroughly prospected; and it is more to the advantage of the community at the present stage that every facility should be given to open up these natural resources, than to retard their development by bolstering up what may be termed artificial industries.

So long as there is a population here supported by the gold produced, we can make use of the pastoral value of the gold-fields country to a considerable extent; otherwise large tracts of good pasture land, suitable for raising cattle and sheep for local consumption, must remain unutilized.

I, personally, would advocate the removal of the duties on all machinery which comes into the country to develop its mineral resources and give employment to workers, and would suggest that the revenue which would be lost from the abolition of such duties could be raised by a tax on, say, liquors and narcotics, and articles of luxury, tea, coffee, and several articles of food which cannot be produced in the Commonwealth. These might be legitimately taxed to raise revenue, and a very small duty on such items would return many times more than the amount now raised by duties on mining machinery, &c.

Western Australia essentially differs from all the other States in the necessity for supporting the mining industry, because, owing to the deficiency of the rainfall in the interior and on the gold-fields, the agricultural land does not extend inland very many miles. Unless we keep the industry going on the gold-fields, this particular part of the country will revert again to the wilderness, and the agricultural interests of the State would immediately suffer a serious decline.

My firm conviction is that in the interests of the State it is of paramount importance that the mining industry should receive every legitimate encouragement.

I have read the reports of the evidence submitted by the mining representatives who have appeared before the Commission, in which evidence I fully concur, and as the case has been, in my opinion, well placed before you from the mining point of view, it does not appear to me

Mr. Fowler.

that I am able to add anything of much importance to the voluminous evidence that has already been submitted.

In these circumstances, it is not my wish to further trespass on the time of the Commission, particularly in view of the fact that the brief time remaining at their disposal in Kalgoorlie will be fully occupied in hearing the evidence which witnesses representing other sections of the community desire to tender.

I have the honour to be, sir,

Your obedient Servant,

(Signed)

RD. HAMILTON.

I became acquainted with the existence of this letter only by receiving it from Mr. Hamilton the other week. It contains a very eloquent plea against subjecting the mining industry to further increases of duty, and shows the position of mining managers, who have sworn that they use Australian machinery to the greatest extent possible.

MR. FRAZER.—Does the honorable member say that the letter was written to the Chairman of the Tariff Commission in his official capacity, and that he kept it from the other members of the Commission?

MR. FOWLER.—I do not wish to say anything like that. The letter has been sent to me as a copy of one sent to the Chairman of the Commission.

SIR JOHN QUICK.—The honorable member knows that the Commission did not recognise letters unless the writers came forward to support their statements on oath.

MR. FOWLER.—I know that the honorable gentleman utilized other letters in drawing up his reports.

SIR JOHN QUICK.—And we put them in the schedule.

MR. FOWLER. — This letter has not been published in the schedule. We are told that it is for the benefit of the workmen in the engineering industry that the industry should be given a high degree of protection to enable it to compete with outsiders. That phase of the question as affecting this as well as every other item in the Tariff was carefully gone into by the free-trade section of the Tariff Commission, but although the labour question has always been put forward by protectionists on the hustings and in protectionist newspapers as the most important aspect of the whole matter, honorable members will not find from beginning to end of the reports of the protectionist section of the Tariff Commission a single attempt made to analyze the labour question. The members of the free-trade section have done so, and we find, as I have said, that the

demand for protection based on the alleged necessity of protecting labour is an absolute sham. Here is one of our findings, based on facts and figures referred to in the report, and I challenge any one to controvert it—

That the amount paid in wages in the manufacture of mining machinery in the Commonwealth does not exceed one-third the total value of the output; that the cost of labour in Australia is, at the most, one-third higher than the cost in competing countries; that, therefore, the existing duty of 12½ per cent. *ad valorem* much more than covers the difference in the labour cost. For example, in an output abroad of the value of £1,000 the sum of £249 would be paid in wages. In a similar output in Australia the amount paid in wages would be £332. The difference, therefore, in labour cost would be £83 in a total value of £1,000; in other words, a little over 8 per cent.

Here is one of the industries in which the disproportion between the wages paid in England and in Australia might be considered more striking than in connexion with many others, and yet it is shown that the difference in price due to difference in labour cost is not more than 8 per cent. This is what all the outcry has been about. I wish to say now that the duties as recommended are intended for the benefit of Victoria, and if adopted would strike a staggering blow at the State from which I come. If I considered merely my personal interests I should be found with the honorable member for Dalley advocating protective duties for the benefit of engineers. There are no mines in my electorate, but there are a great many engineers. Still, in common with other Western Australian representatives, protectionist and free-trade, I realize that the welfare of my State is bound up in the welfare of the mining industry, and that unless I do everything in my power to assist the development of that industry and prevent injury overtaking it the engineers in my electorate will not be well served by me. The engineers of Western Australia depend for their prosperity upon the development of the mining industry of the State, and whatever would be good for that industry would re-act for the benefit of the engineers. So I have no hesitation in taking a broad-minded view of this matter, and in voting for the lowest duties I can obtain, for the benefit of the mining industry of Australia, and specially of the State from which I come, believing, after having gone into the matter carefully as a member of the Tariff Commission, that in so voting I shall be

doing what is best in the interests of the engineering industry of the Commonwealth.

Mr. HEDGES (Fremantle) [2.5 a.m.].—As a member of the Kalgoorlie Chamber of Mines, and knowing the whole of the members of that Chamber, I think I should defend them from the slur attempted to be thrown upon them. It is a scandalous thing that straightforward, honest, men should have been made the subject of such an attack. Two or three times the honorable member for Bendigo made statements which implied that the directors of the mines were interested in purchasing machinery from the Old Country.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—I deny that I said anything of the kind.

Mr. HEDGES.—We shall see what *Hansard* says on the subject. The honorable member said by implication that the managers of the mines were not free agents, and were dictated to as to where they should purchase the machinery they required. I deny the statement. I say that these men are as free as any in the world, and would be prepared at once to resign if any attempt were made, even by their directors, to dictate to them in the manner suggested. The mine managers of Kalgoorlie are Australians, and as capable in the business which they follow as any men could be. I hope the Committee will recognise that they are free agents, who will purchase in Australia where they can. There are only a few items which they ask us to allow them to get elsewhere, because they can do so with advantage to the industry, and in order to lower the working cost of the mines. They have to treat large bodies of low grade ore. They have now to work on lower grades of ore and at lower levels than ever before, and they should surely be allowed to be the best judges of the tools they require for their work. I am English, but I am proud to know that these men are Australians who would not be dictated to in such a matter even by the owners of the mines. I do not believe that any of them would stand it. I know that one of them refused an offer to take charge of a mining property in Borneo at a salary of £3,000 a year. Such men are not likely to be dictated to in the manner suggested by the honorable member for Bendigo, and I hope the members of the Committee will be prepared to allow them to purchase the material they require where they please.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN (Calare) [2.9 a.m.].—I am sorry that the Treasurer has decided to "bullock" this item through at this hour of the morning, when the Committee is not in a condition to give it the consideration which its importance demands. I do not intend to address myself at great length to the question at this hour, although, in view of the importance of the interests involved, the temptation to do so is very great. I cannot allow the opportunity to pass without expressing my appreciation of the straight talk which the deputy leader of the Opposition administered to his anti-Socialist colleague, the honorable member for Bendigo. The debate has shown where the free-trade forces are drifting in this matter. The honorable member for Parramatta must see now that the ultimate goal aimed at by a number of his anti-Socialist supporters is prohibition. The honorable member for Bendigo indicated that that was his objective in the Tariff proposals that he put forward.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—I said 25 per cent. as an average standard.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—That is a fairly high average standard; but he said that so long as there were importations, and the possibility of Australian competition was prevented, no satisfactory Tariff would be obtained. Although a certain amount of work has been produced under the 12½ per cent. rate, if the 25 per cent. proposed does not materially limit the imports now coming in, I presume that the honorable member for Bendigo would meet the difficulty by advancing a little further along the line towards prohibition. The interest for which he is fighting to-night does not represent the whole of the industrial interests of the Commonwealth. It is a secondary interest, dependent upon the development and progress of other interests, amongst which the great mining industry is not insignificant. Figures submitted by competent authorities to the Tariff Commission, of which the honorable member was Chairman, show that the total number of hands employed in the engineering trade throughout the Commonwealth in 1904 was 15,022; and that the total value of plant and machinery in the industry was £1,195,637. As against that, the primary industry of mining, upon which the engineering industry is dependent for its very existence, employed 111,714 hands; and the value of its plant and machinery was £12,476,177. The honorable member

for Bendigo battles for the former as against the latter. The honorable member may get his prohibition, but there is a big element in the Commonwealth that has a say, and that, fighting for its own without asking for any special consideration, will be heard. That is the element which I am going to stand by in my vote. I regret that I am unable to have the duty reduced to what would be equitable and fair to the mining industry. To see the great difference between the prohibitionists of this House and the protectionists of other countries, one needs only to turn to the Tariffs of protectionist countries like New Zealand and Canada, where a big proportion of this machinery is either on the 5 per cent. revenue list or upon the free list, the great bulk being on the free list.

Mr. MAHON (Coolgardie) [2.15 a.m.].—The honorable member for Bendigo voted a little while ago for a 12½ per cent. duty upon agricultural implements. Instead of the honorable member lashing himself into a white heat of passion, it would have been interesting if he had told us why the mining industry of Australia should be treated differently from the farming and other industries.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—I voted for 25 per cent. on harvesters and other big agricultural machines.

Mr. MAHON.—That circumstance scarcely justifies the honorable member, as a protectionist, in voting for so low a duty as 12½ per cent. on a large number of implements used in farming. The honorable member is well aware that the one industry of this country which receives no Tariff advantage whatever is that of mining. No Tariff can add a farthing to the value of an ounce of gold. I have never yet heard protectionists in this House, either in connexion with this Tariff or that of 1902—not even the right honorable member for Adelaide, the framer of the 1902 Tariff, a man who has made protection a life study—face fairly and squarely the question why an industry which receives no Tariff advantage should be loaded up with the highest duties imposed under the Tariff. Why should those who receive no Tariff advantage be required to bear the highest Tariff burden? And why should those whose products are artificially enhanced in price by the Tariff, escape all taxation under the Tariff? I am not specially concerned about the big rich mines at Kalgoorlie or anywhere else. Probably those properties, floated and

managed from London are able to pay any impost that may be levied upon them—

Sir JOHN QUICK.—They have had £13,000,000 in dividends.

Mr. MAHON.—If so, they have put a good many millions into the ground to earn it. They risked a considerable amount of capital, and are surely entitled to some reward for their enterprise. All the Kalgoorlie mines are not Great Boulders, Lake Views, or Perseverances. In a great many cases, there is some difficulty in making low-grade mines even pay their way.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—Persons will not work mines that are made unprofitable to them.

Mr. WATSON.—Yet, we have resolutions from miners' unions asking for a protective Tariff.

Mr. MAHON.—I was coming to that. These resolutions are eloquent of the patriotism and disinterestedness of the Western Australian miners. The bulk of the mining community there desires to see Australia self-contained, being content to sacrifice a good deal to assist the producers of the eastern States to attain prosperity, without having themselves any hope of sharing in it. But the honorable member for South Sydney would be the last to accept a chance resolution of his constituents as an instruction to him to vote in a certain way. He would be still more disinclined to slavishly obey such a resolution if he were convinced that it was adopted hurriedly, or on misleading and *ex parte* information, or without the people concerned having had such an experience of the operation of the Tariff on their interests and occupations as would make their carefully-matured views a chart by which the Parliamentary representative might mark out his course. This is the difficulty which confronts me in respect to these isolated expressions of public opinion. Like the honorable member for South Sydney, I am always prepared to give effect to the will of the people, duly obtained and decisively expressed. In this case, the evidence satisfies me that the protection given by the lower rate of duty will be adequate to the encouragement of the engineering industry without being unduly oppressive to those engaged in mining. That is the golden mean which governs my vote on this item. We must not discard from our consideration the prospectors and pioneers who are working their own properties in the isolated portions of Australia. It is their interests and

not the interests of the large mines at Kalgoorlie, Broken Hill and elsewhere, which arouse my solicitude. Many properties in Western Australia are being developed by the men who discovered them, and they are in the position of small co-operative parties upon whom it would be cruel to place any unnecessary disability.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—That is not confined to Western Australia.

Mr. MAHON.—That is so. I have received a circular relating to the Stanley mine at Bright.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—That has reference to portable engines, which are not in question under this item.

Mr. MAHON.—The two are intimately related. Portable engines are in the next item; and I am anxious to see what the honorable member for Bendigo will do in this connexion. That class of engine is not manufactured here; it is absolutely necessary under the conditions of this particular company. It is mainly composed of working miners; and they recently held a meeting, at which resolutions were passed demanding a reduction of the duty. I remind honorable members that in Western Australia, as the honorable member for Swan is aware, there are many one-mine towns, which are dependent on low-grade ores; and, if the high prohibitive duties favoured by the honorable member for Bendigo, by raising the cost of machinery, have the result of rendering such mines unprofitable, not only will the foundries of Bendigo, Castlemaine, and Melbourne not receive orders, but unemployed miners will be thrown on the labour market in competition with the workers of the towns. We have heard enough about the big mines at Kalgoorlie and Broken Hill; and I do not desire to detain the Committee by any further reference to them. I am sure that the honorable member for Bendigo desires only what is fair and right in the interests of the whole of Australia. I do not accuse him of speaking merely on behalf of Victorian foundries; he had given proof of his zeal as a Federalist long before we ever dealt with the Tariff; and we all give him the utmost credit for being a good Australian. I point out, however, that if, by any action of his the low-grade mines of Western Australia are closed, and the miners, who have been fertilizing other portions of Australia with the proceeds of their industry, are thrown out of employment, the expenditure by the Postal and

other Departments, in extending the conveniences of civilization, will be lost. Some of these small centres will disappear from the map, and the workers, instead of receiving remunerative employment, will be thrown into competition with workers elsewhere. I am sure that that is not a consummation the honorable member desires; and I place it before the Committee as a consideration which ought not to be excluded in dealing with this duty.

Question—That the figures "30" be left out—resolved in the affirmative.

Question—That the figures "20" be inserted—put.

The Committee divided.

Ayes	26
Noes	25
			—
Majority	1

AYES.

Archer, E. W.
Brown, Tilley
Brown, Thomas
Carr, E. S.
Cook, Joseph
Fairbairn, G.
Forrest, Sir John
Fowler, J. M.
Frazer, C. E.
Fuller, G. W.
Hedges, W. N.
Irvine, Hans
Irvine, W. H.
Knox, W.

Mahon, H.
Palmer, A. C.
Poynton, A.
Sinclair, H.
Smith, Bruce
Spence, W. G.
Thomas, J.
Thomson, Dugald
Willis, H.
Wilson, J. G.

Tellers:
Johnson, W. E.
Liddell, F.

NOES.

Bamford, F. W.
Batchelor, E. L.
Chapman, Austin
Coon, J.
Ewing, T. T.
Fisher, A.
Foster, F. J.
Groom, L. E.
Hutchison, J.
Lyne, Sir William
Mathews, J.
Mauger, S.
McDougall, J. K.

Quick, Sir John
Salmon, C. C.
Storrer, D.
Thomson, John
Tudor, F. G.
Watkins, D.
Watson, J. C.
Webster, W.
Wilks, W. H.
Wise, G. H.
Tellers:
Cook, Hume
Hall, D. R.

PAIRS.

Kelly, W. H.
Fysh, Sir Philip
Reid, G. H.
Bowden, E. K.
Edwards, R.
Atkinson, L.
McWilliams, W. J.
Glynn, P. McM.
Wynne, A.
Foxton, Colonel
Livingston, J.

Kingston, C. C.
Harper, R.
Hughes, W. M.
Sampson, S.
Maloney, W. R. N.
Chanter, J. M.
Catts, J. H.
Crouch, R. A.
O'Malley, King
Page, J.
Deakin, A.

Question so resolved in the affirmative.
Amendment of the amendment agreed to.

Amendment (by Mr. FRAZER) agreed to—

That the amendment be amended by leaving out the figures "25," paragraph B.

Amendment (by Mr. FRAZER) put—

That the figures "15" be inserted in lieu of the figures "25," just left out.

The Committee divided.

Ayes	25
Noes	26
			—
Majority	1

AYES.

Archer, E. W.
Brown, Tilley
Brown, Thomas
Cook, Joseph
Fairbairn, G.
Forrest, Sir John
Fowler, J. M.
Frazer, C. E.
Fuller, G. W.
Hedges, W. N.
Irvine, Hans
Irvine, W. H.
Knox, W.

Mahon, H.
Palmer, A. C.
Poynton, A.
Sinclair, H.
Smith, Bruce
Spence, W. G.
Thomas, J.
Thomson, Dugald
Willis, Henry
Wilson, J. G.
Tellers:
Johnson, W. E.
Liddell, F.

NOES.

Batchelor, E. L.
Carr, E. S.
Chapman, Austin
Coon, J.
Ewing, T. T.
Fisher, A.
Foster, F. J.
Groom, L. E.
Hall, D. R.
Hutchison, J.
Lyne, Sir William
Mathews, J.
Mauger, S.
McDougall, J. K.

Quick, Sir John
Salmon, C. C.
Storrer, D.
Thomson, John
Tudor, F. G.
Watkins, D.
Watson, J. C.
Webster, W.
Wilks, W. H.
Wise, G. H.

Tellers:
Bamford, F. W.
Cook, Hume

PAIRS.

Kelly, W. H.
Fysh, Sir Philip
Reid, G. H.
Bowden, E. K.
Edwards, R.
Atkinson, L.
McWilliams, W. J.
Glynn, P. McM.
Wynne, A.
Foxton, Colonel
Livingston, J.

Kingston, C. C.
Harper, R.
Hughes, W. M.
Sampson, S.
Maloney, W. R. N.
Chanter, J. M.
Catts, J. H.
Crouch, R. A.
O'Malley, King
Page, J.
Deakin, A.

Question so resolved in the negative.

Amendment negatived.

Amendment (by Mr. FULLER) negatived—

That the figures "17½" be inserted in lieu of the figures "25," just left out.

Amendment (by Mr. FISHER) agreed to—

That the figures "20" be inserted in lieu of the figures "25," just left out.

Proposed new item, as amended, agreed to.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [2.42 a.m.].—I said earlier in the evening that I would be prepared to adjourn when the consideration of the item which has just been dealt with had been completed.

Mr. FOWLER.—The Treasurer also stated that we should cease work each evening at about 11 o'clock.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—That arrangement was conditional upon fair progress being made. In the circumstances, I do not think it would be fair to ask members to deal with any fresh items this morning. Of course, there are times when the Government might feel compelled to proceed further. If such a long debate had not taken place upon this item in the early portion of the day it would have been disposed of by 10 or 11 o'clock last evening.

Progress reported.

SPECIAL ADJOURNMENT.

Motion (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That the House, at its rising, adjourn until 2 p.m. to-day.

House adjourned at 2.45 a.m. (Wednesday).

House of Representatives.

Wednesday, 27 November, 1907.

Mr. SPEAKER took the chair at 2 p.m., and read prayers.

PETITION.

Mr. POYNTON presented a petition from farmers of Blackrock, Petersburg, and Ororoo, South Australia, praying for a modification of the duties relating to agricultural implements.

Petition received.

WOMEN'S EXHIBITION RIFLE MATCHES.

Mr. SALMON.—I desire to ask the Minister of Defence, without notice, whether he is aware of the series of rifle matches at present being conducted at the Women's Exhibition, in which women are showing such remarkable proficiency with the Francotte and Winchester rifles, that not a single shot had been fired off the target during two days, whilst in many cases the possible has been made; and whether, in

view of these facts, he will give the women of Australia an opportunity of perfecting themselves in rifle-shooting?

Mr. EWING.—I shall be glad to do anything that will further the laudable end which the honorable member has in view. The questions of method will require very special considerations.

TASMANIAN MAILS.

Mr. STORRER.—I desire to ask the Postmaster-General, without notice, a question relating to the delivery of Tasmanian mails to the members of this House. I may explain that members of Parliament have at various times encountered great difficulty in getting their letters. Last Saturday week I telephoned down to the General Post Office to inquire why our mails had not been delivered. I telephoned twice, but I did not get my letters until Monday, although they arrived in Melbourne at 9 o'clock on the Saturday morning. To-day, I suppose, the steamer arrived at her usual time—9 o'clock this morning. I tried to get a telephone message through to the General Post Office, but could not succeed. The mail has not yet been delivered. I ask now, as I cannot get any satisfaction elsewhere—although I telephoned to the Deputy Postmaster-General—whether the Postmaster-General will take this matter in hand himself, and see that we, who are members of Parliament, are not placed at a great disadvantage because we happen to meet in this place?

Mr. MAUGER.—I have taken every possible step to facilitate the delivery of mails to honorable members. As you are aware. Mr. Speaker, I have arranged for a box to be kept at the office, and for a messenger to go down to get mails every hour and bring them up to Parliament House.

Mr. STORRER.—Apparently he does not do it.

Mr. MAUGER.—That is not my fault. I can only put the machinery in motion, and do my best to see that arrangements are carried out. I will confer with Mr. Speaker, and ascertain why the arrangement has not been observed. I will certainly do all that I can to afford every possible facility to honorable members to get their letters.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I desire to say, in justice to the officer concerned, that I have just now asked the Serjeant-at-Arms whether the letters were sent for as usual to-day, and he tells me that they were.

DUPLICATION OF CUSTOMS DUTIES.

Mr. GLYNN.—I wish to ask the Minister of Trade and Customs a question, without notice, whether he is aware of a duplication of Customs duties under which sardines are taxed at 1d. per lb., when imported in oil, whilst if they happen to be imported smoked, they are also taxed $\frac{1}{2}$ d. per lb. as smoked fish? I wish to inquire whether the principle of duplication, which is certainly an anomaly in the case of sardines, runs throughout the Tariff?

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—There are bound to be certain anomalies in connexion with a Tariff covering so many items, and I am glad to have such instances pointed out, so that I may take steps to remove them.

RABBIT EXTERMINATION.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—I desire to ask the Treasurer a question, without notice. I gather that he has received a report from Dr. Tidswell respecting the rabbit extermination experiments in New South Wales. I desire to know whether any representations have been made to him with a view of giving those interested in the result of the experiments, information as to the nature of them? Has the Government come to any decision as to its future attitude regarding the matter?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—In reply to the honorable member's question, I desire to state that those interested have not approached me—I do not know whether they have approached the Prime Minister—regarding the matter to which he has referred. I think the honorable member must mean experiments on the mainland. I saw something about the matter in the press, but I have not been approached. As regards future action regarding these experiments of Dr. Danysz, I intended to see the Prime Minister this morning in order to learn what course it was proposed by the Government to take, but was not able to do so. My own feeling is that the experiments ought not to be repeated on the mainland.

Mr. CHANTER.—Arising out of the question asked by the honorable member for Calare, I desire to refer to a previous question asked by myself. It may be remembered that I asked whether inquiries had been made respecting the attempted introduction of a rabbit disease into Australia, and whether the Government would

ascertain the name of the New South Wales sheep breeder who had attempted to introduce the disease? I may say that I have very grave doubts whether the gentleman—whose name many of us know—has not surreptitiously introduced into Australia a rabbit disease which, if it spread amongst our sheep, might be calamitous. I press the Prime Minister to obtain further particulars if he can. In the meantime, I wish to ask the honorable gentleman whether he will obtain the name of the pastoralist who was on the steamer *Moana*, having with him the germs of a rabbit disease that he was bringing into Australia, which germs were seized and thrown overboard by a steward? It is a serious matter to Australia, and I hope that the Minister will cause the most careful inquiries to be made.

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—The inquiries that I have instituted so far have not been successful. I recognise, however, that the matter is a very serious one, and that if anything of the kind has occurred we should endeavour to sheet it home to the offender.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—I wish to ask the Treasurer whether, seeing that Dr. Tidswell's report on Dr. Danysz experiments has been ordered to be printed, he will direct that the last report supplied by the South Australian Commissioners, Dr. Johnson and Mr. Giddings, is also published?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I shall consult the Prime Minister, in whose Department, I think, the papers to which the honorable member has referred are at the present time.

CADET RIFLES.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS. — I desire to ask the Minister of Defence, without notice, whether he will state what kind of rifle is being supplied to the Cadets at the present time, and whether it is his intention to supply them in future with a heavier rifle than they are now using?

Mr. EWING.—The Senior Cadets are using the .303 rifle, which is the same as is used by our troops so far as weight is concerned. The Francotte rifle is used by Cadets in Victoria. The rifle that is used by Cadets in New South Wales is the Westley-Richards. I may also inform the honorable member that the English military authorities have been considering a suitable rifle for Cadets. We have a sample here,

and it may be possible for us to adopt it, and so provide a uniform rifle throughout Australia. However, I am not quite sure at present.

DUTIES ON PAPER.

Mr. MAHON.—I wish to ask the Treasurer, without notice, whether, before the duties on paper are discussed by the Committee of Ways and Means, he will favour the House with a return showing the duties collected on paper since the imposition of the new Tariff? I desire to know the quantity of, value of, and revenue collected upon paper taken out of bond since the new Tariff came into operation.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—In reply to the honorable member's question, I have to state that I shall confer with the Comptroller of Customs, with a view to obtain the information which the honorable member desires. I will give it to the House as soon as I receive it.

INTER-STATE TELEPHONE SERVICE: DECREASE OF REVENUE.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—I wish to ask the Postmaster-General whether the reported falling-off in the revenue from the Inter-State telephone service is due to its being impossible to carry on a conversation between Melbourne and Sydney through any of the suburban telephone bureaux?

Mr. DEAKIN.—It is quite possible.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—Having tried recently, without success, to establish communication between Melbourne and Sydney through a local telephone bureau, I thought that the falling-off in the revenue might be due to a similar want of success on the part of others. Will the Postmaster-General cause inquiries to be made, and make a statement on the subject?

Mr. MAUGER.—Arrangements can be made to be connected with the local bureaux. All that is necessary is to leave a deposit either at the central or the local office with which it is desired to be connected.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—That is not the point.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—Will the Postmaster-General look into the matter?

Mr. MAUGER.—Yes, I am anxious to afford every facility to the public.

SEIZURE OF TREACLE AS OPIUM.

Mr. WILSON.—Can the Minister of Trade and Customs inform the House whether the treacle recently seized, in the belief that it was opium, has been sold, and, if so, what profit was derived from the sale?

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—If the honorable member can introduce the Department to a probable purchaser, I shall be much obliged to him. I shall make inquiries into the matter.

VIRUS FOR RAT DESTRUCTION.

Mr. MALONEY.—Will the Minister of Trade and Customs cause inquiries to be made as to the efficacy of a virus used in the New Hebrides for the destruction of rats? I am informed that it has proved an absolute failure.

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—I shall be glad to make inquiries.

CHINESE HELMETS FOR POSTAL OFFICIALS.

Mr. CHANTER.—I wish to ask the Postmaster-General whether it is true, as reported in the press, that postal officials in Adelaide have been supplied with helmets made in China.

Mr. MAUGER.—I find that the Deputy Postmaster-General of South Australia, in the exercise of powers recently delegated to him, has accepted a tender, through the State Tender Board, for the supply of a certain number of helmets manufactured in China. I have issued instructions that the order shall be cancelled, and that the Deputy Postmaster-General shall be asked on what authority a tender was accepted under such conditions.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—I wish to know under whose instructions the Deputy Postmaster-General of South Australia accepted the tender through the State Tender Board, and whether there is not a Government policy with regard to the use of locally-made articles?

Mr. MAUGER.—There is a very clear Government policy in the direction mentioned by the honorable member. Our policy and also, I believe, the regulations have been distinctly violated.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—Who issued the instructions to the Deputy Postmaster-General?

Mr. MAUGER.—With a view to carrying out the policy of decentralization, a number of duties have been delegated to the Deputy Postmasters-General. It has been urged that too much of the work of the Department is concentrated in the central office, and one of the unfortunate results of our efforts to remove that cause of complaint is that the Deputy Postmaster-General at Adelaide has misunderstood the policy of the Commonwealth, as well as his instructions, and got himself and the State Tender Board into trouble.

TEMPORARY LETTER CARRIERS, WESTERN AUSTRALIA.

Mr. FOWLER.—Will the Postmaster-General cause inquiries to be made as to the correctness of the statement made in the Western Australian press, that temporary letter carriers are being paid in that State at the rate of 3s. 4d. per day, and, if he finds the report to be correct, put an end to the system?

Mr. MAUGER.—The employment of temporary letter carriers at the rate named is contrary, not only to the regulations, but to the Public Service Act, and instructions that have been issued. If it be found on inquiry that the statement is correct, an order will be issued that the practice shall be at once stopped.

COMMONWEALTH OFFICES IN LONDON.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS. — Will the Prime Minister inform the House whether final arrangements have yet been made with the London County Council for a site for the proposed Commonwealth Offices in London?

Mr. DEAKIN.—Our offer is still before the London County Council, and we expect early to receive an answer.

SATURDAY SITTINGS.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Will the Prime Minister state whether it is his intention to ask the House to sit on Saturday? I seek the information at this stage so that we may make our arrangements accordingly.

Mr. DEAKIN.—My honorable colleague the Treasurer hopes that the progress made with the Tariff will be such as to render it unnecessary to ask the House to meet on Saturday; but if it is not, he trusts that honorable members will be prepared to meet on that day.

TARIFF.

REBATE OF DUTY ON TIMBER FOR FRUIT AND BUTTER BOXES.—EXEMPTION OF HAT-MILL MACHINERY.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—Reverting to a question which I put to the Minister of Trade and Customs some time ago in regard to a rebate of the duty on timber used for the making of butter boxes and fruit cases, I wish to know whether the Minister will explain how it is proposed to make the rebate practically available to those whom it is intended to reach?

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—As I informed the honorable member for Cowper yesterday, the whole matter is now receiving attention, and we hope to be able to make arrangements that will be satisfactory to all concerned.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—I wish to ask the Prime Minister, as a matter of Victorian fiscal history, when there first appeared in the Tariff of this State a provision that a refund of the duty paid on hat-mill machinery should be made as soon as that machinery was established in a factory? As the honorable gentleman is aware, under the new Tariff, machinery for the hat-making industry has been entirely differentiated from the machinery required for other industries, and I understand that the exemption which appeared in the Tariff of 1902, as introduced by the right honorable member for Adelaide, was simply a continuation of a Victorian practice.

Mr. DEAKIN.—I was not even aware that such a practice existed. The only case that I can recall of a refund of duty being granted by the Victorian Parliament related to machinery required for a paper-mill at Geelong.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—That was an exceptional case?

Mr. DEAKIN.—It was. I was not aware that there had been any other.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—Does the Prime Minister know of any reason why there should be a duty of 20 per cent. on mining machinery, while machinery for hat mills is exempt?

Mr. SPEAKER.—Order. The matter to which the honorable member has now referred on two occasions is one for the consideration of the Committee of Ways and Means when dealing with the Tariff, and it would be quite improper for me to

allow an explanation of it to be asked of the Prime Minister, or for the Prime Minister to comply with such a request.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—The Prime Minister may, for reasons of health, be unable to be present when the Tariff is being discussed, and, therefore, I may not have the opportunity suggested to appeal to him as one familiar with the fiscal history of Victoria to tell us why this exemption, for which, so far as I know, nobody knows the reason, has been transferred from the State Parliament of Victoria to the Federal Parliament.

Mr. SPEAKER.—That circumstance would not alter the rule to which I have referred.

Mr. CHANTER.—Arising out of the question asked by the honorable member for Parkes, I wish to ask the Prime Minister if he has noticed the statement which appeared in the *Age* of this morning claiming that the Federal Tariff has resulted in prosperity to New South Wales by leading to the investment of £3,000,000 in various manufacturing industries in that State?

Mr. SPEAKER.—Order!

Mr. CHANTER.—I am leading up to a question.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It appears very clear to me that the honorable member for Riverina is anxious to get in some information which should certainly not be conveyed in the form of a question.

Mr. CHANTER.—I wished to ask whether the Prime Minister will send a telegram on the subject to New South Wales?

Mr. SPEAKER.—The honorable member did not ask that question.

Mr. CHANTER.—I was going to ask it.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The honorable member evidently was more anxious to get in a particular statement, which was not in order in the form of a question.

Mr. CHANTER.—I ask whether the Prime Minister will send a telegram, through you, sir, on behalf of the House congratulating New South Wales on the increase of her industrial prosperity since Federation was accomplished?

Mr. DEAKIN.—I shall probably have another opportunity to communicate on this and other matters.

Mr. FOWLER.—I ask the Prime Minister, without notice, if, when he is sending his telegram to the Premier of New South Wales congratulating the State—

Mr. DEAKIN.—I did not propose to send a telegram.

Mr. FOWLER.—I understood that the honorable gentleman proposed to comply with the request of the honorable member for Riverina.

Mr. DEAKIN.—I pointed out that there might be some other opportunity.

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—Does the honorable member wish a similar telegram to be sent to Western Australia?

Mr. FOWLER.—I wish to ask the Prime Minister whether, should he comply with the request of the honorable member for Riverina, he will not also send a telegram to the Premier of Western Australia, regretting that the Tariff submitted by the present Government will inflict serious injury upon that State?

Mr. SPEAKER.—Order! That question cannot be answered.

UNIFORM COMMONWEALTH STAMPS.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—I ask the Postmaster-General, without notice, whether orders have been given for the printing of the proposed uniform Commonwealth stamps, and, if so, whether they are to be printed in Melbourne?

Mr. MAUGER.—We have not yet reached that stage. We have yet to call for designs.

TELEGRAPH LINE BETWEEN SYDNEY AND BRISBANE.

Mr. SINCLAIR.—I ask the Postmaster-General, without notice, what provision, if any, has been made to relieve the congestion of work on the telegraph line between Sydney and Brisbane?

Mr. MAUGER.—The Department is arranging to erect an additional line to the New South Wales border, and it is now proposed to ask the Treasurer and the House to provide the means for continuing it to Sydney.

ARGENTINE: IMPORTATION OF AUSTRALIAN CATTLE.

Mr. SINCLAIR (for Mr. ARCHER) asked the Minister of External Affairs upon notice—

What steps have been taken to obtain the removal of the embargo on the entry of cattle from Australia into the Argentine, and with what results?

Mr. DEAKIN.—The answer to the honorable member's question is as follows—

Reference to my previous reply on 13th November will show that the Government of the Republic intimated its preparedness to consider the removal of the prohibition upon receipt of an official notification that Australia was free from cattle disease.

The required notification was made, and the decision of the Argentine Government is awaited.

TARIFF.

In Committee of Ways and Means (Consideration resumed from 26th November, *vide* page 6673):

Postponed item 163. Steam Road Rollers, including Scarifier attachments, ad val., 25 per cent.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [2.25].—I move—

That the words "and on and after 28th November, 1907, Item 163. Locomotives, Traction and Portable Engines, Steam Road Rollers, including Scarifier attachments, ad val. (General Tariff), 30 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 25 per cent.," be added.

I move the amendment in this form to avoid the difficulty which arose from the adoption of the course followed yesterday, when I moved that item 162 be left out, with a view to insert a new item, in the expectation that the debate on the amendment would be concluded at a reasonable hour. The item was, as it appeared in the Tariff, left out, and at a late hour we discovered that it was necessary for the Committee to sit until the new item had been dealt with, otherwise there would have been no legal power to collect duties on the articles included in the item.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—I very much question that. I do not think that is the legal position.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I am acting under advice. I do not wish to have any trouble regarding the collection of the duties. That is one reason why I asked the Committee to continue sitting last night until the new item proposed had been dealt with.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN (Indi) [2.28].—The new proposal is practically an amalgamation of items 163 and 164.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—163 and part of 164.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—In the Tariff, as it stands, there is a note attached to item 164.

Subject to rebate under the conditions specified in the Schedule hereto.

That note does not appear as attached to the new item proposed in substitution for item 163, and I think I am entitled to ask for some information with respect to the departure from the original Government proposal.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE. (Hume—Treasurer) [2.29].—The proposed new item 163 includes part of item 163 and part of item 164, as the Tariff now stands. There is a note attached to 164, as the honorable member has stated, and no alteration is proposed in the matter.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—Then the honorable gentleman wishes to carry this under false pretences.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I wish to do nothing of the kind. The honorable member must recollect that if the amendment I have moved is agreed to, the new item will be inserted in the Tariff as it stands, and whatever conditions attached before will continue in force.

Mr. FULLER (Illawarra) [2.30].—The Treasurer proposes to include in this item, locomotives, traction and portable engines, and road rollers. In this connexion I wish to refer honorable members to a voluntary statement made to the Tariff Commission by Mr. Harrington, of Walker's, Limited. He was one of the principal witnesses examined in Queensland, and he appeared before the Commission, asking for high protective duties. The only reference to portable engines is in the statement of this witness. Honorable members will find it at page 2188 of the Minutes of Evidence, wherein a duty of 33½ per cent. is requested. Mr. Harrington, not on cross-examination, but voluntarily, said—

I would go even so far as to strike out my request in relation to traction and portable engines, because I do not wish to trench upon the agricultural industry.

The witness came before the Commission asking for protective duties, but he felt, as every honorable member here must feel, that if the duties as proposed by the Treasurer were imposed they would press severely on the agricultural and mining industries so far as traction engines are concerned. He voluntarily suggested that those machines should come in free. In the interests of the agricultural and mining industries I suggest to the Committee that both traction and portable engines should be put on the free list. Traction engines are used for the carriage of ore in many parts of the Commonwealth. They are not made here.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Yes, they are.

Mr. FULLER.—Where?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Here, in Melbourne.

Mr. FULLER.—We had no evidence of that placed before us. I move—

That the amendment be amended by leaving out the words "traction and portable engines."

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [2.34].—Only the other day, in Collingwood, a new engine of this kind was made, all but 5 per cent. of it of Lithgow iron.

Mr. WILSON.—The honorable member is referring to the new Collingwood steam road roller, known as the "Coon."

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—It was a combined steam road roller and traction engine, made by the Otis Company. The honorable member for Batman is a member of the local council, and knows all about it. It is nonsense to say that it was not made here. Every one who saw it said that it was one of the best that had ever been seen in Australia.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [2.35].—I do not agree with the 30 per cent. and 25 per cent. duties as proposed by the Treasurer, but will agree to a duty of 25 per cent. all round on this group of engines.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE. — I forgot to say that 25 per cent. was the recommendation of the Tariff Commission.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—In support of a duty of 25 per cent. all round, I should like to read a quotation from evidence given in Queensland by Mr. James Ford Pearson, engineer of Walker's Limited, Maryborough, one of the biggest foundries in Australia. On page 2209 of the Minutes of Evidence appears the following—

Do you think you could turn out traction engines on the same scale as John Fowler and Co., of Leeds?—I have turned out several, and although they have not been altogether as highly painted up as are Fowler's engines, they have done practically the same work.

Have you turned out the engines at as low a cost as Fowler's?—No. We get a bigger price, because our engines are made to perform special work.

How much more do you get relatively?—About 15 to 16 per cent. more.

Can you explain why the Clyde Engineering Company did not ask for duty upon traction engines?—Because Mr. Noake their manager, is the agent for Messrs. Fowler and Co.

I should also like to draw attention to a passage in our report as follows—

We have been informed that the firm of J. Renshaw and Co., of Queen's Bridge-street, South Melbourne, has lately built some six horse-power portable engines for the Victorian Mining Department equally as good as, but at a cost of about 15 per cent. more than, imported engines of the same type. The Austral Otis Engineering Co. has built several portable engines in sizes up to 12 horse-power. At present, the same company is constructing two heavy earth-scooping traction engines, each of 80 horse-power, and each to cost £1,200. These machines can be made here, and would form an important addition to the iron trade of the country.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Did the Commission take any other evidence regarding the quality of traction engines alleged to be made in Queensland?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—I know nothing more than what the engineer says—that they were substantially equal to the imported, but a little higher in price.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Would the honorable member regard that as conclusive evidence in a Court of law?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—I am now dealing with the practicability of manufacturing these engines in Australia, and showing that it is all moonshine to say that it is impracticable or impossible. There is the evidence, not of a Victorian, but of a Queensland industry, where it is even more advanced than in Victoria. I have here a letter from the representative of the Austral Otis Company, in which I am informed that at least 200 traction engines will be required in Australia next year, and that at an average price of £800 each they would represent a value of £160,000, of which it is estimated that £60,000 would be spent in wages in Australia. It is also stated—

We are prepared to begin the manufacture at once, if the duty is retained. We would supply 8 horse-power engines of similar type to the best imported, as under:—8 horse-power single cylinder traction engine, £720; 8 horse-power compound traction engine, £825; 8 horse-power single cylinder portable engine, £325.

If it be possible for Australian firms to construct large horse-power locomotive engines, why should it not be possible for them to turn out small portable engines?

Mr. WILSON (Corangamite) [2.40].—I support the proposal of the honorable member for Illawarra, to omit traction and portable engines from this item. The Minister has told us that the Austral Otis Company made a traction engine for the Collingwood City Council; but, I suppose, he means that the company made a steam

roller which may be used as a traction engine. Traction engines, properly speaking, are largely used on farms, and are altogether different from such machinery as the famous Coon road roller. If the Collingwood road roller were placed on a farm, it would be bogged for ever, on account of its weight.

Mr. MATHEWS.—Traction engines are made in Australia.

Mr. WILSON.—That is not so. Under the old Tariff traction engines and portable engines were free; and they are used on every farm in the time of threshing, and also for ploughing, pulling down trees, and so forth. Portable engines are also largely used in initial mining work; and the fact remains that up to the present they have not been manufactured commercially in Australia.

Mr. MATHEWS.—Excuse me; they have.

Mr. WILSON.—I call a commercial transaction a transaction in which an engine can be made for a reasonable price, for the use of people in opening up the country.

Mr. MATHEWS.—I know a firm that turned out twenty such engines.

Mr. WILSON.—The honorable member said that he knew all about the Moore-Heskett process, though when he said that by this process 5 tons can be turned out in a few hours, I think he must have meant 5lbs.; at any rate, the honorable member appears to be the only one who has seen this process. However, the main point is that traction and portable engines are used by primary producers, both in agricultural and mining pursuits, to a very considerable extent.

Mr. ARCHER.—And also in pastoral work.

Mr. WILSON.—Exactly; and they are not in the same category as locomotives and steam road rollers. The Minister seeks to include scarifier attachments, but, in my opinion, there is no necessity for that, because, I suppose, the scarifier is meant for tearing up metal. In any case, duties of 30 per cent. and 25 per cent. are altogether too high. I am sorry that a great many honorable members who are interested in the opening up of the country—

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—And in the destruction of the iron industry.

Mr. WILSON.—I can assure the Minister that there is no desire to destroy the iron industry. I might also add that portable engines are largely used as part of pumping plant for irrigation purposes; and it is a work we ought to encourage.

The Treasurer, who is supposed to have the interests of the whole country at heart, is found siding with the men who live in the cities—is found siding with the honorable member for South Sydney and the honorable member for Hindmarsh—in an endeavour to impose heavy taxation on people who are developing the country. It is time a protest was raised against such a policy. The honorable member for Hindmarsh is an absolute prohibitionist, and admits the fact.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—I do not admit anything of the kind.

Mr. WILSON.—The honorable member votes for prohibition, if he does not admit he is a prohibitionist.

Mr. HUME COOK.—The honorable member is a protectionist in "spots."

Mr. WILSON.—I am not a protectionist for the horseshoe-nail industry in my constituency, as the honorable member is.

The CHAIRMAN.—I must ask honorable members once more to cease interjecting and holding conversation across the chamber.

Mr. WILSON.—In reply to the honorable member for Bourke, I should like to say that I do not go round and lobby for one particular industry in my own electorate. We ought to take a broad-minded view of the whole question of the Tariff.

Mr. HUME COOK.—As the honorable member did on the item of milk!

The CHAIRMAN.—I must ask the honorable member for Bourke to cease his interjections.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—Attention might also be called to the honorable gentleman who is acting as Minister.

The CHAIRMAN.—I must also ask the honorable member for Indi not to interject. These interruptions are so continuous that it may become imperative for me to take some other course.

Mr. WILSON.—I am very sorry that I have stirred up so much feeling and strife.

The CHAIRMAN.—Will the honorable member address himself to the question?

Mr. WILSON.—I feel this item to be one of considerable importance to primary producers from one end of Australia to the other. We must avoid taking a narrow-minded view. We ought not to confine our attention to the interests of Adelaide, Melbourne, and Sydney, forgetting

the men who are developing the resources of the country in the northern parts of Queensland, the back-blocks and the north-west of Western Australia, and in the Northern Territory. The primary producer is always ready to give the manufacturer fair encouragement. In the past manufacturers of some of the items under discussion have enjoyed duties to the extent of 12½ per cent., and have progressed very well under that protection. We are now preparing to give the manufacturer a little more assistance, although that little more is something which cannot be recouped to the producers of butter, grain, and gold. In order that Australia may, as far as possible, be self-contained, we, from patriotic motives, are prepared to extend the protection a little, but that little is as much as we can bear. The honorable member for South Sydney comes here as a sudden convert from free-trade.

Mr. WATSON.—That is not true; I was never a free-trader.

Mr. WILSON.—Upon some occasions, the honorable member will vote for revenue duties, whilst upon others he will support the imposition of extraordinary protective duties.

Mr. WATSON.—Mr. McDonald, the statement of the honorable member that I am a sudden convert from free-trade is offensive to me.

The CHAIRMAN.—I am sure that the honorable member for Corangamite will withdraw the statement, seeing that it is offensive to the honorable member for South Sydney.

Mr. WILSON.—I withdraw it. I would not for the world be offensive to the honorable member. I have too much respect for him. I am very much reminded by this debate of a cartoon which appeared in *Punch* the other day, and which depicted the Treasurer in charge of a cart, and leading a certain party.

The CHAIRMAN.—Does the honorable member intend to connect his remarks with the question now before the Chair?

Mr. WILSON.—Yes. Upon this cart were traction and portable engines—

Mr. SALMON.—Is it in order for the honorable member to refer to the Treasurer as a traction engine?

Mr. WILSON.—Perhaps it would be more in accordance with tradition if I had said that the Treasurer was depicted in charge of a bullock waggon. I think, upon reflection, that it was a bullock waggon. Upon this waggon were traction and

portable engines, and in front of the donkey which represented a certain party, was a bunch of carrots labelled "New protection." I do not know what was the condition of the carrots, but I fear that they were not very sound in some respects. As the result of the promise given by the Treasurer, members of the Labour Party are prepared to vote for duties which under other circumstances they would never have dreamed of supporting. Even the honorable member for Maranoa is prepared to vote for almost prohibitive duties.

Mr. SALMON (Laanecoorie) [2.53].—During the debate which took place last evening, I made a statement to the effect that the patent rights which attached to Messrs. Babcock and Wilcox's boilers had expired. I promised to produce the book upon which my information was based or to apologize to the honorable member for Parramatta. I am happy to say that I have escaped the necessity for offering the apology by producing the information. From page 12 of Messrs. Babcock and Wilcox's own catalogues entitled "Steam," I find a picture of the latest type of tubular boiler which they manufacture, which was covered by patent No. 6623 in the State of Victoria. This patent was registered on the 25th March, 1889, and expired in the same month of 1903.

Mr. MATHEWS (Melbourne Ports) [2.54].—The honorable member for Corangamite, like most of those who are opposed to the manufacture of any commodity in Australia—

Mr. WILSON.—That statement is absolutely incorrect.

Mr. MATHEWS.—In my opinion the honorable member is opposed to the manufacture of Australian commodities, inasmuch as he refuses to extend to our industries a sufficient measure of protection to enable them to successfully compete against the outside world. He has stated that these portable engines are not manufactured in the Commonwealth—

Mr. WILSON.—I said that they were not commercially manufactured.

Mr. MATHEWS.—I take it that the honorable member means that they have not been manufactured and sold here. As a matter of fact there are five establishments in my own electorate which are making portable engines and selling them in Australia. I hold in my hand a photograph of a portable engine of which Johnson's Foundry has manufactured twenty, all of which have been sold in Victoria.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—In what year did they manufacture them?

Mr. MATHEWS. — Fourteen or fifteen years ago. I also have here two plates of a 12 horse-power portable engine of which Mr. Renshaw, of South Melbourne, has made four, which are working in Victoria to-day. His price for each of them was £221. I have still another plate of a six horse-power engine and boiler, of which the same firm has manufactured six, two in 1905, two in 1906, and two during the present year. If any honorable member doubts the accuracy of my statement he has only to visit the establishment in question, where he will see an 8½ horse-power portable engine and boiler which has been manufactured to the order of the Metropolitan Board of Works. Twelve engines of the same type have been sold for £227 each. Is any other evidence necessary to prove that this class of machinery is being manufactured here commercially? There is not a man in Australia who can doubt the efficacy of the steam road roller which was manufactured to the order of the Collingwood City Council. It burns the minimum quantity of coal, it is doing its work efficiently, and it was made in Australia. If engineering firms in this State had to manufacture the whole of the road rollers required in Australia they would be in a position to produce them at a very much reduced price. We all know that a start has to be made at some time. In the first instance a manufacturer has to incur considerable expense before he can produce an article, but in later years he can manufacture it at a much cheaper price. The Collingwood Council, who have received, and rightly received, great credit for paying a little more for their road roller, have put the other councils in a position to procure road rollers at a very much cheaper rate than has prevailed hitherto. Traction engines have been made satisfactorily in Australia. We are told that in these matters the principal consideration is the economical working of the article. I am informed that every user of machinery which has been made in Australia during later years has expressed his willingness to give a certificate as to economical consumption of coal, durability, and capacity to do the work required. Here is a photograph of a portable engine of a special Australian pattern which was made not with a square firebox but with a

round firebox, so that the stumps would not interfere with or disarrange the engine.

Mr. WILSON.—They could not get out the ashes.

Mr. MATHEWS.—No less than twenty of this patented portable engine have been put on the market. Men do not buy a new invention for fun's sake. They generally satisfy themselves that it is worth buying. This portable engine was satisfactory to the user. If the honorable member does not like that one, then like Cheapjack in the market he can take his choice from the other samples of locally-made engines which are shown in these photographs. I ought not, perhaps, to blame the honorable member for Corangamite for advocating the proposed reduction of duty. Many of his constituents, being human beings, are selfish to a certain extent, and they, like all free-traders, wish to secure as free a market as they can in the purchasing of commodities. I can assure the honorable gentleman that within a quarter of an hour's walk of this building portable engines have been manufactured, and the manufacturer has informed me that in point of price they compare very favorably with imported engines. First of all, we are told that it is years since these articles were made. As a matter of fact, the engineering trade in Australia, at any rate in Victoria, did far better thirty years ago than it is doing now. Why? Because the protective Governments of Victoria in their wisdom imposed such a duty that the articles could be manufactured here. What was good for Victoria cannot be otherwise than beneficial to Australia as a whole. The agriculturist, the grazier, and the miner are dependent upon the men in the towns, and therefore they should be prepared to give and take. I ask the representatives of mining districts, "Is it wise to have only one avenue of employment for men?" Are they so much wedded to the mining industry, to working in the bowels of the earth, that they do not want to bring into existence other avenues of employment for their sons and their daughters' husbands? There is no man in the city but will concede to the agriculturist the right to live in the same sense in which he wishes to live. But the agriculturist knows very well that in large cities there is a ready market in which he can always get satisfactory prices for his products. I realize that it is necessary to export certain commodities which we over-produce. That is essential, and also beneficial to us as a whole. At the same time,

it behoves us to see that one and the other are protected in a certain sense. I do not believe that certain honorable members represent the true feelings of primary producers when they urge the Committee to discourage the manufacture of an article in Australia.

Mr. FAIRBAIRN (Fawcner) [3.5].—I am one of those who hold that the great bulk of these engines ought to be made in Australia. I think that, unlike the hot-air engines, they are made to only a very limited extent. In Australia there is a very large market for portable engines. They are used in every State, and are in great demand. I believe that if there was a properly equipped factory they could be turned out as well as locomotive engines are turned out. It is an industry which we ought to try to establish in our midst. At the same time, we ought not to impose too high a duty. I ask the Treasurer to listen to a letter which I received a day or two ago, and which pretty well speaks for itself. Writing on the 23rd of November, my correspondent says—

I beg to call your attention to the injustice which the proposed duty of 25 per cent. on portable engines will entail on a mining company in which I am interested. This is the Wilberforce Gold-dredging Company, situated near Beechworth.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—We had that over and over again last night.

Mr. FAIRBAIRN.—I wish to draw the attention of the honorable gentleman to the actual sum which is involved.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I know all about that.

Mr. FAIRBAIRN.—The company is operating in the Indi electorate. Prior to the introduction of the Tariff it ordered from England a 30-horse-power portable engine—a very large class of engine. Out of £8,000 expended on the mine, over £3,000 has gone in the purchase of engines, boilers, &c., made in this country—a fact which I think the Treasurer has not grasped. The letter continues—

Owing to the fact that the depth of the alluvial ground necessitates a type and size of portable engine never kept in stock by machinery merchants, and, indeed, never made except to order, the directors were compelled to cable to England for the building of this special engine. The duty on this engine will amount to not less than £250.

That is a very large sum for the company to be called upon to pay in Customs duty.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—That was calculated on a duty of 25 per cent., but the Treasurer now proposes to levy a duty of 30 per cent.

Mr. FAIRBAIRN.—I believe that with duties of 20 and 15 per cent. respectively we could establish the industry of making portable engines.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Will the honorable member agree to a minimum of 20 per cent.?

Mr. FAIRBAIRN.—No; I think it would be better to fix the duties at 20 and 15 per cent. respectively. If we did, we should not penalize the industries which have to use portable engines. I want to see the industry started, but I do not wish subsidiary industries to be handicapped too much. I hope that, on reconsideration, the Treasurer may see his way to agree to my suggestion.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I cannot.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS (Robertson) [3.9].—There seems to be a doubt in the minds of some honorable members as to the possibility of making portable engines in Australia. That comes to me as a very great surprise. So far back as I can remember, in the various States portable engines have been made, and made very well indeed. There is nothing extraordinary in the making of a portable engine. But I feel quite sure that very few traction engines have been made in Australia. Not long since I was looking round Australia for traction engines. In Sydney I found several of Fowler's traction engines, for which the owners had no use, and could find no sale, as so few of them are used in that State. I was told that more of them were in use in Victoria. It appears that there is very little demand for traction engines, because of the enormous expense caused by wear and tear when the engines are used on the roads to draw heavy loads. Besides, it is only on excellent roads that they can be used in that way. According to the evidence quoted by the honorable member for Bendigo, Mr. Pearson, a Queensland manufacturer, has stated that he can make engines which will work as effectively as Fowler's best, though they have not the same finish, which is not surprising, because in no country in the world can better engineering finish be given than in Great Britain. I believe that Mr. Pearson's engines can do the work required of such machinery. He says that while he charges from 15 to 16 per cent. more

he sells a better article than the Fowler engine. Therefore a protective duty of 15 or 16 per cent. would give Mr. Pearson all that he asked for when giving evidence before the Tariff Commission. The honorable member for Bendigo, as Chairman of the Commission, recommended a duty of 12½ per cent. on some of these engines, and I take it that he had in his mind traction engines.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—No; we expressly recommended a duty of 25 per cent.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—The Quick section of the Tariff Commission recommended 12½ per cent. on steam road rollers, including scarifiers, while the Fuller section, adopting a different classification, recommended 15 per cent. The Quick section recommended 25 per cent. for other machinery, which, I take it, included portable engines. In Australia manufacturers are in the habit of giving more power per nominal horse-power than is given with imported machinery. That is a failing on the right side which is always noticeable in young countries.

Mr. MALONEY.—Are not these engines made in New South Wales?

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—Traction engines are a drug in the market there. I know of half-a-dozen which are housed in Sydney. There is no sale for them, because the roads are so bad.

Mr. WILSON.—They should be sent to Victoria, where the roads are good.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—More of such engines are used in Victoria. In this State a good portable engine can be made, and we have it on the evidence of a manufacturer that 16 per cent. is a sufficiently high duty to impose on traction engines.

Mr. MALONEY.—A good traction engine, made in Melbourne, was shown at the Royal Agricultural Show, and afterwards sold in the open market.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—They can be made commercially here, all that is asked for being a protective duty of 15 or 16 per cent. The Minister's proposed rates are 30 and 25 per cent. I cannot understand that proposal, in view of his utterance in favour of 25 per cent., and in the face of the recommendation of the protectionist section of the Tariff Commission that the rate should be 12½ per cent., and from 15 down to 10 per cent. for other similar machinery. I think that we shall be adopting the happy mean if we agree to rates of 20 and 15 per cent. If the Minister wishes to make progress, he should adopt the line of least resistance. He can accept, with

honour, rates of 20 and 15 per cent.; but if he sticks out for higher rates he will be ignominiously defeated, as he was yesterday.

Mr. BATCHELOR (Boothby) [3.16].—I was rather surprised by the outburst of the honorable member for Corangamite. I do not understand why he asks that portable engines shall be treated differently from other similar engines. He says that they are used on farms, but so, too, are stationary engines. Why should a portable engine be admitted free and a stationary engine be made to pay duty? Does the honorable member see any particular virtue in the fact that an engine is mounted on wheels instead of being bedded?

Mr. WILSON.—Certainly.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—A portable engine has its advantages for a farmer; but I cannot see why in a Tariff a distinction should be drawn between portable and stationary engines.

Mr. WILSON.—Portable engines are necessary for opening up and developing the country, while stationary engines are used merely for driving chaffcutters and other machinery.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—I cannot see the logic of the honorable member if he says that that is a reason for differentiating in the Tariff between the two classes of engines.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—These facts must have weighed with the Committee in 1902.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—No; the Committee was influenced then, as many honorable members, I am sorry to say, are influenced to-day, by too great a desire to coddle and nurse the farmers. All kinds of social legislation is passed by the Commonwealth and State Parliaments, but the attempt is always made to exempt the farmers from its restrictions, and honorable members are trying to exempt them largely from the payment of duties. Farmers should, of course, receive as much consideration as other classes of the community; but the fact that one kind of engine is more useful on a farm than another is not a reason why it should be imported duty free. Instead of the question asked being: "Can we make these engines successfully?" honorable members wish the Committee to consider only the fact that the farmers use them.

Mr. FULLER.—And what the farmers will have to pay for them if a heavy duty is imposed.

Mr. BATCHELOR. — That question has not been raised.

Mr. WILSON.—Yes; most distinctly.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—As to the matter of price a great deal depends upon whether or not there is a competing industry in Australia. If no portable engines are made in Australia the purchaser will undoubtedly pay more even if there be no import duty. If honorable members in the Opposition corner are prepared to accept a duty of 20 per cent. on portable engines and traction engines, I shall say no more. Personally, I shall vote for duties of 25 per cent. and 20 per cent. Seeing that we have laid it down that we will impose duties of 20 per cent. on motive power engines, we cannot expect to have a higher duty on these engines simply because they are on wheels. All motive power engines should be treated in the same way.

Mr. WILSON.—We shall vote for duties of 20 per cent. on foreign-made engines and 15 per cent. on engines from the United Kingdom.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—That is absurd. Surely we ought to act on logical lines; or at least honorable members should pretend to be logical. It would really be too ridiculous to differentiate in motive power engines. A locomotive is an infinitely more complicated machine than a traction engine. It is probably the most highly complex machine in existence. But it is not suggested that we cannot successfully make locomotives in Australia. Even the honorable member for Illawarra would not propose to place them on the free list. But why should locomotives pay a higher duty than portable engines?

Mr. WILSON.—Because it has been demonstrated that locomotives can be made here commercially.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—Does the honorable member put that forward as a reason? He must be a curious kind of protectionist. If he votes for protection only on goods which the farmer and miner do not use, I am puzzled to know what duties he will support. If the farmer used locomotives the honorable member would say that they could not be made in Australia. I hope that honorable members will agree to make the duties the same for all machines doing the same kind of work and having about the same degree of complexity.

Mr. ATKINSON (Wilmot) [3.28].—Under the 1902 Tariff portable engines and traction engines were admitted duty free. The honorable member for Illawarra is

proposing to revert to the position. I shall support him, though I must admit, from what I know of the feeling of the Committee, that there is not much hope in that direction. At the same time, the good sense of the Committee ought to induce us to reduce the proposed duties materially. According to the opinion of the protectionist section of the Tariff Commission, the duty should be 25 per cent. The Treasurer asks us to make it 30 per cent. with a preference of 5 per cent. in favour of Great Britain. Take an 8 horse-power single cylinder traction engine such as is commonly used. The price is about £650. With a duty of 25 per cent. the price would be increased by £135. The price of a compound engine is about £785. The proposed duty would mean an increase of £150, or thereabouts. Surely the local manufacturer does not require so great an addition to the price of imported engines before he can begin to compete. The question is not, as some honorable members and the protectionist section of the Tariff Commission think, whether these engines can be made in Australia, but whether they can be made at a reasonable price. I do not think that traction engines can be made here at a reasonable price, simply because the Australian market is too limited. According to the report of the protectionist section of the Commission, Mr. Thomas Irons, of Sydney, stated that there was not a sufficient demand for traction engines at the present time to justify their manufacture in Australia. There was no doubt in his opinion that a firm would start to make them if the duties were prohibitive. But the plant would be expensive, and a great deal of capital would be lying idle in stock on hand to meet occasional demands. If these engines cannot be made here at a reasonable price, the probability is that more harm than good would be done by imposing a high duty. If people who are now using traction engines cannot purchase them on account of their dearness, a great many men will be thrown out of employment. So that, looking at the question from a broad stand-point, we should lose more than we should gain by a heavy duty. To add £150 to the price of an article worth £750 is to go beyond the bounds of reason. Witnesses before the Tariff Commission stated that they could produce these engines in Australia only at an advance of 15 per cent. or 16 per cent. on the English price.

Mr. HUGHES.—What is the honorable member in favour of?

Mr. ATKINSON.—I think that traction and portable engines should be allowed to come in free, as under the 1902 Tariff, but seeing that the Committee are not likely to agree to that, I am prepared to be reasonable and to vote for a duty of $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent or 15 per cent. Considering the heavy freight, those would be reasonable duties. The honorable member for Fawcner quoted a very pertinent instance in relation to portable engines. The Great Wilberforce Gold Mining Company did their best to get a suitable engine made in Australia, but they could not get a 30 horse-power engine turned out here according to their requirements.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—Cannot the honorable member get a fresh yarn? We have heard all that before.

Mr. ATKINSON. — So long as the facts are true, due weight ought to be given to them. The price of the 30 horse-power engine they required was £1,150. After being landed in Melbourne, it cost £120 to get it to the mine. A duty of 25 per cent. on such an engine would increase the price by £250. That means a 2d. call on 30,000 shares to pay the duty. Such a heavy tax is one which many mining companies could not afford to pay. Even if only one mine were closed down, it would mean a great loss of employment. We should look at this question as business men. If honorable members do that, I am quite sure that, even if we do not succeed in having these engines placed on the free list, the duty will be lowered considerably.

Mr. COON (Batman) [3.35].—I wish, in the first place, to correct the misstatement made by the honorable member for Corangamite, that road rollers are not portable engines. As a matter of fact, the only difference between a road roller and an ordinary traction engine is that the wheels are in the centre instead of at the side of the machine. It has been said that the effect of this duty will be to increase prices. When the Collingwood City Council proposed to purchase a new road roller, it obtained prices from several importers, but as soon as it determined to call for tenders, and so to invite local competition, the importers reduced their prices by £100. The Council secured a road roller from a Melbourne firm for £25 less than it could obtain an imported one. It was made under the present Tariff, and

we wish the duty to remain. In other parts of the world where these engines are made the workers receive 28s. per week, as against a wage of £3 6s. per week paid for the same class of work in Australia. As to the Great Wilberforce Mining Company, to which the honorable member for Indi has referred, I may say that it made no inquiry as to the desirableness of obtaining locally the engine in question.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—That is not true.

The CHAIRMAN.—The honorable member must withdraw that statement.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—In obedience to your ruling, sir, I do so.

Mr. COON.—The manager of the mine stated that had he known that the engine could be made here he would have placed his order locally, and that if the present duty remains, he will obtain in Australia the two additional machines that he requires. We ought to be prepared to encourage this industry. At the present time it is practically impossible, owing to slackness of trade, to apprentice a boy to the engineering trade, and one of our largest foundries, which, prior to Federation, was employing 600 men, has now only 250 hands. I hope that honorable members who were returned as protectionists will stand by their election pledges and vote for a protective duty.

Mr. FOSTER (New England) [3.40].—I should consider that I was unmindful of my duty to the great primary industries if I supported any attempt to hinder them. It is my intention to heartily support every proposal to abolish duties on machines that we cannot make here. The machinery and engines now under consideration can readily be made in Australia, and I am, therefore, prepared to vote for a protective duty. I fail to understand the attitude of so-called protectionists who desire a revenue duty to be imposed. They would make the Tariff so low as to render it impossible to establish the industry in Australia, and so to give rise to the healthy competition that we desire. It is my intention to support duties of 25 per cent. and 20 per cent. on this item, and I disagree with those who say that such duties will greatly increase the prices of these engines. The result of a healthy local competition is to bring down the prices of imported machines.

Mr. ATKINSON.—But the local market is not sufficient.

Mr. FOSTER.—The foreign manufacturer has a great advantage over Australian

firms, since he has a larger turn-over, has been longer established, and can obtain cheaper labour than is available here. If it is desirable to develop the iron industry, and to secure an increased population in Australia, honorable members should vote for effective protection.

Mr. THOMAS.—Why not have a duty of 20 per cent. all round?

Mr. FOSTER.—Because we wish to give a preference to Great Britain, so long as in doing so we shall not interfere with Australian industries.

Mr. THOMAS. — Does the honorable member think that a duty of 20 per cent. will be effective?

Mr. FOSTER.—Yes; so far as imports from Great Britain are concerned; but I am willing to vote for a duty of 25 per cent. on imports of this kind from other parts of the world in order that a preference may be granted to the Mother Country. I am not prepared to injure local industry by voting for the imposition of an ineffective duty on British imports. I am surprised at the attitude of the honorable member for Barrier, who is opposed to preferential trade. If I think that anything less than a duty of 20 per cent. would be ineffective, as against British imports, why should I vote for a duty of 15 per cent.?

Mr. THOMAS.—The honorable member favours preference to Great Britain, but would make the duty on British imports so high as to exclude them.

Mr. FOSTER.—No. I am prepared to afford every man in Australia an opportunity to buy British-made engines, but if he desires to do so, he ought to be prepared to pay a little more for them, or the British manufacturer should be ready to pay this duty and land his engines as cheaply as he can. We have been asked what consideration we are extending in this matter to the miner. I have been associated with mining, both as a speculator and as a worker, and am satisfied that the establishment of this industry in Australia will enable those engaged in mining to obtain their machinery cheaper later on. The position will be the same in regard to pumping engines for irrigation purposes. Irrigation, together with the making of ensilage, and the storing of other fodders in times of plenty, will lead to the salvation of the Commonwealth. In the days to come the engines included in this item will be in great demand, and we cannot do better than so legislate that their cost will be reduced. I am surprised that

some honorable members should imagine that the miners and farmers have so restricted an outlook that they would have us legislate only for to-day. They are quite prepared to bear their share of any burden involved in the establishment of industries native to Australia, and to support such legislation as will attract population to Australia, and enable her to offer an effective defence in the day of need.

Mr. MALONEY (Melbourne) [3.50]. — My experience as a politician convinces me that no speech made during the consideration of the Tariff is likely to affect a single vote; but I hope to influence some votes by a quotation. I quote from a letter received from Messrs. Welch, Perrin and Company, English manufacturers, the statement that an 8-h.p. traction engine costs £650, and I wish to inform the Committee that Messrs. Cliff and Bunting, of North Melbourne, manufactured an 8-h.p. traction engine this year, which they exhibited at the Victorian Agricultural Show. It was subsequently sold to a farmer for £600, and is now working satisfactorily at Shepparton. I make the point that the price put upon the imported engine is £650, and that a local manufacturer has sold for £600 a similar engine, which is giving complete satisfaction.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN (Calare) [3.52]. — The question is not whether these engines can be made in the Commonwealth, but whether they are being made here in sufficient numbers to enable those who require them to obtain them at a reasonable price. Apparently, in view of the volume of importation, this has not been done in the past. I do not wish to make an appeal on behalf of the poor squatters and farmers. I wish to see justice done, but, while we should have every regard for the secondary industries, we should not forget the interests of the primary industries on which they depend. In my opinion, those who are prepared to push their protectionist principles to the point of prohibition on behalf of the secondary industries are the worst enemies of those industries. If the miners, squatters, and farmers did not use machinery, the workshops of the secondary industries would speedily be closed up. I am afraid that very often honorable members are interviewed by the promoters of secondary industries, and, as a result of the representations made to them, are induced to forget the interests of the primary industries. I am just as anxious as are my protectionist friends to see the manufacture

of engines and machinery promoted, but I do not wish to see the primary industries heavily handicapped by prohibitive taxation upon the machinery and implements they require for their development. These portable and traction engines are very largely used in the pastoral, mining, and farming industries of the Commonwealth. If they are to progress, labour-saving appliances must be used even to a larger extent than at present in those industries. I can inform the Committee that the mineral recovered from the mining property at Nymagee, in the electorate of the honorable member for Darling, which abuts upon my own electorate, is conveyed a considerable distance to the nearest railway station by means of a traction engine. In my own electorate during the drought of 1902-3 the owners of one station spent £120,000 on fodder imported to save their stock; and a large quantity of that fodder was conveyed from the nearest railway station by a traction engine. Along the Lachlan there are numbers of settlers engaged in irrigating large and small areas, and traction engines are largely used in that kind of work.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—The portable engine is also used.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—That is so, but the preference is given to the traction engine because it can be so easily moved about. These engines are also used on farms in connexion with the threshing of wheat and chaffcutting, because by their means the necessary power required is conveniently transferred from one part of a farm to another.

Mr. McDougall.—What percentage of the farmers in Australia own traction engines—2 per cent.?

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—The percentage is not a large one, but I wish to see it increased, because every farmer who is in a position to employ one of these engines on his farm will be able to do a great deal more work than he can do without it. If this class of machinery can be obtained at a reasonable price farmers will be in a position to make use of it who must do without it if the price is considerably increased as the result of the imposition of a prohibitive duty. It is in the interests of the farming, mining, and pastoral industries that I wish to have these engines placed upon the market at something like a reasonable price. I prefer that they should be manufactured in Australia, but imported engines of this

description should not be shut out if they cannot be produced here at a reasonable price. The experience of the Wilberforce Gold Dredging Company is a striking illustration of the effect of these duties. They have presented a petition to this House, the facts stated in which have not been controverted. They have expended something like £10,000 in mining development. Their work is not carried on in the back blocks of Queensland or New South Wales, where they might have some difficulty in obtaining information as to the development of manufacturing industries in the Commonwealth. Their operations are carried on in the vicinity of Melbourne, and they have informed honorable members that they have purchased £3,000 worth of machinery from Victorian manufacturers. It is clear, therefore, that if they could obtain the engine which they found indispensable for their work from the Victorian firms from whom they purchased their other machinery, at a reasonable figure, they would have done so. They have said that they were obliged to import a 30 horse-power engine, because they could not get their order for such an engine executed here.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Because they did not inquire.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—It is all very well for the Treasurer to tell the Committee that they did not inquire. They inquired for £3,000 worth of machinery, and it is therefore reasonable to assume that if they could have secured the 30 horse-power engine in the Commonwealth they would have done so rather than go to the expense of importing it. They made inquiries, and were unable to get it here. In the interests of hypothetical production, the Treasurer submitted a duty of 25 per cent. on these machines, which would represent a tax of £250 upon this company in the purchase of the engine referred to. Not satisfied with that, the honorable gentleman yesterday proposed to jump the duty up another 5 per cent., making these engines dutiable at 30 per cent. I can give another instance. I have here a letter which I suppose other honorable members also have received, from the firm of Welch, Perrin, and Company, of Melbourne. They state that under the old Tariff they were selling three lines of 8 horse-power single cylinder, compound cylinder, and portable engines at £650, £750, and £285 respectively; and the mere imposition of the increased duty has

had the result of increasing the price of these engines to £785, £905, and £341 respectively. The Chairman of the Tariff Commission has said that the Austral Otis Company are prepared to produce similar 8 horse-power engines for £720, £825, and £325 respectively. This indicates, assuming that those engines are identical—and, so far as I can judge, they are—with the engines put on the market here by Messrs. Welch, Perrin, and Company, that there is an advance in the case of the Otis Company of £70 in the price of the 8 horse-power single cylinder; of £75 in the price of the 8 horse-power compound cylinder engine; and of £40 in the price of the 8 horse-power portable engine. This means that, if these high duties are imposed, and the engines are made locally, on the basis indicated by the Otis Company, the farmers, graziers, and miners will have to pay that much more for them than they have been paying. That is the hard pounds-shillings-and-pence side of the question. It means a considerable additional burden to the primary producer. Is it reasonable that he should not be considered in this matter at all? Should not his interests have weight with the Committee? I have presented to the Committee concrete facts, first regarding the mining company I have indicated, and next as to the difference of price between those two reputable firms—the Otis Company and Welch, Perrin and Company.

Mr. McDougall.—Are the mining companies and those importing firms primary producers?

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—I did not claim that they were. I am showing to what extent they are helping the primary producer by supplying him with his machinery. I should like to see these machines on the free list, but, if I cannot get that, I propose to vote only for that amount of taxation which will not be severely felt by the primary producer. I do not propose to move any amendments myself, but I shall support those that have been indicated. The Treasurer seems to overlook the fact that in the great protectionist countries of Canada and New Zealand a great many of these engines are on the free list, or were kept upon the free list until such times as they could be produced locally, other means—such as bounties in Canada—being adopted to bring them to that stage. But here, the Treasurer proposes a heavy 30 per cent.

tax, practically saying to the primary producer, "You will have to buy these machines at that price, or do without them." In that way he proposes to encourage the secondary producer. His policy is largely that of killing the goose that lays the golden eggs. If he penalizes the primary producer to that extent he will find that it will react upon the secondary producer, and that, instead of helping the latter, this prohibitive Tariff will be really a detriment to him.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [4.12].—I wish to say a few words in reply to those who have stated that these engines cannot be manufactured here. The very best of them can be. I have here an issue of the *Australasian* of August last, which contains a picture of as fine a traction engine as ever was seen in Australia, made by Cliff and Bunting, of North Melbourne.

Mr. HUGHES.—Is it on wheels?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Yes.

Mr. HUGHES.—And do they go round?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Several honorable members have made very wild statements. This is what the *Australasian* said about that traction engine—

One of the exhibits at the Royal Show which is sure to attract and hold the attention of the majority of visitors next week will be a handsome, well-balanced, and serviceable traction engine, designed and manufactured by Messrs. Cliff and Bunting, of North Melbourne. This engine—a photograph of which appears in the pictorial pages—is the outcome of years of practical study of Australian conditions and needs. It has been designed and built in Australia, every part has been made in Australia, every feature has been carefully thought out, and the result is an engine which will give satisfactory service under all conditions—on metal roads, on earth roads, and in paddocks hauling or ploughing. The excellent quality of the material used throughout not only insures great strength, but materially reduces the weight of the engine, which is just seven and a-half tons, so that it is well within the weight limit allowed on bridges and culverts. The strength and lightness, combined with wide road wheels, means that no injury is done to metal roads, whilst heavy loads can be hauled in swampy paddocks where weightier engines would stick fast. . . . Two-speed gear is fitted; quick speed for use on good roads and to make good time, and slow speed for use on rough or bad roads, or when there is a heavy load behind. The reverse is a single eccentric, very easy to handle and with little liability to wear. One of the features of the engine is the wonderful ease with which it is steered.

Mr. HUGHES.—How does it compare in price with that of the imported engines?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The price is not given. The honorable member for Batman knows more than I do about the

combined road roller and traction engine made recently for the Collingwood City Council, and regarding which I was questioned this afternoon. That honorable member was to a large extent instrumental in having that work done here. The Collingwood Council invited tenders for it. The tenders came in, but a movement was started to get the machine made here. The moment it was discovered that the Collingwood Council had decided to have it made here the outside tenderers reduced their price by £100. I am told that the price of the accepted engine was 25 per cent. less than the importers' tender price. The honorable member for Calare made certain quotations of importers' prices. Those importers will do exactly as the other importers did in the case of the Collingwood engine. The moment they know there is going to be opposition here, and that good engines are being made here, their price to the farmer will come down immensely, and the farmer will benefit very largely from the fact that we are protecting an engine which is made here, and which they can use. The honorable member for Calare, when he looks at the picture in the *Australasian* of the traction engine I have mentioned, will admit that he never saw a better machine. It is suitable to Australian conditions. Just as the harvester people applied their inventive powers to turning out a harvester fitted for Australian conditions, and have also adapted other agricultural machinery to Australian conditions, so the local makers have adapted this machine to Australian requirements. The practical position before us to-day is that, by putting a good duty on these imported machines, we shall give employment to our own people, and get machines made, like the one I have just shown to honorable members, as good as any ever built.

Mr. HUGHES (West Sydney) [4.18].—This item raises the whole question of whether we are to resort to revenue or protective duties. I have been all my life a very ardent free-trader, but I have never yet conceded, nor am I now going to concede, the expediency of revenue duties. I have to ask myself, in view of what has been said this afternoon, which of the three duties proposed—15 per cent., 20 per cent., and 30 per cent.—is likely to prove most effective so far as production in this country is concerned, and which will be productive of the most revenue. Although what the honorable member for Calare has

said is no doubt true, that it a duty is imposed somebody has to pay it, it is also perfectly obvious that if so low a duty is imposed as not to encourage people in this country to make the article, those who import it will be able, in the absence of opposition, to form a complete ring to fix prices, as all trusts do, by arrangement and not by competition. The one great fact that the twentieth century and the last years of the nineteenth century have made abundantly clear is that the day for the fixing of prices by competition is either past or passing, and that all prices will in the future be fixed by arrangement. We, in this Parliament, deliberately propose to pass a law to compel men, within certain limits, to pay certain wages and sell at certain prices. Honorable members should not merely say that, if we impose a certain duty, prices will rise to the extent of that duty; because, I presume, it will not be denied that we can make eight-horse traction engines in Australia. If I had charge of all the industries in the country, and were all-wise—a supposition which, seeing that I am not on the Treasury benches, is obviously absurd—I should protect the iron and steel industry beyond all others, as the one that requires the most skill and affords the greatest opportunities. There are more ramifications every day in this modern world of ours springing from the engineering industry than from any other. Although machines every day replace or displace skilled labour, yet, as a matter of fact, the great machines are becoming in themselves so marvellously complex, as to demand the highest skill and intelligence in their management, and particularly in their making. It cannot be said that it is impossible to make a traction engine in Australia. Such an engine does not differ, excepting in its wheels, and in its potential speed, from a locomotive. The honorable member for Boothby, who is an engineer, has said that the locomotive engine is the most complex of all, and, no doubt, that is true enough. The question whether we can make traction engines is not to be debated, because it is very obvious that we can; and that we have not done so—if we have not—is entirely owing to the fact that insufficient inducements have been held out. Now, we have come, through no action of mine, or of persons thinking with me, face to face with Government proposals to raise a large amount of revenue. The

necessity for this step may partly be attributed to the constitutional blot, which compels us to raise four times more revenue than we require. We are not asked to say whether engines shall be free or dutiable, but whether the duty shall be 15 per cent., 20 per cent., or 25 per cent. The honorable member for Calare is one who will cheerfully vote for a duty of 15 per cent. But that duty, added to insurance and freight, and taking into account the difference in the value of the articles here and in the place of origin, is equivalent to at least 22 per cent. or 23 per cent. The honorable member for Calare and others are, therefore, in favour of imposing a revenue duty to that extent. They tell us that such a duty is not sufficient to be felt by the people, or, at any rate, not to be appreciably felt; but directly it is proposed to add another 5 per cent., we have presented to us pictures of the most terrific and awesome character as to the consequences. The honorable member for Wilmot told us that a certain machine would, under such a duty, cost £100 more than formerly, and the honorable member for Calare told us of another machine which would cost £70 more. If an engine—I do not care what sort—can be made in this country, it will compete with imported engines, and prices will fall—that prices fall in competition is very obvious. I have, or had, in my possession a letter from a kerosene oil company, I do not know which, to the effect that if the duty of 3d. per gallon be taken off certain oils, then another company will have a monopoly, and prices will rise; that is to say, directly there is a monopoly prices rise. A man must be blind, or shut his eyes to facts, if he does not realize that there are importers' rings just as there are manufacturers' rings. Rings are not confined to any particular class; wherever there is profit there we find a ring, just as wherever there is carrion there we find the crows. That being the obvious fact, we have to ask ourselves whether, as a matter of hard and solid fact, the imposition of another 5 per cent. will not result in a lower price rather than in a higher one. I learn, to my great satisfaction, that farmers are in the habit of purchasing traction engines quite frequently. I have worked for farmers myself many times; and I only knew one man who had a traction engine which travelled with a thresher round the country. Farmers must be more prosperous than they used to be, or than they say they are; and I should be glad

to see many of them possessed of engines. It is of no use pointing to the poor farmers as victims. The farmers have had ample consideration, and the operative and skilled artisan ought now to receive some attention. Since we have to raise a large revenue, why not raise it in a way that will give employment to numerous people? I will not vote for a revenue duty; the mere fact that I am told that a revenue duty is proposed is enough to cause me to vote against it. I know only one effective way of raising revenue, and that is by direct taxation—not necessarily on land—and, if I am forced to choose, I shall not support very low duties, because I hate taxation that falls on the shoulders of very poor people. But he is not a poor person who can buy a traction engine worth from £200 to £700. Personally, I am not a very poor person, but, at the same time, I cannot afford to buy a traction engine. I have been hesitating a long while about getting a very flimsy sort of pumping apparatus, and I find the price, to me at any rate, quite prohibitive. The Treasurer has proposed duties of 30 per cent. and 25 per cent.; but he is an enthusiast, and, when he says 30 per cent., he very often means 20 per cent., and is very glad that is understood to be his meaning. Therefore, I shall vote for the same duty on this item, as I did on the last.

Mr. POYNTON (Grey) [4.30].—Yesterday we had an exhibition of what is generally termed in political circles "getting in out of the wet," and to-day we have had the most shameless display of the kind known since the creation of this Parliament. The honorable member for West Sydney is the apostle of free-trade, and has scores of times, on the floor of this House, contended that duties increase prices. Yet he tells us to-day that the imposition of the proposed duty will mean decreased prices. If the honorable member is right, his argument would apply to every item we have dealt with in this Tariff. Much as I value my position—much as I appreciate the honour conferred upon me by my constituents—I would sooner walk out of Parliament to-morrow, than give such an exhibition as we have witnessed to-day. How far is the honorable member for West Sydney from the fact, when he says that duties decrease prices? The duty now proposed by the Government means an increase from £650 to £785 on one class of portable engine; on another class of engine, from £750

to £905; and on another, from £285 to £341. On the very engine under discussion, under the old Tariff, there was protection, including freightage and other charges, amounting to 33 per cent., whereas the proposed duty means a protection to the extent of 40 per cent. The honorable member for Bendigo told us to-day that the Austral Otis Company, which is primarily interested in this duty, can manufacture eight-horse power single cylinder engines at £720; eight-horse power compound engines at £825; and eight-horse power portable engines at £325. But the Austral Otis Company have increased their selling prices on these lines by £70, £75, and £40 respectively. What becomes then of the honorable member's argument that the imposition of this duty will have the effect of reducing the price of these engines? The high price of horses at the present time renders it almost obligatory that a large number of farmers shall use portable engines to provide them with motive power. The one purpose which they have in view is to cheapen the cost of production. Yet the Committee are asked to sanction—in the interests practically of one firm—a proposal to increase the cost of these machines to the extent that I have indicated. I venture to say that if the Committee assent to that proposal, this firm will take full advantage of its position. It will have its pound of flesh, and, in doing so, I do not suggest for a moment that it is any worse than is the average individual. Upon the first class of machine, it will have a margin of £65 upon which to increase its price directly this duty is imposed. Upon the second class of engine, it will have a margin of £80, and upon the smaller engines, it will have a margin of £60. The Committee. I regret to say, have already authorized the collection of duties upon the tools of trade of the producers, as well as upon the necessities of life. But if honorable members were to visit the various factories in the city of Melbourne, they would find that in nine cases out of ten, the tools of trade and the raw materials of these establishments have been placed upon the free list. If they had not been put in that category, the manufacturers of Victoria would have been in the lobbies of this House pestering honorable members. I recollect my experience when the 1902 Tariff was under consideration. Upon that occasion, boot manufacturers engaged in

Poynton.

lobbying for the purpose of getting a duty of 30 per cent. imposed upon boots. What happened subsequently? They invaded the room occupied by the free-trade members of the House, whom they requested to abolish the duty of 15 per cent. which was being collected upon leather, on the ground that leather was their raw material.

Mr. MAUGER.—Boots are cheaper now than they have ever been.

Mr. POYNTON.—That is the argument of the Postmaster-General, who is interested in an industry which has received a protection amounting in some instances to 150 per cent.

Mr. MAUGER.—I am not interested to the extent of a fraction in any industry in Australia. The honorable member should not make that statement.

Mr. POYNTON.—Then the Postmaster-General is very much maligned. The only industry in which he has exhibited a very great interest is that of hats, and upon the lower class of hats, a duty has been levied which is equivalent to 150 per cent.

Mr. MAUGER.—By way of personal explanation, may I be permitted to say that I am not interested either directly or indirectly to the extent of a single penny in any manufacturing industry in Australia.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. FOWLER).—The honorable member for Grey has departed somewhat from the item under consideration by introducing the question of the duty imposed upon leather.

Mr. POYNTON.—I am quite aware of that; but I was induced to transgress by the interjection of the Postmaster-General. If there be any class in Australia which deserves consideration at our hands, it is that of the primary producers. Can honorable members point to a single line in this Tariff which will benefit either the farmer or the miner? The products of the miner have to compete in the markets of the world, and the same remark is applicable to those of the farmer. I say that it would pay our primary producers to pension off the men employed in the manufacture of these engines, if, by so doing, they were permitted to obtain their tools of trade and the necessities of life at the lowest possible rate. I have had some experience of the lives which our farmers lead, and I know the difficulties with which they have to contend. I am

acquainted with men in the arid portions of South Australia, who have obtained from their holdings very little more than seed-wheat, and the necessary flour upon which to live. As a matter of fact, I have seen them maintaining their families, not upon bread, but upon boiled wheat. Yet this Committee will go into heroics if it can provide work for twenty men, altogether ignoring the fact that by its action 500 individuals are being penalized. I have known men upon the land whose wheat crop did not average one bushel per acre per year for practically ten years, and during some of those years, wheat realized only 1s. 4d. per bushel.

Mr. PAGE.—No man would remain upon the land under such circumstances. How could he possibly live?

Mr. POYNTON.—I will tell the honorable member. To a very great extent, these men live upon the local storekeepers. They starve their families and look forward to brighter times. I have known men who settled upon arid areas when they were young, and who have quitted them practically at the end of their lives without a penny.

Mr. PAGE.—That may be seen every day in Queensland and all the world over.

Mr. POYNTON.—Why should men who have to undergo such difficulties be penalized?

Mr. CHANTER.—There are less cases of insolvency amongst farmers than in any other class.

Mr. POYNTON.—That is not so.

Mr. HUME COOK.—It is absolutely true, as the statistics show.

Mr. POYNTON.—Why should these men be penalized in respect of every tool of trade which they may require?

Mr. PAGE.—That is all right; stick to the text.

Mr. POYNTON.—I am sticking to the text.

Mr. PAGE.—No. The honorable member told us that for ten years the farmers got 1s. 6d. a bushel. That is a tale, because we know different.

Mr. POYNTON.—It is not a tale. Here is an apostle of protection in the person of the honorable member for Darwin, who was in South Australia at the time, and knows that what I said is an absolute fact. For a number of years, I have seen wheat sold at 1s. 4d. a bushel in the out-ports.

Mr. PAGE.—The honorable member said 1s. 6d.

Mr. POYNTON.—No; I said that the farmers did not average more than a bushel of wheat to the acre, and that it realized only 1s. 4d. For years I saw the men sow their seed, and where I expected to see a crop, I saw red fallow land; no wheat came up at all. Yet, with honorable members who live in a fine climate, and are surrounded by the manufacturing interests, the only consideration, apparently, is to pile on duties, ostensibly to create labour. It does not matter to them what duties are imposed, so long as they create labour in the towns, if it be created for only ten, twenty, or thirty men. It concerns them very little whether they penalize hundreds of primary producers who cannot possibly derive any advantage from the Tariff. What did the Prime Minister say only a few years ago in regard to the imposition of duties levied on agricultural implements, which I declare are essential to enable agriculturists to contend with climatic conditions, vermin, and various other things, in the poorest country, whither they have been driven, by land monopoly? Yet, the Government propose to increase their burdens. I trust that the Committee will fix as low duties as possible on these tools of trade, which are essential to cheap production by primary producers, and which, as time goes on, will be used still more largely.

Mr. WILKS (Dalley) [4.54].—Mr. Fowler, I think you will admit that as a rule, the last speaker is a pretty warm sort of chap, and is fairly consistent. Tonight he has told you that he would rather walk out of public life than do certain things; that he would rather take a political cake-walk out of this assembly than go back on his free-trade principles. We must all admit that he is about the most consistent man in this Parliament in advocating the extension of free-trade. If the Committee had been voting on the lines which he has stated right through the consideration of this Tariff, probably he would have found other honorable members keeping him company. I had the pleasure of sitting with him in the first Parliament. At that time the only weak spot he had—and it has been weak ever since that date—was a small patch of Tariff matter, but a bit of salt went over the patch and removed the difficulty.

Mr. POYNTON.—That is not correct.

Mr. WILKS.—The honorable member knows that he did not fight very strongly for free-trade principles in connexion with

one item in the first Federal Tariff, and that a bit of salt prevented the disease from spreading.

Mr. POYNTON.—I rise to order, sir. I have already explained my position on the item to which the honorable member has just referred. If he will extend to me the ordinary courtesy which is extended to an honorable member he will accept the facts as described in *Hansard*. I was rather surprised to hear him again referring to the matter, especially when he, amongst others, agreed to a compromise, and afterwards asked me to break away from it.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. FOWLER).—That is not a point of order.

Mr. WILKS.—I generally extend more than ordinary courtesy to my fellow members, and particularly to the honorable member for Grey. We are not here, however, for the purpose of cultivating personal friendships. I do not believe that there is a stronger friendship between two members of the House than exists between the honorable member and myself. I do not know how it may be affected by my remarks this afternoon. I trust that the honorable member will not be fractious under my observations, because he can pepper us very strongly when he likes. He has rubbed it in strongly in his last speech. He, in common with others when it suits their purpose, imposes a self-denying ordinance, so far as Tariff matters are concerned. I do not think that the electorate of Grey is full of industrials to manufacture anything. I have not yet heard that it was a teeming mass of factories. And when the honorable member says he is prepared to take a political cake-walk out of the chamber rather than do certain things, I take the liberty of saying that probably the policy which he is advocating is a just and useful policy to a constituency in which there are no strong vested interests, no thousands of men engaged in factories, no hundred varieties of industries which require or ask for assistance. It is just as well, sir, for me to throw that sidelight. The honorable member for Dallev, when he addresses you, does not pretend to defend this item on economic grounds any more than he would on any other grounds; but he says openly that as honorable members rise in their places they show that they are free-traders or protectionists, in patches, just as it suits them, and he generally finds that the patch which is put most strongly before the Chair is the patch in their own

electorate where a particular industry is concerned. So far as pestering is concerned—either by personal approach or in any other way—let me tell the honorable member for Grey that not on any item have I been approached directly by either importer or manufacturer. That is the stand which I took on the first Federal Tariff, and the stand which I take on this Tariff. Certainly I have received their circulars, but that has been all. If ever they have got near enough to speak to me, in my electorate or elsewhere, I have asked them to keep off the Tariff question, and to allow me to deal with it as a man who is responsible to his constituency for his votes. I do not ask any one else to share my responsibility. I wish the honorable member for Grey to understand that I have no recollection of the incident to which he referred just now. I do not question that it occurred as he said. Probably the way in which I then dealt with any attempt at pestering has prevented any one from attempting to pester me in connexion with this Tariff. Referring to the item before the Chair, I suppose that the largest engineering establishment in New South Wales is in my electorate. There are also many similar establishments there. Out of all those firms not one of them by letter, to say nothing of a personal interview, has approached me in regard to this item. There is a clear statement of my position, sir. I would not pursue that course any longer, only that I wish to make my case clear. When I was before my electors during the last campaign, I said openly, "So far as the doctrine of free-trade is concerned on the necessities of life, such as food supplies, &c., I shall endeavour to get you the lowest possible duties. But as regards any other question when I find men, either free-traders or protectionists in patches, fighting to get a little assistance for their own electorates, I shall take care that, as your representative, I shall not be slow in demanding a little share of that protection for my electors." That is a frank, open statement. Perhaps, sir, you may say that it was a foolish statement for me to make, but I made it, and am answerable to my constituents. I am now carrying out, rightly or wrongly, my self-imposed policy at the last election. Yesterday, when a similar item was submitted, the plea put forward was that it would be all right if it did not affect mining machinery.

You, sir, pleaded with honorable members not to put penalties on the great mining experiments of Australia. You put that plea pretty strongly before the Committee. You said that you would not be like the honorable member for Dalley—such a practically low-minded individual as to fight for your electorate. You declared that you would not do such a thing, that you were such a noble-hearted, elevated patriot, that all you thought about was the ruination of your State.

Mr. TUDOR.—Who said that?

Mr. WILKS.—I must not take too much liberty, because it was said by an honorable member who at present is handcuffed. I would not like to be sitting in the chair, sir, and to be referred to as I am referring to the honorable member for Perth, who is generally very calm in his speech, and very careful as to his statements. When he put that position to the honorable member for Dalley, he put it very nicely. In fact, with a sort of sorrowful air, he said that he stuck up for his electorate, but that he, like the honorable member for Grey, would rather walk out of Parliament than do such a thing as he indicated. "In my State," he said, "the engineers are more benefited by the successful running of mining ventures than by anything else." So, Mr. Fowler, I find that even that honorable gentleman had a patch. I do not wish to speak rudely, but my nature is a bit rough. I think that there is just as much human nature to the square inch in yourself as there is in the carcase of the honorable member who is addressing you. Yesterday, you were looking after your State. To-day, when this particular industry is concerned, I am looking after, not only my electorate, but also my State. We have dealt with the item of mining machinery, and now that we are dealing with another item, what is the plea put forward? The plea is made on behalf of somebody else—poor struggling men who buy traction engines at £400 or £500; poor individuals who walk into an engineering establishment and give an order for a piece of machinery costing from £500 to £1,000. Poor devils!

Mr. HEDGES.—It will take a good traction engine to shift us off this item.

Mr. WILKS.—And it will take a good traction engine to shift me off my vote. A 60 horse-power locomotive engine such as the honorable member may affect would not take me off my track. It is all very

well for the honorable member for Swan—who yesterday almost burst himself in voting protection for the nail industry—to interrupt me. I ask him now to do a little on behalf of the engineering establishments of Australia.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—But the honorable member is a free-trader.

Mr. WILKS.—The honorable member is a free-trader, is he? He voted for 40 per cent. on nails yesterday.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—The honorable member is a free-trader; I am not.

Mr. WILKS.—I would like to see the honorable member give a little protection to the engineering trades. What have they done that they should not receive it?

Sir JOHN FORREST.—I am going to give them some.

Mr. WILKS.—I do not wish to pursue that argument any further, but to refer to the item before the Chair—to locomotives, traction engines, and other things. Some honorable members desire to have a revenue duty, but I ask them to abolish their idea of getting revenue by this means, and put the articles on the free list. If they think that those who use these engines will have a severe tax placed upon them, let them not vote for a duty of 15 or 12½ per cent., because that will be imposed upon the users, and will be of no benefit to the engineering fraternity. There is no compensating advantage in imposing such low duties. With them it is only a question of imposing heavy duties on articles which, according to their own statement, are the tools of trade of the down-trodden masses, for that is the way in which they put it to you, sir. If they hold that view, do not let them fool with the question at all. Let the honorable member for Swan, and those who think with him that the duty is a severe imposition upon people, and cannot encourage local manufacture, put the articles on the free list. I will show them what sort of an animal I am. If I cannot get an effective duty, I will vote to place the articles on the free list.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—The honorable member has told us that about twenty times.

Mr. WILKS.—If I have, I do not tell it to slow music, as the honorable member tells his story, nor with one-half of the bumptiousness which he exhibits, approaching the table like an inflated balloon, as he has done on very many occasions, and telling the Chairman that he will not allow this member or that member to doubt his

veracity. Let me respectfully tell the honorable member for Swan that the honorable member for Dalley may be allowed to say one or two words regarding the attitude which he is going to take up.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—Yes.

Mr. WILKS.—I thank the honorable member very much for his condescension. With regard to locomotives, even the State of New South Wales has got out of its free-trade ideas. A few years ago its Government refused to purchase locomotive engines for running on their railways, and made arrangements for some to be manufactured at the Eveleigh workshops under Government control by their own workers. The free-trade press of New South Wales accepted that arrangement with the warmest praise, because it meant work for the engineering fraternity. I was very pleased indeed to think that the railway workshops of the State were going in for the manufacture of locomotives. I am only showing you, sir, that they all have little patches of protection upon them. That is a patch which I hope to see enlarged before the debate in regard to machinery is concluded. Honorable members have said that in the past the demand for traction engines has been so small that it did not pay engineering firms to attempt to manufacture them. An engineering establishment cannot be started except with a larger expenditure on plant. The man who thinks that he can start with a file, and 2s. 6d. in his pocket, will soon file his schedule. We have heard a good deal about the great amount of plant lying idle in the nail-making industry, which employs twenty men; but I ask those who voted for a duty of 40 per cent. to protect that industry, why they should be frightened to give 30 per cent. to protect the immensely larger engineering industry? One engineering firm alone in my electorate pays from £150,000 to £170,000 a year in wages. If a man is going to make a splash at all, he should do it for the engineering and iron-working trades, which are national in their character. Engineering establishments are not confined to Victoria and New South Wales. If the Tariff encourages manufacturing, there will be engineering establishments, not only all along the eastern sea-board, but also in Western Australia as well. The trouble of the Western Australian people to-day is that, if they import from the eastern States, they have heavy freights to pay; but with engineering establishments of their own they will be able to get what

they want locally. Although the new grouping of items which the Treasurer has brought forward is an improvement, it still leaves things in an unsatisfactory position. Why should steam turbines be placed on the free list, and a duty of 25 per cent. be imposed on high-speed engines—both of which are used for practically the same purposes? Great Britain leads the world in the manufacture of this kind of machinery, and it will be some time before we can make equally good machinery of the kind here. But the differentiation to which I refer is an anomaly. Both turbines and high-speed engines should be on the free list, or both should be dutiable at 25 per cent. Coming to the question of preference, I have throughout showed the hollowness of the preferential trade proposals. They have been used to secure a lower Tariff, and I have been glad to avail myself of them to bring about the reduction of duties on articles of ordinary consumption. But I am not willing to pretend to do something for the engineering industry, and then take away any advantage by imposing a low duty upon British importations. I ask the Government to go for rates of 30 and 25 per cent., if they can get them, or, if not, for an all round rate of 25 per cent.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—Twenty and 15 per cent.

Mr. WILKS.—I would sooner have this machinery placed on the free list than impose merely revenue duties on it.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—If our manufacturers cannot make it under a protective duty of 20 per cent., they should not try to do so.

Mr. WILKS.—Why did the honorable member vote for the imposition of such heavy duties upon woollens and hats?

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—I have not voted for the imposition of heavy duties.

Mr. WILKS.—The honorable member gave many votes for much higher rates than 20 per cent.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—No.

Mr. WILKS.—If he did not, he is the *rara avis* of the Victorian protectionists, and the honorable member for Grey is a bird of like character in the labour flock. Honorable members know the great dimensions of the engineering trade, in which the wages paid to artisans are from 80 to 50 per cent. higher than are paid in other trades. If any criticism is to be offered on the subject of change of attitude, I shall be very pleased to do my own attacking,

instead of allowing others to attack me. I have stated my position here, and I stated it when before the electors. Those connected with the engineering industry have not appealed to me personally, but, as high duties have been voted for the protection of mere mushroom industries, I shall be very glad to support duties for the protection of a substantial industry. But there must be reason in roasting eggs, and I do not wish to go to extremes.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—A duty of 30 per cent. is very moderate.

Mr. WILKS.—It is moderate compared with duties of 75 and 50 per cent., which have been imposed upon other items. A duty of 30 per cent. should be the high water mark so far as the engineering industry is concerned, and it is a very reasonable rate to ask for. I hope that the Treasurer will not allow the protection given to the engineering industry to be cut down by preferential trade proposals.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—We must have preferential trade.

Mr. WILKS.—No preference was given last night.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—That was because we could not get what we wanted.

Mr. WILKS.—I hope that it will not be given in this case. It is only a device to reduce rates. It is absurd to say that we cannot make steam rollers here. They are the simplest machines to make, and I was glad to know of the manufacture of the machine on which the Treasurer performed baptismal rites at Collingwood.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—That is a traction engine, too.

Mr. WILKS.—Yes. Not many have been made here, because there is not a large demand for them; but that does not prove that they cannot be made. I shall be satisfied with reasonable duties for the protection of engineering; but, seeing that my constituents have to pay heavy duties on clothing, food supplies, and other requisites, I should be worse than a fool if I did not try to get something for them.

Mr. CHANTER (Riverina) [5.17].—I should not take part in this debate had it not been for the strange speech of the honorable member for Grey. I take this opportunity to point out, I hope once and for all, that others as well as he represent farming constituencies, and have the interests of the farmers at heart. It will not help his cause to put the farmers in a false position by making them appear antagonistic to an Australian policy. The bulk of

them are in favour of an Australian policy, because they know that they owe their existence as farmers to it. Does the honorable member think that the Committee will accept such an exaggerated statement as he made?

Mr. HEDGES.—It was quite true.

Mr. CHANTER.—The honorable member for Grey said that in a part of South Australia the farmers for ten consecutive years existed on boiled wheat, that that was their staple food. I have eaten boiled wheat, and know that it makes a good article of diet; in fact, I use it in preference to some of the oaten and maize meals.

Mr. MAHON.—But the honorable member would not like to live on it.

Mr. CHANTER.—No one would like to be confined to one diet. I have been a farmer, and have undergone as many hardships and troubles as any farmer in the country; but I do not believe it possible that for ten consecutive years farmers in any district have had to live on boiled wheat, with a yield of half a bushel to the acre, which they sold at 1s. 4d. per bushel. The farmers in my electorate have suffered as much as those in the northern parts of South Australia. They are called upon to suffer greatly at times, by reason of droughts.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—How does the honorable member propose to connect these remarks with the subject of portable engines? He is making a second-reading speech.

Mr. CHANTER.—I am dealing with the contention of the honorable member for Grey, that traction engines should not be made dutiable, because farmers who have been in the terrible position which he mentioned are forced to buy them for use instead of horses. I challenge the honorable member for Grey to find in any State 500 *bona fide* farmers—I am not alluding to large pastoralists—5 per cent. of whom are employing traction engines and other powerful engines. The 5 per cent. might use them for threshing purposes, travelling round with them from farm to farm, making a levy upon the farmers who use them. A farmer who understands his business knows full well the advantage of breeding a high class of stock. There will always be a demand, both in Australia and outside, for ten times the number of horses we can breed in this country. The arguments used to induce the Committee not to agree to a substantial duty, in this instance, are

the most extraordinary I ever heard coming from a so-called farmers' representative.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—The honorable member's argument seems to be that we should increase the duty on powerful engines to induce farmers to breed more horses.

Mr. CHANTER.—I say nothing of the kind. Some honorable members who represent mining or farming constituencies look at a matter of this kind simply from the point of view of their own electorates, and appear to be incapable of regarding it from any other aspect. Consider it from the miner's point of view. Will it be denied that the miner has been benefited by industrial legislation, by means of which importers' monopolies have been compelled to bring down their prices? The reduction in the cost of machinery has enabled the employers to pay better wages than they could otherwise have done. In years gone by, before Victoria and other States entered into the manufacture of machinery from a serious point of view, prices were 100 per cent. higher than they are to-day.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—That is the old argument—high prices for flour make bread cheaper!

Mr. CHANTER.—What I say as to machinery cannot be contradicted; statistics prove it. I know of no farmers who use steam rollers, traction engines, and powerful engines of other classes. I know of very large capitalists who may sometimes want them for extensive irrigation works; but when I speak of a farmer, I mean a working man who drives his own plough and tills with his own implements.

Mr. MAHON.—The honorable member ought to have a much larger class of that kind around Deniliquin.

Mr. CHANTER.—I quite agree with the honorable member. Will he deny that the farmer is benefited by a Tariff such as this?

Mr. MAHON.—I thought the honorable member was going to show how the miner is benefited.

Mr. CHANTER.—I have done so. I have shown that a Tariff such as this tends to give the miner constant employment, and that he benefits from the competition caused by the internal manufacture of mining machinery.

The CHAIRMAN.—I must ask the honorable member not to enter into a

general discussion of free-trade and protection.

Mr. CHANTER.—We have had such arguments from the honorable member for Grey without any check.

The CHAIRMAN.—I was not in the chair when the honorable member for Grey was speaking; but if I allowed the honorable member to enter into a general discussion, it would open up the whole Tariff from beginning to end.

Mr. CHANTER.—I sat patiently listening to other honorable members who entered into general considerations. The honorable member for Grey made statements which I believe to be absolutely incorrect. I wish to prove that not only has the miner benefited from industrial legislation such as we are now engaged in dealing with, but that the farmer has also benefited.

The CHAIRMAN.—I do not wish to curtail the honorable member's remarks, but I cannot allow a general discussion to take place on this item.

Mr. CHANTER.—I was not opening up anything at all new, but was simply replying to statements made by the honorable member for Grey, which can, I think, be easily refuted. I ask honorable members whether the manufacture in Australia of such machinery as we are now considering has not had the effect of lowering prices? The farmer and the miner have also been benefited by opportunities being afforded for their sons to enter into other fields of employment. A miner does not want his sons to be always miners.

Mr. MAHON.—That is what Graham Berry told the Victorians thirty years ago.

Mr. CHANTER.—And he was perfectly right. It has been demonstrated that thousands and thousands of miners' sons, and of miners themselves, have drifted from the mining fields into our manufacturing industries. The same is the case with farmers' sons.

Mr. FOWLER.—And many of the men in the industries of Melbourne had to drift over to Western Australia to get work in the mines there.

Mr. CHANTER.—The greed for gold has induced men to go, sometimes to the Arctic Regions, and at other times to the hottest of countries. The point is, however, that our farmers and miners have not been driven out of Australia, and we want them to remain here. The miner is as much interested in our manufacturing industries as are other classes, not only

from the point of view of his own benefit, but for the sake of the community of which he is part. I know hundreds of cases, especially on the Bendigo field, with which I am well acquainted, of miners who have left the mines and entered into industrial occupations. How would a farmer be benefited by the policy of those honorable members who, by placing such machines as we are considering upon the free list, would drive our manufacturing industries out of the Commonwealth? Will not the farmer be benefited by such an increase of industries as will increase the population of Australia? If the factories are emptied, whom are we going to depend upon to fight for Australia if a time of stress should come? We cannot depend upon those who want to keep our chimneys from smoking and our wheels from revolving. The farmer knows that he is benefited from the prosperity of our manufacturing industries. They create for him a large home market. He has two markets to depend upon, one of which he can to a certain extent control, whilst the other is beyond his control. His home market is increased by affording profitable employment to thousands of workmen. I challenge another statement made by the honorable member for Grev. He said that the effect of every Tariff that has been passed had been to increase the price of every article upon which a duty was imposed, and that the farmer had to pay more for everything he ate and everything he used. Well, a good farmer does not usually require to buy much to eat. He produces that for himself. As for prices, will any one deny that until the policy of protection was applied in Australia, every machine and every article was dearer by 100 per cent. than is the case to-day? That is a statement that cannot be contradicted.

Mr. FOWLER.—Because all over the world processes have been cheapened to a large extent in the meantime.

Mr. CHANTER.—I can give the honorable member instances where prices have been at a certain figure in one State, and considerably higher or lower in other States, as the case may be, according to whether the price of imported articles was affected by local manufactures. Competition has brought the price down.

Mr. PAGE.—What about co-operation?

Mr. CHANTER.—That is quite another matter. I sincerely hope the Committee will pass this item with the duty proposed. I ask honorable members to break down

once for all the feeling that we cannot make these goods to advantage. Australia has determined upon a protective policy. The details of the Tariff may require rearranging from time to time, but duties should be so fixed that every one may know that for all time capital may safely be invested in Australian industries. We should let it go forth to the world that capital may be invested in our industries with some hope of return. We can make in Australia all that we require, and if the majority of honorable members are true to their election pledges, they will vote for a truly protectionist policy, such as is embodied in this Tariff.

Question—That the words “traction and portable engines,” proposed to be left out, stand part of the amendment (Mr. FULLER’S amendment of Sir WILLIAM LYNE’S amendment)—put. The Committee divided.

Ayes	43
Noes	17
Majority				26

AYES

Bamford, F. W.	Mahon, H.
Batchelor, E. L.	Maloney, W. R. N.
Brown, Tilley	Mathews, J.
Carr, E. S.	Mauger, S.
Catts, J. H.	McDougall, J. K.
Chanter, J. M.	O’Malley, King
Chapman, Austin	Page, J.
Coon, J.	Quick, Sir John
Deakin, A.	Salmon, C. C.
Ewing, T. T.	Sampson, S.
Fairbairn, G.	Spence, W. G.
Fisher, A.	Storror, D.
Forrest, Sir John	Thomson, John
Fraser, C. E.	Tudor, F. G.
Groom, L. E.	Watkins, D.
Harper, R.	Watson, J. C.
Hedges, W. N.	Wilks, W. H.
Hutchison, J.	Wise, G. H.
Irvine, Hans	Wynne, A.
Irvine, W. H.	<i>Tellers:</i>
Knox, W.	Cook, Hume
Lyne, Sir William	Foster, F. J.

NOES.

Archer, E. W.	McWilliams, W. J.
Atkinson, L.	Poynton, A.
Brown, Thomas	Sinclair, H.
Cook, Joseph	Thomson, Dugald
Fowler, J. M.	Willis, Henry
Fuller, G. W.	Wilson, J. G.
Fysh, Sir Philip	<i>Tellers:</i>
Glynn, P. McM.	Johnson, W. E.
Livingston, J.	Liddell, F.

PAIRS.

Crouch, R. A.	Reid, G. H.
Kingston, C. C.	Kelly, W. H.
Webster, W.	Smith, Bruce

Question so resolved in the affirmative

Amendment of the amendment negatived.

Amendment (by Mr. FULLER) put—

That the amendment be amended by leaving out the figures "30," with a view to insert in lieu thereof the figures "20."

The Committee divided.

Ayes	27
Noes	30
			--
Majority	3

AYES.

Archer, E. W.	Livingston, J.
Atkinson, L.	Mabon, H.
Brown, Tilley	McWilliams, W. J.
Brown, Thomas	Poynton, A.
Cook, Joseph	Sampson, S.
Forrest, Sir John	Sinclair, H.
Fowler, J. M.	Stence, W. G.
Frazer, C. E.	Thomson, Dugald
Fysh, Sir Phillip	Willis, Henry
Glynn, P. McM.	Wilson, J. G.
Hedges, W. N.	Wynne, A.
Irvine, W. H.	<i>Tellers:</i>
Knox, W.	Fuller, G. W.
Liddell, F.	Johnson, W. E.

NOES

Bamford, F. W.	Mauger, S.
Carr, E. S.	McDougall, J. K.
Catts, J. H.	O'Malley, King
Chanter, J. M.	Page, J.
Chapman, Austin	Quick, Sir John
Coon, J.	Storror, D.
Deakin, A.	Thomson, John
Ewing, T. T.	Tudor, F. G.
Fisher, A.	Watkins, D.
Foster, F. J.	Watson, J. C.
Groom, L. E.	Wilks, W. H.
Harper, R.	Wise, G. H.
Hutchison, J.	<i>Tellers:</i>
Lyne, Sir William	Batchelor, E. I.
Maloney, W. R. N.	Cook, Hume
Mathews, J.	

PAIRS.

Kelly, W. H.	Kingston, C. C.
Reid, G. H.	Crouch, R. A.
Smith, Bruce	Webster, W.
Fairbairn, G.	Hughes, W. M.
Irvine, Hans	Hall, D. R.
Thomas, J.	Salmon, C. C.

Question so resolved in the negative.

Amendment of the amendment negatived.

Amendment (by Sir JOHN QUICK) proposed—

That the amendment be amended by leaving out the figures "30" with a view to insert in lieu thereof the figures "25."

Mr. FOWLER (Perth) [5.51].—I wish to supply a little information for the benefit of our protectionist friends. The Tariff Commission were told repeatedly by those interested in this industry as workers, that a duty of 25 per cent. on machinery of this kind was of no use whatever to them. If

honorable members desire that protection should be afforded to this industry, they must, therefore, vote for much higher duties than 25 per cent.

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—What do honorable members in the corner say to this?

Mr. FOWLER.—The effect of a duty of 25 per cent. would simply be to add to the cost of all the machinery included in this item. It would not lead to any appreciable development of the industry in Australia. That is the opinion of those who asked the Tariff Commission for higher duties. Those who wish to be considered consistent protectionists should, in this case, vote for higher duties than are now proposed, or leave this machinery dutiable at the rates levied under the old Tariff.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [5.53].—I wish just to say that I should like very much to have been able to secure a duty of 30 per cent., but, as I find that I cannot do that, I am prepared to accept the amendment of the honorable member for Bendigo.

Mr. HUTCHISON (Hindmarsh) [5.54].—I am very sorry to hear the Treasurer make that admission. We have heard from the honorable member for Perth that if we intend to protect this industry, we should not impose lower duties than those proposed by the Government. I have been very much surprised by the action of the honorable member for Bendigo in moving his amendment. It must not be forgotten that if the duty imposed under the general Tariff were fixed at 25 per cent. instead of 30 per cent. as proposed by the Government, it would mean a duty of 20 per cent. on imports from the United Kingdom, because the majority of honorable members are pledged to preference. The Treasurer should have stood by his Tariff, and I say that the honorable member for Bendigo was bound to support him, if only for the reasons stated by the honorable member for Perth.

Mr. KING O'MALLEY (Darwin) [5.55].—I ask the Treasurer whether he proposes that the duty all round shall be 25 per cent.?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—That depends upon the Committee.

Mr. KING O'MALLEY.—If not, the Treasurer, in accepting the amendment, is sacrificing the people's interests.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [5.56].—I cannot allow such remarks to be made. I challenge honorable

members, and especially protectionists, to say that I am sacrificing protection in any way. If they are not prepared, to a very large extent, to leave it to me to decide what I can get, some one else had better be given charge of the business. I know what I can get, and what I cannot get, and what I can best do in the interests of those who desire the highest protection we can secure for them.

Mr. STORRER (Bass) [5.57].—In reply to the honorable member for Perth, let me say that I am a protectionist, and can exercise my right to vote as such without any dictation from free-traders. I made up my mind, when the Tariff was introduced, that I would vote for duties of 25 per cent. and 20 per cent. on this item, and that is how I intend to vote, whether the Government accept the amendment or not.

Mr. HUTCHISON (Hindmarsh) [5.58].—I wish the honorable member for Bendigo to explain whether, in moving his amendment, he is prepared to accept a duty of 20 per cent. in the second column, or whether he does not think that 25 per cent. is the minimum of effective protection for this industry. I can understand the honorable member being against preference, but surely he must be aware that if 25 per cent. is considered a fair duty under the general Tariff, honorable members will look for a duty of 20 per cent. on imports from the United Kingdom.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—Certainly; I said so.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—Then the honorable member does not believe that 20 per cent. is a fair duty. He is going against his own recommendation, although he said that he was prepared to stand by the recommendation of the protectionist section of the Tariff Commission. I say that if we are not to have effective protection for this industry, it is better that this machinery should be admitted free. I have no wish to penalize the users of these machines, unless we can benefit the manufacturers and workers of Australia. I have been prepared to agree with some of the recommendations of the protectionist section of the Tariff Commission, but I have never been prepared to vote for duties below those they recommended. It would now appear to be a fact that the Chairman of the Tariff Commission is prepared to accept a lower duty than that which he believes will give effective protection.

Mr. HEDGES (Fremantle) [6.1].—A duty of 25 per cent. on this item is recog-

nised as a fair duty by Silverthorne and Adair, who have the largest foundry in Kalgoorlie.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—The honorable member proposes that they should be given a duty of only 20 per cent.

Mr. HEDGES.—Wages in this industry are 50 per cent. higher in Kalgoorlie than in Melbourne or Sydney, and if a duty of 25 per cent. is sufficient for Kalgoorlie, manufacturers in Melbourne and Sydney should be ashamed to ask for a higher rate of duty. In view of the increased cost of labour, a duty of 25 per cent., as applied to the industry in Kalgoorlie, would be worth 50 per cent. to the industry in Melbourne. At page 2022 of the Tariff Commission's report it will be found that Mr. Silverthorne asked for a duty of 25 per cent.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—Why did not the honorable member vote for that duty?

Mr. HEDGES.—Because I thought they were asking for too much. If the Western Australian manufacturers secured that rate of protection, the bigger factories with better facilities in Melbourne and Sydney would secure the same rate. If manufacturers at Kalgoorlie can hold their own with a duty of 25 per cent., those engaged in the industry in Melbourne and Sydney should be able to carry on with the duty imposed under the old Tariff.

Mr. HUTCHISON (Hindmarsh) [6.4].—We heard yesterday that the honorable member for Fremantle did not care whether they could manufacture these machines in Western Australia or not.

Mr. HEDGES.—Who said that?

Mr. HUTCHISON.—To-day the honorable member states that if manufacturers in that State are given a protection of 25 per cent. they can carry on. I wish to show that he is prepared to destroy the Western Australian industries. He says that they can carry on with a 20 per cent. duty.

Mr. HEDGES.—I did not say so; they have said so themselves.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—The honorable member must be aware that they cannot carry on with a lower duty. By voting for the amendment, he would decide in favour of a duty of only 20 per cent. on imports from the United Kingdom. That is the position. The honorable member has led the Committee to believe that he thinks a duty of 25 per cent. a fair duty.

Mr. HEDGES.—I did not say it was fair; I said that they asked too much.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—We have to consider not merely the manufacturers of Victoria and New South Wales. I have more consideration for the smaller States, where manufactures cannot be carried on on the same scale as in the larger States. I do not wish to see any industry in Western Australia or in South Australia destroyed in the way the honorable member for Fremantle proposes they should be. If the Committee does not carry a duty of 30 per cent. in the General Tariff, I shall claim the vote of the honorable member for Fremantle in favour of a duty of 25 per cent. on imports from the United Kingdom.

Question—That the figures "30," proposed to be left out, stand part of the proposed amendment (Sir JOHN QUICK's amendment of Sir WILLIAM LYNE's amendment)—put. The Committee divided.

Ayes	12
Noes	50

Majority	38
----------	-----	-----	----

AYES.

Bamford, F. W.	McDougall, J. K.
Batchelor, E. L.	Tudor, F. G.
Carr, E. S.	Watson, J. C.
Chanter, J. M.	
Coon, J.	<i>Tellers:</i>
Maloney, W. R. N.	Hutchison, J.
Mathews, J.	O'Malley, King

NOES.

Archer, E. W.	Livingston, J.
Atkinson, L.	Lyne, Sir William
Brown, Tilley	Mahon, H.
Brown, Thomas	Mauger, S.
Catts, J. H.	McWilliams, W. J.
Chapman, Austin	Page, J.
Cook, Joseph	Palmer, A. C.
Deakin, A.	Poynton, A.
Edwards, R.	Quick, Sir John
Ewing, T. T.	Salmon, C. C.
Fairbairn, G.	Sampson, S.
Fisher, A.	Sinclair, H.
Forrest, Sir John	Spence, W. G.
Fowler, J. M.	Storrer, D.
Frazer, C. E.	Thomson, Dugald
Fuller, G. W.	Thomson, John
Fysh, Sir Philip	Watkins, David
Glynn, P. McM.	Wilks, W. H.
Groom, L. E.	Willis, Henry
Harper, R.	Wilson, J. G.
Hedges, W. N.	Wise, G. H.
Irvine, Hans	Wynne, A.
Irvine, W. H.	
Johnson, W. E.	<i>Tellers:</i>
Knox, W.	Cook, Hume
Liddell, F.	Foster, F. J.

PAIRS.

Kingston, C. C.	Kelly, W. H.
Crouch, R. A.	Reid, G. H.
Webster, W.	Smith, Bruce
Hughes, W. M.	Foxton, Colonel
Bowden, E. K.	Hall, D. R.

Question so resolved in the negative.

Amendment of the amendment agreed to.
Amendment inserting the figures "25" agreed to.

Mr. FULLER (Illawarra) [6.10].—I desire to move in regard to the United Kingdom column that "traction and portable engines be free."

The CHAIRMAN.—We have already decided that traction and portable engines shall remain part of the item.

Amendment (by Mr. HEDGES) proposed—

That the amendment be amended by leaving out the figures "25," with a view to insert in lieu thereof the figures "15."

Question—That the figures "25," proposed to be left out, stand part of the proposed amendment—put. The Committee divided.

Ayes	15
Noes	46

Majority	31
----------	-----	-----	----

AYES.

Bamford, F. W.	McDougall, J. K.
Batchelor, E. L.	O'Malley, King
Carr, E. S.	Tudor, F. G.
Coon, J.	Watkins, David
Fisher, A.	Watson, J. C.
Hutchison, J.	<i>Tellers:</i>
Maloney, W. R. N.	Chanter, J. M.
Mathews, J.	Wise, G. H.

NOES.

Archer, E. W.	Liddell, F.
Atkinson, L.	Livingston, J.
Brown, Tilley	Lyne, Sir William
Brown, Thomas	Mahon, H.
Catts, J. H.	Mauger, S.
Chapman, Austin	McWilliams, W. J.
Cook, Joseph	Page, J.
Deakin, A.	Palmer, A. C.
Edwards, R.	Poynton, A.
Ewing, T. T.	Quick, Sir John
Forrest, Sir John	Salmon, C. C.
Foster, F. J.	Sampson, S.
Fowler, J. M.	Sinclair, H.
Frazer, C. E.	Spence, W. G.
Fuller, G. W.	Storrer, D.
Fysh, Sir Philip	Thomson, Dugald
Glynn, P. McM.	Thomson, John
Groom, L. E.	Willis, Henry
Harper, R.	Wilson, J. G.
Hedges, W. N.	Wynne, A.
Irvine, Hans	
Irvine, W. H.	<i>Tellers:</i>
Johnson, W. E.	Cook, Hume
Knox, W.	Wilks, W. H.

PAIRS.

Kingston, C. C.	Kelly, W. H.
Crouch, R. A.	Reid, G. H.
Hughes, W. M.	Fairbairn, G.
Webster, W.	Smith, Bruce
Hall, D. R.	Foxton, Colonel

Question so resolved in the negative.

Question—That the figures “15,” proposed to be inserted, be so inserted—put. The Committee divided.

Ayes	27
Noes	34
Majority	7

AYES.

Archer, E. W.
Atkinson, L.
Brown, Tilley
Brown, Thomas
Cook, Joseph
Edwards, R.
Forrest, Sir John
Fowler, J. M.
Fraser, C. E.
Fysh, Sir Philip
Glynn, P. McM.
Hedges, W. N.
Irvine, Hans
Irvine, W. H.

Liddell, F.
Livingston, J.
McWilliams, W. J.
Palmer, A. C.
Poynton, A.
Sinclair, H.
Spence, W. G.
Thomson, Dugald
Willis, Henry
Wilson, J. G.
Wynne, A.

Tellers:
Fuller, G. W.
Johnson, W. E.

NOES.

Bamford, F. W.
Batchelor, E. L.
Carr, E. S.
Catts, J. H.
Chanter, J. M.
Chapman, A.
Coon, J.
Deakin, A.
Ewing, T. T.
Fisher, A.
Foster, F. J.
Groom, L. E.
Hall, D. R.
Harper, R.
Hutchison, J.
Knox, W.
Lyne, Sir William
Mahon, H.

Maloney, W. R. N.
Mathews, J.
Mauger, S.
McDougall, J. K.
O'Malley, King
Page, J.
Quick, Sir John
Sampson, S.
Storrer, D.
Thomson, John
Tudor, F. G.
Watkins, D.
Watson, J. C.
Wise, G. H.

Tellers:
Cook, Hume
Wilks, W. H.

PAMS.

Kelly, W. H.
Reid, G. H.
Fairbairn, G.
Smith, Bruce
Thomas, J.

Kingston, C. C.
Crouch, R. A.
Hughes, W. M.
Webster, W.
Salmon, C. C.

Question so resolved in the negative.
Amendment (by Sir JOHN QUICK) proposed—

That the figures “20” be inserted in the blank created by leaving out of the proposed amendment the figures “25.”

Mr. HUTCHISON (Hindmarsh) [6.25].—Now we see the ridiculous position in which we are placed. The honorable member for Bendigo, as Chairman of the Tariff Commission, recommended a duty of 25 per cent. as that which ought to be imposed; and we have agreed on that duty in the general Tariff. I must say that the Treasurer has not shown his usual astuteness; because, although he might

not have the support necessary to carry a duty of 30 per cent., there were still sufficient to enable him to obtain a duty of 25 per cent. all round. Having agreed to allow 25 per cent. to be fixed for the general Tariff, the Government are now practically forced to accept a duty of 20 per cent. as against Great Britain; and that is certainly not sufficient protection. In the case of the previous item there was no preferential duty; but now it is proposed to give a preference which will be injurious to the industry. I invite the honorable member for Bendigo to withdraw the amendment, because, in my opinion, the preferential duties are destroying the Tariff. For my part, I shall vote against the amendment. I am sorry to think that honorable members, who went before the country as protectionists, should be found supporting the amendment of the honorable member for Bendigo. We find honorable members like the honorable member for Echuca voting for a duty of 15 per cent.; and yet, before his constituents, he called himself a protectionist. How can honorable members justify such votes? Why do such honorable members not come out in their true colours and call themselves free-traders? I like honorable members to act consistently with the opinions they expressed when before the electors.

Mr. PALMER.—I rise to a point of order. The honorable member for Hindmarsh has referred pointedly to me, and said that I expressed certain opinions to my constituents, and that I have voted in another direction in this House. Is the honorable member in order in so referring to me?

Mr. HUTCHISON.—I heard the honorable member stand up in his place and say that he was pledged to the recommendations of the Tariff Commission.

Sitting suspended from 6.30 to 7.45 p.m.

Amendment of the amendment agreed to.
Amendment (Sir WILLIAM LYNE'S), as amended, agreed to.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

*Postponed item 164. (A) Engines (including traction and portable), n.e.i.; turbines; winches, n.e.i.; boilers, n.e.i.; pumps; windmills. (B) Elevating and conveying machinery; pile-driving plant; economizers; cranes; beer engines; cloth-folding and measuring machines; wool and other presses; lifts; water and gas meters. (C) Machines and machinery, n.e.i., ad val. (General Tariff), 30 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 25 per cent.

*Subject to rebate under the conditions specified in the schedule hereto.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [7.46].—I move—

That the words "and on and after 28th November, 1907, Item 164 (A) Pulley blocks and travelling blocks; pneumatic elevators and conveyors; steam turbo-blowers; telphers; apparatus for the liquefaction of gases, ad val. (General Tariff), 5 per cent.; (United Kingdom), free. (B) Machines and machinery, n.e.i., ad val. (General Tariff), 30 per cent. (United Kingdom), 25 per cent.," be added.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Can the Treasurer give us any information regarding the addition which he proposes of apparatus for the liquefaction of gases?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I understand that this apparatus is not being made in the Commonwealth. Some honorable members may not be aware of the fact that pulley blocks and travelling blocks will include the tackle connected therewith. The point was raised by the honorable member for Indi as to whether the foot-note—

Subject to rebate under the conditions specified in the schedule hereto,

will be retained. I may inform him that it will have no application unless an asterisk is retained.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [7.47].—I should like the Treasurer to explain what this apparatus for the liquefaction of gases really is? It is of the utmost importance that we should know what we are voting for.

Mr. EDWARDS (Oxley) [7.48].—I desire to know under what item of the Tariff air compressors are included. Do they come under paragraph A of this item?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—No, under paragraph B.

Mr. ARCHER (Capricornia) [7.49].—I would point out that steam turbines are dutiable at 5 per cent. under the general Tariff, and are free under the Tariff for the United Kingdom. Now, the only engines which enter into competition with steam turbines, and which, in many instances, do the same work, are high-speed engines. At the present time these bear a duty of 20 per cent.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—High-speed engines are included in item 162, which has already been passed.

Mr. ARCHER.—I wish to make high-speed engines having a piston speed of 500 feet or more per minute, dutiable at 5 per cent. under the general Tariff, and to admit them free under the Tariff for the United Kingdom.

The CHAIRMAN.—I would point out the item which the honorable member

is desirous of amending has already been passed.

Mr. ARCHER.—Seeing that steam turbines are the motive power for the turbo-blowers, why cannot we include in this item high-speed engines which do the same work? I therefore move—

That the amendment be amended by inserting after the word "blowers," paragraph A, the words "and high-speed engines having a piston speed of 500 feet per minute or over."

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—That matter has already been dealt with in item 162.

Mr. ARCHER.—How about turbo-blowers? Unless my proposal is ruled out of order, I intend to persist in it. Steam turbines and high-speed engines practically do the same work in certain places. I understand that the Department urges some objection to the adoption of the course which I propose, because it alleges that it is difficult to differentiate between slow-speed and high-speed engines. But I would point out that in only a few instances would it be possible to introduce a slow-speed engine under the description of a high-speed engine. In other words, there would have to be a misdescription of the goods. The argument advanced by the Department is not a good one, inasmuch as it might be urged with equal force in regard to every item of the Tariff. Because, in a few instances, it may be possible, under a wrong description, to introduce slow-speed engines as high-speed engines, I do not see why the latter should be refused admittance at 5 per cent. under the general Tariff, or why they should not be included in the free list under the Tariff for the United Kingdom.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [8.0].—I wish to point out that high-speed engines are included in item 162, which has already been agreed to. A steam turbo-blower may be constructed on exactly the same principle as a steam power, but it is not considered a motive power at all. All these items, and the one to which the honorable member has referred, are included in item 162. The only way in which that can be altered is by recommitting the item, and taking out the article, because I do not intend to mix up motive power with secondary machinery. Item 162, I repeat, deals with motive power. I hope that the honorable member will not move the amendment. I do not know whether the Chairman thinks

it can be moved, but I think that we shall have to recommit item 162 before anything can be done in that regard.

The CHAIRMAN.—It is a most difficult thing for me to decide in this technical matter. But if I am assured by the Treasurer that high-speed engines are included in item 162, the honorable member for Capricornia will be out of order in moving the proposed amendment; otherwise, I would have accepted it.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—On a point of order, sir, I understand that we have passed motive-power machinery n.e.i. at 25 per cent., or whatever the duty is, but that we may elsewhere include any particular part of that machinery in any item. The Tariff has been dealt with throughout on the understanding that the term "n.e.i." means "not elsewhere in the Tariff included," and does not mean "not elsewhere in this item included." If you, sir, look through the other items in the same way, you have to look through a number of different divisions to see what the term "n.e.i." means. I wish to have a ruling, because it will govern, not merely the amendment which the honorable member for Capricornia wishes to move, but many others.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—Then we could include helmets in this item?

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—We might include any article in this item. I submit that we have to exhaust the Tariff in order to ascertain whether any article is not elsewhere included. If that be right, the honorable member, of course, will be in order in proposing the insertion of any relevant article.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—But this is not relevant.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—It is relevant, because it is machinery.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—That does not make it relevant.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—The honorable member will not suggest for a moment, I suppose, that a high-speed engine is not machinery?

Mr. BATCHELOR.—Certainly not.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—It is a motive power.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—I understand that, but it certainly would be included in the general term "machinery" if it did not happen to have been already dealt with as motive-power machinery. I contend that the proposed amendment is relevant to the item with which we are dealing. Suppose

that motive-power machinery had not been dealt with, then the proposed amendment of the honorable member ought to be quite in order, because he says, "We are dealing with machinery generally, and I want to include under the head of machinery admitted at 5 per cent., one kind, namely, a high-speed engine." As against that, it is said, "Oh, but that particular kind of machinery comes under motive-power machinery, with which we have already dealt." I submit that we have dealt with only motive-power machinery n.e.i., and in order to find out whether that fact prevents us from dealing with the insertion of high-speed engines here we have to ascertain what the term "n.e.i." means. I hold that it means motive-power machinery not elsewhere included in the Tariff. If that is the meaning of the term, it is left open to the honorable member to include the article anywhere else in the Tariff.

The CHAIRMAN.—I point out to the honorable member for Flinders that the phrase "n.e.i." as used in item 162 refers to that particular item, and to any similar article not specifically mentioned in the item. If it applied throughout the Tariff, then under groceries, textiles, or any other head, honorable members could drag in certain items already dealt with, and deal with them again, and there would be no finality to our dealing with the Tariff. As it stands now, item 162 refers to specific articles, and the term n.e.i. in the item includes similar articles not elsewhere included in the item.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—May I respectfully point out to you, sir, where a ruling like that will land you?

The CHAIRMAN.—Does the honorable member intend to dissent from my ruling?

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—No.

The CHAIRMAN.—Then I cannot allow any discussion on it.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I take it, sir, that there is no rule to prevent me from pointing out to you a resulting anomaly.

The CHAIRMAN.—Six or seven honorable members rose in their places when the honorable member did, and if I were to allow him to question my ruling, every other member of the Committee, if he so desired, must be allowed to do so. If the honorable member considers that my ruling is wrong, the better way will be for him to move that it be dissented from.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Are we to understand, sir, that in future you are going to classify these items?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—No.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—That is the effect of the ruling.

HONORABLE MEMBERS.—No.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Apparently, sir, you intend to take upon yourself the responsibility of saying under what classification a proposed item shall be put. I submit that it is not a matter of order, but a matter of Customs classification.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I have stated what item the article mentioned by the honorable member for Capricornia comes under.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The Committee. I submit, is the final arbiter of that. If it comes under motive power machinery, *n.e.i.*, then the question of where it is to be put arises. The classification of the Tariff must be left to the Committee entirely. You will take upon your shoulders a very complex burden, sir, if you undertake to classify the items.

The CHAIRMAN.—I am not desirous of taking upon my shoulders more than I have already done. I point out to the honorable member that if his contention is correct, then every item with which we have dealt in the way of machinery could be repeated so that there would be no finality in our dealing with the Tariff. I am not here to decide what a turbo blower or high-speed engine is. I can only be guided by the Minister and honorable members. The Treasurer has stated that a high-speed engine is a motive power. My interpretation is that it comes under paragraph B—*n.e.i.*—of item 162, and that its insertion in 164 cannot be moved.

Mr. GLYNN.—May I refer to the fact, sir, that a clearer definition of the term "*n.e.i.*" if wanted, ought to be put in the Customs Act? It defines the term as meaning "not elsewhere included." If there is only one "*n.e.i.*" item attached to machinery, it is clear that all machinery not specified falls under it. But if there is another "*n.e.i.*" item connected with steam machinery there may be some confusion.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—There is motive power *n.e.i.*

Mr. GLYNN.—Although there may be two "*n.e.i.*" items there may or may not be confusion. It will depend upon whether the two are exclusive of one another.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Then there is the question of whether a high-speed engine is motive power or not.

Mr. GLYNN.—The terminology cannot be altered now, but it may be cleared up afterwards in the Customs Act.

Mr. KNOX.—The honorable member for Capricornia may not be precisely in order in urging that high-speed engines should receive consideration—

The CHAIRMAN.—Order! I have already ruled that the amendment is out of order.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [8.13].—I have not risen, sir, to question your ruling, nor to deal with the matter with which the honorable member for Capricornia attempted to deal, though I agree with him that there is great inconsistency. The Treasurer has indicated his opinion that the term "*n.e.i.*" applies to items not elsewhere included in the item which we are considering.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—And motive power is not included anywhere else.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—If the Minister of Trade and Customs is of the same opinion he will have to alter the administration of his Department—

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not think so.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Because it has always recognised the term "*n.e.i.*" not as applying to only the item in which it appears, but as applying to the whole Tariff.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—No.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Machinery would come under the "*n.e.i.*" paragraph of item 164, although it did not consist of pulley blocks, pneumatic elevators and conveyors, steam turbo-blowers or telfers. Other machinery of any kind not elsewhere mentioned in any part of the Tariff would be dutiable at the rates set out in paragraph B. Any other interpretation would entirely change our Customs administration. The Treasurer, however, has given it as his opinion that only machinery not elsewhere included in this particular item will come under the rates fixed in paragraph B.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—That will change the whole administration of the Department.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The classification of this Tariff is quite different from that of the last Tariff.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—If the Tariff is to be interpreted differently, we should know it, because the change will seriously affect its incidence, and our votes.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—And will cause confusion.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—It will prevent confusion.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Does the Minister say that the letters "n.e.i." apply only to the enumeration in paragraph A of this item, and not to the whole Tariff?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [8.19].—This Tariff is arranged differently from the old Tariff. All motive power machinery is dutiable under item 162, and the letters "n.e.i." in paragraph B of that item refer only to motive power machinery not specified in paragraph A. Motive power machinery is not dealt with in any other item in the Tariff.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I was speaking about item 164.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Item 164 is in the same position. Machinery not enumerated in paragraph A will be charged the rates applying in paragraph B to "n.e.i." The Tariff has been re-arranged deliberately, so that the letters "n.e.i." shall apply only to machinery of the kinds grouped in each particular item. There was not the same grouping in the old Tariff, and unspecified goods had to be brought under whatever item the Department thought they properly belonged to.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—But there may be some mistakes in the grouping.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Machinery grouped in other items is not affected by the duties imposed by this item. The machines in regard to which the honorable member wishes to move an amendment come under item 162, and could not be brought under any other.

The CHAIRMAN.—I have decided that point.

Mr. HARPER (Mernda) [8.23].—The confusion which has arisen is due to imperfect classification. The Minister has told us that all motive power machinery is dealt with in item 162.

The CHAIRMAN.—I have already settled that point, and cannot allow it to be discussed.

Mr. HARPER.—I do not wish to discuss it. What I wish to know from the Minister is whether all the machinery dutiable as "n.e.i." under paragraph B of item 164 must be exclusive of but cognate to the machinery specified in paragraph A, namely pulley blocks and travelling blocks, pneumatic elevators and conveyors, steam turbo blowers and telfers.

I understand that a great deal of machinery will be dutiable as "n.e.i." under paragraph B of item 164, which cannot by any stretch of the imagination be regarded as relating to pulley blocks, or the other machinery which is specified in paragraph A.

Mr. WATKINS (Newcastle) [8.25].—Under paragraph A of item 164 certain specified machinery will be dutiable at 5 per cent., while under paragraph B machines and machinery "n.e.i." will be dutiable at 30 per cent. and 25 per cent. Does the item include all the electrical machinery which is not elsewhere included?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Electrical machinery is not dealt with here.

Mr. HUME COOK.—It is dealt with in item 178.

Mr. WATKINS.—Are water and gas-meters dutiable in this item as n.e.i. at 30 per cent. and 25 per cent.? If so, heavy duties are being imposed on machines which are largely used by the municipalities, and cannot be made in Australia.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Gas and water meters and similar machines are dutiable under item 171. Item 164 does not deal with electric machinery.

Mr. WILKS (Dalley) [8.28].—I regard the new grouping proposed by the Minister as admirable. The honorable member for Parramatta has asked why the engineering establishments of Victoria and New South Wales do not make the pulley-blocks and travelling blocks specified in paragraph A of item 164. As a matter of fact, these are wood-split pulleys, and are not made in engineering establishments. But as they are largely used in such establishments, they should be dutiable at as low a rate as possible.

Mr. TUDOR.—There are iron chain pulleys.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—This item deals only with metal pulleys.

Mr. WILKS.—The pulleys I speak of are not elsewhere provided for in the schedule, and therefore must come under this item. They are made chiefly in Canada and the United States of America.

Mr. HUGHES.—Wooden blocks could not come within this item, because we are dealing now with a division of the Tariff relating only to manufactures of metal.

Mr. WILKS.—I have already pointed out that, in my opinion, there should be no differentiation between steam turbines and high-speed engines. Both are made in

highly specialized British engineering establishments, Great Britain making better machines of this kind than are made elsewhere in the world. But both kinds of machine should be treated alike. If one is dutiable at 5 per cent., the other should be so too, while, if one is made dutiable at 20 per cent., the other should be dutiable at that rate. It seems a gross anomaly to put a steam turbine at 5 per cent., and a high-speed engine at 20 per cent. Both should pay either 20 per cent. or 5 per cent. The honorable member for Capricornia has referred to the turbo-blower. It seems an anomaly that the turbine which supplies the motive power should be separated in this Tariff from the turbo-blower, which is screwed on to the blower, and finishes the work. The honorable member was quite right in his desire to have high-speed engines placed on the same basis as turbo-blowers. Certainly it is anomalous that a turbine should pay 5 per cent., whilst in another part of the Tariff it is provided that an engine doing similar work should pay 20 per cent.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The reason is that the turbo-blower is not a motive power.

Mr. WILKS.—Exactly. The honorable member for Capricornia has lost his opportunity of moving an amendment. The matter should have been dealt with in connexion with item 162. But surely the Treasurer is not going to allow this Tariff to be passed with these anomalies upon its face. I ask him to put both on either the 20 per cent. list or the 5 per cent. list. Personally, I should prefer that both paid 20 per cent. I do not know whether the Treasurer has provided for every exemption that it is desirable to provide for. There are other industries affected by this Tariff whose tools of trade are not exempted at all. I resisted efforts to get the tools and machinery of the hat-making industry placed on the exempt list; and why should I vote for a high duty for the benefit of the engineering trade, and not for a duty for the benefit of the tool maker? The engineering people have no greater right to have their tools exempt than have those engaged in other industries. As to pulley blocks and travelling blocks, I was under the impression that those terms covered wood split pulleys. But is that so?

Mr. HUME COOK.—I am informed by departmental officers that they are included.

Mr. WILKS.—Under the old Tariff wood split pulleys paid 12½ per cent. It

can be reasonably urged that they cannot be produced here, because they are manufactured from a special kind of wood grown in Canada and the United States. There is no room for granting preference to Great Britain in this case, because they are not made in Great Britain. To make them free so far as the United Kingdom is concerned is a very empty concession indeed. I hope that the Treasurer will give no undue preference to the engineering trade. If those engaged in it receive Tariff assistance, they should be prepared to give proper Tariff assistance to those who make their tools. I should be the last to ask for a concession of the kind if I were connected with the industry. Personally, I think that iron pulley blocks and travelling blocks ought to be made in the country. Why should not the pulley maker have as much assistance as others?

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney [8.39]).—I am not quite sure as to what is to happen with regard to the application of the n.e.i. provision. I wish to know whether in the item 164—"Machines and machinery, n.e.i."—the n.e.i. means not elsewhere in the Tariff, or not elsewhere in the item?

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—That is the whole point.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—There will be a curious contradiction if it means not elsewhere included in the item.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—That is a catch question. It has not the slightest effect upon the item.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—It will affect our votes.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I did not think that anything would affect the honorable member's vote.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—At any rate, it affects the rate at which an article is to be dutiable. If it means not elsewhere included in item 164, it means that all machines, except those mentioned in paragraph A will pay 30 or 25 per cent. But there are other machines mentioned in other parts of the Tariff which are dutiable at different rates. For instance, in item 166, "machinery and machines and machine tools," there are a number of machines which are dutiable at 25 and 20 per cent. If "n.e.i." applies to the whole Tariff, it is all right, but if it applies only to item 164 its effect will be absolutely contradictory. I have no wish to confuse the Treasurer, but I should like to have an explanation.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The honorable member is not confusing me; but I do not seem to be able to make him understand when I explain.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—If the Minister says that "n.e.i." does not apply to the whole Tariff, a serious position arises. All I wish to know is whether it applies to the whole Tariff or simply to item 164.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [8.42].—The term "n.e.i." in item 164 applies to any machines that are of the same nature and character as those included in that item. It does not, so to speak, rove over the whole Tariff. There are machines of a different character which are dealt with in other items.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Suppose there are machines of the same nature included in other parts of the Tariff?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—If there are machines of the same nature not otherwise included in the machinery part of the Tariff, then the n.e.i. provision in this item would apply to them, unless by so doing it would clash with any other item. "Machines and machinery, n.e.i." in this item applies to machinery belonging to the same category as the other machines mentioned in item 164.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—What I want to know clearly is whether "n.e.i." applies to the whole Tariff?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—What I said before was that there is no other part of the Tariff where machinery of this kind is included. Therefore, "n.e.i." could not be interpreted as applying to any other item.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON. — There are other machines like those mentioned in item 164.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—"N.e.i." in this case only applies to a group of machines that can be classed under item 164.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—What the Minister says would be all right if the grouping were perfect and complete.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I think that the honorable member is satisfied that the item as a whole is all right. "N.e.i." applies to machinery which is not mentioned elsewhere, but which belongs to the group of machines mentioned in item 164.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS (Robertson) [8.45].—The n.e.i. paragraph, following, as it does, after paragraph A in this item, seems to me to be very necessary. The term

n.e.i. will apply to machines or machinery that are not motive power or electrical.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—And which belong to the same group.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—I fail to see how the Department could determine what rate of duty should be paid without this classification. The machines and machinery included in other groups are specified, but that is not the case so far as paragraph B of this item is concerned. As to paragraph A, I would remind the Committee that there are two kinds of pulley blocks, the one made of wood, and the other of metal, but the iron pulley is more generally used, and is found to be more serviceable than is the wooden article. I am pleased that pulley blocks are to be placed in the group dutiable at 5 per cent., because in all probability a larger revenue will be obtained in this way than would be secured if a higher duty were imposed upon them. The Government propose that machines and machinery n.e.i. coming under this item shall be dutiable at 30 per cent. I would point out, however, that at the most the duty should not be more than 20 per cent., since that is the duty imposed under item 162. As both items relate to the same class of machinery the duty in each case should be the same.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [8.48].—I should be glad if the Treasurer would explain why it is proposed to place pulley blocks and travelling blocks from Great Britain on the free list? Under the old Tariff metal pulley blocks with shafts were dutiable at 20 per cent., and subsequently, under Customs administration, at 12½ per cent., whilst pulley blocks of wood were also dutiable at the same rate. I never heard it suggested to the Tariff Commission that metal or wooden pulley blocks should be placed on the free list. Any ordinary blacksmith can make metal pulleys. Surely the advocates of the Western Australian mines are not reduced to the sorry plight of having to ask that pulley blocks shall be placed on the free list. I feel satisfied that the honorable member for Kalgoorlie does not wish them to be so treated.

Mr. FRAZER.—I think that the question of whether or not they shall be placed on the free list is of no consequence.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—I should like to know from whom this brilliant suggestion emanated?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [8.50].—A few weeks ago I informed honorable members that in consequence of various statements and requests that had been made, I intended to depute to two experts—one from the University and the other from the Patent Office—the task of sub-dividing the machinery items of the Tariff as first submitted. The proposed rearrangement was recommended by those gentlemen after consultation with the Department. I am informed that pulley blocks cannot be commercially made here. We have already placed chains on the free list, and I am sure that the honorable member for Bendigo would not expect me to inquire personally into all the details of every item, and to be able to say, as the result of personal investigation, whether pulley blocks can or cannot be made here. I give instructions to the officers in the Department to do certain things.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—We are not bound by their suggestions.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—No; but as a rule I accept the suggestions of my officers, and throw the responsibility upon them. If I can say of my own knowledge that a proposal is wrong, I alter it. I do not know of any establishment where pulley blocks are made. When last in Sydney I visited a ship chandler's store, with a view to making a purchase for my son, and was there informed that pulley blocks were not made in Australia. These are my reasons for including pulley blocks in this item.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN (Indi) [8.53].—There is a footnote to this division setting forth that items 164 and 166, amongst others, are "subject to rebate under the conditions specified in the schedule hereto," and on turning to the schedule, we find that in respect of certain imported machinery the full duty paid is to be refunded. It seems to me that there will be great confusion unless some further amendment be made. The term *n.e.i.* is always confusing to merchants, and is really a dragnet provision. In the schedule to the Tariff, we find that the full duty paid under items 164 and 166 on—

Machinery and parts thereof used in the manufacture of fibrous materials and felt, and felt hats, when installed for use in a woollen mill, or a hat factory, for the manufacture of such materials, felt, and hats—

proposals of the Government might also be extended to them. The same remark will apply to machines used in the preparation of leather. Confusion is sure to arise if the item be passed as proposed.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [8.55].—I have said on two occasions that the footnote to which the honorable member refers will apply to the machines that were included in item 164. There is no intention on our part to depart from that promise. Most of the machines referred to in item 164 are in the division with which we are dealing to-day; but there is no intention on our part to take away any right, whatever it may be, that would accrue to importers of machinery under the footnote to which the honorable member has mentioned.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN (Indi) [8.56].—I think that the proposal to grant a rebate in respect of the duty paid on certain machinery is most improper. The hat-making industry in some cases has been granted the protection of a duty amounting to 150 per cent., and yet it is proposed to allow rebate in respect of the machinery used in that industry, while, at the same time, the claims of the mining community are ignored. I am afraid to speak of the "primary producer," for I notice that whenever I do refer to it some of the newspapers, whether it be true or not, report that my statement is received with laughter. I believe that the granting of a rebate in respect of home consumption is a most improper concession to an industry already heavily protected. If the proposal is to be accepted, its scope should be extended.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [8.58].—I have had brought under my notice a machine known as "The Hollman Patent Hoist," for working underground. It is protected by patents, and I am informed that it is not made here.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Could it be made here?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not think so; although other hoists which might take its place might be made in Australia.

Mr. FISHER.—What is it for?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The photograph of the machine that I have before me simply bears upon it words to the effect that it is for hoisting.

Mr. FRAZER.—It is for pulling rockdrills and mullock out of winzes when the miners cannot get into them.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—There does not seem to be the slightest hope of its being

—It be refunded. Item 166 also includes ines used in the tanning of hides and and it seems to me that the rebate

made here for some years, and I therefore propose, by leave of the Committee, to insert in paragraph A of my amendment the words "Hollman Patent Hoist." The implement is known as the Hollman Patent Hoist, and is used for raising things from a great depth.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—There is no objection to include this class of machinery in paragraph A, but I do not think it is wise to specifically include a particular machine.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I am very loth to add anything to the free list, but I believe it is not possible for this appliance to be made here for many years to come, and I understand that it is considered of great service to miners.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—How is it worked?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—It is worked by compressed air. I move—

That the amendment be amended by inserting after the word "gases" the words "Hollman Patent Hoists."

Mr. PALMER (Echuca) [9.1].—I am by no means averse to the inclusion of this particular machine in paragraph A, but I point out that whilst this patent hoist has the advantage of an advocate in the Committee, there might be a number of other patent appliances of equal merit and importance to other industries which ought also to be on the free list. I do not think it is a proper course to adopt to specify a few particular appliances, and exclude all other machinery of a similar character. I suggest to the Minister, in the circumstances, the advisability of further amending the amendment by the addition of words which would provide for the inclusion of other patent machinery of a similar character.

Mr. HUME COOK.—There is power to provide for that under item 168.

Mr. SPENCE (Darling) [9.4].—The answer to the honorable member for Echuca, who does not know of any other machinery that could be included in paragraph A, is that the officers of the Customs Department, and experts engaged by the Minister, have been specially considering the machinery which cannot be made here, in order that it might be included in paragraph A. The Customs officers have information as to the whole of the machinery of this class that is imported.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—But we are not making a Tariff for to-day. There might be another hoist on the market tomorrow, which might be better than the one referred to.

Mr. SPENCE.—That is quite another question, and I admit that if we could discover some general term that would meet the case, it would be better than to specifically include, under a certain name, any particular article. There can be no doubt that in the interests of the mining industry, this class of hoist should be included in the free list. The most rabid protectionist cannot grumble at the inclusion of the few machines referred to in paragraph A, when they know that every other machine under this item must be admitted under the n.e.i. provision. One honorable member objected to the inclusion of pulley-blocks, but they must be regarded as the tools of trade of an immense number of persons engaged in many industries.

Mr. HARPER (Mernda) [9.6].—I ask the Minister whether he does not think it would be well for the Committee to be informed as to what really is to be included under paragraph B, "Machines and machinery n.e.i." I do not wish to embarrass the Minister in any way, but the Committee should know what it is doing. It seems to me that we are making the minor govern the major, since a small list of minor articles are put in the forefront, and everything else undefined is included in the n.e.i. paragraph. I am informed that there will be included in this item, under the provision n.e.i., air-compressing machinery for hoisting and lifting, hydraulic machinery, pumping machinery, and so on. If we are to be precluded from moving the transfer of any article from one paragraph of the item to the other, and are not informed as to what would be included in paragraph B, it seems to me that it would be well for the Minister to submit an extended list, setting out the machinery included in both these paragraphs. I have no objection to the inclusion of the Hollman Patent Hoist in paragraph A, but it is only typical of many appliances necessary in the mining industry which are not manufactured here. In my opinion, it is not fair to specifically include a particular appliance, and leave scores of others to come in under the n.e.i. provision. I suggest that the Committee cannot intelligently deal with paragraph A until we have some information as to the articles which are to be included in both the paragraphs of this item.

Mr. FISHER (Wide Bay) [9.11].—I trust that the Committee will agree to the amendment.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Why include a special article by name?

Mr. FISHER.—I believe there would be no objection to withdraw the name. I know something of mining, and I understand that the Hollman Patent Hoist is a particularly suitable hoist for winzes. It would afford security in bringing up tools for work, which, as honorable members know, is an important matter to those who have to work in a winze or shaft.

Mr. WILSON.—Would it not be better to omit the name, and include "Patent hoists"?

Mr. FISHER.—I shall have no objection to that. I think the limitation should be that the machinery included in paragraph A should be patent machinery used for mining. On the broader question, I am quite clear as to what the item means. There can be no doubt that what is included in paragraph A is excluded from paragraph B.

Mr. KNOX (Kooyong) [9.14].—Last night I ventured to protest against the drag-net effect of the n.e.i. provision. I am glad that the importance of the matter has forced itself upon the attention of the Committee. I hope the Minister will be successful in inducing the Committee to include the small hoist referred to. The honorable gentleman will see that the effort he has made to systematize this item of mining machinery is likely to lead to confusion, unless there is some definite understanding as to the machinery covered by the words "n.e.i." in paragraph B. I understand that I am entitled to speak with regard to paragraph B, as the whole proposed new item is before the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN.—Paragraph A is before the Committee at present.

Mr. KNOX.—I had intended to suggest the addition of some other articles, but I understand that I am not at liberty to do so at present, because I take it for granted that they come under paragraph B. I and others sitting near me are floundering through want of knowledge as to what is included in paragraph B. I have only risen to protest against the attempt to use that drag-net, instead of allowing the Committee to have specific knowledge of what they are voting upon.

Mr. STORRER (Bass) [9.17].—I wish to protest against this waste of time. We

have been discussing for an hour and a half the question of putting an article on the free list. There may be some difference of opinion regarding paragraph B, but I hope that we shall come to a decision on paragraph A as soon as possible.

Mr. HUTCHISON (Hindmarsh) [9.18].—There is no reason why this amendment should be limited to Hollman patent hoists. If the name "Hollman" is struck out the whole difficulty will be overcome. Instead of saying vaguely that other articles should be included in paragraph A, the honorable member for Kooyong should specify the articles which he desires to transfer to the paragraph. If he does not do that he is only wasting the time of the Committee. I will support any honorable member who shows that it is right to place any specified article on the free list.

Amendment (by Mr. JOSEPH COOK) agreed to—

That the amendment of the amendment be amended by leaving out the word "Hollman."

Amendment of the amendment (inserting "patent hoists") agreed to.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [9.19].—I do not like to do things in too great a hurry. I do not want the words "patent hoists" to have too wide a range. I therefore move—

That the amendment be amended by inserting after the word "hoists" the words "used for underground mining."

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [9.20].—I hope the Committee will not agree to the limitation proposed by the Treasurer. Other patent hoists should be considered as much as is a patent for "hauling mullock out of a hole." The proposed distinction is unnecessary and unfair. I do not know why the Minister persists in interpolating these irritating items. If he desired to "stone-wall" his own Tariff he could not do it more effectively than by making these interpolations. If some patent flour hoist comes out, is it to be penalized while a mining hoist comes in at a low rate?

Question—That the words "used for underground mining" be inserted in the amendment—put. The Committee divided.

Ayes	38
Noes	18

AYES.

Bamford, F. W.
 Batchelor, E. L.
 Brown, Tilley
 Carr, E. S.
 Catts, J. H.
 Chanter, J. M.
 Chapman, Austin
 Coon, J.
 Deakin, A.
 Ewing, T. T.
 Fisher, A.
 Foster, F. J.
 Frazier, C. E.
 Groom, L. E.
 Hall, D. R.
 Harper, R.
 Hedges, W. N.
 Hughes, W. M.
 Hutchison, J.
 Irvine, W. H.

Knox, W.
 Lyne, Sir William
 Mahon, H.
 Mathews, J.
 McDougall, J. K.
 Page, J.
 Quick, Sir John
 Salmon, C. C.
 Sampson, S.
 Spence, W. G.
 Storrer, D.
 Thomas, J.
 Tudor, F. G.
 Watkins, D.
 Watson, J. C.
 Wise, G. H.

Tellers:

Cook, Hume
 Thomson, John.

NOES.

Atkinson, L.
 Brown, Thomas
 Cook, Joseph.
 Forrest, Sir John
 Fuller, G. W.
 Fysh, Sir Philip
 Glynn, P. McM.
 Liddell, F.
 Livingston, J.
 McWilliams, W. J.

Palmer, A. C.
 Poynton, A.
 Sinclair, H.
 Thomson, Dugald
 Willis, Henry
 Wilson, J. G.

Tellers:

Archer, E. W.
 Johnson, W. E.

Question so resolved in the affirmative.
 Amendment of the amendment agreed to.
 Amendment (by Mr. JOSEPH COOK)
 proposed—

That the amendment be amended by leaving out the figures "30," paragraph B, with a view to insert in lieu thereof the figures "20."

Question—That the figures "30" stand part of the proposed amendment—resolved in the negative.

Mr. WATSON (South Sydney) [9.31].—I was one who voted for a General Tariff of 30 per cent., with 25 per cent. against Great Britain. There was a large majority against such duties on an item very similar; and I suggest that we might save time if we took a test vote as to whether on this item, the duties ought not to be 25 per cent. and 20 per cent.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—This is largely mining machinery.

Mr. WATSON.—In regard to mining machinery a duty of 20 per cent. all round was carried; and the only difference, if my suggestion be acted upon, is that foreign imports will have to pay a duty of 25 per cent. instead of 20 per cent.

Mr. THOMAS (Barrier) [9.35].—I think the fairest duty would be one of 20 per cent. all round, and if it be adopted we might pass all these items to-night. If

the Government will accept my suggestion, I am prepared to support them; but if they stand out for duties of 25 per cent. and 20 per cent., I shall vote for duties of 20 per cent. and 15 per cent. If a duty of 20 per cent. is sufficient to insure the manufacture of the articles here, I see no reason for adding 5 per cent. If 20 per cent. is not enough to insure the local manufacture, then the Government, if it be a Protectionist Government, ought to propose 25 per cent. or 30 per cent.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I should do so very quickly if I thought I could get the Committee to accept such a duty.

Mr. THOMAS.—It seems to me very peculiar that a Protectionist Government should propose a duty of only 20 per cent. against England, where goods are produced under free-trade conditions, and, at the same time, propose 25 per cent. as against Germany and the United States, where, I understand, because of protection, the conditions and wages are so much superior.

Mr. SINCLAIR.—This is sarcasm!

Mr. THOMAS.—I understand that, in the opinion of protectionists, industries are carried on under much better conditions in protectionist countries than they are in free-trade countries.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—Who said so?

Mr. THOMAS.—I ask the Treasurer or the Prime Minister whether the worker in protectionist Germany or the United States is not greatly better off than he is under the free-trade and sweated conditions of England. For my own part, I am of the opinion that the worker is as well off in free-trade England as he is in either of the other countries I have mentioned.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Do not get up a debate on that question now.

Mr. THOMAS.—I do not see why we should unnecessarily tax the consumer to the extent of 5 per cent. I ask whether it is not a fact that the workers in protectionist countries are paid better wages and enjoy better conditions, than they do in free-trade countries. Why not answer a simple question like that?

Mr. DEAKIN.—Because the honorable member is the friend of every country except his own.

Mr. THOMAS.—Does the Prime Minister suppose that that answers my question? I think that the Protectionist Government are afraid to answer the question.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—This question was debated to the fullest extent, and it was decided to approve of preferential trade.

Mr. THOMAS.—Was the question 1 have asked then answered?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Yes.

Mr. THOMAS.—In what way? Unless the Government are prepared to answer me, I shall vote against the extra 5 per cent.

Mr. HUTCHISON (Hindmarsh) [9.40].—The honorable member for Barrier wishes to know whether workers are better treated in protectionist America and Germany than they are in free-trade England. That is not the question before the Committee. The question is whether it would not be better to have this work done in Australia, where we can exercise some supervision over wages and conditions.

Mr. THOMAS.—Then why not have a duty of 25 per cent. all round?

Mr. HUTCHISON.—It is my desire that there should be a duty of 25 per cent. all round; and I was endeavouring to show why we could not have such a duty, when the House adjourned for dinner. The reason is that we have honorable members like the representative for Echuca—

The CHAIRMAN.—Order!

Mr. HUTCHISON.—I desire to show the reason why we cannot have a duty of 25 per cent. all round. We have honorable members like the representative for Echuca, who says he is a protectionist, but who votes for a duty of 15 per cent. We have honorable members like the representative of Flinders, who goes to the country and says that he is a protectionist—

The CHAIRMAN.—The honorable member must see that if I allow him to proceed on this personal line it may lead to a long and irrelevant discussion. I must ask the honorable member to discontinue that line of argument.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—Then I shall take another line of argument. I am in favour of a duty of 25 per cent. all round; but there are honorable members who went before the country as protectionists, but who, like the honorable member for Flinders, the honorable member for Kooyong, and—

The CHAIRMAN.—Order!

Mr. HUTCHISON.—I desire to show, as I think I am entitled to do, why we cannot have a duty of 25 per cent. all round. After the interjection of the honorable member for Barrier, I think that he will vote for the imposition of a 25 per

cent. duty all round. I should be very sorry to see the rate reduced to 20 per cent. This is one of the most important items in the Tariff, and 25 per cent. ought to be the minimum duty levied upon it.

Mr. THOMAS.—Will the honorable member answer my question in reference to Germany and England?

Mr. HUTCHISON.—I will, if the Chairman will permit me to do so. The honorable member would rather extend a preference to a foreign country than to his own country. I want to give my first preference to Australia, and my second to the Empire. If the Empire cannot produce what we want, then I am prepared to get it from that part of the world where it can be obtained at the lowest price.

Mr. PALMER (Echuca) [9.47].—Twice this evening the honorable member for Hindmarsh has attacked me. If the honorable member would limit his attention to his relations with his own constituency, and allow me to look after mine, he would have quite enough to do. He is accustomed to dub every man who will not vote for the precise duty which he desires a free-trader. Is that a logical position to take up? Why this hysterical demand for these excessive duties? It is high time that the country awoke to the fact that the demand is being made simply to enable the Government to pass on the benefit of these duties to the employés in the form of the new protection.

Mr. WISE.—The honorable member does not object to the workers getting a fair share of that benefit?

Mr. PALMER.—I do not. I wish now to read a short extract from the report of a deputation which waited upon the Minister of Trade and Customs yesterday in regard to the Excise duty upon agricultural implements.

The CHAIRMAN.—The honorable member will not be in order in referring to that matter.

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—The honorable member must not try to bully me.

Mr. PALMER.—The Minister and myself are the very best of friends. I would no more dream of attempting to bully him than he would of attempting to bully me or any one else. In replying to the deputation which waited upon him yesterday, the Minister of Trade and Customs said that it was necessary to exercise caution—

The CHAIRMAN.—The honorable member must not read the extract.

Mr. PALMER.—Then I will say that the members of a certain party in this House are being induced to support higher protective duties than they would otherwise support, because of the promise of the Government to introduce certain legislation, which legislation, I venture to say, will prove to be absolutely unconstitutional. That is the price which the country is paying to-day for the promise which has been made by the Government—a promise which is never likely to be carried into effect.

Question—That the figures "20" be inserted (Mr. JOSEPH COOK's amendment of Sir WILLIAM LYNE's amendment)—put. The Committee divided.

Ayes	27
Noes	29
Majority	2

AYES.

Atkinson, L.	Mabon, H.
Brown, Tilley	McWilliams, W. J.
Brown, Thomas	Page, J.
Cook, Joseph	Palmer, A. C.
Forrest, Sir John	Poynton, A.
Frazer, C. E.	Sinclair, H.
Fysh, Sir Philip	Spence, W. G.
Glynn, P. McM.	Thomas, J.
Hedges, W. N.	Thomson, Dugald
Irvine, W. H.	Willis, Henry
Johnson, W. E.	Wilson, J. G.
Knox, W.	<i>Tellers:</i>
Liddell, F.	Archer, E. W.
Livingston, J.	Fuller, G. W.

NOES.

Bamford, F. W.	Hutchison, J.
Batchelor, E. L.	Lyne, Sir W. J.
Carr, E. S.	Mathews, J.
Catts, J. H.	McDougall, J. K.
Chanter, J. M.	Quick, Sir John
Chapman, Austin	Salmon, C. C.
Coon, J.	Sampson, S.
Deakin, A.	Storrer, D.
Ewing, T. T.	Tudor, F. G.
Fisher, A.	Watkins, D.
Foster, F. J.	Watson, J. C.
Groom, L. E.	Wise, G. H.
Hall, D. R.	<i>Tellers:</i>
Harper, R.	Cook, Hume
Hughes, W. M.	Thomson, John.

PAIRS.

Kelly, W. H.	Kingston, C. C.
Reid, G. H.	Crouch, R. A.
Smith, Bruce	Webster, W.
Fowler, J. M.	Maloney, W. R. N.
Irvine, Hans	Wilks, W. H.
Edwards, R.	Mauger, S.
Fairbairn, G.	O'Malley, King
Bowden, E. K.	Wynne, A.

Question so resolved in the negative.

Amendment of the amendment negatived.

Amendment (by Sir JOHN QUICK) agreed to—

That the figures "25" be inserted in the blank in the proposed amendment caused by leaving out the figures "30."

Amendment (by Mr. JOHNSON) proposed—

That the amendment be amended by leaving out the figures "25," paragraph B, with a view to insert in lieu thereof the figures "20."

Mr. WATSON (South Sydney) [9.57].—I would suggest that the Government should accept this proposal in view of the rate which has already been fixed under the general Tariff, and thus shorten the debate as much as possible.

Mr. FRAZER (Kalgoorlie) [9.58].—I wish to know if the Government intend to agree to the amendment. If they do, I shall resume my seat, but if not, I think I shall have to present arguments in favour of the adoption of that course.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [9.59].—If I thought that there was the slightest chance of the Government carrying their proposal in favour of 25 per cent., I should persist in it, but I am not going to divide the Committee, merely for the sake of doing so, and knowing that we shall be defeated. The Government have no alternative but to accept the amendment.

Amendment of the amendment agreed to.

Mr. FRAZER (Kalgoorlie) [10.0].—In view of a certain standard having been adopted in regard to articles n.e.i., I desire to mention that there is a particular description of machinery which is used in the Commonwealth, but which, beyond a certain capacity, has not yet been satisfactorily manufactured here. I want honorable members to give consideration to those mining companies which are dealing with low-grade ores, in many cases in an extensive way. In order that they may be able to realize sufficient gold with which to carry on their works, I move—

That the following new paragraph be added to the amendment—

"(c) Air compressors beyond a capacity of 1,000 cubic feet of free air per minute, ad val. (General Tariff), 5 per cent.; (United Kingdom), free."

I have had personal experience in regard to air compressors and engines, and, therefore, I have a fair idea of what can be reasonably done by our manufacturers. The best advice I can get is that the manufacturing plants in Australia can produce satisfactory machinery up to a certain capacity, but that the limited quantity of machinery beyond that capacity which is required is not sufficient to justify the enormous expenditure which has often to be incurred in order to produce a single machine of such size. I am informed

that it may cost as much for patterns and designs to produce one machine as it would cost to produce six machines. According to the best information I can get, air compressors with a capacity of 1,000 cubic feet of free air per minute can drive ten or twelve drills, which, as honorable members know, is beyond the requirements of the majority of ordinary mines. We ought to make it possible for such machines to be obtained from the markets of the world.

Mr. WATSON.—I am informed that air compressors up to a large capacity can be made here.

Mr. FRAZER.—I am assured that, on a commercial basis, an air compressor with a capacity of 1,000 cubic feet of free air per minute is the extreme size which local manufacturers will undertake to make. The limited demand for air compressors beyond that capacity does not justify them incurring the expense of procuring patterns and designs.

Mr. COON (Batman) [10.7].—I may inform the honorable member for Kalgoorlie that air compressors with a capacity of not 1,000, but 4,000 cubic feet of free air per minute, have been made at Bendigo, Castlemaine, and Melbourne, in Victoria, and also in South Australia, and that such a machine may be seen working to-day at the Long Tunnel mine.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [10.8].—In South Australia, Mr. John Felix Martin, of the Gawler Foundry, was asked his opinion about the evidence given by a Kalgoorlie mining manager to the effect that the Ingersoll-Sargent air compressor was more efficient than an Australian-made one. According to the report of the A section of the Tariff Commission, page 41, Mr. Martin explained that—

it was all a matter of price, which varied according to the required capacity of the machine. An Ingersoll-Sergeant compressor could be got in Australia, as that company was not the only maker. He claimed that his compressor could be made as efficient as any imported one working in Australia.

Another South Australian engineer used these significant words—

To say that mechanics who built locomotive engines in South Australia, Victoria, and Queensland cannot make an air compressor is to talk nonsense.

Similar evidence was given on behalf of Walker's Limited, of Maryborough, Queensland—

The engineer for Walker's Limited, Maryborough, informed your Commissioners (in regard to evidence given by Mr. Moss in Western

Australia, that locally-made air compressors were not as good as imported) that this gentleman told him the air compressor which he had supplied had done 25 per cent. better than anticipated. The witness stated that he had made air compressors for the Broken Hill South, Broken Hill North, Block 14, and three other mines on the Barrier, and the indicator cards had shown them equal to the highest class made in England or America, namely, 95 per cent. of efficiency.

Mr. FRAZER.—Will the honorable member state the capacity of those compressors?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—There was no evidence given about the capacity, and that point was not taken at Kalgoorlie. Only the question of price was raised there. I have no doubt whatever that air compressors of the capacity referred to by the honorable member can be made in some of the big engineering establishments in South Australia, Victoria, and Queensland. The Golden Horseshoe Mine gave to an outside firm an order for an air compressor without calling for tenders in Australia, and with reference to that order, Mr. Rigby, of the Austral Otis Company, has made this statement in a letter which he sent to me—

There is no reason whatever why a compressor in every respect similar to the one they had imported could not be made in Australia, and I have no hesitation in saying that if they called for tenders for a duplicate it would be supplied locally for very much less than this one had cost the Golden Horseshoe.

There is a challenge to the honorable member for Kalgoorlie.

Mr. SALMON (Laanecoorie) [10.12].—I sincerely hope that the Committee will not agree to the amendment. At Castlemaine I have been in Thompson's up-to-date foundry, where I suppose more air compressors are turned out than are made by any other foundry in Australia. I have seen as many as five being laid down at one time. They are made there up to almost any capacity which may be used, and they are of the finest quality.

Mr. FRAZER.—What is the highest capacity up to which they are made?

Mr. SALMON.—They can be made up to a capacity of 4,000 cubic feet of free air per minute.

Mr. FRAZER.—To whom did they supply such air compressors?

Mr. SALMON.—At the foundry they can make air compressors up to that size.

Mr. FRAZER.—To whom did they supply them?

Mr. SALMON.—I have not seen their books, and do not know whom the air compressors were supplied to.

Mr. FRAZER.—The honorable member does not know anything about it.

Mr. SALMON.—I have the authority of the men themselves for stating that they are capable of making air compressors up to a capacity of 4,000 cubic feet of free air per minute.

Mr. FRAZER.—I am satisfied that some honorable members will make any sort of statement.

Mr. SALMON.—I am very sorry that the honorable member is adopting that attitude. At Thompson's foundry, Castlemaine, I have seen these air compressors in course of construction, and I have been assured by those who use them that they are equal, if not superior, to imported air compressors. On these grounds, I ask honorable members not to agree to the amendment, but to assist us in maintaining the supremacy we have gained, and also to increase the industry. A great deal has been said in the past about the inability of local manufacturers to make these articles, but any honorable member who will visit Thompson's foundry at Castlemaine will, I feel sure, find one or more of these air compressors in the course of construction, and also see documents in which the users of them speak in the highest terms of their efficiency and durability. That magnificent foundry known as Walker's Limited, Maryborough, in Queensland, also manufactures these articles, and of the highest quality too. Unless they are made well to withstand the strain which is put upon them they will not give satisfaction. We have proof that they are made to the complete satisfaction of the users, and it would be nothing short of a criminal act if we took away from the manufacturers the opportunity they have to prove that Australian workmen are equal to the best workmen whom the world can produce.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [10.15].—I think that there must be a mistake in the minds of some honorable members in regard to the manufacture of air compressors in Australia. The honorable member for Kalgoorlie has said that they are not made here. A very large one has been made here. I have been trying to ascertain its capacity.

Mr. FRAZER.—Did the honorable gentleman state that I said that air compressors are not made here?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I understood the honorable member to say that air compressors of the capacity mentioned in his amendment are not made here. But Mr. Donald Clark, in his work on *Australian Mining and Metallurgy*, page 55, speaking of the Kalgurli Gold Mines Limited, says—

The mine is well equipped with a fine winding engine, and an air compressor made by James Martin and Co., of Gawler, South Australia.

The size of the compressor is not given; but I am assured that it is larger than 1,000 cubic feet. I am informed, too, that an air compressor of 3,000 cubic feet is illustrated in the *Brisbane Daily Mail* of October 5th, 1907, as supplied to the Blayney Copper Mines and Smelting Company, Blayney, New South Wales, and manufactured by the Bundaberg Foundry Company Limited, Queensland. Though I should like to meet any reasonable objections to my proposals, I cannot accept the amendment, seeing that compressors of large capacity are made in Australia.

Mr. MATHEWS.—I hope that the Treasurer will not allow the eyes to be picked out of his Tariff.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I shall certainly not allow it, though I may be forced to if the numbers are against me. I am also informed that the Austral Otis Company has made a 3,500 cubic feet compressor for the Long Tunnel Company.

Mr. KNOX (Kooyong) [10.19].—I wish to inform the Committee that in the Mount Lyell mine we had a compressor of a capacity of 3,500 cubic feet, and that it was made in Victoria. It is an excellent piece of machinery. There is no reason why compressors should not be made here.

Mr. SPENCE (Darling) [10.20].—We are all glad to know that Australia can make these machines. The question at issue is, not whether air-compressors can be made here, but whether the exceptionally large ones which the honorable member for Kalgoorlie has in mind can be profitably made here.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—I have read an offer to make them.

Mr. SPENCE.—That offer did not contain any mention of capacity. Those who know anything about mining are aware that in dealing with low-grade lodes machinery is needed such as it is not reasonable to expect to get in Australia. Evidence given before the Tariff Commission shows that

one-fifth of the cost of a piece of machinery goes in preparing preliminary plans, and it would not be fair to expect an engineering firm to undertake the expense necessary to turn out a big piece of machinery, such as it would not be called upon to make again for a number of years. I do not know enough about the air compressors which are in use to be able to say whether the honorable member for Kalgoorlie has fixed a proper limit; but consideration should be given where machines of an exceptional size are required. When high duties are imposed on machinery which cannot be made here, a heavy tax is levied on the mining industry, without corresponding benefit to Australia. I am glad that the Minister has been able to give us some definite information.

Mr. FRAZER (Kalgoorlie) [10.22].—When I brought forward my proposal, my only desire was to do what is fair in the interests of mining. There are not, on my information, many more than twenty air compressors of over 1,000 cubic feet capacity in the mines of Australia at the present time. A compressor which will deal with 1,000 cubic feet of free air per minute can drive ten three-inch cylinder rock drills, and not many mines use so many drills at one time. When a mining proposition has to deal with a large quantity of low-grade ore, it must reduce its costs to a minimum. No doubt there are manufacturers in Victoria who would proclaim their ability to make any machinery that the most fertile imagination in the Committee could conceive of. But there is such a small demand for machines of the size of which I am speaking, that it would not pay Australian manufacturers to go to the expense of making preparations for constructing them. Of course, my statement is disputed. Any statement made on behalf of the mining industry, no matter how substantiated by facts, is almost sure to be disputed, either by a reference to something contained in the 6,050 pages of the Tariff Commission's reports, or by the statement of the representative of a constituency in which there is a foundry or engineering establishment of some description. My proposal applies to big machinery only, and there are in Australia very few of the machines which it affects. They are being used on low-grade propositions, which are being worked as economically as possible, although the men employed on them are being paid a decent rate of wages. If the

amendment be agreed to, the engineering trade of Australia will not be seriously affected, because the demand for these engines is so small that local manufacturers would not find it worth their while to make them.

Mr. MATHEWS (Melbourne Ports) [10.27].—The honorable member for Kalgoorlie says that he believes that representatives of the constituencies in which there are foundries are ready to assert that anything can be made there, which is equivalent to saying that members will make misstatements in order to get their way. I do not know whether the honorable member would like us to doubt the truth of his statements. I have here a photograph of a Cross Compound Air Compressor of 2,000 cubic feet capacity, capable of driving twenty drills, and designed and manufactured for the Long Tunnel mine, Walhalla, by the Austral Otis Engineering Company Limited, of South Melbourne; and another photograph of steam cylinders fitted with triple expansion valves and air cylinders, with improved Corliss air valves. The manager of the Long Tunnel Gold Mining Company, in a letter to the Austral Otis Engineering Company, dated Walhalla, 22nd July, 1897, says—

I have great pleasure in stating that the double compound and condensing air compressing engine which was constructed by your firm, and lately erected at the company's mine, has given every satisfaction. For the past three months it has been at work night and day, without a hitch of any kind, and during that time has supplied all the compressed air, at 110 lbs. pressure per square inch, required in the mine for motive power, pumping, winding, and rock drilling, at a depth of 1,822 feet below the adit level.

I consider that the whole plant is of the finest class, and is constructed on the most modern and improved principles for air compression, namely, high and low pressure air cylinders with mechanically moved suction and delivery valves, and the steam engine, compound and surface condensing.

The indicator diagrams, which have been taken from both the engine and compressor cylinders, show that the whole machine is working in a thoroughly satisfactory manner, giving a very high economy and efficiency.

But some honorable members will not believe the statements made to them, no matter what proofs are put before them. If they were shown these engines, they would find fault with them, unless there was the name of a foreign firm attached to them. I do not think that the honorable member for Kalgoorlie does credit to the State which he represents when he tries to make the Committee believe that Australians cannot do anything. It seems to

me that the time will come when Australians will say that they cannot have their wants made known in the Houses of Parliament. It is a wonder to me that the advocates of the importers are not imported as well as the mechanical contrivances needed in Australia. I hope that this Committee will not allow the vital points of the Tariff to be picked out so as to make the whole scheme useless. I have noticed during the debate a tendency to pick out portions of it for special attack. I trust that the Committee will strenuously resist the attempt to eliminate air compressing engines.

Amendment of the amendment negatived.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN (Calare) [10.31].—I desire to speak upon item 164 before it is finally dealt with, and to refer to the manner in which the Minister's scheme is formulated. Lines are mentioned which are placed on the free list so far as concerns the United Kingdom, and which are dutiable so far as the rest of the world is concerned. Other mining machinery of all descriptions comes under the general n.e.i. drag-net, which, by a recent vote of the Committee, has been reduced from 30 and 25 to 25 and 20 per cent. I wish to emphasize the point that a large percentage of the minerals that have to be dealt with in this country are low-grade ores. Every now and then some new method of treating such ores is discovered, which enables very large quantities to be treated successfully. Without such methods those ores could not be profitably treated. The improvements are very largely mechanical contrivances adapting electricity and chemical processes to the treatment of ores. Under the Minister's proposal no new method of that character devised outside Australia, and covered by patent rights, could be used here without the payment of royalties to the patentees in addition to taxation at the higher rate. In this way the mining industry would be seriously handicapped. I might mention as an instance the cyanide process. Prior to that process being discovered, a great quantity of low-grade stuff in the Commonwealth was unused. By the introduction of the cyanide process and the appliances connected with it, large areas of mineral country were rendered highly profitable. In my own electorate, enormous quantities of tailings from the old mining fields have been successfully treated several times, yielding a profit each time; and on each occasion the method applied represented an improvement upon the preced-

ing one. But under the proposal of the Minister, new mechanical appliances would be penalized by having to pay the higher scale of duties.

Mr. SALMON.—What appliances does the honorable member mean in regard to cyaniding?

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—I am referring to any appliances which may be discovered in any part of the world for the more economical and profitable treatment of mineral ores.

Mr. MATHEWS.—It would be possible to buy the patent rights or pay royalties to the patentees.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—The patentees would have a good deal to say as to what would have to be paid to them. The honorable member is probably aware that machines are being used in the boot factories of this city upon the rent system, by which the patentees, who refuse to sell their patent rights, secure considerable returns. If I may diverge for a moment, I take up this position in regard to patent rights: I think that we should under our law insist on the manufacture of patented machines in our midst, or that the patents should become invalid. But we have not reached that position yet. We recognise patent rights taken out in all parts of the world. Under this scheme, we are practically going to penalize our own people who are engaged in the mining industry in regard to the use of newer, more up-to-date, and more economical methods of treating ores. The Minister might overcome the difficulty by putting in a paragraph that would allow him to permit the introduction of new forms of machinery on the lower scale, until such time as they could be manufactured here. I quite agree that it is not wise to put too much power in the hands of the Minister, but we have to place power somewhere, and so long as it is used in the best interests of the community, no objection can be taken to it. I point out that countries which are soaked in protection—that are not experimenting with it, but have had practical applications of it, and are further advanced in the arts and sciences than we are—pay greater regard to their mineral development than we propose to do under this Tariff. In New Zealand, very nearly all the large machinery used in mining and mineral recovery is on the free list. The same is the case in Canada. Cyaniding plants are upon the free list there, as are a large enumeration of mechanical contrivances for the

profitable treatment of mineral ores, including gold, silver, and iron ores. Surely, dependent as we are to such a large extent upon our mineral resources for our wealth, we ought to have a little regard to these interests. Whilst the total amount of wealth realized from mining is very large, it must be remembered that a great number of mining propositions are working very close up to the paying margin, and that even a slightly increased impost might make their operations unprofitable, and cause them to shut down. In these circumstances it should be our desire to encourage, as far as possible, instead of to penalize the industry. Under the Treasurer's proposal every new invention that cannot be produced here, and must be imported to facilitate mining operations, will come under the drag-net n.e.i. provision, and be liable to the higher duty. The Minister would do well to insert in the item a new paragraph enabling him to allow new inventions, calculated to assist us to make the best of our mineral resources, and which cannot be made here, to come in free.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—There is an asterisk against this item, and it directs us to a footnote setting forth that the duty is—

Subject to rebate under the conditions specified in the schedule hereto.

I wish to be quite clear that that note is no part of the item, and that in passing the item we are not pledging ourselves to the rebate referred to. As I understand it, the footnote is merely an intimation by the Government that they intend at a later stage to propose a rebate.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [10.43].—This is about the fourth or fifth time that I have made an explanation in regard to the footnote in question. It originally referred to item 164 as introduced. That item, under the re-arrangement, has been divided, some of the machinery covered by it going into one division, and some into another. I do not wish the items to be dissociated from the footnote if it be found necessary that the provision regarding rebates should apply. I have questioned the officers of the Department about the matter, but have not got a satisfactory reply.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—For the present we may wipe it out?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Yes; I shall not at present commit honorable members to it; I wish to make the matter clearer. No doubt the question will come forward

after we have disposed of the Tariff, but a rebate could be granted only by direction of the House, and in cases where bulk had not been broken. Rebate cannot be granted where packages have been broken, and it is impossible to identify the machine.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—You are not asking us now to deal with that question?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—No.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS (Robertson) [10.45].—In dealing with item 164, we are, by inference, dealing also with item 166 as the footnote to which the honorable member for Flinders has referred applies to both of them. The Minister has said that that footnote is not to be read into this item, but the fact that we may have later on to consider the schedule to which it refers may influence the votes of honorable members.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—It is merely an intimation by the Government that they intend to provide for some rebate?

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—Honorable members may not be disposed to deal with the item as they would if the footnote did not relate to it.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—The honorable member thinks that that is an argument for dealing with the rebate in connexion with the item?

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—When this item was first submitted we should have had from the Treasurer a statement in regard to the schedule.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I have made a statement. The question was raised by the honorable member for Indi.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—I know that a question was asked in the House, but no information could be elicited from Ministers.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I promised the honorable member that nothing would be agreed to without the consent of the House.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN (Calare) [10.47].—I should be glad if the Treasurer would adopt the suggestion that I made a few minutes ago. Earlier in the evening he moved to insert in paragraph A a patent hoist, which at the last moment had been brought under his notice, and which he said could not be manufactured here. Can he not see his way to introduce a new paragraph covering other inventions important to the mining industry that may hereafter be brought under his notice, and which in the absence of

such a provision would be subjected to the high duty relating to "Machines and Machinery n.e.i." The action taken by the Treasurer earlier in the evening shows that he is in sympathy with my suggestion, and I hope that he will adopt it.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer [10.49].—The honorable member for Calare has asked me to provide for what would be a very dangerous procedure. To whom would he delegate the duty of deciding whether a new invention should be treated as he proposes?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—It is a matter for legislation.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Of course, it is. Item 168 provides that—

Any dutiable machinery, or machine tool, or any part thereof specified in any proclamation issued by the Governor-General in pursuance of a joint address passed on the motion of Ministers by both Houses of the Parliament, stating that such machinery, machine tool, or part cannot be reasonably manufactured within the Commonwealth, and that it should be admitted duty free,

shall be free. It seems to me that, in any event, that procedure would have to be followed. I do not think that honorable members would agree to allow the Government to say what should be free and what should be dutiable. My experience is that the House is very jealous of its privileges in that regard. I am often told that as I am a protectionist I would, if left to myself, impose protective duties upon many articles. In the same way it might be said that a free-trade Minister would be disposed to put articles on the free list.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—It could not be any worse than it is under the present provision.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I have read to the Committee a provision under which, if it should be found necessary to admit an article free, the Government can at any time submit to Parliament a motion to put the article on the free list, and should it be carried, a proclamation to that effect would be issued.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—And the resolution might be made retrospective if Parliament were not sitting when it was thought the article should first have appeared on the free list.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Quite so. I cannot see how I can undertake to do any more than is already provided for in the Tariff.

Amendment, as amended, agreed to.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Postponed item*. Item 166. Machinery and Machines; and Machine Tools, n.e.i., viz.:—

(A) Machines, n.e.i., used in the Tanning of Hides and Skins, and in the Preparation of Leather; Automatic Can-making and Closing Machines; Machinery for Scouring and Washing Wool; Machinery for the Manufacture of Paper, and for Felting; Soap-Cutting Machines; Artesian Boring Machines, ad val. (General Tariff), 25 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 20 per cent.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [10.52].—In accordance with a promise given very early during the consideration of the Tariff, I intend to move that the words "Machinery for Scouring and Washing Wool" be left out. I was asked by the honorable member for Maranoa why this class of machinery should not be included with other wool-scouring machinery to which he referred at the time. I admit that, so far as I know, there is no reason why it should not, and I therefore move the amendment.

Mr. TUDOR.—Would this cover the whole of the wool-washing machinery?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Machinery for scouring and washing wool.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS (Robertson) [10.54].—The Minister might very well agree also to leave out the item, "Machines n.e.i. used in the Tanning of Hides and Skins and in the Preparation of Leather." Very few machines used by tanners are made in Australia. There are a great many machines in use in America which, if they could be obtained here, would enable our tanners to produce leather, which is the raw material of the shoemaker, at a lower figure, and would in that way benefit the shoemaker.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I hope the honorable member will not press me to do what he suggests.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—The Treasurer must see that there would be such a small demand for machinery of this kind that no manufacturer would be warranted in importing the special appliances necessary to make these tanners' machines in the Commonwealth. Manufacturers in America have a population of 80,000,000 or 90,000,000 of people to provide for, and they have the very best machinery for treating leather. A few days ago the Treasurer was talking to me about a splitting machine. I know the machine referred to. It is an American Band machine, and it is possible with it to cut a hide right

through into two or three thicknesses. It is a comparatively recent invention. There was a Union machine in use prior to the discovery of the Band machine, by which only one layer could be taken off a hide. Cut in this way the leather would, of course, be inferior, but there is a demand for this kind of leather in the manufacture of boots and shoes, and Australian manufacturers are at a disadvantage so long as our tanners and curriers are unable to obtain the machine to which I refer. I may have something further to say when I have heard the Minister on the subject.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I cannot accept the honorable member's proposal.

Mr. COON (Batman) [11.0].—I understand that it is the intention of the Treasurer to allow wool-scouring machines to come in free. I enter my protest against that proposal. These machines are made in my electorate, and I was told some time ago that they were not to be admitted free of duty.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—This matter was under consideration two months ago.

Mr. COON.—Why should wool-scouring machines be allowed to come in free?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Some of them have been free all along.

Mr. COON.—That may be so; but these machines are being made here, and I am at a loss to know why they should be treated differently from other machines that can be made in the Commonwealth.

Mr. PAGE.—Hall's patent wool-scourer is not made here.

Mr. COON.—Wool-scouring machines are made in Australia. Why does a protectionist Ministry propose to put them on the free list?

Mr. HENRY WILLIS (Robertson) [11.1].—I have an amendment prior to that proposed by the Minister. I move—

That the words "used in the tanning of hides and skins, and in the preparation of leather," be left out

The Minister has said nothing to justify the stand he is taking in face of the statement I have made on the floor of the House.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [11.2].—I appeal to the Minister to report progress.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I cannot. I might as well say that we cannot do anything more before Christmas, unless we go on, even if we have to sit continuously. We have done nothing whatever to-day. I want to finish item 166 to-night.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—It is one of the most important items in the whole Tariff. The Minister ought to make a statement at this stage as to the exemption of special machinery for hat and wool factories.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—If I say two words, it gives rise to a long debate, and, therefore I had better say nothing.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Then we shall have to induce some member of the Labour Party to make the honorable member rise. What is the Minister going to do about the special hat and woollen machinery?

Mr. TUDOR.—I think they should all pay duty.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—If the Treasurer will say that, I shall be satisfied. I should think the industries themselves do not desire a special favour. Strange to say, the Minister has taken certain articles out of the special line dealing with that machinery, and included them in this item. I refer to machinery for scouring and washing wool, and for the manufacture of paper and for felting.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I am proposing to take out machinery for scouring and washing wool.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I wish the Treasurer to make them all pay alike. Whatever is done, let them all be classified together. We should not single out the hat manufacturer.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The honorable member goes mad over hats.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The honorable member would sit in his chair all night, rather than do what is fair by the Committee. He seems to think that he is doing excellent work if he sits in his chair and lets honorable members talk at him for half the day with nothing done. That is what he calls "bullocking it through." He wastes half the time of the Committee by that attitude.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I should do so if I talked.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The honorable member will have to talk before he gets this item through.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The honorable member wants me to state that I am going to put on the free list a lot of articles, when I am not in a position to tell him that I can do so.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I simply wish the honorable member to tell the Committee now what he proposes to do regarding hat-making and woollen machinery.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [11.6].—Whatever is done, I am not prepared at this moment to say what I shall do. But if that class of machinery ought to be dutiable, I will make it all dutiable. If I think that machinery that is not manufactured here should be free, I am not going to pick out one particular item to be dealt with by itself. I shall deal with that class of machinery as a whole.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Is the honorable member referring to the item now before the Committee?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I am referring to the line at the end of the Tariff, to which the honorable member has referred.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The honorable member will treat that machinery the same as the rest?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I will treat it in whichever way other similar machinery is treated. There will be no special arrangement.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Farramatta) [11.7].—The Treasurer's statement is satisfactory. I appeal to the Committee to agree to the amendment of the honorable member for Robertson. The question of tanning machinery and tools was debated for nearly a week during the consideration of the last Tariff, and the then Minister decided to put them on the free list. He found that they were not being made in Melbourne. Some tanning machines are being made here, but some of them are obsolete. Now these things are sneaked in again under this general item. In the last Tariff nearly all the different machines were itemized, but now they are brought together in this innocent form. A number of these tanning machines are patented and are not made here, and cannot be done without. They must be imported, no matter what duties are imposed. I appeal to the Minister to put them on the free list as they were before.

Question—That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the item (Mr. HENRY WILLIS' amendment)—put. The Committee divided.

Ayes	26
Noes	10
Majority	16

AYES.

Batchelor, E. L.
Carr, E. S.
Chapman, Austin
Coon, J.
Ewing, T. T.
Forrest, Sir John
Foster, F. J.
Frazer, C. E.
Groom, L. E.
Lyne, Sir William
Mahon, H.
Mathews, J.
McDougall, J. K.
Page, J.

Quick, Sir John
Spence, W. G.
Storrer, D.
Thomas, J.
Thomson, John
Tudor, F. G.
Watkins, D.
Watson, J. C.
Webster, W.
Wise, G. H.

Tellers:
Cook, Hume
Catts, J. H.

NOES.

Archer, E. W.
Atkinson, L.
Brown, Thomas
Cook, Joseph
Johnson, W. E.
Sinclair, H.

Thomson, Dugald
Wilson, J. G.

Tellers:
McWilliams, W. J.
Willis, Henry

PAIRS.

Kingston, C. C.
Fisher, A.
O'Malley, King
Hall, D. R.
Maloney, W. R. N.
Wilks, W. H.
Harper, R.
Mauger, S.
Hutchison, J.
Sampson, S.
Deakin, A.
Bamford, F. W.
Salmon, C. C.
Chanter, J. M.
Knox, W.
Hughes, W. M.

Kelly, W. H.
Livingston, J.
Fairbairn, G.
Smith, Bruce
Fowler, J. M.
Irvine, Hans
Fysh, Sir Philip
Edwards, R.
Palmer, A. C.
Irvine, W. H.
Glynn, P. McM.
Fuller, G. W.
Hedges, W. N.
Poynton, A.
Liddell, F.
Bowden, E. K.

Question so resolved in the affirmative.

Amendment negatived.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) proposed—

That the words "Machinery for Scouring and Washing Wool" be left out.

Mr. MAHON (Coolgardie) [11.12].—The action of the Treasurer in submitting this amendment is very remarkable. So far as I can judge, the wool industry is well able to pay any impost of the kind.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—And so should mining be.

Mr. MAHON.—We are not dealing with mining now; when we were the Treasurer was adamant against any such concession as he now proposes. In the 1902 Tariff this machinery was in the free list, but in a totally different form from that now proposed, seeing that it was placed there along with a number of other items. In the 1902 Tariff the exemption read as follows—

Machinery for Scouring, Washing, Carding, Spinning, Weaving, and Finishing the Manufacture of Fibrous Materials.

That covers much more ground than the particular exemption sought to be introduced now.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [11.13].—Perhaps the honorable member will allow me to explain that this particular machinery will come under a new item which I propose to follow item 166, embracing machinery and parts, and accessories used in the treatment, manufacture, and finishing of fibrous materials, and felt, and felt hats. The new item will embrace those other items to which the honorable member referred.

Mr. MAHON (Coolgardie) [11.14].—I object to those articles being made free, because the industries concerned are quite capable of paying their share of taxation. Furthermore, I understand that this machinery can be manufactured with commercial advantage within the Commonwealth. The honorable member for Batman informs me that wool scouring machinery is made in his electorate.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I make the proposal because the honorable member for Batman informed me that machinery for wool scouring in the woollen mills came in free, while the machinery used for scouring in the ordinary way was dutiable.

Mr. MAHON.—The Treasurer has the remedy in his own hands, inasmuch as he can impose a duty on both. Protectionists who desire to be logical and consistent must resist the Treasurer's proposal and support me in my determination.

Mr. WATSON (South Sydney) [11.20].—I cannot reconcile the attitude taken up by the Government on this question with their attitude a few moments ago in reference to tanning machinery. I voted against the exemption of that machinery from duty, because I think that all machine tools should be placed upon exactly the same footing.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The Minister has promised to exempt machine tools enumerated in this item.

Mr. WATSON.—But I understand that whilst hat-making machinery is to be taken out of the free list and subjected to a duty, wool-weaving machinery is to remain in the list of special exemptions.

Mr. PAGE.—What protection do we accord to the woollen industry?

Mr. WATSON.—It receives a protection of 30 per cent.

Mr. PAGE.—The product of that industry has to be sold in the markets of the world.

Mr. WATSON.—I intend to vote to impose a slightly heavier duty upon yarns, so as to prevent their importation. All I claim is that we ought to impose a uniform duty upon every class of machine tool.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Irrespective of whether or not they can be made here.

Mr. WATSON.—Does anybody suggest that wool-washing machinery cannot be made in the Commonwealth?

Mr. PAGE. — Yes, I do. I say that Hall's patent wool scourer is not made in Australia.

Mr. WATSON.—That is true. But does the honorable member say that a wool-scouring machine, which is one of the simplest pieces of machinery imaginable, cannot be made in the Commonwealth?

Mr. COON.—They are made here.

Mr. WATSON.—I can understand that some machines which I have seen working are made locally.

Mr. PAGE.—The Williams wool-washer is made in Australia, but that machine cannot be compared with Hall's patent wool-scourer.

Mr. WATSON.—I say that all machine tools should be placed in the same category, no matter for what purpose they may be used. I am in receipt of a letter from some tanners in New South Wales, in which they express themselves as being ready to pay a duty upon their machinery so long as other machinery is treated in the same way. That is a reasonable attitude to take up. I shall vote against the Government's proposal.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [11.28].—I should be sorry to keep honorable members here very late to-night. I did not anticipate that a long debate would take place upon this question.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—Think it over by to-morrow.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I will not think it over. I have made up my mind upon it. But I know that honorable members are tired, and I wish to be reasonable. Consequently, I ask them to come prepared to-morrow—and we shall meet at 11 o'clock in the morning—to get on with the business without undue debate.

Mr. JOHNSON.—There has not been much discussion to-day from this side of the chamber.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I am not blaming the Opposition. I think that in many respects we are arriving at an understanding upon these matters, and, there-

fore, I am led to hope that we shall dispose of the business engaging our attention without undue debate, and thus obviate the necessity for all-night sittings. Upon that understanding. I shall ask that progress be reported.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—We cannot sit both night and day.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—That is why I appeal to honorable members to assist me.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Have we not endeavoured to do so?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I quite admit that the members of the Opposition have not talked very much to-day, and in that respect, I recognise that they have extended consideration to the Government.

Progress reported.

SPECIAL ADJOURNMENT.

Motion (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That the House, at its rising, adjourn until 11 a.m. to-morrow.

House adjourned at 11.30 p.m.

House of Representatives.

Thursday, 28 November, 1907.

Mr. SPEAKER took the chair at 11 a.m. and read prayers.

PETITION.

Mr. KNOX.—I beg to present a petition from 2,648 professors and teachers of music in the State of Victoria, who pray the House not to consent to the increased duty on pianos. I invite honorable members to examine the petition, which is unique in form, while every signature is that of a registered music teacher.

Petition received and read.

Mr. KNOX.—Mr. Speaker, in view of the unique character of the petition, and the trouble and care which have been taken in connexion with its compilation, I should like to move that its text be printed for circulation.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Under the Standing Orders that motion cannot be moved unless the honorable member gives an assurance that he intends to take action thereon in

the House. If he intends to submit a motion in the House of course I cannot object to the motion which he now desires to move. Otherwise it cannot be moved.

Mr. KNOX.—The matter will come forward for consideration in connexion with the Tariff.

NATIVES OF PAPUA.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—I beg to ask the Prime Minister if he will lay upon the table of the House any communication which he has received in regard to the natives of Papua, and also if he will obtain from the Director of Agriculture a report on the condition of the natives working in Papua, especially on the mines.

Mr. DEAKIN.—Last night the honorable member was good enough to mention this matter to me, and this morning I asked for a report, though in recent reports Mr. Staniforth Smith has referred to the condition of the natives in employment in general terms of approval. He had called attention to the fact that there had been an undue amount of sickness among carriers, but, on inquiry, it had been discovered that the condition of the rest houses had been allowed to become insanitary, with the result that dysentery had become prevalent. The insanitary condition has been removed. That appears to have been the only sickness to which he has recently called attention.

TELEPHONE ADMINISTRATION.

METALLIC CIRCUITS AND TUNNELS:
RATES: NEWCASTLE SERVICE: SUPPLY
OF NEW SWITCHBOARDS: MELBOURNE
AND SYDNEY SERVICE.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I desire to ask the Postmaster-General a question in regard to the statement in the press that, in anticipation of the electrification of the railways and tramways in Melbourne, steps are being taken to have a complete metallic circuit and underground tunnel in connexion with the telephone service. I desire to know what action is being taken in Sydney for completing the metallic circuit and underground tunnel, because for years the telephone service has been affected seriously by the induction from the electric tramway service. The suffering has lasted for a long time, and I want to know what steps have been, or are going to be, taken to complete the metallic circuit and underground tunnel?

Mr. MAUGER.—I am fully seized of the importance of the matter mentioned by the honorable member. In Sydney works to the end mentioned are in progress, and will be continued. A further vote will be asked for in order to carry them to a successful conclusion.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK. — I desire to know if the Postmaster-General has yet taken any step to do away with those anomalies in regard to telephone charges which have been a source of so much comment in the House—the differential treatment of subscribers to private telephones?

Mr. MAUGER.—Yes. I have endeavoured to meet what I regard as the well-grounded complaints of honorable members by extending the distance for the minimum charge from one mile to two miles, and also by making an additional charge of 10s. for every quarter of a mile or fraction thereof, and 20s. for every additional half-mile. That will, I think, meet the majority of the cases. If, however, I find that it does not, we will make a further extension in order to make the charges equitable.

Mr. TUDOR.—I should like to ask the Postmaster-General when the amended mileage rates for telephones will come into operation?

Mr. MAUGER.—On the 1st January.

Mr. WATKINS.—Since it is stated that an order for a new switchboard must be placed in America two years before it is required, I wish to ask the Postmaster-General whether he does not think that a better business arrangement should be adopted by the Department, so that the telephonic service in any town or city may not in the meantime be held up and disorganized?

Mr. MAUGER.—I think that the Department needs to have at its disposal a considerably larger amount of money than it has, so that it could take steps to anticipate any such abnormal growth of the telephone service as has occurred in my honorable friend's constituency.

Mr. WATKINS.—What action does the Postmaster-General propose to take pending the securing of a new switchboard to improve the telephone system in the Newcastle district?

Mr. MAUGER. — I propose presenting to the Cabinet a minute asking that the necessary funds be provided, and to do

all that I can in the meantime to remedy the disorganization.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—Is the Postmaster-General aware that owing to the congestion of business in the local telephone services of Melbourne and Sydney it is practically impossible to speak between Sydney and Melbourne, and, if so, will he take steps to have the line made clear so that it will be possible to speak without interruption between local or suburban exchanges in the two capitals? The service would thus be popularized.

Mr. MAUGER.—Everything that can be done in the direction indicated by the honorable member will be done.

LONDON DOCKS.

STORAGE AND REFRIGERATING ACCOMMODATION.

Mr. GLYNN. — In last week's newspapers there appeared a cablegram from England, stating that the Imperial Government were about to introduce a Bill for the improvement of London port and docks. I desire to ask whether the Prime Minister will consider the advisableness of making a friendly suggestion to the Imperial Government to consider the expediency of providing better repacking and storage and refrigerating processes at the docks, such as exist in Hamburg for perishable produce?

Mr. DEAKIN.—A project for a Bill for the purpose mentioned by the honorable member has been before the Imperial Parliament for some time, and I think that a first Bill has been laid before the House of Commons. The matter is doubtless being watched anxiously by the Agents-General for the States, and the Commonwealth Government will certainly have no objection to calling attention to the fact that in such a scheme it would be well to make provision for cool storage accommodation. As the honorable member is aware, however, in England that would only be open to private enterprise.

EXPORT OF BUTTER TO THE PHILIPPINES.

Mr. MALONEY.—I wish to ask the Prime Minister a question without notice. It has come under my observation, from reading some Chinese newspapers, that in Manila, in the Philippines, an embargo has been put upon the importation of Australian butter, on account of the preserva-

tives that are used. I should like to know whether the Prime Minister can give the House any information upon that subject?

Mr. DEAKIN.—Yes; on a statement being published to the effect mentioned by the honorable member, we communicated by cable with the Philippines, and the statement has been confirmed. As I informed the House previously, the addition of boric acid or boron—which is the preservative mainly used in Australian butter—renders it ineligible to be received in the Philippines, except in bond for the purpose of re-export. Owing to the honorable member for Capricornia, I was able to take advantage of the presence in Melbourne of the British Vice-Consul for Manila—who was passing through only a week or two ago—to discover from him the present position. We have a list of the preservatives authorized there, but they do not appear to be applicable to butter. In fact, salt seems the only preservative that may be used for the preservation of butter. It really appears as if the list of preservatives was drawn—either intentionally or unintentionally—in such a manner as practically to exclude Australian butter. Other regulations have also been employed in a severe manner in regard to live cattle, though that has not yet affected the Commonwealth. But we are communicating at some length in regard to these matters, because at present it seems almost impossible for shippers from Australia or elsewhere to be perfectly certain of the principle upon which the authorities in Manila intend to proceed.

Mr. WATSON.—Is it not possible to preserve butter without the use of boric acid?

Mr. DEAKIN.—Certainly; but, apparently, every preservative except salt is condemned.

Mr. WATSON.—I should think that the use of salt, with cool storage, ought to be sufficient.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—How do they get their butter there?

Mr. DEAKIN.—They get it salted. The information supplied to me is that the butter which is exported to the Philippines from America is salted.

Mr. MALONEY.—The butter one gets there is very good indeed. It is imported in cool storage, of course.

Mr. DEAKIN.—The official list of preservatives is not clearly understood by our exporters, and I intend to make further inquiries.

ELECTRIFICATION OF VICTORIAN RAILWAYS.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—Has the Prime Minister read in the newspapers a statement made by the Premier of Victoria that if the suburban railways of Melbourne were electrified, £200,000 would be the cost in duties to the State of Victoria? In view of this statement, will the Prime Minister say whether it is not a fact that three-fourths of the money obtained by such duties at first goes back to the States, that a large amount is spent upon the Victorian branches of the Civil Service taken over by the Commonwealth from the State, and that a further amount of it is spent in new services, of which Victoria gets a fair share, and that the rest is also returned to the State.

Mr. DEAKIN.—I had not happened to notice the statement by the Premier of Victoria to which the honorable member has called attention; but if he is responsible for such a statement I hope that he will also take the opportunity of perusing the honorable member's well grounded argument.

IMMIGRATION FROM AMERICA TO GREAT BRITAIN.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—I wish to ask the Prime Minister, without notice, whether he has observed in the morning newspapers a cable stating that there is an unprecedented rush of artisans and workpeople from protective America and Canada to free-trade Great Britain; and whether he proposes to take any steps to show those people the advantages offered by Protectionist Australia to immigrants of that character?

Mr. DEAKIN.—While I have seen the cablegram to which the honorable member refers, and am only too happy to take advantage of any opportunity of advertising Australia, I hope that the honorable member will bear that fact in mind when dealing with the proposals we have now before us for increasing the employment of artisans in Australia.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Will the Prime Minister, when trying to do his best for Australia in regard to those workmen who are said to be rushing to the Old Country from Canada and the United States, take care to inform them, if he disseminates any facts at all, that the proposals we are making in the direction he suggests are very

much below the duties which already obtain in countries from which they are escaping?

Mr. DEAKIN.—The question is, as I understand it, whether I will inform the migrating workmen that the protection afforded here is less than that obtaining in America. Well, I should be rather reluctant to do that, because I do not think that it would tell in our favour. I should prefer to show them that they have a better field of employment in Australia.

MAIL SERVICE TO EUROPE.

INTERIM SERVICE—DIFFERENTIAL FREIGHTS.

Mr. KNOX.—Perhaps the Prime Minister will allow me to ask him a question without notice—whether he has been able to make arrangements with the Orient Steam Navigation Company in regard to expediting their mail service during the interim period?

Mr. DEAKIN.—Some progress has been made. Communications have been passing between the agents of the company and their managers in London, and I hope that—probably, next week—I shall be able to obtain a definite statement on the subject.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—I should like to ask the Prime Minister whether the differential freight now charged by ocean mail steamers calling at Fremantle is to continue until the new mail contract comes into operation, two years hence, or whether some arrangement has been made with the Orient Steam Navigation Company by which the practice of imposing an additional freight of 10s. per ton on goods from London to Fremantle over goods from London to Adelaide, Melbourne and Sydney is at once to cease?

Mr. DEAKIN.—The equalization of freights is a condition of the main contract. There is no provision of that nature in the interim contract, which merely carries on the existing arrangement for the carriage of mails.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—It is a two years' extension.

Mr. DEAKIN.—That is an extension of a contract for the delivery of letters at Adelaide, and having no cargo conditions.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—Will the Prime Minister make representations to the company in regard to the matter?

Mr. DEAKIN.—Yes.

NORTHERN TERRITORY.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—I wish to ask the Prime Minister, without notice, whether negotiations are still proceeding with the South Australian Government, with a view to the taking over of the Northern Territory by the Commonwealth; and, if so, whether the Prime Minister has noticed that the South Australian Government are piling up the interest upon the enormous fictitious debt of the Territory, and that they are adding to it this year a further deficit of £40,000 or £50,000?

Mr. DEAKIN.—I can express no opinion, of course, as to the fictitiousness or otherwise of any debt on account of the Northern Territory; but the latest information from South Australia is that the question is before the Legislative Council, where the proposals are not being unfavorably received. The result of the decision of that Chamber is, of course, material in making a reply, because, should it be adverse, we shall have no interest in the question. I hesitate, under the circumstances, to comment upon the matter in any way until it comes practically before this Parliament.

SUPPLIES FOR POSTAL DEPARTMENT, SOUTH AUSTRALIA.

Mr. LIVINGSTON.—I wish to ask the Postmaster-General whether it is not a fact that the Supply and Tender Board of South Australia has more power in regard to ordering goods for the Post and Telegraph Department in that State than has the Deputy Postmaster-General?

Mr. MAUGER.—I cannot say; but I know that the Board in future will have no power in that regard.

CHRISTMAS RECESS.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—I desire to ask the Prime Minister, without notice, whether he has taken into consideration—or, if he has not taken into consideration, will he endeavour to inform honorable members soon—the date when the House will be likely to rise for the Christmas holidays? I believe that if it were known what is in the mind of the Government—I do not, of course, want to bind them down to too definite a statement—more expedition in the transaction of business would result than is likely to be the case by leaving the matter indefinite.

Mr. DEAKIN.—Having in view the fact that we are now dealing with one of the most contentious parts of the Tariff, covering a great variety of dutiable articles, or articles which may be made dutiable, one has to recognise that the slowness of the progress made is not a fair test of the general progress we hope to make. I still trust that not later than the second week of the month upon which we are about to enter, we shall have concluded our work upon the Tariff, and shall, therefore, be able to take our Christmas holidays.

Mr. McDONALD.—In the event of the Tariff not being passed by this House before Christmas, will the Prime Minister take into consideration the desirableness of our reassembling after the holidays not later than the second week in January, so that honorable members representing far distant parts of the Commonwealth may have an opportunity to visit their constituencies at least once in the year?

Mr. DEAKIN.—If we should be so unfortunate as not to pass the Tariff before Christmas we shall certainly have to meet in the second or third week in January.

SATURDAY AND MONDAY SITTINGS.

Mr. BAMFORD.—Has the Prime Minister yet determined whether or not the House is to sit on Saturday next as well as on Monday?

Mr. DEAKIN.—It will be absolutely necessary to sit on Monday, and I fear it will be necessary, after our experience of last night, to meet also on Saturday.

HAT-MAKING MACHINERY.

Mr. JOHNSON asked the Minister of Trade and Customs, *upon notice*—

1. Is it a fact that under the 1902 Tariff all machinery used in the various processes of manufacture of fibrous materials for the production of hats has been exempted from duty by a rebate of the whole amount paid as soon as such machinery was installed for use?

2. What is the aggregate amount of duties so rebated during the period 1902 to date?

3. Is it not proposed—under the Tariff now in force—to rebate the whole of the duty paid on all machinery used in the manufacture of felt and felt hats as soon as such machinery has been installed for use?

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN. -- The answers to the honorable member's questions are as follow—

1. Under the 1902 Tariff machinery for scouring, washing, spinning, weaving, and finishing the manufacture of fibrous materials was free. The method was not one of rebate, but complete exemption.

2. No distinction was made in the returns between this class of machinery and other machinery, which was free. Consequently, the information desired cannot be supplied.

3. The conditions mentioned in answer 1 were always held to include the hat-making machinery mentioned. This machinery is now specifically mentioned for the sake of clearness only.

ALLEGED BARRISTERS' COMBINE.

Mr. J. H. CATTS asked the Attorney-General, *upon notice*—

1. Has his attention been drawn to a statement, made at a meeting of the Victorian Law Institute on Monday night last, to the effect that a Barristers' Combine existed, composed of Queensland, Victoria, and New South Wales barristers, the members of which decided that they would not hold a brief with any other members of the profession before the High Court except in cases where the other barrister appeared before the Court when sitting in his own State? In other words, members of the Bar in Western Australia were not to hold a brief except in Western Australia.

2. Is not such combination for such purposes in contravention of clause 49 of the Judiciary Act 1903, which states:—"Any person entitled to practise as a barrister or solicitor or both in any State shall have the right to practise in any Federal Court"?

3. Is not such action as referred to by the Barristers' Combination in opposition to section 117 of the Commonwealth Constitution, which states:—"A subject of the Queen, resident in any State, shall not be subject in any other State to any disability or discrimination which would not be equally applicable to him if he were a subject of the Queen resident in such other State"?

4. If the law at present existing is sufficient to prevent the power of the Combine to enforce the discrimination mentioned, will he take steps to conserve the rights of individual barristers against whom the Combine operates; if not, will he consider the advisability of so amending the law as to effect such purpose?

Mr. GROOM. — The answers to the honorable member's questions are as follow—

It is not in accordance with Parliamentary practice for me to express such an opinion as asked for; but my attention has been drawn to the two different statements in the daily press referring to an agreement. In the absence of any definite information of the precise nature of the agreement, it is impossible to form any opinion as to its legality. However, I will endeavour to ascertain whether any arrangement of such a nature with reference to the Federal Courts has been made.

TARIFF.

In Committee of Ways and Means (Consideration resumed from 27th November, 1907, *vide* page 6725):

Postponed item *166. Machinery and Machines; and Machine Tools n.e.i., viz. :—

- (A) Machines n.e.i., used in the tanning of hides and skins, and in the preparation of leather; automatic can-making and closing machines; machinery for scouring and washing wool; machinery for the manufacture of paper, and for felting; soap-cutting machines; artesian boring machines, ad val. (General Tariff), 25 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 20 per cent.

* (B) Machine Tools :—

Hat-making—hydraulic blocking press for making straw hats.

Indiarubber working—hose machines; steel stamps; steel tyre mandrils; spreading; tread drums; washer cutting.

Metal working—wire netting machines; blowers for foundry and mining purposes; pneumatic hammers; steam hammers, up to and including sizes up to 16 in. cylinders; punching and shearing machines, combined or separate, sizes up to $\frac{3}{4}$ in.; slotting machines, sizes up to 12 in. stroke; centering machines to center up to 6 in. diameter; bolt screwing and nut tapping, combined or separate, sizes above $\frac{3}{4}$ in., and up to 2 in.; bending rolls in sizes to bend up to $\frac{3}{4}$ in. plate.

Artesian boring tools n.e.i.

Boot-making machine tools, n.e.i.

Tyre benders and shrinkers.

Tinsmiths' tools being machine; ad val. (General Tariff), 25 per cent.; (United Kingdom) 20 per cent.

*Subject to rebate under the conditions specified in the schedule hereto.

Upon which Sir WILLIAM LYNE had moved by way of amendment—

That the words "Machinery for scouring and washing wool" be left out.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [11.28].—The way has been cleared for our dealing with this item in an equitable manner since the declaration made last night by the Treasurer that he intended to take out the special exemption of items relating to the hat industry and the woollen industry generally. We ought to make no distinction between one trade and another regarding things which are in the nature of tools and preliminary requirements. All ought to be placed, as far as possible, on the same footing, and I take it that much of the cause of complaint on the part of the honorable member for Maranoa has now been removed. If I remember rightly he built up his complaint principally on the ground that certain industries were

being specially treated, and he urged that such treatment should also be extended to wool-washing machinery.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Scouring machinery for use in woollen mills was free before.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Why it should be free when the machinery employed in other industries is taxed is beyond my comprehension. Why cannot the woollen industry, which has been highly protected, pay its fair quota to other industries which are making tools and machinery in the ordinary way? There are some industries for which we cannot do very much, even though we do our best in the direction of protection. We cannot assist the currier and tanner very much with duties, since he manufactures largely for export. Why, therefore, should we tax his tools of trade, when we exempt the tools of trade required in an industry peculiarly susceptible to the benefits of protection, whatever they may be? I hope the Treasurer will agree to treat all industries alike so far as their tools of trade are concerned. I am sure I can appeal to the sense of fairness of the honorable member for Maranoa not to press his views unduly if other trades are being treated exactly as the one in which he is interested. I have a suggestion to make in connexion with this series of items. I think that there ought to be a uniform duty imposed on tools of trade, and, personally I should not be prepared to make it more than 15 per cent.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—That would be simply a revenue duty.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—No, it would be slightly protective. I take it that it is a fundamental principle even with protectionists that tools of trade should as far as possible be free. No better evidence of that could be found than in the very full list of exemptions provided for already. A duty of 15 per cent. on these lines would be slightly protective, and I think sufficiently protective having regard to the class of articles in question. What I suggest is that we should make all these things subject to a uniform duty of 15 per cent., and that having done so we should strike out item 169, which appears to me to confer a very dangerous power on the Customs authorities. Under that item provision is made for the free admission of—

Tools of trade for the use of artisans and mechanics and tools in general use as prescribed by departmental by-laws.

I do not think we should put that power in the hands of the Customs authorities.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I am thoroughly opposed to taxing tools of trade that cannot be made here.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—So is every one else. Might I suggest to the Treasurer that he has all the power he needs under item 168?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—No, it might take twelve months to give effect to that provision. We should have to get a resolution passed through both Houses of Parliament.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I do not quite see how that could be. The Government control the business, they could bring down a resolution at any time they pleased, and it should not take twelve months or even twelve days to pass it through Parliament, unless the Ministry desired that it should take longer.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—My experience of Tariff debates teaches me otherwise.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I do not know what the honorable gentleman is referring to, but since he has made that statement I wish to reply to an insulting interjection made just now by the Government Whip, to the effect that if the House is to rise at Christmas the leader of the Opposition should be consulted and asked to say whether he would allow it. That is good, considering that the whole of yesterday's sitting was taken up entirely by speeches from honorable members on the Government side.

Mr. WATSON.—Honorable members in the corner opposite had a good deal to say.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK. — Really, I think the Government might try to keep their own side in order, that we may get through with the consideration of the Tariff in decent time. The talk from the other side has been interminable during the whole of this week, and that is why we have not made better progress. In the circumstances, it is idle for the Government Whip to suggest that honorable members on this side are obstructing business. I am making a suggestion which, if agreed to by the Treasurer, would save a day's debate on this very debatable item. I suggest that he should agree to a uniform duty on all tools of trade and machines which in their nature are tools of trade. The honorable gentleman has already agreed to take out of the schedule at the end of the Tariff, specially favoured industries. In accordance with the suggestion I have made, I am prepared now to move that the General Tariff duty

of 25 per cent. be left out with a view to inserting 15 per cent., with the understanding that that duty should be applied to all similar articles.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE. — The honorable member will not be able to get what he wants in that way.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Will the Treasurer state his objection to the proposal, and so save the time of the Committee?

Mr. SPENCE (Darling) [11.38].—It is refreshing to hear the honorable member for Parramatta advocating protection, or objecting to put anything on the free list. I think the honorable member is under some misconception, and is assuming that this wool-scouring machinery is associated only with the woollen industry. It is only in the out-back districts that very much wool-scouring is done at the present time. Owing to the fact that German and other continental buyers come into our markets and buy wool on the spot, very much less wool-scouring is done on the coast than used to be the case. It is in my electorate, and in the electorate of the honorable member for Maranoa, in districts 500 miles from the coast, that wool-scouring is chiefly carried on at the present time, in order to lessen the weight of the wool that must be taken to ports.

Mr. WATSON.—There is not as much wool-scouring done in those districts as there used to be.

Mr. SPENCE.—There is a great deal done at Coonamble, where there is a very large wool-scouring establishment, and also at Bourke. The wool-scouring done out back has increased, whilst it has decreased on the coast. Honorable members should remember that wool-scouring is not done by the big wool kings, but is an industry which in many cases is in the hands of working men, and is a large employer of bush labour. A good deal of the machinery used for wool-scouring may have been made locally, but some of the best is covered by patent rights, and could not be made here. There is a somewhat limited demand for it, and, therefore, its free admission would not interfere very much with the engineering trade. On the other hand, a high duty on it would put a considerable tax on an important industry that is already fairly heavily taxed through the great cost of taking the machinery long distances inland, especially in Queensland and New South Wales. The machines are practically the tools of trade of an industry

which gives considerable employment to labour in the back country, where the workers have few other advantages, and the Minister is right in proposing to put them on the free list.

Mr. COON (Batman) [11.42].—These machines are made here. The patentee is Mr. Hall, of my electorate. He has had the patent for the last thirty-eight years. I believe the patent has now run out. Messrs. Hall Bros. and Company have made 150 of the machines here. Previous to their competition the price of the imported machine was £750. To-day the price is £500—a reduction of £250 through the establishment of the local industry. I stand here as a protectionist and as an advocate for the farmer, so that he may get his machinery cheap. I want the primary producers to share in the benefits of a protectionist Tariff. That result can be achieved by imposing a duty on imported machinery of this character. If the duty is removed the importer, who sits in Collins-street, will send home for more machinery, and the price will be put up. The following testimonial was given by the manager for Mr. S. McCaughey, the wool king of Australia:—

Toorale Station, Bourke, N.S.W.

Messrs. Hall Bros. & Co.,
Clifton Hill, Melbourne.

Dear Sirs,

I have pleasure in testifying to the value of your wool-scouring machine. Your machines have been in use on Toorale and Dunlop stations for some (20) twenty years, and the fact that they have not been superseded by other machines that have been put on the market as improved machines since then, and also that the wool from these properties scoured with your machines sells to the highest price in the London wool market every year, speaks for itself. Any person going in for a scouring machine can't, in my opinion, go wrong by having Hall's.

Yours faithfully,

M. ROBINSON,
For S. McCaughey & Co.

Mr. PAGE.—What is the date of that letter?

Mr. COON.—The date is not given, but it is stated that the machines have been used on those stations for twenty years. The following is another testimonial, which comes from Queensland:—

Winton Wool Scouring and Machine
Shearing Co., Winton, Q'land.

Messrs. Hall Bros. & Co.
Dear Sirs,

I am pleased to say your machine is still doing excellent work. We put through 3,000

bales of scoured wool last season, nearly always topping the markets. Some of our scoured wool, T. C. Vindex, sold up to 2½d. in London, averaging 2½d. per lb.

Yours faithfully,
WINTON WOOL SCOURING CO.,
per W. S. Hutchinson.

Those letters are sufficient evidence that good machines can be made here. I have also shown that the local competition has reduced the price by £250. There is no reason why the article should be put on the free list. I saw the machine working this morning, and have with me samples of the wool, scoured and unscoured, which honorable members can see. If such excellent work can be done by locally-made machines I cannot understand why the Treasurer wants to put the article on the free list. Out of the £500 cost of the machine £350 goes in labour. I am certain that when the Treasurer knows that the machine is being made here, and is doing good work, and that the pastoralists are satisfied with it, he will not persist in his proposal.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS (Robertson) [11.48].—The machine referred to by the honorable member for Batman is, in all probability, a very good one, and cleans the wool well, but wool can be cleaned excellently with a stick. The cleaning will not give it quality. The fact that Mr. McCaughey's wool brings more in the London market than does any one else's only shows that his stations are more suitable for sheep-raising than are other stations. He grows on his runs some of the best wool in the world. That does not prove anything for the machine. There is, however, something to be said for the imported machines, which are the best articles for doing the work of the fellmonger. The fellmongering industry was once a very large one in Australia, but owing to the exportation of sheepskins it has fallen off, and, consequently, fewer machines are in use. If the cost of machinery for wool scouring is continually increased there will be still less done here. It is merely a question of whether wool can be more cheaply scoured here than in England, taking into consideration the loss of weight in the carriage of wool. I shall support the Treasurer's proposal to place the article upon the free list. The arguments urged in favour of that course last night are as strong to-day as they were then. The machinery for industries such as wool-scouring should be rendered as cheap as possible in order that the industries may expand.

I hope the Treasurer will adhere to his proposal, because, I think, he has shown a good deal of common sense in proposing to make this machine free. The best machine for this purpose is from England.

Mr. COON.—What machine is it?

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—There are several makers of wool-scouring machines in England, especially in Bradford, where more wool-scouring is done than in the whole of Australia. Those engaged in the industry of Australia ought to have an opportunity to test the imported machines along with the locally made machines, and to that end it is not advisable to impose a high duty. We have been told by the honorable member for Darling that a number of men are engaged in this business; and the cheaper the machinery is made the more employment will be afforded.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [11.52].—I am rather sorry that the Prime Minister has proposed to make any alteration in the grouping of this item. Probably, if he were aware of the facts of the case, he would not have given his word to the honorable member for Maranoa. Clear and positive evidence was given before the Tariff Commission to the effect that leather-making machines, and also wool-scouring machines, were made in Victoria on a commercial basis, and that a fair trade was gradually being built up; but some of the importing firms had resorted to cutting tactics in order to kill the local industry. On page 2296 of the Minutes of Evidence there appears a letter, in which one of the New South Wales importing firms intimate their intention to reduce prices for the present, in order to compete with local manufacturers. These machines are made by Messrs. Pullan and Company, of Queen's-parade, North Fitzroy, and Messrs. Hall Brothers, of Clifton Hill, and Mr. John Hope, of Abbotsford, manufacture them exclusively, showing how important the trade has become. I have here a letter from Messrs. Hall Brothers, in which it is stated—

We beg to advise you that we are the patentees and makers of Hall's patent machines. This is a superior type of machine.

Mr. PAGE.—There are machines vastly superior to the Hall machines.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—It is urged that it is not fair to exclude these tools of trade from the general list; but, at the same time, I am prepared to consider any proposed slight reduction in the duty.

Mr. WATSON.—There ought to be uniform treatment.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—All ought to be treated on a uniform basis—wool-scouring machines, woollen machines, and hat machines. There ought to be no picking and choosing in this connexion.

Mr. PAGE (Maranoa) [11.55].—I cannot understand some of the members of the Labour Party who object to this item being made free. Of course, the honorable member for Batman, the honorable member for Melbourne Ports, and the honorable member for Yarra are what I should call one-eyed protectionists; they cannot see any further than Melbourne or Victoria. I cannot understand the attitude of the honorable member for South Sydney, who, especially on the occasion of the last Tariff, has always been very amenable to reason.

Mr. WILKS.—He is a free horse now.

Mr. PAGE.—He always was a "free horse"—in fact, he is so free that he left the leadership of the Labour Party. There is no secret in that, because the honorable member has already admitted that his health broke down under the strain of the work. At any rate, I cannot understand the honorable member's present attitude, in view of the fact that he almost went into hysterics over the duties on piece-cotton goods. I shall never give a vote to impose unnecessary taxation on the masses. We have been told by the Treasurer that the freeing of these articles would mean a very large reduction in revenue; but revenue was not the consideration which caused him as an out-and-out protectionist, to propose these duties. Last night the honorable member for South Sydney recommended a revenue duty on these particular tools of trade of 15 per cent. Such a duty protectionists usually regard as merely revenue producing, though I suppose the honorable member for Batman would call a duty of 150 per cent. a revenue duty, if it put half-a-dozen men out of employment in Melbourne, and gave a job to half-a-dozen men in the bush of western Queensland.

Mr. McDougall.—Are not some of them Japanese and Germans?

Mr. PAGE.—I have never seen any Japanese in my constituency, and the Germans who are there are really good colonists. When I was working in western Queensland the machine in use for wool-scouring was Hall's.

Mr. TUDOR.—And a good machine, too.

Mr. PAGE.—No doubt Hall's machine has done good service, but, at the same time, it has been found necessary to trot out in its favour a testimonial twenty years' old. And that is what is wrong with some of the woollen mills; the machinery in use is twenty years old, and then it is wondered why they cannot compete with the outside world. Hall's machine was all right for the time being, but there are now improved machines on the market, particularly McNaught's machine, which is made in Bradford, England. That machine does twice as much work in twelve hours as the Hall machine does. I do not say that the English machine scours the wool any better, but it is more up-to-date.

Mr. WILKS.—How much does it cost—£500?

Mr. PAGE. — About that, I think. Most of the wool-scouring is done inland in Queensland, and when the machinery has been landed at Rockhampton, Brisbane, or Townsville, enormous railway freight has to be paid for its conveyance. Further, wool scouring provides employment for a great number of men after the shearing season has closed. If we impose an increased duty upon this class of machinery, there are many establishments in the western districts of Queensland which will be compelled either to use obsolete machinery or to cease operations. Some years ago, I heard a member of the party to which I belong advocate in this Chamber the imposition of an export duty upon greasy wool.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK. — His idea was that the operation of such a duty would force all greasy wool into our woollen mills.

Mr. PAGE.—I do not think that that was the idea underlying the suggestion. I know for a fact that the German buyers prefer to purchase greasy wool. During the past ten years a larger quantity of wool has been scoured in the Commonwealth than was previously scoured here. As a matter of fact, the quantity of wool scoured is increasing every year. I should like patent wool scouring machines to be placed on the free list. I fail to see why the wool industry should be penalized any more than is any other industry, seeing that it has to compete in the markets of the world.

Mr. WILKS (Dalley) [12.3].—I am opposed to the exemption from duty of

machine tools. When my fiscal principles were said to be a little bit "rocky" I was fighting for extending protection to the engineering industry. That industry has already received a very stiff measure of protection, and why should not a protective duty be levied upon the machinery which it uses?

Mr. PAGE.—We are now dealing with woollen machinery.

Mr. WILKS.—If this machinery could not be made in the Commonwealth I could understand honorable members urging that it should be exempt from duty. But it does not come within that category. Having fought for the engineering establishments, I must, in common fairness, consider the interests of the machine tool makers. I do not know of any particular firm in New South Wales which produces these machines, but that is no reason why a uniform rate should not be imposed upon them. The honorable member for Maranoa has opposed the Government proposal upon the ground that it will levy a tax upon the masses. But when we consider that these machines cost £500, surely it is patent that such an argument is devoid of substance.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—The honorable member must recollect that there are machines and machines.

Mr. WILKS.—I am quite aware of that. At a later stage I might just as reasonably put forward a plea to exempt from duty expensive engineering machines, costing £2,000 or £3,000 each, in the interests of a company like that of Mort's Dock. But I shall refuse to do so. The honorable member for Parramatta has adopted the common-sense view of this matter. He supports the imposition of a uniform rate. Uniform treatment should be meted out to all these industries, and I fail to see why one branch of an industry should be protected whilst another is not. If any honorable member proposes a duty of 15 per cent. or 20 per cent. upon these machine tools, I shall be found supporting him.

Mr. WATSON (South Sydney) [12.8].—I stated last night that I am in favour of uniform treatment being extended to all classes of machine tools, and I trust that the Committee will indorse that view.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—If the Treasurer would say that he will accept that suggestion debate upon this item would cease.

Mr. WATSON.—I understand that the Treasurer gave some pledge on the matter,

and I do not desire him to abandon it. In reply to the observations of the honorable member for Maranoa I wish to say that I have not abated one jot of my opposition to revenue duties. But the proposal of the honorable member is to make absolutely free articles which are being manufactured in Australia very extensively and satisfactorily.

Mr. PAGE.—That is not correct.

Mr. WATSON.—The proposal is to exempt from duty wool washing and wool scouring machinery. The honorable member desires to exempt one particular machine, but he must recollect that hard cases make bad laws. It would be unwise on our part to exempt only one particular machine. The proposal to exempt wool scouring machinery if carried would mean placing upon the free list machines which are being manufactured in Australia. As a protectionist I cannot subscribe to that principle. I want to see uniform treatment meted out to manufacturers so far as their tools of trade are concerned. I am willing to admit that a duty of 15 per cent. all round would not be much in the nature of a protective duty. But it is better than having a machine admitted free.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—There would be a good deal of protection on some of them.

Mr. WATSON.—There might be a fair amount of protection on some; but the protection on others would not amount to much. I would sooner give some degree of protection to the local manufacturers than put a large number of machines on the free list.

Mr. PAGE.—Will the honorable member vote for preference?

Mr. WATSON.—When the general duty is only 15 per cent., I shall not vote for preference. The only alternative to a uniform all-round duty on machine tools is to admit all machine tools free, and the Government, to be logical, should propose one course or the other. We have decided that a duty shall be charged on machines used by tanners, to which I did not object, although there are a number of tanneries in my district. But now the Government ask us to admit free of duty wool-scourers, some of which are manufactured here. I trust that the Committee will agree to an all round duty of 15 per cent. upon all kinds of machine tools, and to bring that about we should vote against the omission of wool-scouring machines from the dutiable list.

Mr. GLYNN (Angas) [12.13].—Last night I drew attention to the fact that many objections have been made to the classification of machine tools. My attention has been drawn to the very arbitrary classification adopted by the Department, under which tools which are regarded by the trade as all coming within the same category have been treated, some as dutiable, and some as free. Under item 167 the Department has power to issue by-laws declaring that certain machine tools should be free. I have here an enumeration of machine tools, all of the same class, and some of them actually used in the same machines, in regard to which the Department differentiates, making some dutiable and allowing others to come in free. I indorse the sensible suggestion of the honorable member for South Sydney that there should be an all-round low duty, and I suggest that there should be a common definition of machine tools. We should not proceed by enumeration. We might define machine tools as tools which are worked by power instead of by hand.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—We should require a big exemption list.

Mr. GLYNN.—My suggestion accords with the statements of witnesses before the Tariff Commission. Mr. Pearson made the same suggestion, and a large importing firm has pointed out to me that a designation which would cover all machine tools should be adopted.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The question is whether we should not get a more favorable result by imposing a small all-round duty than by differentiating.

Mr. GLYNN.—I shall support the lowest rates proposed. I understand that many machine tools which are very effective and economical—some of them very delicate—are not manufactured in the Commonwealth. These tools, especially such as are driven by pneumatic power, are largely used by the smaller engineering establishments, in which it is found too expensive to use steam motive power. Some of these tools are covered by patents, so that they could not be made here, and any duty imposed on them will amount to a specific tax on production. I hope that the Minister will consider the advisability of imposing a low all-round duty, if these tools are not to be admitted free, and of determining upon some principle of differentiation.

Mr. BAMFORD (Herbert) [12.15].—I wish to defend myself from the charge of

inconsistency made by the honorable member for Maranoa. When he spoke of an export duty on wool exported in the grease, I said, "Hear, hear." I wish to say that I thoroughly indorse that suggestion. The honorable member treated my interjection, assenting to an export duty on wool, as inconsistent, and he went on to say that a great deal of the wool exported from Australia is now locally scoured. The honorable member for Parramatta interjected that the desire was to get the greasy wool manufactured in Australia. I regard that as a very laudable desire, though, under present conditions, there is not much hope of getting a great deal of it manufactured here. But there is no reason why the bulk of it should not be scoured here, and if we put a high duty on the machinery used in the various processes of scouring, those who manufacture such machinery will establish works here, because this is the largest wool-producing country in the world. I know, of my own knowledge, that the largest manufacturing concern in the world contemplates establishing in Sydney, in the immediate future, large manufacturing works—that is, provided that certain duties are agreed to. I am not at liberty to make the name of the firm public; but I will give it to any honorable member who asks me for it.

Mr. PAGE.—Is it a machinery-making firm?

Mr. BAMFORD.—Yes.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—Interested persons will promise anything.

Mr. BAMFORD.—The firm is negotiating for, if it has not already purchased, a site on which to erect works. Other firms will follow its example. The inconsistency of honorable members amuses me, because, although I do not say much, I listen carefully to what is said. To impose a duty on harvesters, corn shellers, and similar machinery, and to put machinery, such as is now under discussion on the free list, is grossly inconsistent.

Mr. PAGE.—The machinery which I mentioned cannot be manufactured here commercially.

Mr. BAMFORD.—If high duties are imposed, the manufacturers will establish works here. Besides, the honorable member for Batman proved that machines equally good can be manufactured here. A machine used by a firm like McCaughey and Company, the largest sheep-owners in Australia, should be good enough for any one.

Mr. PAGE.—So far as station scouring is concerned, it does not matter whether the process takes a month or three months; but the man whose business is scouring wishes to get the work done as soon as possible.

Mr. BAMFORD.—That does not affect my argument. In reply to what has been said about freights, I ask how much more would it cost to send an imported machine from Rockhampton inland than to send a locally made machine. The freights would be identical. I am sorry that the Ministry should make promises without due consideration. All machines should be treated alike. If one machine which can be made locally is placed on the free list, all similar machines should be admitted free. It is intended to place other machines affecting other industries on the free list, but I shall vote against those proposals just as I shall vote against the proposal of the honorable member for Maranoa.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN (Calare) [12.20].—I propose to support the proposal of the Minister, and I hope that the deputy leader of the Opposition will not persist in his objection to our getting wool-scouring machines, and as many other articles of that kind as possible, placed on the free list.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Which will give the better result—to put those articles, and others, on the 25 per cent. list, or to bring the duty on all down to 15 per cent.?

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—The honorable gentleman, if he is the clear-seeing man that I take him to be, and understands the temper of the Committee, will realize that, if he cannot get wool-scouring machines put on the free list, he will not get them put on the 15 per cent. list.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I do not know about that.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—I am endeavouring to get as many tools of trade as I possibly can made duty free or put on the 15 per cent. list, and because I cannot get all the items enumerated free, I am not going to object to wool-scouring machines being free. The honorable member for South Sydney has urged that all tools of trade and mechanisms for assistance to trades should be treated on a uniform basis, and subjected to a certain amount of taxation. That sounds very nice, but I think the honorable member will find that when his theory is practically applied a number of his protectionist compatriots will be as

strongly against its application as any free-trade members will be favourable. Again, I must congratulate the pioneers and workers out-back in having discovered a new friend in the honorable member for Batman. It has been claimed by him that under a 12½ per cent. duty a reduction in the price of machinery to one man in the back country has been made to the amount of £250. What the farmer and working man out-back would like to know is what further reduction a 25 per cent. duty would bring about, and at what particular stage the magic in which the honorable member believes would give them free machines all round. That is a line of reasoning which the honorable member must carry to its logical conclusion to see that it is not the Tariff altogether which determines the reduction in the price of machinery. There are other conditions which apply, and those conditions have operated to such an extent with all kinds of machines—the manufacture of which cost a certain sum fifteen or twenty years ago—that there has been an all-round reduction, irrespective of the Tariff which has been imposed by this House. That will operate in the future as it has done in the past. Where new labour-saving appliances have been applied to the production of machines, and the cost of labour and material has been reduced, the result has been a reduction in the prices, quite irrespective of the Tariff. A duty affects the price of an article by increasing the cost to the consumer. Otherwise, it is of no benefit to the manufacturer. It is claimed that it is more profitable to export wool in a greasy state to the seat of manufacture, and have it scoured there, than to have it submitted to a scouring process here and then re-submitted to another process.

Mr. STORRER.—We all know that.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—That argument has been put forward. Apparently a number of honorable members have not fully realized the changes which have been brought about. Take the far-back country, such as the Maranoa electorate, where the product has to be carried for hundreds of miles by bullock or horse teams to the nearest railway station. There is a large quantity of wool which is inferior in that it is short. It is so loaded with dirt that, unless it is cleansed on the spot, it is a lost product.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—It generally is treated on the spot.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—In the far back country, I have seen sheds where large quantities of that kind of wool have been thrown out in heaps until such time as mechanical contrivances are brought along and enable it to be properly treated. That is done with the assistance of wool-scouring machines, and men are profitably employed in the process. The honorable member for Maranoa has pleaded with the Minister to assist that form of industry by allowing the machines to be imported as cheaply as possible. I remind the Committee that the men who are engaged in this industry have to compete with Germany, France, and other producing centres, and that their wages and returns are determined by that open competition. They cannot derive any benefit from a protectionist policy. If honorable members levied a duty of 100 per cent. on wool, it would not benefit those persons by one iota. The product has to be sold in outside centres. There is another point which I think ought to appeal to the Committee very strongly. When framing the old Tariff, it was decided that wool-scouring machines should be placed on a 12½ per cent. list, but the very same Committee decided that the cod-dled manufacturing interests of Australia, particularly of Victoria, should have certain lines of machinery put on the free list, despite the fact that they could be made here. That principle has been indorsed by this Committee. So that at the present time the big woollen mills of Melbourne and elsewhere can freely import wool-scouring machines for use in their factories. If a squatter or settler requires a machine to assist him to prepare his wool clip for the market, to turn an unmarketable commodity into a marketable one, the protectionists clap a duty of 12½ per cent. on his machine, and now it is proposed to raise the duty to 25 per cent. in the general Tariff, and 20 per cent. in the preferential Tariff. Where is the justice in that kind of Tariff reform? If the Committee has any sense of justice at all it will assist the Minister to put wool-scouring machines on the free list in the interests of not only the Victorian wool manufacturers, but also the men struggling in the way-back districts of the Commonwealth to develop its resources.

Mr. PAGE (Maranoa) [12.31].—Mr. Wilks, I am sorry that you are in the chair this morning, because I want to reply to

a remark which you made about a wool-scouring machine being in every home in the western portion of New South Wales.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. WILKS).—The honorable member need not restrict his remarks.

Mr. PAGE.—It is well known that a man does not want to cart a wool-scouring machine about on his back. A wool-scouring plant, if erected in any town in western Queensland, would make many homes bright, and give a chance to the nomad to settle down and become a respectable citizen. In western Queensland the nomad has not the opportunity of settling down that he has in Melbourne and Sydney. He cannot go home every night to his wife and family. In many instances he has to follow the sheds round through the seasons, and he does not see his family from one end of the year to the other; he has to follow up his nomadic employment. The establishment of a wool-scouring industry in a town would give him a chance to settle down there, and add to the population, sending his children to school.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—Is this a population question?

Mr. PAGE.—It is all very well for the honorable member to talk about this being a population question.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—I did not.

Mr. PAGE.—Was the duty on salt a population question? I remember seeing the honorable member standing in his place and shedding crocodile tears about the poor farmer having, during the bad times, to take his horse and dray and go out to collect salt. But I shall not pursue that line of remark. The honorable member for Batman had the cool effrontery to get up here this morning and say that he is a representative of the pastoralist and the farmer. I wonder how many pastoralists, farmers, and selectors are to be found in the great city of Collingwood. If there are any pastoralists, selectors, and farmers in the honorable member's constituency, they have retired from business. The rest of the people there simply make money out of our producers. If it were not for our farmers, selectors, and pastoralists, Collingwood would be no more than a run for pigs. The reason why I feel so strongly on this point is that the most unfair proposition I ever heard of in my life was made by the Government in the first instance in regard to these machines. As the Tariff was introduced,

machines for scouring wool had to pay 25 and 20 per cent. duty. But the woollen mills of Melbourne and Sydney, whose managers could get the ear of the Government, were allowed to import the self-same machines duty free. I have no objection to machines that can be made in the Commonwealth being taxed, but these particular machines cannot be made commercially in Australia. They are patented. That is why I am so eager to have them placed on the free list. The honorable member for South Sydney said that Mr. McCaughey had one of these machines on his station. That may be so. But on such stations it is not very important whether the machines scour the wool in a week or in a month. They do not mind so long as they get the wool scoured in time for the next sales. But persons who undertake this work by contract want to get rid of it as quickly as possible. Those who go in for the latest machinery are worthy of applause. By imposing a high duty on these machines, we are simply barring the path of progress. If I cannot get the machines placed on the free list, I ask honorable members to make the duty as small as they possibly can.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [12.40].—This debate has taken a turn which I hardly expected. Some time ago I had a conversation with the honorable member for Maranoa, who pointed out to me that wool-scouring machines for use in the woollen mills were admitted free, whilst machines of the same character used for scouring wool in wool-sheds were charged duty. I thought that was a serious anomaly, and told the honorable member that all these machines should be placed upon the same basis. That is why I have moved the amendment.

Mr. PAGE. — The Minister has carried out his promise.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The schedule at the end of the Tariff contains the words—

Rebate for Home consumption—machinery and parts thereof used in the manufacture of fibrous materials and felt, and felt hats, when installed for use in a woollen mill or a hat factory for the manufacture of such materials, felts and hats—rebate, the full duty paid.

That was not made so explicit in the Tariff of 1902, but the rebate was allowed departmentally. There seems to be a strong desire that this machinery should

not be treated differently from other machinery, but that all should be dutiable. I regret very much that the Committee has not agreed to all the duties as proposed by the Government, and that the duty on machinery is not as high as I had hoped it would be. But this question is very far-reaching, though the sum of money involved is not large. For instance, the imports of machine tools amount to £125,000 a year. The duty paid is not much. There will not be much loss of revenue from the reduction proposed to be made. It is not a very important matter either from a protectionist or revenue point of view. To save a long discussion, it is just as well that an arrangement should be made. The honorable member for Maranoa has very generously relieved me from the promise which I made to him, because I should have felt bound, even if my proposal had been defeated, to fight it for him if he had insisted. As he has relieved me, and as it is the general feeling that an average duty of 15 per cent. should be placed upon these goods, I shall ask leave to withdraw my amendment. It has been proposed that the duty shall be 15 per cent. all round.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—On both paragraphs A and B?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Yes, because it is impossible to separate them. I feel that it is of no use for me to go on with my proposal in the face of an adverse majority.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—The Treasurer would get a good deal more revenue out of what is proposed than out of his own proposal.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not care a two-penny dump about revenue in regard to this item.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—It will mean £100,000 a year.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not think that it will mean nearly as much. The A section of the Tariff Commission recommended a duty of 20 per cent. on the items under consideration. The B section recommended a duty of 10 per cent. As there does not seem to be any chance of the Government getting what they desire, I do not propose to proceed with my amendment.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Do the Minister's remarks apply to machine tools also?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Yes.

Amendment (Sir WILLIAM LYNE's), by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. JOHNSON (Lang) [12.49].—I understand that there is a proposal to make

the duty 15 per cent. I have been asked to move the omission of the words "Machinery for the manufacture of paper and for felting." This request comes from a manufacturer.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I am not going to agree to any other alteration of any kind. I expect the Committee to support me since I have given way to the extent I have indicated.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Perhaps the Treasurer will not object to my reading what the manufacturer has so say before he decides whether or not he should agree to my proposal. A manufacturer of cardboard boxes and other goods writes that item 166, "Machinery for the manufacture of paper and for felting"—

has probably been suggested by the Strawboard Trust for two reasons, viz.—

1. So that they can say, "We have to pay 25 per cent. on our machinery, and, therefore, should have a prohibitive duty on strawboard."
2. So as to frighten any possible competitor from starting a paper mill. They have their machinery for paper-making already, and, therefore, would have no duty to pay; whereas if, say, a new firm started to make brown paper they would have to pay from £2,000 to £3,000 duty on their machinery.

In this connexion it is interesting to note that strawboard lining machinery is on the free list under Customs by-law "Paper finishing, &c." because, I suppose, the Strawboard Trust is thinking of importing another lining machine; while, on the other hand, it has all the paper-making machinery that it needs, and wants to block possible competitors. I do hope that you will put these lines on the free list. They are, of course, not made in Australia.

I promised to bring this matter before the Treasurer, but since he states that he absolutely declines to omit any of these machines from the item, I suppose it is useless for me to press it.

Mr. WYNNE (Balaclava) [12.54].—I hope that the Treasurer will have no objection to meat-slicing machines being included in this item. They are a Dutch patent, and cannot be manufactured in Australia. These machines are used by tradesmen to slice bacon and like commodities, and motives of cleanliness should induce us to encourage their use rather than knives for such a purpose. If they are not included in the item they will come under the heading of general machinery.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—We shall have power to exempt them under item 168.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [12.55].—Is the Treasurer prepared to insert a

further line dealing with machinery for fibrous materials and felt, and providing for a duty of 15 per cent.? If that course be not adopted such machinery will be dutiable at 25 per cent.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I am having a line prepared.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—I should like the Treasurer to consult the Comptroller-General as to the advisableness of including in paragraph B machine tools of certain sizes. At present certain machines and machine tools from sizes $\frac{3}{4}$ -inch to 12 inches are included in the item, and I should like to know how machines beyond that size are to be dealt with.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—When I was replying to the honorable member for North Sydney, I meant my remarks to apply only to the items before "metal working." I shall have to consider what is to be done with the others.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—I think it would be advisable, in the circumstances, to eliminate the limitations of sizes; otherwise machine tools and machines above the sizes named would fall under paragraph A.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [12.57].—I should like the Minister to consider the suggestion made last night by the honorable member for South Sydney in regard to printing machinery. I recognise that there is some reason for imposing a lower duty on such machinery than on machinery of other kinds, since there is no protection given to the printing and bookbinding trade by the exclusion of books and so forth. Would it not be desirable to subject printing and bookbinding machinery to this rate of duty?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—They are not in this list.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON. — But would it not be advisable to include them?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I shall consider the matter.

Mr WEBSTER (Gwydir) [12.58].—I have listened with some attention to the discussion of this important item in the Tariff, and fail to understand the position into which honorable members have allowed themselves to drift. Honorable members seem to be dealing with this item from the point of view, not of whether or not it is desirable to impose a duty, but of whether we can include all machine tools in the item and subject them to the duty, with a view to securing more

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—That is not my object.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Our effort is to prevent any inequality.

Mr. WEBSTER.—Is it reasonable to impose a duty of 15 per cent. on machines which cannot be made here, and the prices of which, therefore, cannot be regulated by local competition?

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—To what machines does the honorable member refer?

Mr. WEBSTER.—Many machines mentioned in this item can be made in Australia. If they cannot, they should not be subjected to a duty of 15 per cent. No protectionist, worthy of the name, should attempt to raise revenue in this wholesale fashion by imposing a duty of 15 per cent., which is a revenue, rather than a protective impost. The discussion which has taken place with regard to the machinery mentioned by the honorable member for Maranoa should convince the Treasurer that it is unwise to indicate to any honorable member that he sympathizes with some object that he has in view.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I was merely asked what I intended to do in reference to this machinery.

Sitting suspended from 1.1 to 2.15 p.m.

Mr. PAGE (Maranoa) [2.15].—I wish to ask the Treasurer to say what can be introduced under the term "artesian boring machines"? My constituents are very much interested in artesian boring, and I should like to know what the term covers?

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON. — Does it include the diamonds?

Mr. PAGE. — There are numerous makes of artesian boring machines, and I wish to know what can be introduced under this item?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The whole of the machinery for boring.

Mr. PAGE.—Would it include the engine and belting used in driving the machinery?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—No, it would not include the engine.

Mr. PAGE. — I wish to have a statement by the Treasurer as to what the term really covers recorded in *Hansard* for future reference.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I cannot describe every part of an artesian boring machine.

Mr. PAGE.—I do not wish the honorable gentleman to do so.

Mr. STORRER.—The term would cover artesian boring machines, but not the motive power used in driving them.

Mr. PAGE.—That is a haphazard interpretation of the term. Suppose, for instance, that a diamond drill used for boring for coal struck a flow of artesian water, would the people of the district be at liberty to use the same drill in boring for artesian water?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Diamond drills are not included.

Mr. PAGE.—They can be used for boring for artesian water, and have been so used in western Queensland.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The item would not cover the cutting parts of the machine.

Mr. PAGE.—The more the Minister says, the more complicated the matter becomes. I want to know just what the item would cover?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Let the gentleman who has been asking the honorable member to put these questions put them in writing.

Mr. PAGE.—That is not fair. As God is my judge, no one has spoken to me about the matter. I happen to know what I am talking about, since artesian boring is in full swing in my constituency. There is more artesian boring done in my constituency, and in the Kennedy electorate, than in the whole of the rest of Australia. If I do not make some effort to safeguard the interests of my constituents, of what use am I here? I want to have some interpretation of the term "artesian boring machines" on record, in order that my constituents may have no trouble in connexion with the importation of this machinery. I hope the Treasurer will not think that any one has been getting at me in connexion with the matter.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—They have tried to get at me already.

Mr. PAGE.—I want the information for which I have asked, and I assure the Treasurer that it is gospel truth that no one has spoken to me on the subject.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [2.26].—The application for a duty on these artesian boring tools came from New South Wales.

Mr. PAGE.—I want to know what the item would cover.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—I will inform the honorable member if he has patience. A Mr. Overall, who is a manufacturer of these tools in New South Wales, was heard by the Commission with respect to artesian boring tools, machinery, and plant, and he said that the industry was in a languishing condition owing to the want of sufficient protection and consequent excessive importa-

tions. Mr. Overall and a Mr. Thomson joined in the request that the duty should be from 15 per cent. to 20 per cent. on boring tools, including jars, bits, under-rimers, fishing tools, boxes, and pins, sinkers, and sand pumps. The item has nothing to do with the motive power, but merely with boring tools.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—It does not include the particular part of the machine that does the cutting. It does not include the diamond.

Mr. PAGE.—The honorable member for Bendigo has just said that it includes bits.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—Our recommendation is confined to artesian-boring tools, and we think that they should be dutiable at 20 per cent., whilst we think wire rope and casings should be free.

Mr. PAGE.—What I want to know from the Minister is what is to be free, and what is to be dutiable.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—The wire rope is free, but I am not sure about the casings.

Mr. PAGE.—I want to know about the casings.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Casing is not machinery.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—That is quite true. The tools include the items I have just enumerated.

Mr. PAGE (Maranoa) [2.23].—I am not objecting to the duty proposed, but I do wish to know what the item will cover. I want to know exactly what the Treasurer means by artesian-boring machines. The Chairman of the Tariff Commission has stated that it would cover almost everything connected with artesian bores.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—We are dealing only with the tools.

Mr. PAGE.—This is a most peculiar position, and apparently every member of the Committee can give me information on the subject with the exception of the honorable gentleman in charge of the Tariff.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—And I am not going to be drawn to introduce anything that may not be exactly classed as boring tools.

Mr. PAGE.—I have no wish to trap the honorable gentleman, but surely the Committee is entitled to know what he intends shall be covered by the term "artesian boring machines." The honorable gentleman has said that it would not cover casing. I want the information for which I am seeking for the benefit of my

constituents, and I shall get it before this item goes through if I have to stay here for a week.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I cannot give it to the honorable member. I am not going to bind the Department.

Mr. PAGE.—Every other member of the Committee appears to be able to give the information.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Other members of the Committee have not the responsibility which I should have if I recorded an opinion on the subject in *Hansard*.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—The honorable member cannot expect the Minister to enumerate all the parts of the machine. The honorable gentleman has said that the item does not include casing.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—It does not include the motive power, the casing, or the actual bits.

Mr. FRAZER.—The only thing left is the rod.

Mr. PAGE.—The rods and the rope are about the only things left.

Mr. WATSON.—The term would not include the motive power for driving the machinery.

Mr. PAGE.—I have seen hundreds of bores put down. The turning of the rods is done by hand.

Mr. WATSON.—Does the honorable member mean to say that a 3,000-foot bore is sunk by hand?

Mr. PAGE.—I am talking about the turning of the rods, and the honorable member is thinking of the working of the jars. The one is turning, and the other is sinking. I intend to stop here until I get the information for which I have asked. The Treasurer has not said whether the rods used would be duty free or not. Are the wire rope and the shackles used in connexion with artesian boring to be free? I have said that I do not wish to trap the Minister, but I should be told exactly what would be admitted free and what would have to pay duty. If any of the appliances used in connexion with artesian boring can be made in Australia, I am prepared to assist the Minister in imposing a duty upon them, but I wish to help my constituents by letting them know what they will have to pay duty on, and what they can import duty free.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS (Robertson) [2.26].—I do not know what all the fuss is about. The matter appears to me to be as clear as daylight. The term covers everything used in connexion with artesian bor-

ing that is not specially classified. We do not want a list as long as from here to Christmas of the various articles required in boring. Shackles were mentioned, and they are used for many purposes as well as for artesian bores. Rods and wire ropes have also been mentioned, and they are used for a thousand and one purposes.

Mr. COON (Batman) [2.27].—I should like to correct a statement made by the honorable member for Maranoa with respect to wool scouring machines. I know of a case in which an imported and an Australian machine are being worked side by side, and the Australian machine is doing double the quantity of work done by the imported machine. The Minister proposes a duty of 15 per cent., and I thought the Chairman of the Tariff Commission would have had something to say about the evidence on the matter before the Commission.

Mr. PAGE.—I never questioned the fact that these machines were made here.

Mr. COON.—The witnesses examined by the Commission asked for a 30 per cent. duty.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—Let us get along.

Mr. COON.—The country has had to pay for the inquiry which the Tariff Commission made into these matters, and we should take some notice of the evidence collected by the Commission. It shows that previous to Federation a manufacturer of these machines was employing sixty men, whilst under the 12½ per cent. duty he is employing only ten.

Mr. HEDGES.—What manufacturer does the honorable member refer to?

Mr. COON.—Pullan and Co., of Melbourne.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Of course there could be no other reason but the low duty for the reduction of the number of men employed.

Mr. COON.—That was the reason given by the manufacturer. A manufacturer in Brisbane also gave evidence on the subject. Why should the rate be reduced to 15 per cent.? Machinery is lying idle in my electorate in connexion with this industry, and the place is practically closed down. The Committee should have some information from the Chairman of the Tariff Commission on this item. A large amount of evidence was given about it, but none of it has been quoted so far in this debate. If the duty has the effect of reducing prices, and of giving employment, why should we reduce it? Why say to the

people who ask for 30 and 25 per cent., "We will give you only 15 per cent.?" Why have the Government come down from their original proposition? If the Government agree to a revenue duty, which will give no protection, the result will be to put up the prices of machines and tools used in connexion with various industries. A high protective Tariff, which encourages local competition, will reduce prices. The price of one boot-making machine when there was no local competition was £70. As soon as the local competition took place it was reduced to £50. In addition, the American trust stated that they were prepared to supply their machines at 20 per cent. less. I gave an illustration earlier in the sitting of local competition reducing the price of wool-scouring machines by £250. In New Zealand, the duty is 20 per cent. against Great Britain, and 30 per cent. against the foreigner. We should have the same rates here. I am surprised at the Government climbing down as they have done.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—In New Zealand the rate is 20 per cent. on a few items, while others are free.

Mr. FRAZER (Kalgoorlie) [2.34].—I understand that there is an agreement for a general duty of 15 per cent. on this item. That appears to be quite sufficient, but I take this opportunity of pointing out the extraordinary position occupied by some honorable members. In the case of machinery for the mining industry, which is one of the great primary interests of Australia, a number of apparent prohibitionists were not prepared to go below duties of 25 per cent. in the general Tariff and 20 per cent. as against Great Britain. Some honorable members fought for even higher duties, but when it is a question of machinery for secondary industries, they regard 15 per cent. as sufficient, especially in the case of those allegedly important and highly technical machines for tanning hides or making hats, or for use in woollen mills. I think that one industry should be put upon the same basis as another as regards the duties on its machinery. There is nothing highly technical in the manufacture of the machines included in this item as compared with some intricate mining machinery, yet an extraordinary preference is given to one industry over another. That preference, moreover, is given to industries which already receive considerable assistance from the Tariff by protection on the commodities which they produce.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—I understand that the Government have accepted the amendment.

Mr. FRAZER.—I believe that they have, and I admit that that seems to settle the question, but an explanation ought to be given why 25 per cent. and 20 per cent. duties are imposed on the machinery of a great primary industry which can receive no direct benefit from the Tariff, while there is such an extraordinary anxiety to reduce to 15 per cent. the duty on machinery for secondary industries, which certainly can be made in this country. With the natural protection in the case of all the articles included in this item, excepting, perhaps, some of the boring machinery, 15 per cent. is ample, but it will be necessary for some of those who voted for a 25 per cent. duty on other machinery to show special reasons why they should vote for 15 per cent. in this case. There seems to be a certain amount of mystery, so far as the Treasurer is concerned, surrounding artesian boring machines, but outside of the motive power, rods, bit, and cable of a boring machine, what remains? They are not very technical, but if they are not being produced commercially in Australia they might well be placed on the free list, because it is very much more important to Australia to encourage artesian boring in arid districts than it is to have two or three men engaged in a factory near one of the big cities. Immense areas of arid land could be utilized by the discovery of artesian water, and that would mean thousands of pounds to Australia. Motive-power machines have already been dealt with under the n.e.i. division in a previous item, and I suppose that five men would be able to produce all the rods, cables, or bits needed in Australia. If they cannot be commercially manufactured here, they ought to be on the free list, and not subject to a duty of 15 per cent., although in regard to the rest of the item I do not feel disposed to vote for a lower duty than 15 per cent. At the same time, there is no necessity to make the duty any higher than 15 per cent.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [2.40].—The honorable member for Kalgoorlie is continually accusing honorable members of voting in different ways on different kinds of machinery, but the machinery under this item is not in the same category as that which the honorable member refers to. Any one who votes for

a 15 per cent. duty on this item should not be considered inconsistent because he has voted for duties of 25 and 20 per cent. on previous items.

Mr. FRAZER.—Why are they not in the same category?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—These are far smaller matters. One cannot compare a pin with an engine.

Mr. FRAZER.—Yesterday a number of honorable members regarded a nail as equal to a thousand-horse-power engine.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The honorable member has occupied a great deal of time in connexion with machinery. If this delay is to continue, there is not the slightest chance of getting the Tariff through in a reasonable time. I am sure that honorable members do not want to be called back about the middle of January to resume the consideration of the Tariff. It is a case of "Harp, harp, harp." Honorable members must do one thing or the other. Great progress must be made during the rest of the week, or it will not be possible to go much further.

Mr. FRAZER.—The Minister will not influence me to rush the Tariff through by a threat of longer sittings. I shall be no party to slumming.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—If honorable members are going to obstruct simply because they cannot get their own way, we shall never get the Tariff through in twelve months or two years. I cannot get my own way in many things, but I have had to submit. I propose to ask the Committee to leave out the asterisk and the foot-note which have been several times referred to, and to insert after the words "machinery for scouring and washing wool," the words "machinery and parts thereof used in the manufacture and treatment of fibrous materials and felt and felt hats." I understood that it was the desire of the Committee to strike out the rebate provisions appearing at the end of the Tariff, and to include all this class of machinery under one item. There has since been a proposal to add machines required in the manufacture of tops.

Mr. WATSON.—Would the machines referred to for the manufacture of fibrous materials cover woollen manufactures, or are they confined to flax making?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The intention is to cover the items mentioned in the Bounties Bill.

Mr. WATSON.—I think that more than those items will be covered.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I think so; and unless further complications are to be created, the proposal must be amended. There seems to be a desire to have a uniform duty of 15 per cent., though, personally, I think that desire is, perhaps, a mistake. A great number of these items were free in the old Tariff, while others bore a duty of 12½ per cent. The A division of the Tariff Commission recommended a duty of 20 per cent., while the B division recommended, in certain cases, 10 per cent., and, in other cases, 15 per cent. Evidently there is a feeling that, as I say, there ought to be a uniform duty of 15 per cent.; and in order to save time, that might as well be accepted. So far as the machines mentioned by the honorable member for Batman are concerned, those interested in the manufacture have no ground of complaint, except that the duty that will be imposed is not so high as that proposed by the Government. At the same time, the duty which the Committee seem to desire is higher than that in the old Tariff. The proposal now is to make all dutiable at 15 per cent.

Mr. WYNNE.—A good average!

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not believe in averages in these cases. It will be necessary to first move that the asterisk be struck out, so as to eliminate the foot-note "Subject to rebate under the conditions specified in the schedule hereto." I move—

That the asterisk, paragraph A, be left out.

Mr. CHANTER (Riverina) [2.50].—I do not rise for the purpose of discussing the item, but in order to make a personal explanation at the earliest possible moment. When the honorable member for Fawcner was dealing with item 150, he quoted some letters in which it was stated that the discs or plates used in connexion with disc ploughs and harrows were not made in Australia. I challenged the honorable member's statement, and said that these articles were made by a gentleman whose name I gave at the time, and who carries on business at Finley, in the State of New South Wales. I find, however, that I was misinformed. I have been in communication with the gentleman, and he writes that, while it is true he manufactures disc ploughs and harrows, the discs or plates are imported.

Mr. HEDGES.—Everybody knew that but the honorable member!

Mr. CHANTER.—The honorable member is not quite fair. When there are advertisements, such as that I now hold in my hand, declaring that the patents are held by the manufacturers, and thus leading to the belief that the whole machine is made by them, the conclusion at which I arrived is a very natural one. I have no desire that the Committee should remain under any misapprehension so far as this manufacturer is concerned; and, if his statement be correct, I suggest that an opportunity should be afforded to reconsider the item, with a view to placing the discs or plates on the free list.

Mr. FAIRBAIRN (Fawknor) [2.53].—I am glad to hear the manly explanation of the honorable member for Riverina; and I hope that his suggestion to recommit item 150 will be accepted by the Treasurer. The articles referred to are admittedly not made in the Commonwealth; and to retain the duty would simply increase the prices of ploughs and harrows which are very largely used by agriculturists.

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) proposed—

That after the word "wool," paragraph A, the words "Machinery and parts thereof used in the manufacture and treatment of fibrous materials and felt and felt hats" be inserted.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I understand that this amendment will dispose altogether of the provision for rebates?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—No; I shall have to move the omission of that part of the schedule to which the honorable member refers.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON. (North Sydney) [2.55].—I desire to draw the Treasurer's attention to what I think is an error in connexion with the proposed duty on pneumatic hammers. It was not intended, under the old Tariff nor, do I think, in this, that hand pneumatic hammers should be made dutiable. These patent hand hammers are not made in Australia, and, under the by-laws, ought to be free as machine tools for metal working, caulking, chipping, and riveting. As the item appears now, however, these hand pneumatic hammers are made dutiable under the all-embracing words "pneumatic hammers," Steam hammers, where the steam operates within the tool, are allowed in free, while other steam hammers are dutiable.

I suggest that after the words "pneumatic hammers" the words "other than hand pneumatic hammers" be inserted.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I have no objection to offer to the suggestion.

Amendments (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) proposed—

That after the words "25 per cent," paragraph A, the words, "and on and after 29th November, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff) 15 per cent." be inserted; and

That after the words "20 per cent.," paragraph A, the words "and on and after 29th November, 1907, ad val. (United Kingdom) 15 per cent.," be inserted.

Mr. MALONEY (Melbourne) [2.58].—Mr. James, a manufacturer of tools, formerly employed a great number of men and did some very important work, but, under the operation of the present duties, his business has almost disappeared. In my opinion, a duty of 15 per cent. is much too low.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Probably the honorable member was not present when it was arranged to compromise, and thus save a long debate, by imposing a uniform duty of 15 per cent.

Amendments agreed to.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That the asterisk, paragraph B, be left out.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [3.1].—I move—

That the words "blowers for foundry and mining purposes," paragraph B, be left out.

I intend at a later stage to move after the words "artesian boring tools, n.e.i." the insertion of a new line, which will include the articles which I now propose to eliminate. They will thus still be dutiable at 15 per cent.

Mr. JOHNSON (Lang) [3.2].—I presume that it is intended to strike out the foot-note, "Subject to rebate under the conditions specified in the schedule hereto." Otherwise, the effect of the omission of the asterisk will be that instead of the foot-note applying to a particular item it will apply to the whole of the items on this page.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I consulted the Chairman upon that point, and he informed me that the effect of omitting the asterisk would be to nullify the foot-note.

The CHAIRMAN.—It appears to me that the foot-note was intended to refer only to that portion of the item which was immediately preceded by the asterisk.

Seeing that the asterisk has been omitted, the foot-note cannot apply to any of these items.

Mr. JOHNSON.—It seems to me that in the absence of the asterisk the foot-note may be taken to apply to the whole of the items on the page.

Amendment agreed to.

Amendments by (Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That after the words "pneumatic hammers," paragraph B, the words "other than hand pneumatic hammers" be inserted.

That after the words "Artesian boring tools n.e.i.," paragraph B, the following new line be inserted, "Blowers n.e.i."

That after the words "25 per cent.," paragraph B, the words "and on and after 29th November, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff) 15 per cent." be inserted.

That after the words "20 per cent.," paragraph B, the words "and on and after 29th November, 1907, ad val. (United Kingdom) 15 per cent." be inserted.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Postponed item 167 (Machine tools) agreed to.

Postponed item 171. Manufactures of metal n.e.i. ad val. (General Tariff) 30 per cent., (United Kingdom) 25 per cent.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [3.12].—It occurs to me that, having intimated his intention of eliminating the schedule at the end of the Tariff, the Treasurer might very well consider the propriety of incorporating item 169 with 168, and of striking out the latter item altogether. Neither the Department nor the Treasurer can advance any reason for the retention of that schedule.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I will consider the matter. I want to look into it further. If the honorable member will allow the item to pass, I will consider the question.

Mr. GLYNN (Angas) [3.13].—Incidentally I may mention that item 169 is affected by this item, and that the wording of item 169 is somewhat ambiguous. Tools of trade for the use of artisans and mechanics were intended to be free, but the Department holds that they cannot be admitted free unless they are specified by departmental by-law.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—The point ought to be made clear, at all events.

Mr. GLYNN.—I have read three or four communications dealing with the matter. If I am not mistaken "roll shells" have been removed from an item under which they were free and placed under this item. Now, roll shells are very largely used in

connexion with mining operations. They are manufactured only by one local company, and I am informed by men from Broken Hill that the locally-manufactured roll shells are not much good. It is only under the compulsion of circumstances that they are used. According to telegrams received from Broken Hill within the past three or four days, consternation was created at that centre by the action of the Committee in removing roll shells from the free list and including them in this item under which they are dutiable at 30 per cent. Inasmuch as the mining industry is heavily taxed already under the Tariff, and seeing that it gives employment to about 112,000 persons, and that our mineral exports are worth about £25,000,000 a year, whereas our manufactured exports are worth only a little over £1,000,000 a year, I trust that the Treasurer will reconsider this matter, and not, apparently in the interests of one firm, unduly tax an article very largely used in mining.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—To which firm does the honorable member refer?

Mr. GLYNN.—Does that affect the question? I am informed that under the Tariff of 1902 roll shells were free. My informants state that the Steel Company of Australasia makes shells, and that they have tried a few, with poor results. Those made by Krupp undoubtedly have the longest life, and are of uniform quality, a virtue which the Australian article does not possess. Inasmuch as they use thirty sets per annum in a new mill, the duty will come to a very considerable sum. The following letter has been sent to me to show how many and various are the articles which come under item 171—

Since writing you on Tuesday with regard to this, we have had the curiosity to look up a few of the items which the Customs bring under this heading, and we find amongst them the following heterogeneous list, viz.: Blacksmiths' anvils; masons' sieves and riddles; bells of every description; door bolts; fire proof safes; hinges; gate latches; iron, water and steam tubes, up to 4 inches; trace and dog chains, nawies' picks; gas pipe tongs; cast iron saucepans and boilers; cash boxes; corkscrews; fenders and fire irons; glue pots; blocks and pulleys.

In the above list we know of only two lines which are being made in the States, viz.: cash boxes and fire proof safes, so that you will see that, with these exceptions, the item is purely a revenue line.

I hope that protectionists will agree, either to the reduction of the proposed rates of duty, or to placing the articles which I have named on the free list. The informa-

tion which I have given to the Committee has come to me from correspondents who can be absolutely relied on.

Mr. MAHON (Coolgardie) [3.18].—The Minister should give us more information as to what it is intended to bring within this drag-net item, and what it is intended to exempt. In the 1902 Tariff there is a long list of articles exempted from the duties on manufactures of metals. Nothing of the kind appears in this Tariff, and we have no information as to what the Department will, later on, declare to be included in item 171, and what will be exempted from the proposed duties. Another matter to which I wish to refer is this: The Government in the future will have to import a large quantity of copper wire for the extension of its telegraphs and telephones. I am aware that no direct Government importations are dutiable, but, inasmuch as this material will probably have to be purchased from contractors, who will import it, the free list is the proper place for many of these articles. The adoption of a duty will involve higher prices; it will artificially inflate the revenue, and we shall be repeating the experience of Victoria, where, during a boom, the Government inflated their revenue by charging high duties upon articles imported for Government use. Our accounts will become complicated, inasmuch as three-fourths of the revenue from Customs and Excise must be returned to the States.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—If the Government obtained quotations in bond, there would be no duty to pay.

Mr. MAHON.—It would be all right so long as the contractors had not to pay the duty. If duty is paid, the Commonwealth gets only one-fourth and the States the remaining three-fourths, so that it is not sound finance to impose duties on Commonwealth requirements.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Copper wire is free under the Tariff.

Mr. HUME COOK.—The Committee agreed to that a few days ago.

Mr. MAHON.—What about galvanized iron wire?

Mr. HUME COOK.—That, too, is free.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—A number of exemptions are specified in the next few pages of the Tariff.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Yes; in items with which we have already dealt. We are now dealing with items, the consideration of which was postponed originally.

Mr. MAHON.—It would be impossible, without an enormous amount of labor, to identify in the Tariff all the articles to which my remarks apply. There are many other imported commodities, besides copper wire, used by the Government.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—Is this not rather a matter of administration?

Mr. MAHON.—Not quite. The course suggested by the honorable member for North Sydney could be followed; but it is worth while to bear in mind the undesirability of collecting duty on goods imported for the various services of the Commonwealth. The cost of all the imported articles used by the various Departments will be increased if they are made dutiable, and this will give a false impression as to the actual amount of our Customs revenue.

Sir JOHN FORREST. — We cannot deal with the matter in any other way, unless we give a rebate.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Where large lines are concerned, we can avoid the payment of duty.

Mr. MAHON.—That is so; but it is an anomalous thing merely to take money out of one pocket to put it into another.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—It does not matter, so long as we do not lose any of it.

Mr. MAHON.—But we shall lose some of it, because three-fourths of our receipts must be returned to the States, the Commonwealth retaining only one-fourth. To levy duty on Commonwealth imports is a false way of obtaining revenue.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—In the States they have treated borrowed money as revenue.

Mr. MAHON. — There have been all kinds of devices adopted by the States Governments for meeting their difficulties. If borrowed money has been used to pay interest I hope that it is not being done now, and that it will never be done by the Commonwealth. I should like the Government to prepare a list, similar to that in the 1902 Tariff, showing the exemptions under this item.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—What about the man who manufactures in Australia goods of the kinds imported for the service of the Commonwealth?

Mr. MAHON.—I have been speaking of material which cannot be obtained in Australia.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—The honorable member's contention is that, if duty be levied on Commonwealth requirements, the

various Departments will have to pay more for the material they buy, while the Commonwealth will be able to retain only one-fourth of the revenue produced by the duties.

Mr. MAHON.—Exactly. Another matter to which I wish to call attention is this: Parliament is voting various rates of duty for the encouragement of our different industries. Those rates must be regarded as the maximum protection which we think should be given to those industries. But the practice of the Departments has been to give local tenderers a preference of from 15 to 25 per cent. over foreign competitors, in addition to the duty. That, in my opinion, is illegitimate and improper.

Mr. SAMPSON (Wimmera) [3.29].—Item 171 covers, I take it, practically all the manufactures of metal not elsewhere specifically dealt with in the Tariff. Yesterday, however, after a great deal of discussion, the Committee decided that the rates of duty which should apply to the various kinds of machinery dealt with under items 163, and 164 should be 25 and 20 per cent., and, therefore, I intend to move to reduce the rates now proposed from 30 and 25 to 25 and 20 per cent. I hope that the Government, with a view to expediting business, will accept the suggestion.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [3.30].—I desire to insert the letter "A" before the words "manufactures of metal n.e.i.," in order to make a separate paragraph, and then to insert as paragraph B the words "articles made entirely of aluminium for household use," subject to duties of 10 and 5 per cent. respectively. I have made inquiries, but cannot find that there are any manufacturers of these goods in Australia.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—Why not make them free? Duties of 10 and 5 per cent. are not intended to be protective.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I am not particular as to whether they are made free or not.

Mr. TUDOR.—Make them free.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I am quite agreeable to make them free. I move—

That the letter "A" be inserted before the word "manufactures."

Amendment agreed to.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I am willing to accept duties of 25 and 20 per cent.

Amendments (by Mr. SAMPSON) agreed to—

That after the words "30 per cent." the words "and on and after 29th November, 1907,

ad val. (General Tariff), 25 per cent."; and after the words "25 per cent." the words "and on and after 29th November, 1907, ad val. (United Kingdom), 20 per cent.," be inserted.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That the following new paragraph be added:—

B. Articles made entirely of aluminium for household use, ad val. (General Tariff), 5 per cent.; (United Kingdom), free.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Postponed item 172. Saws n.e.i., ad val. (General Tariff), 25 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 20 per cent.

Mr. STORRER (Bass) [3.32].—I think that the Government are proposing rather high duties on saws, which are tools of trade to those who are engaged in various industries and in bush work. Therefore, I move—

That after the words "25 per cent." the words "and on and after 29th November, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 15 per cent.," and after the words "20 per cent." the words "and on and after 29th November, 1907, ad val. (United Kingdom), 15 per cent.," be inserted.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—Are saws made here?

Mr. STORRER.—Yes, in Lonsdale-street.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [3.33].—Under the old Tariff all saws were free, and I suggest that band and circular saws should be made free.

Mr. HUME COOK.—Those are the saws which are principally made here.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—No; there are crosscut and other saws made.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—They are nearly all made here.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The Minister is mistaken.

Mr. CHANTER.—Band saws are made here.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Band saws, for breaking down logs, are nearly all imported, because the saw-making industry is more developed in other countries. In the case of circular saws I do not think it is desirable to restrict the range of choice. The lives of the workers depend upon the quality of the saws. If the users are not given the widest range of choice they are apt to take a saw which may not be so reliable as the saw which they would otherwise demand.

Mr. CHANTER.—Does not the honorable member think that the local manufacturers will study the question of quality?

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—That may be so, but I would give to the users the widest possible range of choice, because those who have been making these saws for generations in other countries have acquired great perfection in the art. The local manufacturers would undoubtedly get the preference if they made good circular saws; but I would not limit the range of choice. I propose to move that all band and circular saws be duty free.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [3.35].—I hope that neither amendment will be carried.

Mr. HEDGES.—I want a lower duty than 15 per cent.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—The honorable member wants everything free.

Mr. HEDGES.—No.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—I think the honorable member might allow me to put the case in my own way.

Mr. HEDGES.—From the Victorian point of view.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—The recommendations of the A section of the Tariff Commission were that saws generally should be liable to a duty of 20 per cent., but that hand saws, saw plates, steel band or ribbons for making saws should be free. So that a duty of 20 per cent. would operate on the very class of saws which honorable members want either to exempt or to be made liable to a lower duty. It is the band and circular saws which we want to have made here. We propose to admit free the carpenter's hand saw; but the big saws are being made in Melbourne and Sydney, and I strongly object to them being made liable to a lower duty, or to being placed on the free list. There was very strong and satisfactory evidence given in favour of a duty of 20 per cent.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—By how many men?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—By two firms who said that they were making the saws.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—They want a good protection.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—Twenty per cent. is not a very strong protection.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—I think that the honorable member might give way a little when the general body of the Committee want a lower duty.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—I do not know that they do. The honorable member wants to smash up everything. Provided that band saws and raw materials are admitted free, I think that a duty of 20 per cent.

might fairly be placed on the big saws which can be made here.

Mr. POYNTON.—Under what item do hand saws come in free?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—I do not know. I cannot find the item.

Mr. HEDGES (Fremantle) [3.38].—If there are any articles in this schedule which can be considered tools of trade they are saws. They may be made in Melbourne and Sydney, but they are used all over Australia.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—It does not matter about that if the saws can be made here.

Mr. HEDGES.—The saws are used by men who have not seen and do not want to see Melbourne or Sydney. They are used by men who get their living in the bush in saw-mills, both small and large. I have bought saws in different States. Last year I purchased a saw in Melbourne but I had to wait for five or six weeks while it was being made.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Good gracious! What a terrible thing that the honorable member should have to wait!

Mr. HEDGES.—I shall not be bullied out of my course by the Treasurer. I am speaking of what I know. There is no chance of the local manufacturers making saws suitable for the various descriptions of business which are carried on in Australia. For sawing hard wood and soft wood, different kinds of teeth are required. Tasmania requires saws different from those which are used in Western Australia or Queensland. It is unfair to impose duties of 25 and 20 per cent. I am a reasonable protectionist.

Mr. MAUGER.—The honorable member is joking.

Mr. HEDGES.—No; I am not a hat maker. Honorable members who laugh have just allowed the free admission of hat-making machines, but they will not allow a man who is employed in the bush in building up Australia to get his saws free of duty. I do not want the saws to be admitted free, but I desire a reasonable duty to be levied. According to some invoices which I saw to-day, a saw which was sold at £4 16s. under the old Tariff is now sold at £6 6s. That is monstrous. I want honorable members to realize that these high duties of 25 per cent. and 20 per cent. affect Queensland, Tasmania, and Western Australia particularly. In my opinion, duties of 15 per cent. and 10 per cent. will be quite enough to impose. That is what I call reasonable protection.

The CHAIRMAN.—I understand that the honorable member for North Sydney wishes the honorable member for Bass to withdraw his amendment, so that he may move a prior one.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [3.40].—I still think that band and circular saws should be made duty free; but as it cannot be carried, and to save time, as the honorable member for Fremantle is going to move an amendment to reduce the preferential duty to 10 per cent., I shall allow the proposed duty on those saws to go.

Mr. HEDGES (Fremantle) [3.41].—I wish to move—

That after the words "25 per cent." the words "and on and after the 29th November, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 15 per cent." be inserted.

Mr. CHANTER (Riverina) [3.42].—What the honorable member for Fremantle proposes is no protection. He made a statement which suggests that he is prejudiced against anything eastern. He stated in the first place that we could not make anything good, and in the second place, that he had to wait for a long time while a saw was being made.

Mr. HEDGES.—I did not say that they could not make anything good.

Mr. CHANTER.—The honorable member for North Sydney has said that the life of a man working in a mill depends upon the quality of the saw used.

Mr. MCWILLIAMS.—That is a fact, too.

Mr. CHANTER.—A man is a fool who will put his finger or neck on a saw in a mill. In my electorate there are a considerable number of saw-mills dealing with, perhaps, as hard a wood as the honorable member for Fremantle has had any experience of, namely, the well-known red gum. I believe that the majority of the sawmillers—certainly some of them—prefer the Australian-made saw to the imported saw.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I did not say a word against the Australian saw. I merely said that users ought to be allowed the widest range of selection, as their lives depended upon the quality of the saws which they used.

Mr. CHANTER.—They have the widest range of selection now. They can please themselves as to whether they buy an imported saw or an Australian-made saw.

Mr. WILSON.—The local man makes only certain kinds of saws.

Mr. CHANTER.—He makes the kind to which the honorable member for Fremantle referred. Hand saws are placed on the free list. Circular saws and vertical saws of all kinds are made at an establishment in Lonsdale-street, Melbourne. To show the despatch with which saws are made in that establishment, I may mention that only very recently a vertical saw in a mill on the Murray River broke.

Mr. HEDGES.—That was a colonial one, I bet.

Mr. CHANTER.—I cannot say whether it was a colonial one or not, but the saw-miller telegraphed to me saying that he would be very much obliged if I would go and purchase for him a vertical saw, in order to get the works going again. He asked me to purchase the saw from the establishment in Lonsdale-street, where saws of better quality are made.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—How many men does he employ?

Mr. CHANTER.—He employs twenty-two men in one mill alone. I am in sympathy with the sawmillers. The industry in the West is a very good one, but there is also a good one here. The millers themselves are interested in getting these articles as cheaply as they can; and they are now getting them cheaper than they used to do when they had to obtain them from the importer. I hope that the Government will stand firm.

Sir JOHN FORREST (Swan) [3.46].—I trust that the Committee will not place a greater burden than is absolutely necessary upon the great timber industry of Australia. Saws are essential for the cutting of timber. When we compare the magnitude of the sawmilling industry with the smallness of the saw-making industry, it seems a very mistaken policy to make the duty very high. In Western Australia alone we export over a million pounds worth of timber per annum. I can well understand honorable members saying that, as a duty has been placed upon other machines which are of great importance to Australia, such as artesian-boring plant, we should, for the sake of uniformity, place a duty on saws. But certainly it ought not to be higher than the duty on other tools of trade. Personally, I think that saws should be free, though I am prepared to vote for a duty of 15 per cent. I do not think that saws can be made in Australia as good as those which are imported. It is not an easy thing to make a saw. People who are new to such an industry cannot turn out

as good an article as is produced in a place where they have the experience of many years. I shall support the amendment of the honorable member for North Sydney.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS (Robertson) [3.48].—We have heard a great deal about uniformity, and there is something to be said from that point of view. But saws are tools of trade, which, I think, might fairly be put on the free list. It will be admitted that the material of the saws which are made locally is imported in sheath form. They are then made circular or otherwise, fitted up, and have teeth put into them. That is all that constitutes the industry. Those people who use saws in the three States where there is a large lumber trade are well able to pay the duty, if they choose to import superior articles, and from that point of view there is no reason why saws should not be put on the same footing as other tools. But still I shall support a proposal to make them free, as saws are in general use. Our saw-millers want the very best material for their purpose, and to secure the best saws they must import. We were sent here to rectify anomalies in the Tariff. Saws were formerly upon the free list. Even protectionists admitted that they should be free. We leave no anomaly by allowing them to remain on the free list. The local saw-making industry is one that can stand alone. It requires no protection. As pointed out by the honorable member for Riverina, saws have been made in Melbourne in the open market. What better evidence do honorable members require that there is no need to impose a duty? I move—

That after the words "25 per cent." the words "and on and after 29th November, 1907 ad val. (General Tariff), 5 per cent.; (United Kingdom), free," be inserted.

Sir JOHN FORREST (Swan) [3.53].—The honorable member for Fremantle has pointed out that since this Tariff was introduced those concerned in the saw-making industry have increased their price by 50 per cent.

Mr. STORRER.—The Tariff has not done that.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—That is a state of affairs that should not be tolerated.

Mr. CHANTER.—I think a statement like that ought to be substantiated.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—It is not correct, I believe.

Mr. HEDGES (Fremantle) [3.54].—The honorable member for Echuca has in

his possession an invoice from a Melbourne firm, and the explanation of the increase of price is that it is owing to the Tariff. An increase of 50 per cent. on invoice cost has been made in the price of the same saw of the same gauge. I saw the invoice myself at lunch time.

Mr. CHANTER.—Will the honorable member produce it?

Mr. HEDGES.—I have seen it, and will produce it to-morrow.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Paramatta) [3.55].—If there is a case of protection run mad, it is this. There are employed in the sawmills of Australia about 11,000 men. It is preposterous that we should compel them to be dependent upon one source of supply. Apart altogether from the quality of the saws, there should be some choice left to the people who use them. Otherwise, we might as well destroy a man's freedom at once. Why compel him to buy his saws, good or bad as the case may be, from one particular State in the whole of Australia? There is no reason in it.

Mr. FAIRBAIRN.—They are made in Sydney, too.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Only a very few of them. If honorable members choose to impose a steadying duty, all right, but to shut out importations altogether, and compel the whole milling industry of Australia to be dependent upon a small local source of supply seems to me to be protection run mad.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE (Flinders) [3.56].—I think we should endeavour to have something like uniformity in this Tariff, and to prevent differentiation between different classes of people engaged in different occupations. We have just dealt with a large class of things under the heading of machinery and machine tools which are used by people engaged in various occupations. I understood that by the general assent of all parties we agreed to a compromise to make these goods pay a uniform duty of 15 per cent. I do not see why these particular goods—saws—should be free any more than any other goods.

Mr. HEDGES.—No one asks for that.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—Yes, it was asked for. I think that the amendment of the honorable member for Bass is more in accordance with the decision that the Committee has already arrived at in similar matters, and I for one shall support it.

Mr. JOHNSON (Lang) [3.58].—May I point out to those who are anxious to have a high duty on saws, that there are only two manufacturers of saws in the Commonwealth, both of whom established their industries without any duty whatever. One is Blakeley, in Victoria, who established his business thirty years ago without a duty, and the other is Chapman, of Sydney. Saws are essentially tools of trade, which should have been included under the same heading as other tools. If honorable members look at the evidence taken by the Tariff Commission, they will find that Blakeley asked for a duty of 35 per cent. on circular saws, band saws, and other saws for five years only, whilst Chapman, of Sydney, asked for a duty of 25 per cent. on circular saws only. Both makers admitted that their industry had been established without any duty, and acknowledged that they were doing a splendid business. They said that they were able to compete with American makers of saws, and Chapman, of Sydney, stated that he was cutting the Americans entirely out of the market. So that they are doing very well indeed under present circumstances. They are not only able to hold their own, but are absolutely driving their foreign competitors out of the local market. One of them also admitted that he was exporting profitably to New Zealand, and that for the last twenty years, in spite of the New Zealand duty, he charged 70 per cent. higher prices in New Zealand than his principal American competitor, and still held his own. Mr. Chapman said that he charged £18 10s. for a 5 ft. circular band saw invoiced in America at £12 8s., so that the local manufacturers secure immensely higher prices for their saws than are obtained for the imported articles. He added, however, that he allowed a discount of 10 per cent. to merchants. Mr. Blakeley admitted that he got a reasonable price, and that if the duty were increased—and this bears out the statement that prices have been increased since the imposition of the new Tariff—the consumer would have to pay more. The evidence of the only two makers in the Commonwealth shows that there is not the slightest need for any duty. I suppose that it would be too much to expect the Committee, composed as it is, to place these items on the free list, as they were under the old Tariff, but I intend to vote for the lowest duty I can obtain.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [4.3].—I would suggest that a compromise be effected by reducing the general Tariff from 25 per cent. to 20 per cent., and the duty in the case of imports from the United Kingdom from 20 per cent. to 15 per cent.

Amendment (by Mr. HENRY WILLIS) negatived.

Amendment (by Mr. STORRER) put—

That after the words "25 per cent." the words "and on and after 29th November, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 15 per cent.," be inserted.

Ayes	29
Noes	27
Majority	2

AYES.

Archer, E. W.	Knox, W.
Atkinson, L.	Livingston, J.
Bamford, F. W.	Mahon, H.
Brown, Tilley	McWilliams, W. J.
Brown, Thomas	Page, J.
Cook, Joseph	Poynton, A.
Edwards, R.	Sampson, S.
Fairbairn, G.	Spence, W. G.
Forrest, Sir J.	Storrer, D.
Fowler, J. M.	Thomson, Dugald
Frazer, C. E.	Willis, Henry
Fysh, Sir Philip	Wilson, J. G.
Glynn, P. McM.	<i>Tellers:</i>
Hedges, W. N.	Johnson, W. E.
Irvine, W. H.	Liddell, F.

NOES.

Batchelor, E. L.	Mathews, J.
Carr, E. S.	McDougall, J. K.
Chanter, J. M.	O'Malley, King
Chapman, Austin	Quick, Sir John
Coon, J.	Salmon, C. C.
Deakin, A.	Thomson, John
Ewing, T. T.	Tudor, F. G.
Fisher, A.	Watkins, D.
Foster, F. J.	Watson, J. C.
Groom, L. E.	Webster, W.
Hall, D. R.	Wise, G. H.
Hutchison, J.	<i>Tellers:</i>
Lyne, Sir William	Catts, J. H.
Maloney, W. R. N.	Cook, Hume

PAIRS.

Kelly, W. H.	Kingston, C. C.
Palmer, A. C.	Wilks, W. H.
Irvine, Hans	Hughes, W. M.
Reid, G. H.	Crouch, R. A.
Smith, Bruce	Harper, R.
Thomas, J.	Mauger, S.

Question so resolved in the affirmative.

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment (by Mr. JOHNSON) proposed—

That the words "and on and after 29th November, 1907, ad val. (United Kingdom), 10 per cent.," be added.

Mr. STORRER (Bass) [4.13].—I hope that the amendment will not be carried. When I moved that the duty in the case

of foreign imports be reduced to 15 per cent., I intimated that I thought that we should impose the same rate on imports from Great Britain, since we had adopted a similar course in regard to other tools of trade.

Mr. FAIRBAIRN (Fawcner) [4.14].—In order to put this industry, which is a very important one, on the same footing as is that of the making of artesian well-boring plant, and other classes of industry, I think that we ought to vote for the same duty as we have just imposed on foreign imports; we should otherwise stultify ourselves.

Amendment negatived.

Amendment (by Mr. STORRER) agreed to—

That the words "and on and after 29th November, 1907, ad. val. (United Kingdom), 15 per cent." be added.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [4.15].—I move—

That the whole of the remaining items be postponed until after the consideration of the schedule "Rebate for Home Consumption."

I make this motion because I have already added these machines as well as wool and felt hat machines to item 166A; and it is necessary to strike out that part of the rebate schedule which would come into conflict with what the Committee has already decided in connexion with these items.

Motion agreed to; items postponed.

Schedule—

REBATE FOR HOME CONSUMPTION.

No. of Item in Schedule A, 124.—Piece Goods of any material, when used in the manufacture of Rubber Waterproof Cloth. Rebate—Three-fourths of the duty paid.

Nos. of Item in Schedule A, 164 and 166.—Machinery, and parts thereof, used in the manufacture of Fibrous Materials and Felt, and Felt Hats, when installed for use in a Woollen Mill or a Hat Factory for the manufacture of such Materials, Felt, and Hats. Rebate—The full duty paid.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [4.17].—I move—

That the following words be left out:—

Nos. of Item in Schedule A, 164 and 166.—Machinery, and parts thereof, used in the manufacture of Fibrous Materials and Felt, and Felt Hats, when installed for use in a Woollen Mill or a Hat Factory for the manufacture of such Materials, Felt, and Hats. Rebate—The full duty paid.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—Why should we not at the same time strike out the reference to item 124?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The honorable member will see that the reference is not to piece goods generally, but only to such goods when used in the manufacture of rubber waterproof cloth.

Amendment agreed to.

Postponed item 174. Type, Printers', ad val., 25 per cent.

Mr. MAHON (Coolgardie) [4.19].—I intend to move that the words "25 per cent." be left out.

Mr. CHANTER.—With a view to insert what?

Mr. MAHON.—Nothing. If the honorable member were familiar with the printing trade he would know how absurd it is to attempt to protect an industry of this kind. An individual who has a small factory in Sydney has sent circulars and also a catalogue to honorable members.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—It was a pretty big business to send out the circulars.

Mr. MAHON.—The honorable member probably knows that there is a big business to be done with the printers of Australia in the supply from time to time of small odd lots of type. That is about all the business the Sydney manufacturer has done or is ever likely to do.

Mr. CARR.—That is wrong.

Mr. MAHON.—If the Committee agreed to impose a duty of 250 per cent. on type this man could not compete with American and English type foundries. I have the catalogue which he has mailed to honorable members, from which they may infer that the faces it includes were all of his own design and manufacture, whereas I find that most of them, as well as the borders shown, are common to the whole of the world.

Mr. CARR.—Of course, they are.

Mr. MAHON.—I ask honorable members whether the printers of Australia are to be confined in their selection of faces to what is included in this meagre catalogue, when, under existing conditions, they can have recourse to a vast variety of serviceable and ornamental type and borders?

Mr. PAGE.—I am prepared to support a duty.

Mr. MAHON.—But this is merely a revenue duty, and I do not understand the honorable member is here to vote revenue duties.

Mr. PAGE.—I am here to vote against anything which the honorable member proposes.

Mr. MAHON.—The honorable member for Maranoa can do anything he pleases.

Mr. PAGE.—I intend to vote against the amendment, because the honorable member for Coolgardie proposes it.

Mr. MAHON.—I hope I have a little better sense of my duty to the people of this country than to make a fool of myself by doing such a thing as that.

Mr. PAGE.—The honorable member is making a fool of himself every day.

The CHAIRMAN.—Order!

Mr. MAHON.—If the honorable member for Maranoa thinks so he is welcome to retain the opinion. A glance through the two printers' catalogues I have here they would see what an absurd thing it would be to impose any duty at all on type or printers' materials. If this man did succeed in shutting out the results of the genius and industry of type foundries throughout the world, a good deal of the printing that is now done in Australia would have to be done elsewhere. Certain banks and manufacturers wish to have high-class printing done, and if they were to be confined to the few faces manufactured by the Sydney manufacturer, it would be impossible for them to have the work they require done in Australia. I may inform the Committee that there is very little type imported to Australia at the present time. Honorable members who may be under the impression that they are being asked to vote for a duty which will have the effect of starting a type foundry with a large output are utterly mistaken, because throughout Australia the large newspapers now use linotype or monoline machines, and have practically discontinued the use of ordinary type. That is the position of affairs with the largest users of type in Australia. The *Melbourne Age* and *Argus*, the *Sydney Daily Telegraph*, the *Sydney Morning Herald*, and, in fact, all the metropolitan newspapers have installed linotype or monoline machines, and do not now use ordinary printers' type at all. I wish the Committee to thoroughly understand that the proposed duty would operate as a special tax upon country printers and small job printers throughout Australia. It would not affect the big newspaper proprietors, who would not have to pay one penny of this duty. It would be merely an impost levied on men who, at the present time, have the utmost difficulty to

To prove what I say, I have only for honorable members to the value of

the importations of type into Australia in 1906. The quantity imported in that year amounted in value to only £9,032, and of that about £5,000 worth—and I can get the exact figures in a moment—was re-exported to New Zealand and other countries.

Mr. CARR.—What about the imports in 1902. They amounted in value to £46,000.

Mr. MAHON.—Of what use is it for the honorable member to take us back to 1902?

Mr. CARR.—To show that large stocks were laid in then.

Mr. MAHON.—We cannot undo the past. The gods themselves cannot do that.

Mr. CARR.—We can provide against the future.

Mr. MAHON.—Does any sane man believe that in 1902 people loaded up with type sufficient to last them until 1907 or 1908?

Mr. CARR.—Yes, stocks held are often ten years old.

Mr. MAHON.—An importer knows better than that. The amount of interest which he would lose on his capital during the time would be more than anything he could possibly gain by any Tariff advantage. Of this material, £5,975 worth was re-exported last year, so that, as a matter of fact, only a little more than £4,000 was imported into and used in Australia during that year.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—Can the honorable member give the amount of importations for each year since the uniform Tariff was imposed?

Mr. MAHON.—I did not look the figures up. I do not think they are material. I fancy that what I have stated is about the normal import.

Mr. CARR.—The amount imported in 1902 was £46,000.

Mr. MAHON.—Anything may be proved by quoting an abnormal year. If the honorable member quotes 1902, why does he not go back and quote 1898 or 1900, or any other year selected at random? Why not also 1903, 1904, and 1905? The fact remains that only about £4,000 worth of type was imported and retained in Australia during the year mentioned. The proposed duty is merely a tax upon the country printers, a class of men who have all they can do at present to make ends meet.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [4.33].—I move—

That the words "including spaces and quads, lino. and other slugs," be inserted.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—What does the Treasurer propose to do with regard to the articles struck out of item 209?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I am moving now to insert them in this item.

Mr. MAHON (Coolgardie) [4.34].—The Treasurer's amendment will only make the item a little more ridiculous than it is at present. In addition to quads and spaces, there are also metal spaces known as "quotations." At the present time those are admitted free. If the Treasurer desires to be consistent he should add them to this item. They can be made here just as readily as anything else.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [4.35].—I am told by the Department that they include "quote marks" under "type," without specifying them.

Mr. HUTCHISON (Hindmarsh) [4.36].—Quads are certainly part of the type, because type is never supplied without the quads; but "quotations" are always supplied separately. They should be included in the amendment.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—To save debate, I will agree to add "and quotations" to the amendment.

Amendment amended accordingly, and agreed to.

Amendment (by Mr. MAHON) proposed—

That the words "and on and after 29th November, 1907, free," be added.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS (Robertson) [4.38].—I agree with the honorable member for Coolgardie that this duty is a tax upon the country press. Type is not largely used by the large daily papers in the cities, although the job printers use it. The country press does a great deal of service in placing before the public reports of the proceedings of Parliament and other information, and the least we can do is to take into consideration the amount of benefit which we receive from it. The type is a tool of trade to country papers. I support the proposal of the honorable member for Coolgardie that the article should be free. Failing that, the duty should not be higher than 15 per cent., which is the rate already imposed upon other tools of trade. Assuming that some protection should be given to a local industry, the amount of type used does not

appear to be very great. The importation has amounted to something like £5,000 worth per year for the whole of the Commonwealth, although we are told that when the Commonwealth Tariff first came into operation about £46,000 worth was imported. Still, if we add another £10,000 worth a year to the figures I have stated, it would mean only about £15,000 worth of type imported yearly that could be manufactured here. As the type is chiefly for the use of the country press, the tax would fall upon only a small section of the community, and, therefore, would be a class tax. It cannot be passed on like many other duties. The price of the newspapers cannot be increased, nor can the charges for advertisements.

Mr. SALMON.—They are doing it at 2d. an inch in my district.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—The fact that they are doing their work at a remarkably low figure is all the more reason why we should tax their tools of trade at the lowest possible rate. Will the honorable member for Laanecoorie vote to put them on the free list, as he seems to think that in this trade the duty cannot be passed on? I hope the honorable member for Swan will throw his weight into the scale in favour of the amendment moved by the honorable member for Coolgardie.

Mr. GLYNN (Angas) [4.42].—I rise, not to express my surprise that one of the artistic sensibility and taste of the Treasurer should have consented to place an *ad valorem* tax upon "quotations"—probably that will not affect him very much—but to say that my attention has been called to this item by the South Australian Printers' Association, and also by the Master Printers' Association of Queensland. They state that it is necessary to have a continual change of fonts, which they cannot get unless there is bigger competition, which an increase of population in Australia will induce, and that, in the circumstances, the tax will really hamper them in getting out the best work. I hope to support the honorable member for Coolgardie in successfully getting this duty struck out.

Mr. HUTCHISON (Hindmarsh) [4.43].—I cannot support the honorable member for Coolgardie, because I do not see how we can give protection to all other trades, and not to the makers of type in Australia. Like the honorable member for Angas, I have been asked both by the Typographical Society and the master printers of

South Australia to make the item free. It is true that the firm of F. T. Wimble and Company, of Sydney, are making first-class type. I have used a good deal of it, and found it most satisfactory. I have also used their composition and ink, and found them satisfactory also; but the number of type faces that they are able to supply is very limited. I admit that for the artistic printing of to-day, there is required a number of faces which this firm is not likely to supply.

Mr. WATSON.—The firm is turning out a great number of very fine faces now.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—The firm has done admirably, and there is nothing that any small country printer can require that it cannot supply.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—Perhaps the firm charges too much.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—I have no complaint to make about the charges.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—But if the firm had a monopoly it might charge too much.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—I do not think it would. Honorable members are discussing this question in the belief that if a duty of 25 per cent. is imposed—I should not mind if the duty were 20 per cent.—the printers of Australia will not be able to obtain the type they require. Honorable members, however, have only to look at page 106 of the Customs statistics to see that the total value of the printers' materials imported last year was only £9,032. There is a large number of printers in the Commonwealth, and, keeping in view the comparatively small value of the importations, it will be seen that the duty would not add one iota to the cost of printing—it would be merely a few pounds divided amongst the printers. If the duty were distributed over the work, it would amount to practically nothing, because the price of printing is anything but prohibitive.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—That is an argument against a duty.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—It is an argument for doing all the work we can in the country. If I were in the printing business again, I should not be afraid of a duty twice as high, because printing is so cheap that people who require it can well afford to pay all the difference any duty would entail.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—The duty would come out of the pockets of the proprietors of small newspapers.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—That is not so; the proprietor of a small newspaper can, in Australia, get all the type he requires.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—Will he not have to pay more for his type if a duty be imposed?

Mr. HUTCHISON.—It is admitted that the enterprising firm in Sydney has been supplying to the printers in Australia quantities of type that there would have been the greatest difficulty in obtaining but for the existence of the firm. When doing special work printers have very often been glad to be able to obtain odd sorts from this firm, without being under the necessity of sending to the Old Country. Surely this firm ought not to be made a convenience of for the supply of odd sorts, and yet denied encouragement which would enable it to produce all the type that is required.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—Then, the honorable member has used imported type?

Mr. HUTCHISON.—A printer must do so if he cannot get local type; and I have had to get from the Old Country type which Messrs. Wimble could not supply. We ought not to destroy an industry of great value to Australia—an enterprising firm which under the present Tariff is prepared to extend its business.

Mr. WATSON.—The business is being extended every day.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—There is no doubt about the Tariff, in this instance, helping an industry.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—Would a duty not mean increased cost to the consumer?

Mr. HUTCHISON.—The consumer would never know the difference, because it would be so infinitesimal. Further, I understand that Messrs. Wimble have pledged themselves not to increase prices. Personally, I should not complain even if the firm did increase their prices; they have proved such an enormous convenience, and saved so much cost and trouble to printers, that they deserve to be allowed to charge a little more.

Mr. MAHON.—We know very well that the importers stock everything that printers require.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—They do not; there are large firms which have been obliged to Messrs. Wimble and Company for tiding them over difficulty. I think that in the General Tariff a duty of 20 per cent. would be fair, but nothing under that figure. However, I shall vote for a duty of 25 per cent., so that we may not fix a duty of 20 per cent. in the General Tariff,

and of 15 per cent. as against Great Britain. With duties of 20 per cent. in both columns I should be quite satisfied.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN (Calare) [4.52].—In this item we have another evidence of the anomalies which have been created, and which are being created, in the Tariff. Big interests are favored, while small industries are penalized. This House decided some time ago to put linotypes, monolines, and other printing machinery on the free list, and now it is proposed to tax the supplies of the small printers by imposing a duty of 25 per cent. As the honorable member for Coolgardie has pointed out, most of the large newspaper and printing establishments are equipped with modern machinery of the kind I have indicated.

Mr. WATSON.—That machinery is only for newspaper work, and is not used for jobbing.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—All the big newspapers, such as the *Sydney Morning Herald*, *Sydney Daily Telegraph*, and the *Melbourne Age and Argus*, and also newspapers in centres like Bathurst and Orange, are equipped with the up-to-date machinery which is admitted duty free.

Mr. SAMPSON.—Do not some newspaper proprietors also do jobbing work?

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—Yes; a good part of the earnings of many country newspaper proprietors arises from jobbing work. I have here a circular letter, copies of which other members have no doubt received, from Messrs. John Haddon and Company, of the Caxton Type Foundry, Sydney; and from that I gather that a country printer has to pay a duty of 25 per cent. on his type, and a further duty of from 30 per cent. to 40 per cent. on his frames and cases, while the larger newspaper companies, who can afford linotypes, and so forth, practically escape all imposts. Is it fair that struggling country newspaper proprietors should be penalized in this way?

Mr. WATSON.—The duty will not penalize country printers. I have here Messrs. Wimble's catalogue of good type at reasonable prices.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—Do I understand that Messrs. Wimble and Company, if this duty is imposed, are prepared to supply country printers with type as cheaply as they do under present conditions?

Mr. CARR.—More cheaply.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—Then where is the need for a duty?

Mr. WATSON.—The increased business will permit the firm to do the work more cheaply.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—But the firm gets the business now.

Mr. WATSON.—The firm gets some of the business, but not so much as they ought to get.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—If Messrs. Wimble and Company can meet the demands of the Commonwealth as cheaply—I do not say more cheaply—as can their competitors abroad, I fail to see the need for the duty. Messrs. Wimble and Company apparently have a fair field and no favour; and if they do not avail themselves of the margin of 25 per cent., then they do not run their business on the same commercial basis as do other companies. I hope that the margin will be reduced; and I am prepared to support the amendment of the honorable member for Coolgardie.

Mr. WATSON (South Sydney) [4.57].—I happen to know a little about this subject; and I say that in regard to quality and prices no complaint can be found with Messrs. Wimble and Company, who, unfortunately, are at present the only firm of this class in Australia. The existence of this firm, even on a small scale, with free imports from outside, has been of great advantage to jobbing printers, especially in New South Wales. If a printer ran short, he could always get a supply in a fashion not possible with importers, who are occasionally depleted in one or other of their sorts.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS. — Are Messrs. Wimble and Company philanthropists?

Mr. WATSON.—No; like the honorable member and myself, they are for business.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—Does the honorable member think that if this duty is not imposed they will close their foundry?

Mr. WATSON.—If Messrs. Wimble and Company close their foundry the importers will have it all their own way.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—And if a duty be imposed Messrs. Wimble and Company may have it all their own way.

Mr. WATSON.—I do not think that a duty of 25 per cent. is likely to cause importers to cease business.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—Will a duty not add to the cost of imported type?

Mr. WATSON.—It may, but it will not add to the cost of Messrs. Wimble and Company's type. I dare say that if the duty be imposed other type foundry

establishments will arise, and cause competition. Here we have the catalogue of the firm, and it will compare with that of any type foundry in the world.

Mr. MAHON.—Are the other people asking for a duty?

Mr. WATSON.—By the "other people," I suppose the honorable member means printers; and I may say that I had a circular from the Typographical Association suggesting that a duty ought to be imposed.

Mr. MAHON.—Has there been a similar circular from country printers?

Mr. WATSON.—No; but I know a country printing office which has been furnished at a reasonable cost almost completely by Messrs. Wimble and Company.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—Messrs. Wimble and Company competed against free imports.

Mr. WATSON.—For that reason their establishment is not so extensive, and their faces of type are not so numerous, as would otherwise have been the case. They are not likely to increase their prices under a duty; but if they do, we can deal with them. I do not think that the imposition of a reasonable duty upon type is likely to prove any serious charge upon the printing community. The Committee ought to be prepared to extend some consideration to this industry, which has had to contend against great disadvantages for a long time.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [5.1].—This is a case in which it is proposed to penalize the whole of Australia for the sake of maintaining a small industry in one corner of it.

Mr. PAGE.—Type is a tool of trade of the printer.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—It is a medium of communication and instruction—a medium for the conveyance of all that which is highest and best in our civilization. A tax upon any medium of that kind must necessarily be a tax upon enlightenment. It is idle to suppose that the cost of type will not be increased by the imposition of the duty proposed. Is it to be suggested that Messrs. Wimble and Company conduct their business from philanthropic motives? This firm is already exporting its products to New Zealand, besides doing well in Australia, so far as its resources go. I hope it may

long flourish. Before we penalize all the varied products of the world, we ought to be sure that these up-to-date appliances can be manufactured as well here as they can abroad. I understand that the reason why type foundries do not multiply in Australia is that two or three type foundries practically supply the whole civilized world with type of various kinds.

Mr. WATSON.—That is not so.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—That is my information on the subject. I am assured that two or three type foundries conduct a world-wide business.

Mr. WATSON.—They conduct a world-wide business, but they do not supply the requirements of the world. I can assure the honorable member that he is wrong.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I am told that they supply the bulk of the trade of the world.

Mr. CARR.—That does not mean cheap type.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I am not so much concerned about obtaining cheap goods, so long as they are serviceable. When one buys cheap things, he usually finds that they are nasty. I always purchase an article which is good, in preference to one which is cheap.

Mr. CARR.—That is a good protectionist argument.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I am told that Mr. Wimble produces only a few kinds of type. This is not owing to lack of skill or intelligence on his part, but owing to the lack of a demand in Australia. There is not a sufficient demand in the Commonwealth to render it worth his while to produce all these varied types. For that reason, we might very well allow this item to be retained in its present form. Even in the largest type foundries in the world, there is not much labour employed. The work, I am told, is chiefly done by machinery and boys.

Mr. MAHON.—By a machine and a boy.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—This is one of those instances in which we might very well leave it to the skill and enterprise of whoever can to supply our requirements. No doubt the time will come when the gentleman to whom I have referred will extend his industrial enterprise, and nobody will be more pleased to see him do that than I will. But we are not justified in shutting out the skill and enterprise of the world for the purpose of supporting a small industry, which he is conducting so worthily and successfully.

Mr. CARR (Macquarie) [5.10].—It appears to me that the free-trade section of the Committee consistently adhere to one form of argument. The deputy leader of the Opposition has flippantly referred to the type-founding industry as a "one man industry," which is scarcely worthy of consideration.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I did nothing of the kind.

Mr. CARR.—The honorable member said that it was only a very small industry, and that it was scarcely worth protecting. If a large number of hands had been engaged in it, he would have affirmed that it did not need protection. It seems to me that that attitude is opposed to our national development. Seeing that we can manufacture type in the Commonwealth, we ought to extend to the industry all the encouragement that is possible. In a Committee constituted as this is, I suppose that it is idle to expect to secure a higher duty than 20 per cent.; but I do hope that we shall obtain that rate. Some reflection has been cast upon the quality of the type manufactured in Australia, and, for the purpose of showing how ill-founded is that imputation, I propose to make a few quotations. Mr. Percy W. Outram, superintendent printer of the *Daily Mail*, Brisbane, writing to Messrs. F. T. Wimble and Company on 18th January, 1906, says:—

I beg to acknowledge receipt of your letter of 15th inst. I am pleased to inform you that the type, &c., supplied by you, now in use in this office, is giving every satisfaction, and compares favorably with either English or American type for durability and finish. The advantage of being able to duplicate founts, or obtain sorts at such short notice, increases the value of your foundry to the trade.

Mr. Samuel Cook, the late general manager of the *Sydney Morning Herald*, wrote to the same firm, under date 16th August, 1900, as follows:—

I regret that in consequence of an emergency I shall not be able to be present at the interesting function to which you have invited me. At some future time I hope to have an opportunity of seeing your type-casting works. Your local foundry should be of great advantage to united Australia. I am glad to be able to bear my testimony to the excellence of the types which from time to time you have supplied to the *Sydney Morning Herald*. In perfection of form and sharpness of outline they are equal to the most finished products of the Old Country.

Here is another letter, dated 7th February, 1900, from Mr. John T. Anderson,

overseer of the *Town and Country Journal*—

In reply to your inquiry—"Is our type giving you satisfaction?" I have pleasure in stating that the type supplied by you is giving every satisfaction. I am using a lot of it now—especially fancy type—

That is a class of type which, according to some honorable members, Messrs. Wimble and Company are unable to manufacture—

and for finish and durability it is equal to the imported type in use. Your fancy type is used in the same forms with imported type, and stands the test of stereotyping equally as well as the latter. A great advantage to a large office like the *Evening News* and *Town and Country Journal* is the fact of your being able to supply any special sorts when required for founts supplied by you. By retaining your present standard of metal and finish you should have no trouble in giving satisfaction.

Then, on the 21st March, 1906, the Government Printer of Tasmania wrote to the firm, as follows:—

In reply to your inquiry respecting the type "sorts" you have on various occasions furnished to this office, I have pleasure in stating that they have given entire satisfaction, and it has proved a decided advantage to be able to secure type supplies at short notice when extraordinary demands have been made on the body founts for special characters. As regards depth of face, alignment of body, height, finish, and quality of metal the type compares favorably with the products of the large foundries of other parts of the world.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Do any of the authors of these testimonials purchase the whole of their type supplies from this firm?

Mr. CARR.—If all did that, there would be no need to extend protection to the industry. The testimonials merely show that the foundry is able to supply type equal in quality to the imported article. The chief menace to Australian industries is to be found in the fact that, when our local manufacturers approach importing firms, the latter are not in a hurry to drop their old world connexions, particularly when a new line is offered at a slight increase on the price at which they can buy abroad. That phase of the matter is always ignored by the Opposition. They forget that importers, because of the special consideration shown to them by manufacturers abroad, give preference to the imported article. A man who is starting a newspaper is compelled to go to the Sydney firms for his type, and, as they are helping him along, he must take what they give him. They therefore thrust upon him foreign type, at prices at which

the local manufacturer could sell at a good profit, the imported type in most cases being sold at prices higher than those charged for the locally-made type. It is difficult for a man, unless he be independent—and a man starting business is not generally independent, while a newspaper man very seldom is—to break away from any one set of wholesale dealers, and, therefore, the local type manufacturer has not the opportunities for selling his type which he would otherwise have. The honorable member for Coolgardie has stated that the importations of type are now worth only £9,000 a year. But in 1902 £46,000 worth of type and printers' materials were imported, the annual importation subsequently decreasing to £16,000, £15,000, and then to £9,000. The foreign manufacturers are in a position to sell large consignments at very reduced rates, and the importers, since they deal in a commodity which can be kept indefinitely without deterioration, find it advantageous to lay in large stocks. It pays the makers to send out large consignments, because a bulk deal is more profitable than a small transaction, and it pays importers to carry large stocks, because, although they have a good deal of capital lying idle, they can obtain good discounts when buying. The foreign manufacturers pay freight, packing, and insurance to Australia, and give 15 per cent. discount on their published price lists, and another 10 per cent., or 25 per cent., altogether on big weight stuff. But while burdens may be passed on, benefits of this kind are very rarely passed on, and, therefore, the users of type get little or no advantage from this arrangement. I am opposed to giving preference to Great Britain in connexion with the importation of type, because the English manufacturers are the principal consignors of type to Australia. It has been said that the proposed duty will be a special tax on the country printers. I deny that it will. How could it be a tax on country printers, seeing that the local maker is selling his type at the same price, and, in some cases, at a lower price, than is charged for imported type? Messrs. Wimble and Company are prepared to come under any legislation for the regulation of their industry, and have already notified the printing trade that they do not intend to increase their prices. Their specimen-book contains the same list of prices as was published before the imposition of the Tariff, and I have it from Mr. Wimble himself that he is prepared

to guarantee not to increase his prices if the duty is agreed to. Those who wish to see industries flourish in Australia should vote for the duty. The firm to which I allude is, because of the special circumstances which I have mentioned, prevented from doing as well as it might do in the local market. Those connected with it, however, undertake not to abuse any protection which may be given to them. Being interested in the trade myself, I know that it is possible to make locally nearly all kinds of type faces. All the new designs of type faces come from America; but the English makers pirate them.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—There are many kinds of type which the honorable member has not had occasion to use.

Mr. CARR.—I go through all the books illustrating the various kinds of type on the market. When I have wanted up-to-date type and borders for job printing, I have been able to get it from Wimble and Company, when I could not get it from the importers.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—Did the honorable member go to the importers first?

Mr. CARR.—Yes; I tried them all round. I saw samples of English and American types in the catalogues of foreign firms which I could not get here, but Wimble and Company had something like them. They are able to make and cast from these patterns. As a matter of fact, there are very few patent rights in connexion with type, and the slightest alteration from any particular pattern enables a maker to evade the patent law.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—The slightest variation?

Mr. CARR.—Yes; the slightest variation from the type forms registered.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—The honorable member does not approve of that.

Mr. CARR.—I regard it as an ordinary business transaction. According to the *American Inland Printer* of February of this year—

Through neglect to secure the protection afforded by the registration or patent laws of Great Britain, Germany, France, and Italy, the foreign sales of original faces of American types have been unnecessarily curtailed by the competition of letter-founders in all those countries, who have exercised their legal right to appropriate such designs.

Messrs. Stephenson, Blake, and Company, the English manufacturers, make type very similar to that illustrated in the *American*

Line Type Book, the standard work on American printing type. The same type often goes under two different names. For instance, what is called the "Westminster Old" by the English type-makers is called "Della Robia" by the Americans. Then what is called "Italian Old-style" by English makers is called "Jensen Old-style" by the Americans. The fact that different faces of type are sold under the same name shows that there are no patent rights in regard to them. Moreover, it is very hard to define any special face, so that local manufacturers are practically at liberty to make any face of type that they like. It has been said that only a few boys and girls are employed in making type locally; but, as a matter of fact, some seventy hands are employed in the Sydney type foundry. Twelve handlings are necessary to produce the finished article; but, without wearying the Committee with a description of all the processes of manufacture, I wish to emphasize what I have already stated, that, while at the present time the kinds of type available for jobbing fonts are somewhat limited, there is nothing to prevent all the varieties of type that the world knows of being made, supposing that the industry gets the protection for which it now asks. I know Mr. Wimble personally, and have had business dealings with him. The country would be quite safe in accepting his pledge not to increase prices; but, in any case, Parliament can protect the consumers under a measure for regulating this and other industries. The firm pays the best wages, and there is a good feeling towards it on the part of the employés, which is very pleasant to see. Even at the present time, notwithstanding the use of linotypes, the expenditure on type amounts to between £14,000 and £20,000 a year. The honorable member for Coolgardie said that some of the type which is imported is again exported. That is not so. The type exported is, as the honorable member for Parramatta has stated, the Wimble type, which is sent to New Zealand, where it finds a better market than in Australia, because the operations of the business concerns there are not so hidebound as those of the Australian firms. If we cannot get patriotism spontaneously, we must, since it is so necessary for the development of Australian industries, compel people to be patriotic by making it impossible, or at least unprofitable, for them to buy other than Australian manufactures, when these can be produced at prices not exceeding those of importations, and are of as good quality.

In view of the large expenditure upon type in Australia, probably with an increase in the duty, another firm will start, and that will provide competition. The honorable member for Calare objects to the duty on type because type is used by the small man, and he would exempt linotypes because they are used by the large man. The existence of patent rights prevents the Australian manufacture of linotypes; but there is nothing to prevent the manufacture, within the Commonwealth, of ordinary and jobbing type of all kinds, and it is only reasonable to provide for its manufacture here. The present makers are ready to be bound by any reasonable restrictions that Parliament may choose to place upon them. Once we have a factory hedged about by the necessary conditions, we have, as it were, a policeman to watch the operations of any similar factory, and prevent evasions of the law. I hope that the Committee will take advantage of this opportunity to encourage an industry which will be a boon and not a bane to our printers.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN (Indi) [5.31].—I do not profess to know much about the printing business; but I have received a circular from an influential body of printers who I think would not be guilty of printing an absolute untruth. I quite recognise the principle enunciated by the last speaker. We are here, I think, to do what we can to give a good protectionist policy to the country. But whether that is to be prohibition or not I do not know. It appears to me that we are departing very steadily from what I call a good protective policy. While at first I was quite prepared to follow the protectionist recommendations of the Tariff Commission, I am considerably shocked at the manner and the mode in which they were arrived at. Hitherto type has been allowed to come in free, and the duty recommended by the Tariff Commission, and proposed by the Government, is 25 per cent. The circular which I hold in my hand puts the position in this way—

Again the occasion has arisen for united action by the masters printers of Victoria in protection of their interests.

Of course, there are two sides to every question. The side of the workman has been presented with great force, but the side of the other man, who, in my opinion, is concerned as much as the worker, has not yet been presented. The circular continues—

The Federal Tariff, as recently introduced, contemplates the taxing heavily of the principal articles constituting our raw material, namely, writing and printing paper, type, and ink.

After dealing with the first two items, it goes on to say—

Even if the one type foundry in Sydney essayed the impossible task of meeting all Australian requirements the restriction of the printer to the type faces obtainable here would be tantamount to throwing the printing art in Australia back twenty years.

That circular is signed by two reputable men—Mr. J. C. Stephens, President, and Mr. J. B. Walker, Honorary Secretary, of the Victorian Master Printers' Association. To show how considerate they have been, let me mention that there is attached to the circular a printed list, and that in 95 cases out of 100 they have agreed very largely to many of the items submitted in this Tariff. That shows, at any rate, that they were not biased. The Treasurer has, I understand, practically agreed to a duty of 20 per cent. in each column.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Too much.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—That may be. It would be a considerable reduction of the present duty, but I understand that my colleagues in the corner are anxious to secure a duty of 20 per cent. in the general Tariff, and 15 per cent. in the preferential Tariff. If it is true that it will take a considerable period to build up a manufactory sufficient to cope with the requirements of the printing trade, surely it is only fair to give the printers the benefit of the doubt? If the Treasurer will agree to duties of 20 per cent. and 15 per cent. respectively, he will show his appreciation of the difficulties which have to be faced by the master printers. While some of my honorable friends ejaculate that a duty of 20 per cent. is too high, I think it is a great jump to impose that duty on an article which hitherto has been free. I was only a neophyte when the great Graham Berry introduced his protectionist policy. As I said the other night, I do not believe that he can be resting in his grave when we are putting duties of 30 and 40 per cent. on articles which he declared would never require to bear more than a duty of 12½ or 10 per cent. Although, as I said before, it is a big jump to impose a duty of 20 per cent. on an article which hitherto has been free, still I am prepared to fall in with the suggestion. If the bulk of the material is imported from Great Britain, it will not do any great harm if we reduce the preferential duty to 15 per cent.

Mr. SPENCE (Darling) [5.38].—In re-

mittee is called upon to adhere to the policy which so far has been pursued. A case has been made out on behalf of a local firm of manufacturers, who, under adverse Tariff conditions, entered upon an important business. Their products are very essential to the printing trade. It is admitted that only one fault can be found with the firm, and that is that they have not yet attained to the position of having on hand always a stock equal to that which is essential to a country with a population of 80,000,000. No fault has been found with the faces of the type. Every one has approved of their quality. Every criticism has been favorable. Therefore, the firm have proved their ability to produce the quality. Any one who glances at the book referred to by the honorable member for Macquarie, or the *Inland Printer*, or indeed at any catalogue, will realize what an immense number of faces the firm necessarily have to produce to keep a supply equal to modern requirements. The firm, I understand, are employing seventy hands, and importing five experts—several are now on their way—to design new faces. My information is that it is quite a common thing for type foundries to attach new names to the same faces of type. The local firm have already taken steps to invent Australian designs. In my opinion, they are entitled to consideration at our hands. I have been surprised that not one of the Victorian protectionists has risen to say a word on behalf of this industry. Whenever a duty is proposed on behalf of a Melbourne industry, even if it employs only three men and a boy, there is quite a rush on their part to support the proposal, whether the local manufacturer is able to make the articles or not. I expect those honorable members to rise and support the protection which is proposed on behalf of this type-founding industry. Apart from members' individual views, Parliament has adopted a protectionist policy. We have already imposed duties on items which, owing to the existence of patent rights, cannot be made in Australia. I have been trying to get some consideration for the users of those articles. I intend to support the claim of a firm which, in my opinion, is well founded, so that they may be put on an equality with other manufacturing firms, and I expect to secure the active support of valiant Victorian protectionists whether the industry is conducted in their own State or not.

Mr. MALONEY.—Any one who wants a book printed with better type is very hard to please.

Mr. SPENCE.—It is admitted that practical printers require for the trade a larger number of faces than the local firm produce; but the quality of the Australian type is approved. I am informed that the best type passes through thirteen hands before it is finished. There is more labour employed in producing the best quality of type than is generally supposed. The idea of the honorable member for Parramatta seems to me to be quite out of the question. What he suggests is that the local firm shall go on without a duty until they are able to supply the whole market. If the firm should ever attain to that position, they will not require a duty. That is not the idea of protectionists at all. Why should that firm be singled out for differential treatment simply because it is not able to supply local requirements? The only other question to consider is, how much duty shall be imposed? Some practical printers have indicated that there is a sufficient margin to enable them to supply, without increasing the price, the demand which the local firm cannot supply. How far that statement is correct, those engaged in the business know best. I believe that there is a considerable margin. The local firm have, I understand, agreed not to raise the price, and the importers will act as a check upon them. There is an advantage in having type made locally. If it is up-to-date, if it is equal in artistic appearance to the best type in the world, printers are always able to secure a supply whenever they run short. I happen to know that in some cases printers have been unable to procure from the importer an additional supply of a particular font of type, and it has had to be ordered from England or America.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—That does not occur often.

Mr. SPENCE.—I do not suggest that it happens very often, but it is an advantage to a printer when he runs short of a particular font to be able to readily get an additional supply from a local maker. This firm undertake to make a special feature of that. I am inclined to think that a duty of 20 per cent., as suggested by the honorable member for Hindmarsh, will be sufficient. Wimble and Company have been able to build up a trade without any duty at all. I think that the Com-

mittee might very well agree to an all-round duty of 20 per cent. Necessarily printers will have to import type to some extent. The local makers cannot completely overtake the Australian demand.

Mr. MAHON.—The honorable member had better hear what the small printers have to say about a 20 per cent. duty.

Mr. SPENCE. — Unfortunately the small printers are not very frequent purchasers of type. They struggle along for a long while with their old type. Any one who looks at some country newspapers will see that the type from which they are printed has not a very good face. Of course, the printers want to get their type as cheaply as they can, but the duty would not increase the price materially. There is a sufficient margin of profit to enable the importer to cut his price down. In any case, country printers are not constantly buying type. I wish to be quite fair all round. If we are going to have a protective policy, why single out type for an exception? I have tried to get consideration for other industries, and have failed. The printer can pass on the cost to his customers, but that cannot be done in the case of mining.

Mr. MAHON.—How can he pass on the cost when his newspaper always sells for a penny?

Mr. SPENCE.—He can increase the price of advertising, or charge more to those for whom he does job printing. I think we might very well pass the duty at 20 per cent.

Mr. JOHNSON (Lang) [5.48]. — It seems to me that as long as there is one little industry in Victoria which, quite irrespective of the rights of consumers, clamours for a duty, that little industry must have protection amounting in its incidence practically to prohibition.

Mr. BAMFORD.—This little industry is in Sydney.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Now, we happen to have under consideration one of those rare instances in which Sydney has an industry that wants a duty. It happens that the only type foundry in Australia is situated in Sydney. It was established in 1882.

Mr. MALONEY.—Mr. Wimble first started in Melbourne.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The Government will agree to a duty of 20 per cent. all round.

Mr. JOHNSON.—That is too high; and I shall state my reasons for thinking so. I refer honorable members to the

evidence given before the Tariff Commission. The proprietor of the Sydney industry gave evidence which is reported on page 2659. He said that owing to lower prices of imported type, he can only supply "sorts," which the agents of foreign makers do not supply, his prices being from 7½ per cent. to 10 per cent. higher. Those statements are contained in questions 78014 and 78022. The agent of one of the importing firms, Mr. Burke, gave evidence in rebuttal of the local manufacturer's statements. He said, on page 2663, that the local maker largely sells his type in New Zealand, against all foreign makers, at the same price as in Sydney, he paying the freight and expenses—questions 94125, 94148, and 94158. Again, he stated that two or three type foundries supply, and suffice to supply, all the requirements of the English-speaking world, and that therefore the local industry would be small even if it supplied all the type required in the Commonwealth. He went on to say that it would not pay to design and make a new variety of type even if every printer in Australia agreed to take a quantity of each—question 94126. The honorable member for Macquarie has mentioned that English manufacturers of type pirate American designs.

Mr. CARR.—I can prove it.

Mr. JOHNSON.—I am not in a position to say whether or not that is so. I am willing to take the honorable member's word. But I point out that the same kind of thing takes place in the case of the local manufacturer. I do not make that statement on my own authority, because I do not know. I base it upon the evidence given before the Tariff Commission. With reference to pirating, it was stated there that the local maker "pirates" the new types designed elsewhere by making electrotype castings of each letter—questions 94132 and 94162. The evidence goes on to show that one of the automatic type-making machines produces £100 worth of type in a day, and that consequently little labour is employed, and the labour cost is insignificant—question 94174. It is further stated that the wages are higher in American and British type foundries than in the Australian ones—question 94136-7. It will be seen that this is not a question of low-priced as against high-priced labour, because, as a matter of fact, the only competitors in this line of industry are paid higher wages in Great Britain and America than the local workmen are paid. It was also stated in the evidence

that youths are doing work in the Australian industry which elsewhere is done by adults at high wages, those wages being \$18 per week in America, and 38s. in England—questions 94126 and 94138.

Mr. MCWILLIAMS.—How many men does Wimble employ?

Mr. JOHNSON. — About sixty or seventy, I believe; but I do not think that that matters a great deal, because the great point at issue is that of wages. The argument of those honorable members, who pin their faith in heavy taxation as a means of promoting prosperity and who believe that we need to protect Australian labour against the lower wages paid in other countries, is, "How are you to prevent the local manufacturer from fairly competing unless you give him the advantage of a duty?" I have pointed out that the American and British workmen have greater reason to complain in this instance of the lower wages paid in the Australian industry, and that therefore there is not a tittle of excuse for removing this item from the free list. In the absence of any stronger argument than I have yet heard, I shall vote for retaining type on the free list.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN (Calare) [5.57]. —I wish to supplement what I have already said with further information. I have before me a circular from Messrs. Wimble and Company in which they state, writing on the 6th September, that they have about sixty men employed in their factory. Writing on the 15th November, they state that they have seventy-one employes. I also have circulars from the Master Printers' Association, and allied trades of Queensland, New South Wales, and Victoria. All of those associations ask that these goods should be placed on the free list. The secretary of the Queensland Association states that 14,000 hands employed by these associations are interested in having the goods placed on the free list.

Mr. CARR.—The employes want the duty.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—The honorable member may know what is in the employes' minds, but against that contention are two facts. First of all, we have to remember that the big printing firms get a large proportion of their appliances free. But the small country pressmen are asked to pay 25 per cent. In the second place, there are only seventy-one employes engaged in the factory that is asking for this duty,

while there are 14,000 employés who are interested in the goods being placed on the free list.

Mr. McWILLIAMS (Franklin) [6.0].—The honorable member for Calare has made a point which I think is a good one, and deserving of attention. The machines, which are really the makers of type for the large newspapers, are admitted free. In other words, the large newspapers which have linotypes practically use no other type at all. This duty will, unquestionably, for many years hit the proprietors of small country newspapers. It is all very well for the honorable member for Darling to say that it will not be felt by newspaper men; if he had to buy a few faces of type for a newspaper, or sufficient founts for a job printing office, he would quickly discover that it is a very considerable item. Country newspaper and job printing offices have to stock a large quantity of type, having regard to the work that they turn out; they have to keep in stock type which sometimes is not used more than once or twice in a year. Variety is necessary to secure custom. I have no desire to say one word against the Australian type foundry, but I would point out that it does not produce the variety of founts to be found in the catalogues of the large American and English type foundries. The cost of type, even when it was on the free list, was quite dear enough for the man who had to buy it, and this duty will fall heavily upon men who can ill afford to bear it. I recognise that there is no hope of restoring the item to the free list, but I would urge honorable members not to agree to a duty of more than 20 per cent. on foreign imports, or of more than 15 per cent. on imports from Great Britain.

Mr. CARR (Macquarie) [6.3].—In reply to the statements made with reference to the Australian type foundry, I desire to say that it employs five skilled men, who receive from £6 to £3 15s. per week, and that three more skilled artisans are being brought out by the *Dorset* in order that the foundry may cope with the increased trade which has resulted from the imposition of the duty. Since the introduction of the new Tariff, the trade has not been called upon to pay an extortionate price for type; the country printer has not been, and is not going to be, asked to pay any portion of this duty. If he were, I should be one of the first to agitate for its repeal. I know the men engaged in

this industry, and therefore have no hesitation in making this statement. In view of the fact that there are seventy-two hands engaged in the industry, and that following the arrival of the three special artisans to whom I have referred something like 250 persons will be employed, I think we should be prepared to assist it.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—How many boys are employed?

Mr. CARR.—Scarcely any boys; but a number of girls are employed. The type is cast in slugs, which are easily separated, and the girls have simply to part the "stamps" and pass them on for trimming purposes. The process is a very simple one, and since many girls have to work for their living, it is better that they should be employed in this than in many other ways. I have it on undoubted authority that the Australian type foundry is casting over 100 varieties of jobbing type, comprising some 300 characters; and fifty series of type, comprising 500 different sizes or bodies, are now cast by it. In short, I may say that the variety is sufficiently wide to meet the necessities of every country printing office. I have been identified with country newspaper offices for many years, and have no hesitation in saying that they need never go beyond Wimbles factory for what they want. Special type may be required by large job printing offices, and even those varieties will be obtainable from the local foundry when the industry is sufficiently established.

Sir JOHN FORREST (Swan) [6.7].—I have listened with attention to the debate, and have learnt that there is only one large firm in Australia engaged in the casting of type. That firm is well known throughout Australia, and, under free-trade, its business has attained considerable proportions. We have only to look at the catalogue which the members of that firm sent to us the other day, to satisfy ourselves that the industry is in a flourishing condition. No one desires that they should not have some assistance, although they seem to have done very well without it. Last year, I understand, our imports of type were valued at less than £10,000, showing a falling off as compared with the imports of previous years. I am not going to suggest that the reason for this reduction is solely that the local industry is successfully competing with the importers, but it would not be unfair to use such an argument. It would certainly be unjustifiable to grant

an industry which has flourished without protection, the benefit of a protective duty of 25 per cent.

Mr. CARR.—These people have been struggling.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—I knew them twenty years ago, when they were in a large way of business in Little Collins-street, and should be pleased, knowing that they are enterprising people, to give them some protection. If we agree to a duty of 15 per cent. against imports from Great Britain, and 20 per cent. on imports from the rest of the world, they should be satisfied. I have not heard one argument in support of the Government proposal, and I think that duties of 20 per cent. and 15 per cent. would constitute a very effective protection.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I have already agreed to accept a duty of 20 per cent. all round.

Mr. FOWLER (Perth) [6.10].—This is an item on which I am very much tempted to vote protection for the time being, if only to encourage some of the great protectionist newspapers in Australia to support an Australian industry. The witness who appeared before the Commission to ask for a duty on type, pointed out that that great protectionist organ, the *Melbourne Age*, would not use his type, and I take it that protectionists in this House are under an obligation to compel such a representative protectionist newspaper to observe the true principle of protection. I merely mention this for their information and education.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—The big newspapers are not affected; they use linotypes.

Mr. FOWLER.—They also use some type. For the sake of encouraging a local industry, they ought to be prepared to support such a duty as that now under consideration; but in this, as in other cases, we find them saying, "Protection is a bad thing for the other man, but very good for us."

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I take up a very different attitude.

Mr. FOWLER.—I compliment the honorable member on the thoroughness of his efforts to carry into effect the policy of protection, and I can only regret that there are among protectionists so many striking instances to the contrary. My own view is that this duty will undoubtedly fall on those who can ill-afford to bear it—the proprietors of struggling country newspapers, who—although I may say in passing I am

not a representative of a country constituency—I think are entitled to the consideration of the Committee.

Mr. MALONEY (Melbourne) [6.12].—As the honorable member for Swan has said, Wimble and Company are a very old firm. Mr. Wimble bought out a man named Thitchener in Melbourne, but, being unable to carry on the business, he went to Sydney, and after a hard struggle, endeavoured in vain to induce the Master Printers' Association to buy him out. If he has succeeded to a certain extent in establishing this industry, it has been by dint of great exertion, by reason of his splendid mental capacity and as the result of the assistance of others in monetary and other directions. I have read all the circulars that have been sent to me in regard to this matter, and I think the fairest suggestion that I have had put before me by a master printer is that we should impose this duty in respect of all the classes of type which Mr. Wimble manufactures, and allow other classes to come in at a reduced rate. All the printers to whom I have spoken have referred in complimentary terms to the type made by the Australian foundry, and I am sure that no master printer will indorse what were perhaps the unkind remarks uttered by the honorable member for Coolgardie.

Mr. MAHON.—I deny absolutely that I said anything unkind.

Mr. MALONEY.—The honorable member uttered remarks that were as unkind as a bitter tongue could make them.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS (Robertson) [6.14].—Four independent gentlemen selected by the Prime Minister of Australia to investigate the condition of this industry, as well as that of others, have recommended the imposition of a duty of 10 per cent.

Mr. WATSON.—And four other equally independent gentlemen have recommended a duty of 25 per cent.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—Those gentlemen, being in favour of high protective duties, recommended the duty which the honorable member for South Sydney has mentioned. But it must be borne in mind that all the members of the Tariff Commission were equally conscientious in their examination of the evidence. There was an understanding amongst the protectionist members of the Commission when they set out on their inquiries that Australian industries were to receive higher protection, and be-

cause of that they recommended the imposition of a higher duty on nearly everything that was brought under their notice. The free-traders on the Commission, knowing that this industry had been carried on in New South Wales without any protection, and was in a flourishing condition, determined that the duty ought not to be more than 10 per cent. The honorable member for Perth has stated that the *Age* newspaper, which is a protectionist organ, will not use the type manufactured by this firm.

MR. FOWLER.—I do not think the *Age* proprietors will use them inks either.

MR. HENRY WILLIS.—In contradistinction, I may point out that such free-trade organs as the *Sydney Morning Herald* and the *Town and Country Journal* do use the type manufactured by this firm. They say that it is excellent type; quite as good as any they could get elsewhere for their particular purpose. This goes to show that free-traders are not against the establishment of local industries. The reason why the proprietors of the newspapers referred to do not use more of the Australian type is because of the excessive charge made for it as compared with the price of the imported. An honorable member of the Committee, who represents the "Fourth Estate," said that if this firm obtained the protection of the proposed increased duty, they would not pass the duty on to the consumer.

MR. CARR.—That is correct.

MR. HENRY WILLIS.—While the honorable member might not pass on this duty, thinking that it would not be right to do so, the honorable member for South Sydney has stated that it is probable there will be competition in the industry, and we cannot speak for those who later on will come into the trade. We cannot be sure that they will not pass the duty on to the consumer.

MR. CARR.—Surely they would not raise prices to catch the other man's trade?

MR. HENRY WILLIS.—It is about time something was said on behalf of industries that can live without protection, and on behalf of the small class in the community that would be called upon to pay the whole of this tax. It would certainly fall on the poor printer in the country who would be unable to pass it on. He could not increase the cost of his publication, or his charges for advertisements, because of the keen competition of the city press. In justice, therefore, to a section of the community who have done so

much for the whole Commonwealth in circulating their publications, very often at a loss, we should place this item in the position which it occupied in the old Tariff, and that is upon the free list. We know that the industry now existing would not, in consequence, be crushed, because it grew and prospered under free-trade.

MR. WATSON.—It has not prospered. One company failed some little time ago, and another firm is taking up the business to try what they can do with it.

MR. HENRY WILLIS.—I gathered from what the honorable member for South Sydney said that there is capital available for investment in the industry.

MR. WATSON.—I do not know that.

MR. HENRY WILLIS.—I understand that even after investigation of the position of a mismanaged concern, capital can be found for investment in this industry on a free-trade basis. Why then should we penalize the small country printer by imposing an excessive duty upon printers' type? If honorable members will not agree to admit type free of duty, they should not impose a higher duty than 10 per cent., which was recommended by the free-trade section of the Tariff Commission and if they must impose a higher duty than that, then I ask them to treat the small section of the community interested in this item, as they have already decided to treat the large section to whom they have given in respect of their tools of trade a duty of 15 per cent.

MR. WYNNE (Balaclava) [6.21].—As I understand that other honorable members are willing to forego their right to speak, in order that we may have a division before dinner, I am willing to do the same.

MR. FOWLER.—I wish to make something in the nature of a personal explanation. The honorable member for Robertson spoke under a misapprehension in saying that the free-trade section of the Tariff Commission recommended a duty of 10 per cent. on type. I have explained time and again how the Government have seized on our system of classification and applied it, as they have done in this case, incorrectly. Our finding on this subject is stated at page 28 of our report, as follows—

The demand for type in Australia is too limited to permit of its manufacture on the most approved and economical system. A protective duty would, therefore, become a tax which would fall most heavily on the job and country printers.

Mr. WATSON.—Ten per cent. is not a protective duty.

Amendment (Mr. MAHON'S) negatived.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS (Robertson) [6.23].—We have arrived at an understanding to-day that tools of trade shall carry a duty of not more than 15 per cent. I hope honorable members will regard type as a tool of trade, and I therefore move as an amendment—

That the words "and on and after 29th November, 1907, ad val., 15 per cent.," be added.

Amendment negatived.

Amendment (by Mr. MAHON) agreed to—

That the words "and on and after 29th November, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 20 per cent.," be added.

Amendment (by Mr. MAHON) put—

That the words "ad val. (United Kingdom), 15 per cent.," be added to the item as amended.

The Committee divided.

Ayes	18
Noes	28

Majority	...	10
----------	-----	----

AYES.

Archer, E. W.	Poynton, A.
Atkinson, L.	Sinclair, H.
Brown, Tilley	Storrer, D.
Cook, Joseph	Thomson, Dugald
Edwards, R.	Thomson, John
Fowler, J. M.	Wilson, J. G.
Fysh, Sir Philip	
Liddell, F.	<i>Tellers:</i>
MAHON, H.	Johnson, W. E.
McWilliams, W. J.	Willis, Henry

NOES.

Carr, E. S.	Maloney, W. R. N.
Catts, J. H.	Mathews, J.
Chanter, J. M.	McDougall, J. K.
Chapman, Austin	Quick, Sir John
Coon, J.	Sampson, S.
Deakin, A.	Tudor, F. G.
Ewing, T. T.	Watkins, D.
Fairbairn, G.	Watson, J. C.
Forrest, Sir John	Webster W.
Foster, F. J.	Wise, G. H.
Groom, L. E.	Wynne, A.
Harper, R.	
Hedges, W. N.	<i>Tellers:</i>
Irvine, W. H.	Cook, Hume
Lyne, Sir William	Hutchison, J.

PAIRS.

Kelly, W. H.	Kingston, C. C.
Fuller, G. W.	Bamford, F. W.
Livingston, J.	Batchelor, E. L.
Bowden, E. K.	Salmon, C. C.
Brown, Thomas	Page, J.
Reid, G. H.	Crouch, R. A.
Smith, Bruce	Hall, D. R.
Hutcheson, W. M.	Knox, W.
Colonel McM.	Mauger, S.
H.	O'Malley, King
C.	Frazer, C. E.
	Fisher, A.

Question so resolved in the negative.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. WYNNE.—I wish to make a personal explanation. I am personally in favour of duties of 20 and 15 per cent. on this item, but the Minister in charge of the Tariff said that he was under the impression that an arrangement was made that 20 per cent. should be agreed to, and I voted as I did, in order to carry out the arrangement which the honorable gentleman thought was made.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I also wish to make a personal explanation. I desire to say that, on the understanding that the vote was to be for duties of 20 and 15 per cent., we agreed to forego division on the other amendment. If the Minister has been mistaken, so have we.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—I have to say, by way of personal explanation, because I think the honorable member for Parramatta can only refer to me—

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Not at all.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—Then I will say no more.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—I have a personal explanation to offer. I wish to say that I was decidedly in favour of this duty being fixed at 20 and 15 per cent., but, as the Treasurer considered that there was some understanding that those with whom I am acting would vote for the 20 per cent. duty all round, I felt compelled to vote with the Government rather than carry out what I should like to have seen done.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Sitting suspended from 6.32 to 7.45 p.m.

Postponed item 176. Screws, n.e.i.; including Screws with nuts not being bolts and nuts; Sash Screws and attachments; Engineers' Set Screws; Music Stool and Table; Roofing, and Spiral Screws (General Tariff), 5 per cent.; (United Kingdom), free.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [7.45].—I move—

That the words "And on and after 29th November, 1907—

A. Screws with nuts, engineers' set screws, brake and plough screws, music stool, table, roofing and spiral screws, ad val. (General Tariff), 25 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 20 per cent.

B. Screws for wood, per cwt., ad val. (General Tariff), 5s. 6d.; (United Kingdom), 5s.

C. Screws, n.e.i., including sash screws and attachments, ad val. (General Tariff), 5 per cent.; (United Kingdom), free," be added.

I am proposing new paragraph A because it is in accord with what seems to be the decision of the Committee in all these items. I do not want to propose duties

of 30 per cent. and 25 per cent., and then, after a long debate, have to come down to duties of 25 per cent. and 20 per cent.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS (Robertson) [7.46].—The Minister has not told us why he has changed his mind, and raised the proposed 5 per cent. and free to 25 per cent. and 20 per cent. respectively.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I have not.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—The item as it stands now in the Tariff is, "Screws n.e.i. including screws with nuts, &c. (General Tariff) 5 per cent.; (United Kingdom) free."

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I am moving to add what I have read to the end of the item as it stands, because, if we were to strike out the item, we should have to pass the amendment in substitution of it, or else the Department could not collect the duties to-morrow.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—The Minister is proposing to increase the duties. He proposes to add words similar to those in the item, but with the articles enumerated in more detail, and to increase the duties up to 25 per cent. and 20 per cent.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—It is a re-distribution and re-arrangement.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—The amendment includes all the articles in item 176, and a few others of a similar nature. The Minister, as an intelligent man, should give some explanation to an intelligent Committee for increasing the rates. He may be able to make out a strong case, but he has made out no case at all yet.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [7.50].—What I propose is a re-distribution of the articles. Screws n.e.i. come under the 5 per cent. rate and free, and are not raised to the 25 per cent. rate, as the honorable member for Robertson suggests. The articles were not clearly defined in the item as it stood in the Tariff. There is no intention in my proposal to interfere with the principle of what we have done before. The re-distribution and re-arrangement has been made departmentally. Screws with nuts, engineers' set screws, music-stool and table, roofing and spiral screws, should not have appeared generally in the item as they did originally. I propose to make those, and also brake and plough screws, subject to duties of 25 per cent. and 20 per cent. respectively.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [7.53].—It strikes me that this is an at-

tempt to put the screw on. We are entitled to know from the Minister the reason for his entire change of front.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—It is not a change of front; it is a redistribution with proper wording.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—It is a change from 5 per cent. to 25 per cent.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—On some articles.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Of course, that is a matter of no consequence to the honorable member! Only one of the articles in item 176 is omitted from his new 25 per cent. list.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I have retained "screws, n.e.i.," on the 5 per cent. and free list.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The Treasurer has omitted one article, and included two fresh ones in the 25 per cent. list. Why has this been done?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—It has been done by the Department absolutely for departmental reasons, in connexion with the subdivision of the item.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Then has it come to this: that the Department imposes these duties?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—No. I get my information as to the best arrangement from the Department.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Hang the arrangement! I have no quarrel with that. I am speaking of the increase of the rates of duty from 5 per cent. to 25 per cent. The Treasurer can re-arrange as much as he likes, so long as he does not increase the rates in this way.

Mr. CHANTER.—Let us take a vote on it.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I am sure the honorable member will give an intelligent vote, because he knows as much about it as I do—and that is nothing. Some honorable members would vote for anything under the sun, so long as it meant an increase of duty.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The items are to be re-arranged, because it was a mistake to put them as they were in the original item.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The departmental arrangements, in order to facilitate the handling and controlling of these matters, have nothing to do with the rates of duty. I suppose that, under the item as it stood in the Tariff, the majority of these articles would have been free, as the bulk of them come from Great Britain.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—They are all parts of those machines and engines upon which we put duties of 25 per cent. and 20 per cent.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Is a music-stool screw a part of mining machinery?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—It is part of the music stool.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I am quite aware of that. I shall be glad to hear an explanation from the Minister, but I shall certainly resist the attempt to increase duties in this way without a word of explanation or warning to the Committee. The Treasurer should, before re-classifying articles in this way in paragraphs, and subjecting some of them to fixed duties and others to *ad valorem* duties, intimate his intention to the Committee, and not spring it upon us in this way. Why are "screws for wood" to be subjected to fixed duties of 5s. 6d. and 5s. per cwt., instead of 5 per cent. *ad valorem* and free, as the Treasurer proposed when he submitted the Tariff?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—They are all made here.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—On none of these articles was there any duty in the old Tariff.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—That was a great mistake. It closed up an industry here. They have started again now.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Why, if the honorable gentleman knew of all these calamitous occurrences, did he put these articles on the free list when framing his Tariff? Have they only lately come to his cognizance? He says the want of duty has closed up an industry. Apparently, he has only just discovered it, because, a few weeks ago, he put the articles on the free list. Now, perforce, they must be subjected to fixed duties of 5s. 6d. and 5s. per cwt. How do those rates work out *ad valorem*? I have no idea as to what the incidence of this new taxation is. I do not know the value of the screws for wood, and, unless the fixed rate can be taken out for us *ad valorem*, how are we to know what duty we are voting? The "5s. 6d. per cwt." is so much Dutch to us. If, as the honorable member for Boothby says, music-stool screws are related to mining machinery, I should like to know why they have not been placed in the same category as to the rates of duty? Mining machinery bears a duty of 20 per cent.; and yet the Treasurer proposes to make screws bear an impost of 25 per cent.

WILLIAM LYNE.—A duty of 5s. 6d. t. means a little over 5 per cent.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—There is not much to cavil at in a duty like that, and, therefore, the change becomes the more mysterious.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—It was made for better classification.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Then leave the classification as it is, and reduce the rates of duty; we do not quarrel with the classification, but with the duties. Somehow or other the classifications of the Treasurer always mean an increase in duties. And I submit that this is a most surreptitious way of endeavouring to get higher duties passed. It is most unfair that we should not be given notice of the Treasurer's intentions; and I do not see why these amendments should not have been circulated this morning, so that honorable members might have an opportunity to compare the amendments with the items in the Tariff. I move—

That the amendment be amended by leaving out the figures "25," paragraph A, with a view to insert in lieu thereof the figure "5."

Mr. BATCHELOR (Boothby) [8.5].—I think that the re-arrangement proposed by the Treasurer is an improvement. The duty on some of those screws certainly ought not to be 5 per cent. and free. For instance, I have in my hand a brake screw, and this and nearly all the screws mentioned by the Treasurer are square-threaded screws made on lathes. There is no reason in the world why these screws should be admitted free, because most of them are parts of the machines and engines which are to be admitted on duties of 25 per cent. and 20 per cent. There is no difference between a music-stool screw, a table screw, or a brake screw, and the other screws mentioned, so far as the mechanism is concerned; and all of them ought to be made here, as most of them are. Their manufacture gives considerable employment; and I do not think that, in any case, many of the larger screws would be brought in finished. It is certainly ridiculous to put them in the same category as, for instance, carpenters' screws, which are not made here. Engineers' set screws are not square threaded, and really take the form of a bolt without a nut. These are made here; but if they were free of duty, they would probably be imported ready-made. Almost all machines contain engineers' set screws, which are generally made from steel. In my opinion, duties of 25 per cent. and 20 per cent., as in the case of machinery, would be fair. No one will pretend to say

that such screws cannot be made here, or are not made here; and it is best, in order to make the Tariff harmonious, that the parts should bear the same duty as the finished article.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS (Robertson) [8.9].—If these screws are, and have been, entirely made here in the past, it is evident that the industry is on a sound footing, and does not require any fostering.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—I did not say that the screws are entirely made here.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—The honorable member indicated that the metal was imported, and then turned into screws in Australia.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—I said nothing about the metal coming here.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—That was what I understood the honorable member to indicate; and, if it be the case, the industry is, as I say, already established on the basis of the old Tariff. The Comptroller-General has had thirty or forty years' experience of such matters, and his suggestion was that the duty should be 5 per cent. and free. It would appear as though the honorable member for Parramatta has had a word with the Minister, and that, as a result, we have the proposal to increase the duty. The only difference between the last list and the present one is, that screws for wood have been made subject to a duty equal to about 5 per cent. As I said, the original schedule was not prepared by the Minister, but by the Comptroller of Customs.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—And he also prepared the schedule, which I am now proposing.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—Yes, but the Comptroller-General did not alter the schedule until the Minister made the suggestion.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I never spoke to him about it.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—In that case, I say no more.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [8.12].—There is much reason in the protest of the honorable member for Parramatta against proposals of this nature being suddenly sprung on the Committee, and honorable members being thus deprived of any opportunity to test the reasons given for the alteration.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I can assure the honorable member that I never had any

conversation with Dr. Wollaston at all about the matter. He submitted this item for the reasons I gave.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—That makes it all the worse, because it shows that even the Treasurer himself has not had time to test the possible effects of the alteration.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I depend on my officers in matters of detail.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—But Parliament cannot depend on the honorable gentleman's officers in the matter of fixing duties.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I have sufficient confidence in Dr. Wollaston to know that he will do the right thing.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Quite so; but I am sure the Minister would not allow Dr. Wollaston to prepare a Tariff—a matter in which both the Government and honorable members generally claim to have a say. I suggest that notice should be given of all such amendments.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I have other amendments.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Then notice ought to be given so that we may ascertain their possible effect, not only on the industry immediately concerned, but on other industries. No such opportunity is presented; and I shall support the amendment of the honorable member for Parramatta. The Treasurer has stated that the duty on screws for wood means about 5 per cent. If so, why separate these screws from screws n.e.i. Those screws for wood would have to cost about £100 a ton, according to the percentage which the Treasurer states.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I spoke on information from the Department.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—If the percentage be such, why form another division?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—That is desired by the Department.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Oh, the Department—

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—We must pay attention to the recommendations of the Department.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I refuse to pay attention to recommendations of the Department in determining the duties to be levied. If these fixed duties are equivalent to 5 or 6 per cent., why not include the articles enumerated in paragraph b under "screws n.e.i." in paragraph c?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [8.15].—Because on the smaller screws the specific duty is less than the *ad valorem* rate. At first, it seemed to me that there must be some anomaly in the rates fixed under this item. But I find that the difference between the duties levied upon nails and screws is explained by the fact that under the previous arrangement 20 per cent. would have been levied upon nails, whereas in reference to screws we proposed 5 per cent., and free.

Question.—That the figures “25” proposed to be left out stand part of the proposed amendment (Mr. JOSEPH COOK’s amendment of Sir WILLIAM LYNE’s amendment)—put. The Committee divided.

Ayes	31
Noes	17
—			
Majority	14

AYES.

Batchelor, E. L.	Lyne, Sir William
Carr, E. S.	Maloney, W. R. N.
Chapman, Austin	Mathews, J.
Coon, J.	McDougall, J. K.
Deakin, A.	Page, J.
Ewing, T. T.	Quick, Sir John
Fairbairn, G.	Sampson, S.
Forrest, Sir John	Spence, W. G.
Foster, F. J.	Storror, D.
Frazer, C. E.	Thomson, John
Groom, L. E.	Tudor, F. G.
Harper, R.	Watkins, D.
Hedges, W. N.	Wynne, A.
Hughes, W. M.	Tellers:
Hutchison, J.	
Knox, W.	Catts, J. H.
	Cook, Hume

NOES.

Bowden, E. K.	Mahon, H.
Brown, Thomas	Palmer, A. C.
Brown, Tilley	Poynton, A.
Cook, Joseph	Sinclair, H.
Edwards, R.	Thomson, Dugald
Glynn, P. McM.	Willis, Henry.
Johnson, W. E.	Tellers:
Liddell, F.	
Livingston, J.	Atkinson, L.
	McWilliams, W. J.

PAIRS.

Kingston, C. C.	Kelly, W. H.
Irvine, Hans	Wilks, W. H.
Bamford, F. W.	Fuller, G. W.
Crouch, R. A.	Reid, G. H.
Hall, D. R.	Smith, Bruce
O’Malley, King	Fowler, J. M.
Chanter, J. M.	Foxton, Colonel
Mauger, S.	Fysh, Sir Philip
Salmon, C. C.	Archer, E. W.

Question so resolved in the affirmative.

Amendment of the amendment negatived.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [8.20].—I desire to move that the duty in paragraph A be 15 per cent.

The CHAIRMAN.—I would point out that the Committee has just affirmed that the rate of 25 per cent. shall be retained. The item was a new one, submitted by the Treasurer, and it was necessary for the honorable member to move the omission of the figures “25.” Consequently the question was put in the form “that the figures proposed to be left out stand part of the question.”

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—But we might have placed the figures before the words “*ad valorem*.”

The CHAIRMAN.—I would point out to the honorable member that I can only do as I am directed by the members of the Committee.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I merely submitted the amendment, and left it to the Chairman to shape it.

Amendment (by Mr. JOSEPH COOK) negatived—

That the amendment be amended by leaving out the figures “20,” paragraph A, with a view to insert in lieu thereof the figures “15.”

Amendment (Sir WILLIAM LYNE’S) agreed to.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Postponed item 177. Mining Engines and Machinery, n.e.i., *ad val.* (General Tariff), 35 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 25 per cent.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [8.28].—I move—

That the words “and on and after 29th November, 1907—

Item 177. (A) Earth and Rock Boring, Cutting, Dredging, and Excavating Machinery;

(B) Ore Dressing Machinery and Appliances, n.e.i., and Accessories;

(C) Smelting, Leaching, and Metal-Refining Appliances,

ad val. (General Tariff), 30 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 25 per cent.,” be added.

Mr. WATKINS (Newcastle) [8.29].—I do not know whether the words “rock boring” will cover all the machines that should be included in this item. I would suggest the omission of the word “boring” with a view to the insertion of a new paragraph which will include mining machines which are not made in the Commonwealth, and which are not likely to be manufactured here for many years. I think that a new paragraph might be added to read—

“(D) Rotary and Percussive Rock Drills, Coal Cutting Machines, and Diamond Drilling Machines.”

I move—

That the amendment be amended by leaving out the word “boring.”

I move this amendment with a view to afterwards moving the addition of the new paragraph I have indicated.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [8.33].—I have no objection to a straightforward consideration of the item as it affects rock-boring drills; but I do not see that there is anything to be gained by the proposed alteration. I do not know why these kinds of machinery should be dissociated.

Mr. WATKINS.—We must dissociate them to make rock drills dutiable at 10 per cent. and 5 per cent.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—I think that the grouping proposed by the Government should be allowed to stand, on the rates being reduced from 30 per cent. to 25 per cent. on the general Tariff, and from 25 per cent. to 20 per cent. on the Tariff against importations from the United Kingdom. Before any change, such as is proposed is agreed to, reasons should be submitted to the Chamber in support of it.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—All other tools are dutiable at 15 per cent.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—We are now dealing with machinery of a very complicated character, rather than with tools.

Mr. WATKINS.—Is rock-boring machinery made in Australia?

Mr. SPENCE.—Or coal-cutting machinery?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—I know nothing about coal-cutting machinery, and I am not going to offer opposition to any proposed modification of the Tariff in regard to such machinery; but I do not think that rock drills and coal-cutting machines should be put together. There are many types of rock drills at present used in Australia which not only are of local manufacture, but owe their usefulness largely to their improvement and development by Australians. A Victorian engineer, Mr. Taylor-Horsfield, and a South Australian mining manager, Captain Hancock, of Moonta, have designed rock drills which are a considerable improvement upon those originally imported. These drills have acquired popularity in all the States, where they are largely used in assisting mining operations.

Mr. WATKINS.—Are they electrical drills?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—They may be driven by compressed air or by steam power, but they cannot be driven by electrical power.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—Are they used in Western Australia?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—Yes. Rock drills which do useful work have also been invented and manufactured in Queensland. Mr. Jas. F. Pearson, who gave evidence before the Tariff Commission as the representative of Walkers Limited, Maryborough, Queensland, said—page 2204, question 92351—

I should like to point out that I have for years made rock drills far cheaper than the American article. I have made them by the gross for use in Broken Hill, and it is only the hostility exhibited towards Australian-made articles that is in the way. If we had the market to ourselves we should introduce new machines and new gauges, so that every part we manufactured would be interchangeable.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—How many rock drills are used in Australia?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—I do not know how many are used in a year, but 3,000 Taylor-Horsfield rock drills have been made in Victoria, and since the Tariff came into operation no fewer than thirty or forty of these drills have been placed in the mines at Broken Hill, which shows that they are useful for the purposes for which drills are required. A catalogue issued by the makers mentions that the drills have been used, not only in the Bendigo district, but at Zeehan, Tasmania, a certificate in their favour having been given by Mr. C. F. Heathcote, A.M.I.C.E., general mining manager of the Western Silver Mines Company, there; at Paeroa, in New Zealand; at the Nil Desperandum Gold Mine, Forbes, New South Wales; at the Gibraltar Consolidated Gold Mines at Shepardsdown, New South Wales; at the Hillgrove gold-field; by the New Hillgrove Proprietary Mine Limited; and at the Menzies Consolidated Mine, Western Australia. The manager of the last-named mine, in a letter dated 13th December, 1902, wrote—

I have been using the Taylor-Horsfield improved national rock drills for the past two and a half years on the Menzies Consolidated G. M., and have pleasure in recommending them for durability and efficiency, also economy in air consumption. I have been working rock drills of all makes in the various States for the last twenty years, and have no hesitation in stating that the Taylor-Horsfield drills have proved superior to all others I have used.

I also find a certificate by Mr. M. Furguson, general manager of Queensland Menzies Gold Mining Company; a certificate by Mr. William Treloar, mining manager of the Princess Royal Gold Mining

Company, Norseman, Western Australia; a certificate by Mr. Charles I. Smith, mine manager of Charters Towers; a certificate by Mr. T. Hooper, manager, of Charters Towers; a certificate by Mr. Mathew Caine, of Burbanks Birthday Gift Gold Mine Limited—in New South Wales, I think.

Mr. HEDGES.—No, in Coolgardie. It is practically shut up, though.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—That's not the fault of the rock drill. I also find a certificate by Mr. W. W. Johns, manager of the Brown Hill Extended Limited of Kalgoorlie, which is in the honorable member's electorate.

Mr. FRAZER.—Yes; and when my honorable friend has finished reading the list, I will tell him that not one of those drills is working in Western Australia now.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—Let us hear the opinion of Mr. Johns of the Brown Hill Extended, Kalgoorlie. Writing on the 24th December, 1902, he says—

I have great pleasure in stating that the Taylor-Horsfield Improved National Rock Drill has been in use in this mine for the past three years, and has given every satisfaction.

In a certificate, dated January, 1903, Mr. W. J. Loring, manager of the Sons of Gwalia Limited, of Leonora, Western Australia, says—

I may state that we have been using two Taylor-Horsfield New Type Improved National Rock Drills for some time past. I take great pleasure in stating that they have given entire satisfaction.

Here is a certificate by Mr. Cleland, general manager of the Bailey's Gold Mine Limited, Coolgardie.

Mr. HEDGES.—That is shut up, too. It seems to shut up all the mines.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—This is not a matter for joking. I suppose that the mines are shut up because the gold has run out. Mr. Cleland says—

For rather more than two years we have been using the No. 2 Taylor-Horsfield Improved National Rock Drills in shaft sinking, driving, and mining generally on this property. . . . For boring solid quartz, I find the machine particularly effective. The four machines now in use have given us great satisfaction during the past two years, and are always in demand by our contract miners.

In another case, a man writing from Gympie, in Queensland, certifies that this improved rock-drill was satisfactory. The *Coolgardie Miner*, of the 20th November, 1902, gives an account of an interesting

contest for rock-drills, which was held at Kalgoorlie, and in which various descriptions competed. It says—

The new Ingersoll machine was the first to operate, and in 8 minutes 43 seconds put in a hole 47½ in. in depth. This was taken as a period for the test, and each machine was given a similar time to operate to see what it could do. The Taylor-Horsfield New Type National Drill then started, and put in excellent work from the first strike, and soon got to the extent of its longest drill. It was then found that this drill had put down a hole to the depth of 53½ in., and that it had been at work for only 7 minutes 8½ seconds, or 1 minute 34½ seconds less than the time allowed for the test. The Ingersoll-Sargent Drill was then set to work, and having operated for the full time—8 minutes 43 seconds—the hole was found to measure 48 inches.

That is the account of a test made in the honorable gentleman's own stronghold, and the Australian rock-drill came out on top. I do not see that there is any justification for running down Victorian, South Australian, and Queensland rock-drills.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—That is not necessary.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—I understand that it is held that they are inefficient, and do not serve their purpose, and that the imported rock-drill is wanted.

Mr. HEDGES.—Who said that?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—I have been told that it is going to be alleged, that the Australian rock-drill is inferior and unworkable, and that the American article is wanted.

Mr. WATKINS.—I did not say that. I said that I was informed that rock-drills were not made here.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—I am sure that this testimony will convince honorable members that rock-drills are made in Australia, and on an extensive scale, too, and also that they have acquired a good reputation. Of late years, I believe that the American Drill and Pump Trust—known as Ingersoll-Sargent-Rand—have been exploiting the Australian market and trying to run out Australian drills. I am informed that they have been entering into agreements and compacts with some mining companies to sell their drills at a cheaper rate, in consideration of the understanding that the latter shall use only imported drills.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—If the honorable member can produce a contract of that kind, it will affect this vote very much.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—I have also heard that tremendous efforts have been made by

this large company to defeat this duty, and to get rock-drills practically placed on the free list. I hope that honorable members will extend fair consideration to the Australian drills as well as to other Australian productions, and will not give any weight to the misrepresentations which are being made in various quarters about their inefficiency. It has stood the test and led the way in the development of mechanical ingenuity. I may say that in South Australia, the Tariff Commission were informed by an engineer that this Trust were on the look out for the slightest improvements in Australian drills, and that wherever they saw that an improvement had been made, they practically pirated it and utilized it for their own purposes.

Mr. FRAZER.—Can the honorable member say whether the makers of these Australian drills have asked for any duty to be imposed?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—I do not know. Mr. Taylor-Horsfield did not give evidence, but in South Australia evidence was given by Mr. John Felix Martin, of the Gawler Foundry.

Mr. HEDGES.—That is shut up, too.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—I wish that the honorable member would not make irrelevant interjections. If the Gawler Foundry has been shut up, it may have been due to circumstances which have nothing to do with this Tariff. At any rate, it was a going concern when the evidence was taken.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—That is so—it had nothing to do with the Tariff.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—Mr. Martin is one of the most famous engineers in Australia, and I do not think that the honorable member for Fremantle should cast sneering reflections upon a great establishment that turned out the locomotives and other high-class machinery which helped to keep the gold-fields of Western Australia going long before this imported rock drill was heard of. Mr. Martin was one of the foremost engineers in placing mining machinery on the Western Australian gold-fields. Not only did he do that, but he also put his money into some of the mines, and gave credit to struggling companies—a thing which English firms would not do.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Is the honorable member able to say whether the price of the local rock drill is lower or higher than the price of the imported article?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—With reference to prices, I have before me a communication which shows that the Broken Hill Proprietary

Company bought eight of Mr. Taylor-Horsfield's rock drills in February, 1903, for £44 10s. each. In June, 1904, the company called for tenders for the supply of rock drills by local makers and agents for imported machines. I have a list of the quotations, but I will not give the names. One American rock drill was quoted at £45; the Bendigo rock drills at £41 and £42 each; the Castlemaine rock drill at £37 15s.; and the Austral-Otis rock drill at £43. An order was placed with Parke and Lacey, of Sydney, for Ingersoll-Sargent rock drills at £44 10s. each, which was largely in excess of the price quoted for the local article.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I am told that sometimes the price of the imported rock drill is as much as from £10 to £20 higher than the price of the local article.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—I can assure the honorable member that the figures I have quoted are correct.

Mr. FRAZER.—I suppose that the increased price was paid because the imported article was no good.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—Evidently, in the exercise of their judgment, they give a preference to the imported drill.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Unquestionably they gave a preference to the imported article.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—The local article was cheaper, but evidently they wanted to obtain the imported article.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—And thereby hangs a tale, surely?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—I suppose that they wished to give a preference to the imported article. Since then, I believe, the price of the Australian rock drill has been reduced. I am assured that through the fierce competition which has been going on some of the imported rock drills can be obtained at £32 or £34 or £35, and some of the local rock drills at from as low as £27 to £28. So that, as regards price, they are getting down to bedrock. I do not believe that they could be made here more cheaply without being sold at a loss. The Ingersoll-Sargent-Rand Trust are making things so hot for the local manufacturers that it is feared that the latter will have to carry on their business at a loss, which, of course, could not be sustained for any length of time.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—The honorable member cannot accuse the trust of underselling the local article.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—Evidently the trust are making things very warm and bringing down the price, and the manufacturers of the local rock drills, in order to get any trade, have to quote a price lower than that of the imported article. Otherwise they would go behind.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—Evidently the imported rock drill is the better article.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—In the opinion of some persons it is. I have been told, and according to the evidence given before the Tariff Commission it is clear, that the Australian drill is as good as the imported article. As regards the rock to be penetrated, the Long Tunnel mine, at Walhalla, in Gippsland, has, I believe, country as tough, hard, and metallic as any rock formation in Australia, and yet the Taylor-Horsfield rock drill was used with great success in the sinking of an inclined shaft at that mine. In the *Mining Journal*, Mr. John Finlayson gives an account in which it is stated that the boring in the hard slate and the sandstone silurian of the Long Tunnel mine was done by machines made by Mr. Taylor-Horsfield, of Bendigo. I do not think that the rock formation of Kalgoorlie is harder than the rock formation of that mine, or the New Chum Railway mine at Bendigo, 4,400 feet deep, being the deepest quartz mine in the world. I contend that Australian rock drills are equal to the requirements of mining, not only in Victoria, but in all the other States. Up to the present time I have not heard any fair, reasonable grounds why the imported rock drill should be differentiated and placed on the free list.

Mr. FRAZER (Kalgoorlie) [8.59].—I listened very quietly to the speech of the honorable member for Bendigo.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—He has made out a good case.

Mr. FRAZER.—If my knowledge could lead me to make a speech on his side, I believe that the Treasurer would applaud me just as enthusiastically as he has applauded the honorable member for Bendigo. But we have to deal with this item as it affects the mining industry, and also secondary industries. Under the old Tariff this was one of the items which were placed on the free list, and so far as I know no suggestion was made then that a duty should be imposed. Up to the present time there has been no duty on this article in the Australian Tariff. An ex-

traordinary position has to be faced, however, in regard to this matter. The factory where rock drills are made happens to be in the constituency of the last speaker, who was also Chairman of the Tariff Commission; but although the head of the firm had an opportunity of bringing his case before the Commission, he did not do so. The only firm in Australia that puts rock drills on the market in any large quantities at the present time is the Taylor-Horsfield firm.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—He sent a letter to the Commission, but did not attend to give evidence.

Mr. FRAZER.—He did not ask for a duty.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—He sent a letter asking for one.

Mr. FRAZER.—Where is the letter? Is it printed as an appendix to the report? Will the honorable member produce it?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—It is somewhere in the archives of the Customs House, Melbourne.

Mr. FRAZER.—After all, it really does not matter very much whether he attended; he did not ask for a duty. The honorable member has read a number of testimonials from Western Australia—some from Kalgoorlie—but the latest which he could produce was written in 1903—four years ago. My honorable friend will admit that in regard to rock drills, as in regard to all other classes of mining machinery, the mind of the designer, of genius, has been at work. He will admit that the percussive rock drill is one of the most difficult pieces of machinery to manipulate continuously that is used on a mine. These machines have only about three inches of piston area, upon which they have to get a considerable strength to make the drill pierce the stone. What differentiates the scientific rock drill from the unscientific machine is the accuracy and style of the valve, a consideration that is important in order that the mine may have durability, and get satisfactory results from its drills. My honorable friend quoted extensively from the testimonials supplied to him, but it is remarkable that he quoted from none more recent than four years ago. Although the locally-made drills have been nursed on the Kalgoorlie field by a man who originally belonged to Bendigo, and who was one of Bendigo's strongest protectionists, Mr. Richard Hamilton, manager of the Great Boulder Mine, and although he did his level best to get good

results from the Australian rock drill, and has spent a good deal of money in endeavouring to prove its value and perfect it, yet I ask my honorable friend to accept my assurance that the Chamber of Mines, Western Australia, states that there is not one of these Australian drills in use in any important mine in Western Australia to-day.

Mr. COON.—Nonsense!

Mr. FRAZER.—Of course, the honorable member knows all about it, and the Western Australian Chamber of Mines knows nothing!

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—He has taken the Postmaster-General's place, and knows all about everything!

Mr. FRAZER.—The honorable member can get up and deny my statement if he chooses.

Mr. COON.—I will.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—Will the honorable member tell us why the Australian drill is not in use?

Mr. FRAZER.—I will proceed to do so. I repeat that I have it on the authority of the Society of the Chamber of Mines, and one of the members of the Committee, who should know what is in use at Kalgoorlie, that not one is being used there at the present time. And why? My honorable friend, the member for Bendigo, admits that the Australian drill is being sold at the present time for about £27. He also admits that the lowest quotation which could be got for a foreign or English drill in Bendigo was not less than £34. There is a difference of £7 on the capital cost. If the Australian drill is giving that satisfaction to mining men that the honorable member claims, is it not a most extraordinary thing that men in Bendigo are prepared to pay £34 for an imported rock drill when they could get a satisfactory locally-made drill for £7 less? That seems to me to be a very strong point. I am assured that the great difficulty in regard to the Australian drill is this: that up to the present time the makers have not been enabled to get the patents associated with the valve gear, so as to be able to produce a satisfactory drill. They cannot produce one which can be worked at the same cost in fuel and consumption of air as the imported drill. I am also assured by mining men, who produce figures in proof of their statement, that it costs about five times as much for the up-keep of the Australian drill as it costs for the up-keep of the

more highly developed scientific drill that is usually imported into this country. I am certainly not opposed to giving consideration to the encouragement of the production of this description of machinery, if it can be done without an unreasonable cost to any section of the community. If a proposal were made to Parliament for the inauguration of a system of bounties to promote scientific invention in Australia in regard to rock drills, I should be prepared to give favorable consideration to it. But when we are dealing with our great mining industry we must recollect that the cost of production in many instances is a matter of the existence or non-existence of a mine. The honorable member for Batman will admit that.

Mr. COON.—Yes; I admit that.

Mr. FRAZER.—Then we are getting on. The passing of a Tariff is not going to put a pennyweight more of gold into the ores that have to be mined and treated; and if our mining managers are not permitted to reduce their mining costs, I have the highest authority for stating that there are a number of mines in Western Australia which are just on the border-line between success and failure, the directors of which will have to consider whether they will be able to keep them going, or will have to close down. I suppose that that is not peculiar to Western Australia either.

Mr. ATKINSON.—It applies all over Australia.

Mr. FRAZER.—It must not be supposed that there is any prejudice on the part of our mining managers in favour of imported machines. They are prepared to look at the matter fairly. There are, for instance, men like Mr. Hamilton, whom I have already mentioned; Mr. Sutherland, of the Golden Horse Shoe; Mr. Nicholson, of the Ivanhoe; Mr. Moss, of the Kalgurli; and several other men, who have all graduated in the schools of the eastern States. These men have tried the Australian rock drill, and have had to abandon it.

Mr. COON.—Why?

Mr. FRAZER.—Because they have not been able to get satisfactory results from it. If that is their experience, are we justified in imposing a heavy duty for the benefit of a few men employed in Bendigo? Perhaps my honorable friend could tell us how many men are employed in rock-drill making there now?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—It is a big foundry.

Mr. FRAZER.—Are there fifty men engaged in the foundry altogether?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—I should say so; and not more than ten are engaged on rock drills.

Mr. FRAZER.—Is it reasonable that we should compel mining companies to pay largely increased prices for their rock drills for the benefit of these few men in Bendigo?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—How many rock drills are used in Western Australian mines?

Mr. FRAZER.—There are about 900 in Western Australia altogether. The life of a rock drill is, roughly speaking, five years. So that the utmost advantage which the local makers could expect to get would be to the extent of a couple of hundred rock drills per annum in Queensland, New South Wales, and Victoria. The number used in Australia is about 2,400. In my opinion, the arguments for giving the same treatment to rock drills as they had under the previous Tariff is unanswerable. I do think that if we are going to endeavour to encourage the improvement and manufacture of these machines in Australia, the best course for us to pursue would be to give consideration to the industry on the lines proposed in regard to the manufacture of iron and its associated products, instead of by imposing a duty which will be injurious to the mining industry.

Mr. SPENCE (Darling) [9.11].—Instead of taking our information from the advertisements of firms and being guided by testimonials supplied by them, I think that honorable members would be well advised in giving consideration to the evidence adduced before the Tariff Commission. I turn to the report of the protectionist section of the Commission, of which the honorable member for Bendigo was chairman. On page 16 of the report on Mining Machinery, there are references to rock drills. I quote this passage—

The principal rock drill recognised on the Kalgoorlie mines is that of the Inger-oll-Sergeant Co., of New York. This drill has been worked alongside of and against the Taylor-Horsfield (Bendigo) and other outside makes of drills, and it has been found that the Inger-oll-Sergeant drill bored better and quicker than any other. The mining manager of the Ivanhoe Gold Corporation mine was not able to say which of the drills was responsible for the greatest consumption of air. It was proposed to make proper comparative tests of the various drills, including Australian, in order to show the exact consumption of air for the

boring done per minute, or per hour, as the case may be. Whichever was found to be the best would be installed.—(Q. 41382-5; 41486.)

Further on the report says—

The principal items of machinery imported from America, and used at Kalgoorlie, are rock drills, rock breakers, belt conveyers. These imported articles were preferred to Australian-made, because they were considered to be the best.—(Q. 41404.)

That statement, which the honorable member for Bendigo fathered as Chairman of the Commission, was very different from the one which he made here as member for Bendigo.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—I also read an extract from page 31 of the report.

Mr. SPENCE.—The report on page 17 says—

A quantity of engines and machinery has been discarded and scrapped on the gold-fields, and its place taken by high-grade machines of English and American manufacture.—(Q. 40877; 40982-5.)

Mr. FRAZER.—Who said that?

Mr. SPENCE.—The protectionist section of the Commission, and the report was signed by the honorable member for Bendigo.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—That was contradicted; and besides, it does not say that any rock drills were scrapped.

Mr. SPENCE.—On page 31 the report says—

Many types of rock drills are in use in Australia. A Victorian engineer (Taylor Horsfield, of Bendigo), and a South Australian mining manager (Captain Hancock, of Moonta), had designed rock drills, which had considerable improvements on those imported. It was said, however, that under present conditions there was small chance of getting Australian designed and made drills into general use. The better such drills were the greater the probability of their being copied by American makers and sent to Australia free (if percussive). The method of American manufacturers was thus described; when they found a better drill than their own their agent secured samples, sent them to America to be copied; they were then sent to Australia and sold at any price, until the local manufacturers were knocked out.—(Q. 46487; 46643.)

Percussion rock drills, now duty free, were made locally, but competition with the importer was impossible. A duty of 25 per cent. would enable the local men to capture the market, and would greatly increase employment.—(Q. 48031.)

Then at page 36 we have the statement—

The Shaw rock drill lately patented in America was being introduced into Australia, and the Austral Otis Co. had arranged for its local manufacture. "This," said Mr. E. J. Rigby, "is another instance where patented machinery is made here, and there is no reason why it should not be made here."

These are the only references to rock drills that I have found in the report.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—Read the statement at page 41.

Mr. SPENCE.—I had overlooked that paragraph, which reads as follows—

Walkers Ltd. had made rock boring percussion drills. Their engineer stated he had made rock drill parts by the gross for mines at Broken Hill far cheaper than the American article. "It is," he said, "only the hostility exhibited towards Australian-made articles that is in the way of local production. If they had the market to themselves local makers would introduce new machines and new gauges, so that every part made would be interchangeable."

It will be seen from the evidence taken in Western Australia, where rock drills are most largely used, that the imported machines are preferred. We may once and for all dismiss the suggestion that mine managers and engineers are prejudiced against local productions. Directors are not going to run the risk of losing dividends by refusing to use a good machine or tool merely because it is of Australian origin. The suggestion is too ridiculous to bear a moment's consideration. Prejudice does not enter into this matter. Capable mining managers, working under directors who have made a study of mining, take care to secure the very best machinery available, for they recognise that in that way alone can they hope to profitably develop their properties. Pirating is not confined to the Americans. Reference is made in the report to an improved drill, claimed to have been invented by Captain Hancock, of Moonta. As a matter of fact, the patent was really the invention of a resident of Stawell, Victoria, but a clever workman employed by Captain Hancock at a wage, I suppose, of about 7s. 6d. per day, added to it an improved jacket, and his employer took credit for the improvement.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—An Australian engineer told us that it was Captain Hancock's invention.

Mr. SPENCE.—It was not; the new jacket was the only improvement, and the resident of Stawell to whom I have referred received a good many pounds by way of royalty from Captain Hancock, after learning that he had been using it. Another idle suggestion has been offered that certain mining companies are making an effort to push imported drills on the market. I have not heard of mining companies entering into arrangements with a trust to push any drill. The inducement

offering would not be sufficient to lead them to undertake the work. The statement embodied in the report of the Commission as to the drills most favored in Western Australia, is supported by the experience of the Great Cobar Copper Mine in my own electorate. The manager, who is an Australian, and therefore naturally prejudiced in favour of Australian goods, has been trying different drills and keeping a record of the cost of repairs. The honorable member for Kalgoorlie has referred to the valve on the Australian drill which cuts very rapidly. A little pin running on a slot, and causing the drill to revolve, wears out rapidly because of the speed at which it revolves, and it has constantly to be repaired. After experimenting with three or four drills, the manager of the Great Cobar Mine found that the Ingersoll-Rand Drill was the best, the cost of repairs to it during a period of twelve months amounting to only 12s. 6d., as against an expenditure of £4 10s. on repairs to the Australian drill.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—How does the honorable member account for the certificates given by mine managers as to the value of the Australian drill?

Mr. SPENCE.—Those certificates are old, and it is a question of whether the persons who gave them had tried the Ingersoll-Rand drill.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—How does the honorable member account for forty Australian drills being purchased for use at Broken Hill since the imposition of the Tariff?

Mr. SPENCE.—How does the honorable member account for the fact that at a public trial in his own constituency it was found that the Australian made drill was not so effective as was an imported drill? The Australian drills may suit some people, but a big concern requires the very best obtainable.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—The New Chum Railway Mining Company is a large concern.

Mr. SPENCE.—The imposition of a high duty on rock drills will not prevent the use of the imported machine. It will simply handicap the mining industry. Why should we punish the mining industry when by doing so we can do no good for the local manufacturers of drills? I have here the statement made in a circular sent to honorable members by Mr. Thomas, mining engineer of Western Australia, and a man of large

experience in mining. He estimates the total annual consumption of drills in the Commonwealth at between 400 and 500, and gives the running age of a drill at about five years. He puts the cost of these drills at about £50 each, which is considerably higher than we are told is the present cost of the machines. As it has been opened up, I suppose the discussion on this item will be concluded; but I think the Committee should favorably consider the proposal of the honorable member for Newcastle to omit boring machinery from this item. I appeal to the Committee to let the mining industry have a few of the implements required to carry it on admitted at a reasonable rate of duty. I appeal to honorable members also to be guided by the views of men who have to handle these drills, which are likely to be more reliable than the opinions expressed in advertisements published by firms who have drills for sale.

Mr. COON (Batman) [9.34].—I have listened with attention to the previous speakers on this item. We have in connexion with this item again to consider the questions of monopoly and protection. Before Victorian manufacturers of these drills entered into competition for the trade, the price of drills was £80 apiece. I wish the Committee to bear that in mind. Since we have had local competition for these machines, the price has come down, and I am given to understand that they can now be purchased for about £30 each. The honorable member for Darling spoke of the annual cost of repairs, as amounting in the case of the imported to 12s. 6d., as against £4 10s. for the locally-manufactured machine. In answer to that, let me inform honorable members that the deepest shaft in Australia was sunk 252 feet with a locally-made drill, at a cost for repairs of only 1s. per foot. The honorable member also informed the Committee that straps were used in connexion with the locally-made drill. I know of no straps being used in connexion with them, and I have worked both imported and locally-made drills.

Mr. FRAZER.—Where did the honorable member work them?

Mr. COON.—In a shaft 1,000 feet deep.

Mr. FRAZER.—Where?

Mr. COON.—At Maldon. Perhaps the honorable member would like to know the time, as well as the place? I am prepared to have an imported drill worked

alongside a Taylor-Horsfield National drill, and if the latter will not bore 5 feet more quickly, and use less air in doing so, I shall be prepared to admit the imported drills free. I wish to say that Victorian manufacturers should be credited with bringing this machine up-to-date. When these drills were first imported it took three men to cart them around. The pistons of the imported drills were so brittle that if one broke it could not be repaired, and had to be replaced at a cost of £7 10s. Australian manufacturers have succeeded in manufacturing a piston that can be repaired. In the next place, the chuck attached to the piston of the imported drills was of so brittle a character that in working pieces of metal became detached and workmen were injured in this way. The Australian manufacturers have improved the machine in that direction also. But what do we find to-day? We find the company which has been referred to adopting the Australian chuck, and putting it on to their machines.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—Which company?

Mr. COON.—The Ingersoll-Sargent Company. Australian manufacturers have made improvements upon the machine, and brought the price down from £80 to £30, under the operation of a protective duty of 25 per cent., which was in force in Victoria prior to Federation. Now we are being asked to allow the imported drill to come in practically free. The honorable member for Coolgardie referred to Western Australia, and let me say that the deepest mine in that State is only 2,500 feet deep, whilst the deepest mine in Bendigo is 4,000 feet deep.

Mr. FRAZER.—What has the depth of the mine to do with it?

Mr. COON.—Honorable members would have us believe that a drill which is worked at a depth of 4,000 feet is not good enough for working a mine 2,500 feet deep.

Mr. FRAZER.—Is the stone harder at the greater depth?

Mr. COON.—Certainly it is, and the difficulty of working is greater. I ask honorable members why the miners at Long Tunnel prefer the local to the imported drill, where they might use either? In carrying out a contract at Walhalla at the present time the miners prefer to use the local drill, and yet we are told that the Trust at the back of the imported drill should be allowed to flood Australia with their machines. Under the protective Tariff of Victoria, the wages

in one foundry alone totalled £10,000 a year; but since Federation, only £6,000 a year has been paid in wages. Would the mining industry have benefited in the way it has done in this connexion, but for the protective Tariff of Victoria? I say it would not. It was the operation of that Tariff that brought down the price of the drill, and now we are being asked to place this machine on the free list that the importers may secure a monopoly, and put up the price again. These drills are being made in many parts of Victoria, and I believe also in South Australia. There is plenty of local competition, and, to secure orders, the local manufacturers of drills are obliged to sell them practically at cost price. I venture to say that no member of the Committee can tell me the exact price now being paid for the imported article. The importers try to secure a monopoly by saying, "We will let you have our machine at a certain price if you agree to use no other in connexion with your mine."

Mr. HEDGES.—The honorable member is trying to get a monopoly for the Victorian manufacturers.

Mr. COON.—I am not. This is not a Victorian question; it is a Western Australian question. Honorable members have not been able to show that the locally-made drills cannot do the work required of them. A test took place three years ago in Western Australia, and the Taylor-Horsfield National machine beat the imported machine out of sight. The men who have to use these drills are the best judges of their value, and I have shown that they prefer to use the locally-made drills. That is being proved at Broken Hill at the present time, where men on contract are using Australian in preference to imported drills. In Australia to-day, over 131 mines are using locally-made drills.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—Then what is the honorable member grumbling about?

Mr. COON.—I am grumbling because some honorable members wish that imported machines should be admitted free, when they can be made in Australia. I ask honorable members who are in favour of a protective Tariff which will give employment to labour, to impose such a duty on these machines as will encourage the use of the locally-made article. I have not the slightest doubt that if we can place the locally-made machines in mines

throughout Australia, they will be found to do the work as well in the future as they are shown to have done it in the past. The only reasons urged against the proposed duty have been from the importers' stand-point, and I venture to say that behind the move being made to-night, there is the importer if he could be seen.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—That is not fair.

Mr. COON.—Only importers' reasons have been assigned for the opposition to the duty.

Mr. FRAZER.—The honorable member makes that statement because he would make any statement.

Mr. COON.—Unlike the honorable member for Kalgoorlie when I make a statement, I am prepared to stand by it.

Mr. FRAZER.—Can the honorable member prove that the importer is behind the opposition to this duty?

Mr. COON.—Let me tell the honorable member for Kalgoorlie that locally-made drills were sent to Western Australia this year and last year also by the firm to which I have referred.

Mr. FRAZER.—Where did they go to?

Mr. COON.—I do not know to what mines they were sent. I did not travel after them. It is sufficient for me to say that they were sent to Western Australia, where we have been told that none of the locally-made drills are at work at the present time.

Mr. FRAZER.—That is rather a bad advertisement for them, because they have evidently been "scrapped."

Mr. COON.—They were sent to Western Australia, where they beat the imported machine in a test at Kalgoorlie. If honorable members vote against the duty, the result will be that imported rock-borers will be dumped in Australia and the local factories will be closed up.

Mr. FRAZER.—Why was not that the case before? These drills were free under the last Tariff.

Mr. ATKINSON.—If the whole Australian market was secured, to how many more men would employment be given?

Mr. COON.—Five hundred. Under the Victorian Tariff, one foundry alone was paying £10,000 a year in wages, but since the duty was taken off, it is only paying £6,000 a year. I have clearly shown that this machine is capable of doing the work, and that one foundry alone has turned out 3,000 of them. On a test it showed itself equal in every way to the

imported machine. Its manufacture has been the means of reducing the price. The honorable member for Flinders the other night said that he was prepared to vote for the proposals of the Government on a certain item, because they were framed in relation to the Excise duties. I trust that honorable members who are in favour of protection, or who take the view held by the honorable member for Flinders, will vote on this item to keep out the imported article, and to give employment to men who are now out of work. There has not been a single reason advanced why rock drills should be struck out, and I trust the Committee will vote for the highest protection it is possible to get.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS (Robertson) [9.48].—The honorable member for Batman made a very fine speech in favour of the Australian-made rock drill, and satisfied me that its manufacturers are doing a roaring business. He states that 500 or 600 drills are in use in Victoria. I attach a good deal of weight to what was said by the Chairman of the Tariff Commission. Although he quoted from a trade circular, it is not fair to say that what he quoted was not correct. The drills to which the honorable member for Bendigo referred are to be found in some of the principal mines in Western Australia. I was upon the fields some months ago, and saw the Bayley's Reward claim. There was no reason to suppose from its appearance that the best of everything had not been put into it. It was closed down because they could not get gold, and not because the drill did not do its work. It is no part of my business here to run down a colonial production. I believe that the Australian drill is a good one, but, so far as I can gather from the evidence quoted by the honorable member for Darling, the imported drill will do the work quicker and better. Still that does not mean that the local drill will not do its work. The honorable member for Bendigo quoted an extract which showed that there had been some competition between the two drills, and that the colonial article was a first-class one. Still, the imported drill is so much better that the makers can afford to keep its price above that of the colonial article. The honorable member for Batman stated that its owners will only allow people to buy the imported machines if a guarantee is given that they will not use the colonial article. But only a man who is sure of his ground will make such a stipulation. If

his machine were inferior, he would be told, "I do not want your machine, and would not have it on those terms."

Sir JOHN QUICK.—He sells it at a lower price to get the monopoly.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—I thought the honorable member pointed out that the imported machine costs £7 more than does the local drill. That is not a very large difference, especially to rich mines. Apparently the difference between the two machines is small, or the difference in price would be greater. The honorable member for Kalgoorlie has stated over and over again that, as a protectionist, he would not agree to placing on the free list any article which can be produced here of good quality. But where is the honorable member on this item? Let him vote with the protectionists. All through the Tariff, a large amount of protection has been given for articles of excellent manufacture that will do their work. If that is to be the policy the protectionist ought to stand by the colonial article. While I am in favour of free competition in manufactures, and would open our ports to allow the best articles to come in, so as to keep the local maker up to the highest pitch of efficiency, I would not say that the imported article should be taken in preference to the colonial. All things being equal, I should give the choice to the colonial article. I have come to the conclusion that in this case the colonial rock drill is not quite so good as is the imported machine, and, if that is so, we should allow the latter to come in. But the local manufacturers have nothing to fear, because everybody in Victoria uses their machine. The honorable member for Bendigo has pointed out that at immense depths it is better than any other. My desire is to have the local article made as good as is the American or English production. That will never be brought about unless the imported machine is allowed free entry to our markets. The local machine also has the advantage of the local prejudice in its favour; otherwise, it would not be so largely used. Although it is proved that it is not quite so good, its makers can thrive in spite of the competition of the imported article. A low duty would therefore satisfy all requirements.

Mr. KNOX (Kooyong) [9.55].—I favour the suggestion of the honorable member for Newcastle, for the addition of a separate item in this case with a lower rate of duty.

But I cannot agree with those who suggest that the item should be practically free. It is ridiculous to suppose that we are not able, with our large mining interests, to make rock drills in Australia, and it is idle to suggest that the manufacturers should be given no assistance through the Tariff in order to enable them to compete with the machines that come from America, Great Britain, and Germany. But, on the other hand, to put a high duty upon the Ingersoll-Sargent and the Rand drills would be doing an injustice to the mining community. None of these mines are in any sense philanthropic bodies, nor do I imagine that the question enters very much into the consideration of the directors or mining managers as to whether a drill is made in Bendigo or America, but the managers—many of whom, like Mr. Richard Hamilton and others who have been mentioned, are at the very top of their profession—have unquestionably a strong desire to secure a machine which will do the work effectively and cheaply, and in such a way as will allow the miner to show the most satisfactory results. I do not wish to prejudice, by any remark of mine, the drill which is made in Australia, but the bulk of testimony from the managers of large mines throughout the Commonwealth will show that the mining industry has good reason for urging that a prohibitive duty shall not be put upon an article which has proved itself to be so serviceable. That is due to the fact that the makers of three great drills have joined together, and, as Edison does in America, have their agents all over the world to ascertain what improvements or changes are being made, and secure them. Consequently there is no possibility of an Australian manufacturer ever being in such a completely satisfactory position as to have at his command all the latest ideas and practical improvements in the way the great combinations have. I shall, therefore, favour a lower duty than the one proposed by the Government. Some assistance and help should unquestionably be given to the manufacturers, not only in Victoria, but in all the other States. But I do not approve of a duty which would prevent drills of a higher class being introduced for use in the mines here. This drill is being used in some of the mines in Broken Hill and Tasmania, and has found its way to the West; and it would be unjust to our local manufacturers

to say that their manufacture does not deserve consideration, seeing that it has been adopted by most capable and able managers. I shall support the suggestion to have this appliance put into a separate line, but I shall ask the Committee to impose a higher duty than that proposed by the honorable member. I think a fair compromise would be to have a duty of 20 per cent. in both columns.

Mr. ATKINSON.—That would shut down some mines.

Mr. KNOX.—There is too much made of that argument; no mine worth working will be shut down by the imposition of such a duty as I suggest. There is no question that these rock drills ought to be made in Australia.

Mr. ATKINSON.—So they are, but they are not good enough.

Mr. KNOX.—We are justified in giving local manufacturers some assistance. They have struggled under the old Tariff, and I have previously protested that we were doing them an injustice. I hope the Government will accept the compromise I have suggested, and in the case of rock drills impose a higher duty than that attaching to the other machinery and appliances in the item.

Mr. ATKINSON (Wilmot) [10.5].—I intend to support the proposal of the honorable member for Newcastle. Australian-made rock drills are sold in the local market at a cheaper rate than are the imported drills, and, that being so, I do not see why any more protection is required. The Australian consumption of rock drills is about 5 per cent. of the world's consumption, and, if the idea of imposing a duty is to compel the foreign manufacturer to establish works here, I do not think it will have the desired effect. To make it worth while for a foreign maker to put down the necessary expensive plant in Australia, there would have to be an output of 2,500 drills annually, whereas the Australian consumption is about 400 or 500. These facts appeal to me as a business man, and, in my opinion, the duties will be excessive if they exceed 10 per cent. and 5 per cent. The Hollmann drill is composed of very fine material, which is not available in Australia; and which, in case of the manufacture being carried on here, would have to be imported, thus adding to the cost of production. Nearly every part of this drill is protected by patent rights; and therefore I do not see how any good can arise from an increased duty, unless the makers are

compelled to put down a plant in Australia. The great desideratum in mining is cheapness in working; and, notwithstanding what so great an authority as the honorable member for Kooyong has said, there are many propositions in Australia which would employ thousands of men if, by means of scientific improvement, they could gain a little advantage in this connexion. In Western Australia there are many old mining propositions which, with a little cheaper working ensured, would become good going concerns. If a mine be shut down, or a proposition is prevented from maturing, more men will be thrown out of employment than could find work were the whole of the market for this appliance confined to Australian manufactures.

Mr. CHANTER. — Does the honorable member think that a small duty like that proposed would cause any mine to shut down?

Mr. ATKINSON. — Such a duty would not affect thoroughly established mines, but there are many other ventures which are only waiting for improved and cheaper means of working in order to employ thousands, who would be consumers of the products of those engaged in other industries. When there is a chance, on the one hand, of injuring a great industry, and, on the other, of benefiting only a small industry, business discretion should be used.

Mr. WATKINS (Newcastle) [10.10]. — When I submitted the amendment I was under the impression that rock-boring machines were not manufactured here to any material extent. I have learned since, however, that these machines are made and used here extensively, and, under the circumstances, I should not care to put them in the same category as other machines which cannot be made in Australia. With the permission of the Committee I should like to withdraw my amendment, with a view to separating the rock drills from the other appliances in the item.

Mr. McWILLIAMS (Franklin) [10.16]. If we do not deal with the word "boring" in paragraph A, I am afraid we may be prevented from taking an effective test vote in a subsequent paragraph; there may be a technical difference between "drilling" and "boring." I do not dispute the statement that drills are made in Australia; and the honorable member for Newcastle, in view of his fresh information, is perfectly justified in seeking to alter his amendment. But, with the wider

experience that I believe I have had in connexion with these matters, I am certainly not convinced that this is an appliance which ought to be used as a means for taxing the mining industry. Can the Treasurer tell us whether the withdrawal of the amendment would prevent an effective test vote being taken?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [10.13]. — It will not be possible by any amendment moved afterwards to separate the two if the word "boring" be allowed to remain.

Mr. FRAZER. — The wording in the first line of paragraph A is very indefinite.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE. — It is intended to include the whole of the rock drills; and it would not be possible, without a recommittal, to subsequently test the question.

Mr. FRAZER. — Then the test vote had better be taken on a proposal to leave out the word "boring?"

Sir WILLIAM LYNE. — Yes.

Mr. FRAZER. — I object to the withdrawal of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. — There being an objection, the amendment must be put.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [10.14]. — I have no objection to facilitate a straight out vote, understanding that drills will be dealt with in a separate line. I agree to the elimination of the word "boring" so that there may be no complication.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [10.15]. — I have no desire to get into a complication over this item. If the word "boring" be struck out, the tenor of the whole paragraph will be altered. If the amendment in regard to drills is not carried afterwards, I shall have to recommit paragraph A for the purpose of re-inserting the word.

Mr. FRAZER. — The Treasurer is at liberty to insert any additional words that may be necessary, and to place any duty that he chooses opposite to them.

Mr. McWILLIAMS (Franklin) [10.16]. — I wish to point out to the Committee that in the electorate of Darwin, Tasmania, there are enormous mineral propositions which are just below a remunerative working price. If these could be worked with the aid of up-to-date machinery, they would employ thousands of miners. It is all very well for the honorable member for Kooyong to urge that the difference between the rates of duty proposed will not affect the working of the

mines. His contention is perfectly accurate so far as mines like those of Mount Morgan, Mount Lyell, and Broken Hill are concerned. But there are many smaller propositions which would be severely handicapped if we imposed a duty of 30 per cent. upon rock-drills. I have never attempted to decry our local manufactures, and I do not say that the drills made in the Commonwealth are not excellent for some purposes. Roughly speaking, the price of the imported article is about £44, so that a duty of 30 per cent. would be equivalent to about £14. That is the increased amount which the users of these machines will be called upon to pay under the Government proposal. The locally manufactured drill is being sold to-day for less than is the imported article. It is the acme of absurdity for honorable members to declare that men will purchase the imported in preference to the Australian article as the result of mere prejudice.

Mr. MATHEWS.—The price of the imported machine is about £27.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—I have been informed by a reliable authority that it is £44. But, assuming that it is £27, an *ad valorem* rate of 30 per cent. would very nearly enhance its cost by one-third. The honorable member for Batman has argued at considerable length that the local drill is superior to the imported article. If that be so, surely there is no justification for the imposition of a duty of 30 per cent.

Mr. THOMAS.—If the local article is a better one, why is it not exported?

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—I am not going to say a word against the Australian machine. For certain work, it is an exceedingly good one. But it is monstrous to propose that the price of the article should be increased by 30 per cent.

Mr. SPENCE (Darling) [10.25].—The honorable member for Batman apparently entertains the idea that the supply of rock drills is practically in the hands of an American trust. As a matter of fact, 50 per cent. of the drills imported into the Commonwealth are of British origin.

Mr. MATHEWS.—The American trust maintains large and expensive agencies here.

Mr. SPENCE.—But English firms have already secured half of the trade, and they ask for no preference as against the trust. The honorable member for Batman mentioned the fact that a shaft had been sunk at Bendigo by means of drills of Australian manufacture at a cost for re-

pairs of only 1s. per foot. I may inform him that at the Princess Royal Mine, Norseman, a shaft was sunk several hundred feet at a cost for repairs of only 7d. per foot. These figures, however, convey nothing, because so much depends upon the character of the ground. I hope that the Committee will vote in favour of the lower duty.

Mr. WYNNE (Balaclava) [10.27].—I am sorry that honorable members should have spoken disparagingly of the locally manufactured drill. I have had considerable experience of these drilling machines in connexion with the Long Tunnel Company, at Walhalla. There we sank a shaft 2,800 feet in twenty months. The men employed, who were first-class shaft sinkers, sunk as much as 160 feet per month, which, I think, constitutes a world's record. They started by using Taylor-Horsfield drills. They were allowed to use whatever machines they chose. After they had been working some time, acting on the advice of our mining engineer, we substituted American drills. But the men speedily reverted to the Australian machines. The fact that they sank 160 feet per month through granitic rock is convincing testimony of the value of these machines.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—Why do people pay more for the imported article?

Mr. WYNNE.—We advertised all over Australia for expert shaft sinkers, and we agreed to pay them a bonus for every foot that they sank in excess of 100 feet per month. We were only too pleased to do so. When the locally manufactured drill can accomplish the work that I have outlined, no complaint can be urged against it.

Mr. HEDGES (Fremantle) [10.29].—I do not think it is a question of which is the better drill—the imported or the locally-manufactured article—so much as it is one of allowing those who are managing our mines to say what tool they shall use.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—That is free-trade.

Mr. HEDGES.—It is not. We can only judge of the relative merits of these machines by instituting very severe tests over long periods. That a test has been made at some sports counts for nothing. The men who are managing the biggest mines in Australia, and in whom the shareholders and directors of the largest mining companies have confidence, men who have been dealing in machinery of this kind year after year, are most competent to

judge of its merits. I do not say that drills should be admitted free of duty. It is a question of tools of trade again. Rock-drills are the tools of trade of shaft-sinkers and miners. Men very often take contracts to do work of this kind finding their own explosives and machinery. If the Australian drill is so much better than the imported drill, why has it not possession of the market, seeing that it costs only £27 as against £34?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—It has possession of the market in Victoria, where it receives fair play.

Mr. HEDGES.—Victoria is not all Australia. The States are now federated; but if this talk of Victoria being all Australia continues, it will affect their good feeling to each other. Australia is a very big country, and cannot be governed wholly in accordance with the views of the people of Melbourne or of Bendigo. Men whose employers consider them worth salaries of £3,000 or £4,000 a year to manage mines should be the most capable judges of what is the best machinery to use in those mines. The talk we have heard about American trusts has no weight with me, because some of the best drills that come to this country are British. The honorable member for Batman proved more than he intended to prove. Statistics show that Australia requires 500 new rock drills annually, so that if Victoria had the whole business of manufacturing drills, the work would not give employment to 500 persons as stated by the honorable member for Batman; that would be only one drill per man per annum. The honorable member for Darling bears me out in the contention that it is necessary that the big mining companies, such as the Great Cobar Company, should have up-to-date machinery, and should be allowed to say what machinery is best for their purposes. A drill which might suit one kind of rock might not suit another. We have listened to a great many so-called experts to-night; but I claim to have some knowledge of this subject, because I have driven underground, through hard rock—bluestone and granite—for a length of half a mile at a time, and I know that a drill which will do good work in one shaft or tunnel may not do good work in another. Any one who knows anything about rock drilling will support that statement. Indeed, men who have been accustomed to deal with one particular kind of rock, if taken to another

place where the rock is different, and given the drill to which they are used, will often prove practically useless, and their drills, too. The honorable member for Bendigo says that the drills which he mentioned have been used at the Queensland Menzies mine, at Bayley's mine, and at one or two others, all of which are now closed.

Mr. THOMAS.—Was the closing of those mines the result of using the particular drills referred to?

Mr. HEDGES.—I cannot say. Honorable members must draw their own conclusions. No doubt the drills have been used in mines which are still at work, and are doing well; but the fact that they have been used in mines which are now closed, does not show them to be any better than other drills. Had they proved so good as to be able to keep the mines going, there would have been something to say for them. Honorable members have a great deal to say of that small portion of Australia called Victoria, and of the little bit of mining which goes on here. But they forget that nowadays Western Australia produces more gold per annum than all the other States put together.

Mr. MATHEWS.—Victoria has been in that position.

Mr. HEDGES.—I am not now dealing with "has-beens." Seeing that Western Australia now produces more gold than all the other States of the Commonwealth put together, she should be allowed a voice in choosing what tools shall be used in her mines. If Victoria, considering the small amount of gold she produces, were allowed to dictate to Western Australia in this matter, it would be a case of the tail wagging the dog. The tail should wait until the dog wags it, and Western Australia is certainly the dog so far as mining goes. I do not ask that rock drills be treated differently from other tools of trade, or that they be admitted free to the detriment of local manufacturers. But the proposed rates of duty are unreasonably high. I am willing to vote for a duty of 15 per cent.

Mr. THOMAS (Barrier) [10.41].—I should like to know what rates the Government really propose to agree to in connexion with this item?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not ask for more than 25 and 20 per cent., the rates which have been fixed for other similar items.

Mr. THOMAS.—I think that those rates are too high.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—There must be uniformity.

Mr. THOMAS.—Ore dressing machinery and appliances for smelting, leaching, and metal refining are of as much importance to the mining industry as are rock drills, and if the Minister was prepared to make all this machinery dutiable at 20 and 15 per cent., I would support the proposal; but if the Treasurer insists on duties of 25 and 20 per cent., I shall not hesitate to attempt to have rock drills made free, or dutiable at a much lower rate.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—All other tools of trade are dutiable at 15 per cent.

Mr. THOMAS.—That would be a fairer rate. No doubt, rock drills can be made in Australia. Whether they are as good as imported drills is for those concerned to say; but I do not think that they can be as good, because I have not heard of them being exported, and when manufacturers are making a better article than is being turned out by others in the same line, they can always sell it, either in or out of Australia. Take, for instance, harvesters. I understand that a large number of these machines are exported to Argentina. That, to my mind, shows very conclusively that when the Australian harvester comes into competition with harvesters of the world in other markets, it is able to hold its own. The same thing would apply to the rock drills. If, as the honorable member for Balaclava has stated, the Australian rock drills are better than the imported article, I cannot understand why there is not a foreign market as well as a home market for them. I am prepared to give a reasonable duty to the makers of rock drills to see if they cannot in time compete with the imported articles. At the same time, I think that duties of 30 and 25 per cent. are too high.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—Let us impose duties of 25 and 20 per cent.

Mr. THOMAS.—Those rates are, I think, too high. Originally the Minister asked for duties of 30 and 25 per cent. not only on rock drills, but also on the other articles included in this item. He has a majority at his back, and it may be that if he attempts to carry his new proposal to levy duties of 25 and 20 per cent. on all these articles he will win. But we may be able to carry an amendment against him so far as rock drills are concerned. In that event I would vote for rock drills to

be made free, but I would prefer that all the articles in the item should be dutiable at 20 and 15 per cent. respectively, because there are other things which are as helpful to the mining industry as are rock drills. I realize that it is one of the greatest industries in Australia. If honorable members cripple the mining and pastoral industries, what will be left? Those great industries certainly maintain the other industries. Anything which honorable members can do to help the mining industry will be to the advantage of Australia generally, because, I venture to say, that there is no industry which finds such diversified employment for people as it does. Not only does a mine find work for the miner, but it also finds work for an engineer and a carpenter on the spot, besides providing employment for engineers, carpenters and other artisans elsewhere. It also keeps stores going. With two or three mines in a locality, a township generally springs up.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—With one mine sometimes.

Mr. THOMAS.—Certainly, one good mine will cause a township to spring up. I think that honorable members should hesitate before they unnecessarily handicap the mining industry.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN (Indi) [10.49].—The discussion on this item has centred round the quality of rock drills and their relative prices. The price of the imported article is about 25 per cent. more than that of the locally-made article, and the latter has had the benefit of a protective duty of 12½ per cent.

Mr. ATKINSON.—Under the old Tariff rock drills came in free.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—If they did that only strengthens the argument I propose to use. I am connected with two small mines. We purchased seven or eight Taylor-Horsfield rock drills, with which we have been well pleased. Evidently these rock drills have established a market. Some conflicting statements have been made. The honorable member for Bendigo has quoted some testimonials which were given before the mines in which the rock drills were used were shut down; but the honorable member for Balaclava has quoted a very good testimonial, and it is confirmed by my own experience, because in the small mines I have alluded to we have done some wonderful driving work. If the locally-made rock drill has been able to hold its own, as it has done,

an import duty of 30 per cent. is excessive. Under the old Tariff the original duty on nearly all mining requirements was $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. But under this Tariff, in almost every instance, the Government have proposed duties of 25 and 30 per cent., and it has only been after a very heavy struggle that we have been able to secure some reduction in the rates. It has been truly said by honorable members that the mining industry is a great one. In my electorate it has kept two or three townships going. Surely it is only fair to assume that the increased duties are likely to do considerable injury. The honorable member for Bendigo did not tell everything in connexion with the locally-made rock drill. I am informed that about three years ago a trial took place between the imported Hollmann machine and the locally-made machine, that the whole of the mining managers of Bendigo gave the palm to the former; and that it is being used by the bulk of the mines in Bendigo.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Is that not very disloyal to their own State?

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—I cannot help that. I am dealing with a proposal of the Treasurer which, if carried, will involve a huge additional expenditure in connexion with the mining industry. The other night the honorable member for Kooyong stated that the increased duties on mining machinery meant an immediate additional cost of nearly £250,000 to the mines throughout the Commonwealth. I also have been informed on reliable authority that the increased duties will cause a very considerable increase in the expenditure on those mines. For instance, a duty of 30 per cent. on 500 rock drills would realize about £30,000. What is the use of building up an industry and then crushing it out of existence? I know that in this very city the interests in connexion with mining companies are so great that they have almost created a slight financial paralysis. If we keep on increasing the duties on item after item, what will be the result? It is all very well for some honorable members to say that the Government are proposing an increase of only $7\frac{1}{2}$ or 10 or 15 per cent., as compared with the duty under the old Tariff. But if we impose an increased duty on every one of nearly 600 items, we shall impose upon the people a burden which they cannot afford to bear. I recognise that we must have increased duties.

But suppose, for the sake of argument, that the duty on a mining requirement was $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. under the old Tariff. Surely an increase to 20 per cent. is fair, and an increase to 30 per cent. unfair. When a locally-made piece of machinery can be sold at 25 per cent. less than the cost of the imported article, honorable members should hesitate before they impose an excessive duty. I recognise that it is no use trying to get the duty down to what I consider would be a fair rate. As the industry for which the duty is proposed is a going concern, there is no need for it to be propped up and buttressed. Surely a going concern does not require more than a reasonable duty. In this instance the old story of protection cheapening the article is not a factor in determining the issue. The Government Whip sits at the table while this debate is going on, and takes more responsibility on his shoulders than do Ministers themselves. When an honorable member is endeavouring to speak intelligently to the subject, nothing but talk goes on between that honorable member, who ought to be sitting on one of the back benches, and the Minister. He interjects frequently in an impertinent manner, and is constantly in evidence when he should be behind the scenes. Every honorable member has a right to express his opinion, and it is not my fault that I have to speak at five minutes to 11 o'clock.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not think that it is anybody else's fault.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—I am accustomed to dealing with matters on business principles. I have been a business man all my life. What little standing I have in the community is due to the consistent following of business principles. I have never in my life seen such indifferent business methods pursued as have been followed since I have been a member of the Federal Parliament.

The CHAIRMAN.—The honorable member is not addressing himself to the question.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—When the Minister interjects in reply to my arguments, I venture to say that I have a right to reply to him.

The CHAIRMAN.—Interjections are disorderly, and the honorable member should not reply to them.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—The Minister is the man who ought to be called to order. We have heard a great deal about the rela-

tive qualities of machinery. Many names have been mentioned. Some of them are household words. I have heard mentioned the names of Mr. Hamilton, Mr. Nicholson, and others who acquired their knowledge of mining in Victoria. Some of them were born and bred in this State, and went away from here biased in favour of everything Victorian. When they have had to give up the use of the locally-made machines and to adopt the imported article, I say that this Committee ought to hesitate before it consents to add duty upon duty against an industry which, in many instances, I can say to my own personal knowledge, cannot afford to bear these increased burdens. I trust that the Treasurer will review the position, and will adopt the conclusion of the honorable member for Barrier, who has urged that duties of 15 per cent. and 20 per cent. should be adopted. I shall support those duties.

Sir JOHN FORREST (Swan) [11.0].—I do not desire to compare the respective qualities of imported and locally-manufactured machines. But we have already approved of duties on machine tools at 15 per cent. in both columns. I cannot see why, if a duty of 15 per cent. is sufficient in the case of other machine tools, the same duty should not be adopted as applying to the machine tools of the mining industry. We shall not be acting consistently by doing so. It will not be defensible to vote lesser duties in the case of industries of minor importance than we vote on account of this immense industry. If we are to act consistently, we should agree to a duty of 15 per cent. in both columns.

Mr. STORRER (Bass) [11.2].—Like the honorable member for Indi, I am a business man, and want to get to business on this matter. In my opinion, we should vote duties of 20 per cent. and 15 per cent. as to paragraphs A, B, and C, and of 15 per cent. in both columns as to the proposed paragraph D.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Will the Minister agree to that?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—No; I will not.

Mr. STORRER.—Then it will be for the majority of the Committee to decide.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not see why the duties should not be 25 per cent. and 20 per cent.

Mr. STORRER.—We may all have our own opinions, but it will be for the majority to decide, and the sooner we come to a division the better.

Mr. FOSTER (New England) [11.4].—I hope that the Government will retain the 25 per cent. duty for the item generally, but will, in regard to rock drills, make the duties 20 per cent. and 15 per cent. It is unnecessary to reiterate *ad nauseam* the arguments in favour of different treatment for rock drills. I am not an alarmist, like the honorable member for Indi. Listening to his remarks, one might think that the whole mining industry would be killed if we did not allow rock drills to come in free; but I have more faith in the mining industry than to think that. This is only a very small item, but I justify the position that I take up on the ground that other tools of trade have been made dutiable at only 15 per cent.

Mr. KING O'MALLEY (Darwin) [11.7].—Listening to the speech delivered by the honorable member for Indi one would think that it was a wail from the grave of Solomon, and that the whole country was going to old night and chaos if we did not have absolute free-trade.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—Nonsense.

Mr. KING O'MALLEY.—For what else does the honorable member ask? What is the use of protection that is no protection? A duty of 15 or 20 per cent. would afford no real protection to the industry. I trust that the Treasurer will not surrender; that if he wishes to make this industry something that will be of benefit to the country he will stand on the rock, and, if he is to be defeated, will go down with the flag of democracy and protection flying over him.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [11.9].—I should like to know how far the Treasurer intends to go to-night?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I intend to ask the Committee to dispose of the items relating to electrical machinery before we adjourn.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—That is practically an announcement that we are to sit far into the night.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I think not.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The complicated proposals immediately following the item now under consideration cannot be disposed of in a short time.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—Let us take a vote on this item.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—My honorable friend who has made about four speeches to-night begins to interject as soon as I rise. I wish to make one or two observations concerning the Chairman of the Tariff Commission, who has been here for two

days purporting to give us information from the reports furnished for the guidance of honorable members. I very much regret that the honorable member appears to me to speak always as the protectionist propagandist of this House, and not as Chairman of the Commission.

Mr. SAMPSON.—He speaks in support of the reports that he has signed.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—He does; but he quotes only the evidence of interested individuals. On no occasion has he made allusion to any statement made contrary to his views. In quoting from the reports of the protectionist section of the Commission he has invariably singled out the statement of an interested manufacturer who intimated that he could do this or that if he had certain duties. Would he accept such evidence in a Court of law? He knows that outside the Tariff Commission it is not worth a snap of the fingers. It is about time that we had less of interested evidence quoted from the reports, and more of the evidence as it appears fairly in them.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—Can the honorable member quote any adverse evidence about rock drills?

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—An abundance of evidence on the other side has been quoted during the debate. Is the honorable member unaware of that evidence? Did the Commission take evidence from only a few interested manufacturers? If so, what are the reports worth? I do not regard the evidence of one or two interested manufacturers as of conclusive value in determining this question. Were no mining managers examined?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—The honorable member for Darling has quoted the opinions expressed by mining managers.

Mr. McWILLIAMS. — Why did not the honorable member for Bendigo do so?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—It is not my duty to help the other side.

Mr. STORRER.—I should like to know, Mr. Chairman, whether the question before the Chair is the attitude of the Chairman of the Tariff Commission?

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I am not discussing the Chairman of the Tariff Commission; I am merely making an allusion to his readings during the last two days from the reports of the protectionist section of the Commission. I have done with the matter; but I think it a pity that the other side in this and many other cases has not been presented. I could understand the

honorable member for Batman bringing his brief into the House and reading it with gusto, as he always does, but we expect a little more from a man of the standing of the honorable member for Bendigo, having regard more particularly to the responsibility of the position, which he lately held. What are the facts in regard to this item? I do not pretend to be an expert on rock drills, but I have listened to the debate with a keen desire to understand the rights and wrongs of the question. I confess that the discussion has left me perplexed and puzzled. I am perfectly satisfied that good machinery can be made in Australia, and that the rock drills made in this State are excellent of their kind. But the point which has been borne upon my mind is that those drills do not work equally well in every class of country. That is plain to any one who has listened to the conflicting statements made during the debate. Whilst they may have performed the boring feat to which the honorable member for Balaclava has referred, it does not follow that they would do equally good work in the rocks of Western Australia and elsewhere. I should like to know whether the honorable member for Kooyong and that huge company with which he is so honorably connected—and which is so well conducted—are in the habit of buying imported machines, when they can obtain better ones locally-made, at a cheaper rate.

Mr. KNOX.—We also use some of the Bendigo drills.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—A statement was made to-night that tenders were called by a Broken Hill Company for boring machinery, and that it paid a larger price for an imported machine than was quoted for a local production. I apprehend that they treated that tender on pure business lines, and there must, therefore, be some preference in the minds of practical men engaged in the mining industry for these imported drills for certain purposes. All the statements to the contrary do not tend to clear up the matter. The honorable member for Batman might say that the locally-made machines do their work at a cost of rs. per foot; but he is met by the honorable member for Darling, who says that the imported machine does the work at 7d. per foot. We must have some more reliable authority; and listening to the conflicting statements which have been made, I prefer to accept those made by men responsible for the conduct of mining operations, the expert mining managers

of Australia, who, I believe, if they have a prejudice at all, would favour the productions of the country in which they have been trained and received their experience. These gentlemen declare that so far as mining in Western Australia is concerned, they must have these imported rock drills.

Mr. WISE (Gippsland) [11.17].—A most unfair and improper attack has been made on the honorable member for Bendigo to-night by the honorable member for Parramatta. For many weeks protectionist members of the Committee, who had a right to look to the protectionist section of the Tariff Commission for assistance and guidance in these matters, have been deprived of any assistance whatever by reason of the illness and absence of the honorable member for Bendigo from this chamber.

Mr. ATKINSON.—Honorable members have had the reports; could they not read them?

Mr. WISE.—I do not suppose the honorable member has read them.

Mr. ATKINSON.—I have read sufficient of them to know that many of the conclusions of the protectionist section of the Commission are unwarranted.

Mr. WISE.—We have not had a member of the protectionist section of the Commission in the chamber during all these weeks, but we have had thrust down our throats page after page of the reports of the free-trade section of the Commission by the honorable members for Illawarra and Perth, who were members of that section. They have given us nothing but free-trade evidence and conclusions, and now, because we are at last getting some little assistance from the Chairman of the Tariff Commission, who was one of the protectionist members of the Commission, and was selected to be a member of the Commission because he was a protectionist, we have a member of the Free-trade party denouncing the action of the honorable member, and reminding him that he occupies a judicial position. Such was not his position. We know very well that the members of the Commission were appointed because of the fiscal views they were known to hold, and they have presented two sets of reports in accordance with those views. We could only expect from either section of the Commission conclusions representing their particular views. In the circumstances, I think the attack made upon the honorable member for Bendigo was improper and

most unfair. On the question of rock drills we have had many statements made by different members as to what some one else told them, but we had one very practical piece of evidence in the short and pithy speech of the honorable member for Balaclava, who, as a director of a mining company by whom various drills were tried—

Mr. ATKINSON.—Only American and Australian. The honorable member never said anything about English drills, although I asked him the question.

Mr. WISE.—The honorable member for Wilmot knows nothing about drills. Where protection is concerned, the only thing the honorable member knows is potatoes.

Mr. ATKINSON.—I object to that statement. I have heard it so often in this chamber that it has become offensive to me.

The CHAIRMAN.—I am quite sure the honorable member for Gippsland, when he learns that he has said something offensive to the honorable member, will withdraw it.

Mr. WISE.—Very well; if my remark, that where protection is concerned the only thing the honorable member knows is potatoes be regarded as offensive, I will say that the honorable member knows nothing about potatoes. The honorable member for Balaclava gave us his experience as a director of a mining company in connexion with the sinking of the great incline shaft at the Long Tunnel, at Walhalla. He has told us that the staff employed to carry out that work was advertised for and collected from all parts of Australia, and these are the men who selected the Australian drills for the work in preference to the other drills given them to use. That is practical evidence which comes nearer home to the question than any other evidence submitted to the Committee this evening. Like the honorable member for Parramatta, I know nothing of the subject beyond what I have heard, but the evidence to which I have just referred weighs heavily with me. So far as protectionists are concerned I claim in this connexion the vote of many protectionists in this chamber. When we have honorable members like the honorable member for Indi, who continually gets up here—

The CHAIRMAN.—Order. The honorable member is now going away from the question.

Mr. WISE.—I am claiming the vote of the honorable member for Indi, who flouts honorable members on this side and talks of his business capability, and of the disgraceful way in which the business of the Committee is being carried on.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—I said nothing of the kind. The honorable member is telling an untruth.

The CHAIRMAN.—Order. The honorable member must withdraw that remark.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—I do. I said it on purpose to be able to withdraw it.

The CHAIRMAN.—The honorable member should withdraw the remark unreservedly.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—Honorable members should not make these statements.

The CHAIRMAN.—Order.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—I withdraw it.

Mr. WISE.—I do not care to make statements which I cannot justify. I expected that the honorable member for Indi would be one of those who would give a solid vote for protection in this House.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—So I have done.

Mr. WISE.—And would follow the recommendations of the protectionist section of the Tariff Commission. On the 24th of November last, he is reported—

The CHAIRMAN.—Order. I do not see how the honorable member is going to connect this matter with rock drills. If I permit him to follow that line of argument, I cannot prevent a reply and a general discussion on the same lines.

Mr. WISE.—I am satisfied that nothing I propose to quote from the remarks of the honorable member for Indi would enable him to continue the discussion by quoting anything against me.

The CHAIRMAN.—That might be so, but I point out that the honorable member for Indi might try to disprove the statements attributed to him, and an endless discussion might arise as to what various honorable members have said.

Mr. WISE.—If we are not allowed to refer to the platform utterances upon which honorable members secured an entrance into this chamber, and to claim that they should vote in accordance with those utterances, a very great deal of the criticism we hear in this chamber must be ruled out of order.

The CHAIRMAN.—I do not know whether on the platform the honorable member for Indi said he was or was not a protectionist, but while the honorable member would be justified in making an incidental

reference to the utterances of the honorable member, I think that it would be difficult to show that he had rock drills in mind at the time those utterances were made.

Mr. WISE.—The honorable member made a general statement that he advocated the enforcement of the recommendations of the Tariff Commission, and we are now dealing with one of them. He said further that the Age had stated that he was a free-trader, a statement which he wished to deny.

The CHAIRMAN.—Order. The honorable member will be out of order in continuing that line of argument, and I ask him not to persist.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—If I might be permitted to say so, I would prefer that the honorable member should be allowed to read what he proposes to read, because we can then put the pin in and prick the bubble.

Mr. WISE.—It would take a great deal to prick the bubble. It is a very solid one.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Will the honorable member in all fairness say what the recommendation of the A section of the Tariff Commission is on rock boring machines?

Mr. WISE.—On the item that covers those machines.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—On rock boring machinery. Let the honorable gentleman tell us what they recommend.

Mr. WISE.—If the honorable member for Indi will say that he meant that he would follow the recommendations of the free-trade section of the Tariff Commission, I will say no more. If he is unable to say that, I expect him to follow the Chairman and the protectionist section of the Commission in dealing with this item. I do not propose to deal with the matter any further, except to say that the honorable member does not stand alone amongst those who professed to be sound protectionists upon the platform.

Mr. HEDGES (Fremantle) [11.26].—The honorable member for Bendigo referred to Mr. W. J. Loring, of Messrs. Bewick, Moreing, and Company, the manager of the Gwalior Mine, as having used these drills. Since then, Mr. Loring has informed me that his firm command mines in Western Australia producing £2,500,000 worth of gold. He states that the Bendigo drill and all other drills have been tried, but that the Bendigo drill does not last. It gives out too easily, and increases the cost of mining. Mr. Loring made that statement to me since I spoke to-night.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—Is he in the gallery?

Mr. HEDGES.—I rang him up on the telephone, so that I got the information from a thoroughly reliable source.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Then is he over here about it?

Mr. HEDGES. — He gets £6,000 a year. I do not know what he is here about.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—What did he give that certificate for?

Mr. HEDGES.—I asked him for it. If he had told me anything in favour of the Bendigo drills, I should have given it to the Committee as fairly as I am giving this information.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [11.28].—I have suggested to the Minister to omit the word "boring," so that the question of rock drills may be dealt with in a separate paragraph D, and have asked the Minister to propose rock-boring machines at a duty of 20 per cent. I find, on examining our report, that we recommended the omission of rock drills from the free list, and thereby they would fall automatically under "manufactures of metals, n.e.i., 20 per cent."

Mr. THOMAS.—Do I understand that the Government are prepared to omit the word "boring"?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Yes, for a purpose.

Amendment—to leave out "boring"—agreed to.

Amendment (by Mr. STORRER) agreed to—

That the amendment be amended by leaving out the figures "30."

Amendment (by Mr. STORRER) put—

That the blank be filled by the insertion of the figures "20."

The Committee divided.

Ayes	24
Noes	26

Majority	2
----------	-----	-----	---

AYES.

Archer, E. W.
Atkinson, L.
Brown, Tilley
Brown, Thomas
Cook, Joseph
Forrest, Sir John
Frazer, C. E.
Glynn, P. McM.
Hedges, W. N.
Irvine, W. H.
Knox, W.
McWilliams, W. J.
Palmer, A. C.

Poynton, A.
Sinclair, H.
Spence, W. G.
Storrer, D.
Thomas, J.
Thomson, Dugald
Willis, Henry
Wilson, J. G.
Wynne, A.

Tellers:
Rowden, E. K.
Johnson, W. E.

NOES.

Batchelor, E. L.
Carr, E. S.
Catts, J. H.
Chapman, Austin
Coon, J.
Deakin, A.
Ewing, T. T.
Fisher, A.
Foster, F. J.
Groom, L. E.
Hutchison, J.
Lyne, Sir William
Maloney, W. R. N.
Mathews, J.

Mauger, S.
McDougall, J. K.
Quick, Sir John
Salmon, C. C.
Sampson, S.
Tudor, F. G.
Watkins, D.
Watson, J. C.
Webster, W.
Wise, G. H.

Tellers:
Cook, Hume
O'Malley, King

PAIRS.

Kelly, W. H.
Smith, Bruce
Reid, G. H.
Fuller, G. W.
Page, J.
Hughes, W. M.
Livingston, J.
Fysh, Sir Philip
Mahon, H.
Irvine, Hans

Kingston, C. C.
Hall, D. R.
Harper, R.
Bamford, F. W.
Chanter, J. M.
Edwards, R.
Wilks, W. H.
Fairbairn, G.
Thomson, John
Crouch, R. A.

Question so resolved in the negative.

Amendment of the amendment negatived.

Amendment (by Mr. STORRER) agreed to—

That the blank be filled by the insertion of the figures "25" (General Tariff).

Amendment (by Mr. STORRER) proposed—

That the amendment be amended by leaving out the figures "25" (United Kingdom).

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [11.35].—I rise to make a personal explanation in regard to the pairs for the division which has just taken place. When the leader of the Opposition left for Sydney a few days ago, he told me distinctly that he had paired with the Minister of Defence; but I understand that that pair has been constantly changed by the Government Whip.

Mr. JOHNSON (Lang) [11.36].—I also desire to protest against the manner in which the pairs have been dealt with. I have remonstrated with the Government Whip about the present system of "boxing about" the pairs. I wired to the leader of the Opposition to-day, and I have received a reply, which I will read.

The CHAIRMAN.—I have already pointed out to honorable members that pairs are not officially recognised.

Mr. JOHNSON.—I quite admit that, but, at the same time, the pairs are recorded in *Hansard* and in the newspapers, and when an honorable member goes away

and makes a pair, good faith ought to be kept. The following is the reply I have received from the leader of the Opposition—

Asked Ewing for pair while at Jury Sittings. Explained importance to me of his pair. He kindly agreed.

Mr. HUME COOK (Bourke) [11.37].—As my name has been mentioned, and some unfairness imputed to me—

Mr. JOHNSON.—Gross unfairness!

Mr. HUME COOK.—It is only right, under the circumstances, that I should say a word or two. It is quite true that pairs are constantly being changed, but that is to suit the convenience of honorable members. The honorable member for Corio has been away the whole of the week.

The CHAIRMAN.—I hope the honorable member is not going into the general question of pairs?

Mr. HUME COOK.—I desire to explain the particular transaction in which unfairness has been imputed to me.

Mr. JOHNSON.—All we desire is that good faith shall be kept.

Mr. HUME COOK.—Good faith has been kept absolutely.

Mr. JOHNSON.—I say that good faith has not been kept.

The CHAIRMAN.—The honorable member for Lang has already had an opportunity to explain, and I ask him to allow the honorable member for Bourke to proceed.

Mr. HUME COOK.—I point out that I did not interrupt the honorable member for Lang. Pairs are constantly being made between members and constantly altered, and they are bound to be altered on both sides, in order to suit the convenience of honorable members. On this particular occasion, the Minister of Defence gave the leader of the Opposition a pair, and the honorable member for Angas gave the honorable member for Corio a pair. But the honorable member for Angas has been voting, and so we transferred the pair of the honorable member for Corio to the leader of the Opposition, just as during the last week, when the honorable member for Parkes had paired with the honorable member for Macquarie, he voted on every occasion, his pair having been transferred by the Opposition Whip.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I ask the Minister of Defence to say a few words in order to make the matter clear.

The CHAIRMAN.—I cannot allow this matter to go any further.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Then we shall see what can be done in the House!

Mr. GLYNN (Angas) [11.42].—There is some misapprehension created by what the Government Whip has said. I was paired with the honorable member for Corio until last Tuesday. Being detained by important business I did not arrive at the House until Wednesday, and, in case the honorable member might have an idea that he was still paired, he not having returned, I asked the Government Whip whether he expected me to continue the pair on the Wednesday. The Government Whip said "No," and, of course, I voted.

Mr. HUME COOK.—Of course, the changes are made to suit honorable members generally.

Mr. EWING (Richmond—Minister of Defence) [11.43].—Since the acting leader of the Opposition has asked me to make a statement I have no objection to doing so. The leader of the Opposition towards the end of last week asked whether I would pair with him as he was going to Sydney, and I said I had no objection. I consulted the Government Whip, who said that the pair was quite satisfactory. I have no desire to find fault with regard to the length of the pair, but I had no idea that it was for beyond the Tuesday; and I think I said so at the time to both the Government Whip and the Opposition Whip. I do not desire to raise any question about that, however, because I know these loosely-made agreements very frequently give rise to misapprehension. I know that pairs are constantly being changed in the way that has been described. In the early part of the pair I did not vote, and once or twice the Postmaster-General did not vote; all the changes were absolutely fair.

Mr. JOHNSON.—I objected all the time.

Mr. EWING.—This matter was discussed by the whips in the corridor to-day after the telegram from the leader of the Opposition arrived; and before I left that conference, I asked the whips whether they were satisfied with what had been done, and they said they were.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Provided that the honorable member for Bourke's statement regarding the honorable member for Angas was correct; but it has just been shown to be inaccurate.

Mr. GLYNN (Angas) [11.45].—In justice to the Government Whip, I should like to say that, although I was only paired until Tuesday, I was asked that the pair

should be extended for the convenience of the honorable member for Corio. The Government Whip also said that it might be necessary to change the pairs, to which arrangement I replied that I had no objection.

Amendment (by Mr. STORER)—to leave out the figures "25"—agreed to.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN (Calare) [11.48].—I do not desire to address the Committee at any length upon this question. I had intended to do so earlier in the evening, but the debate turned upon one matter, in which I was not specially interested. In the proposal which is now under consideration, however, the whole of our mining interests are involved. If honorable members will turn to the Budget statement, and to the papers connected with it which were laid upon the table of the House by the Treasurer, they will find that from 1902 to 1906 inclusive, the mining industry exported wealth to the amount of £104,225,000. As against that, the export of machinery, implements, and manufactures of metals was valued at only £469,000. In this connexion it must be remembered that the product of the mining industry has to find its market in the outside world. Notwithstanding this, there are large numbers of persons engaged in the industry who are not working rich mineral fields, but fields upon which the margin between profit and loss is a very narrow one. Yet it is now proposed to increase the taxation upon mining machinery from $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. to 25 per cent. under the general Tariff and to 20 per cent. under the Tariff for the United Kingdom. I would further remind honorable members that this industry employs about 112,000 labourers, as compared with some 16,000 who are employed in the whole of the machine and metal manufacturing industries of the Commonwealth. I desire to call the attention of honorable members to the different treatment which is accorded to the mining industry by other protectionist countries. I find that in item 222 of the New Zealand Tariff it is specified that steam engines and parts thereof, including the boiler or boilers therefor, imported specially for mining or gold saving purposes and processes or for dairying purposes, are dutiable at 5 per cent. Again, in item 439 I find that machinery for gold-saving purposes and processes has been placed upon the free list. That is the treatment which the industry receives in a country which believes in a protective

policy, but which does not believe in penalizing its large primary industries. A similar remark is applicable to the Dominion of Canada.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Does the honorable member think that it is wise at this hour of the night to speak at such length, especially as the general question has already been settled?

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—I refrained from speaking earlier in the debate in the hope that a reasonable duty would be agreed to. But instead of securing a duty of 20 per cent.—which I was prepared to accept—the Committee have imposed a duty of 25 per cent. upon mining machinery under the general Tariff. Consequently I have no alternative but to fight for the insertion of a reasonable rate in the preference column. In Canada all the important machinery used for mining purposes is upon a list of special exemptions. The case of the Wilberforce Gold Dredging Company has already been cited. There is also the case of the Cobar Company, which recently ordered machinery to cost about £71,000, of which about £47,000 worth was to come from England and about £23,000 worth from America. Under the old Tariff the duty— $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.—would have been about £8,800, but if 25 per cent., and the preferential duty of 20 per cent., is charged it will be increased by £17,000, and will come to £25,987. About £9,000 or £10,000 worth of machinery included in the order was previously on the free list, but is now dutiable at 25 per cent. That is an instance of the way in which one of our great primary industries, which has been a source of enormous wealth to the country, is being burdened, so that it will become more difficult for those connected with it to obtain decent wages. I move—

That the amendment be amended by inserting the figures "15" in the blank created by leaving out the figures "25."

Mr. MATHEWS (Melbourne Ports) [11.57].—The honorable member for Calare has referred to the Great Cobar mine; but those connected with that mine, as is well known, will purchase nothing in Australia.

Sir JOHN FORREST. — It keeps a good many working men going.

Mr. MATHEWS. — Because it earns many thousands of pounds profit. It is controlled by a London company, which orders all its requirements from England and from America. I am credibly informed that a large part of its plant, consisting of

blast furnaces, smelters, converters, and accessories, all of which could have been purchased in Australia for no more than was paid for it, was imported. The company, when it started, imported even its columns and girders, showing that it is capable of resorting to any device to avoid purchasing in Australia. It has already been determined in connexion with similar items that the rates of duty shall be 25 and 20 per cent., and if the free-traders try to force a reduction to 15 per cent. in connexion with importations from the United Kingdom, I hope that the protectionists will insist on an all-round duty of 25 per cent.

Mr. McWILLIAMS (Franklin) [11.59].—What was said in connexion with the proposal to tax rock drills applies with a hundredfold more force to the proposal to tax ore-reducing appliances. It is absolutely necessary to encourage the use of the best and latest ore-dressing and ore-reducing appliances, as they do in other countries, in order that our very low-grade ores may be worked to advantage. The Simmer and Jack Mine, by far the largest gold-producing mine in the world, which uses 600 head of stamps, is working on a 6-dwt. reef. But it can do so only by using the latest and most up-to-date appliances. Here in Australia we have many hundreds of low-grade propositions, and we can work them profitably only by using the most up-to-date appliances. The mining industry, instead of employing a few handfuls of men, as some of the manufacturing industries do, gives work to tens of thousands. We ought to try to give those who put their money into mines a fair chance to profit by their investments. The honorable member for Melbourne Ports has had a great deal to say about the mining companies importing their requirements, but we are very glad to get money from abroad to work our mines. Apparently the honorable member would consider a man who put money into Australian mines as an enemy to the country, but what we need is the investment of more capital in mining. I am surprised that honorable members should wish to put a duty of 45. in the £1 on the machinery that we most need in Australia to develop the mining industry. I shall vote for the lower duty.

Mr. SPENCE (Darling) [12.2 a.m.].—The honorable member for Melbourne Ports has spoken of the Great Cobar mine as an English company which never buys anything in Australia. That mine, however, was for many years an Australian property, it was developed by Australians. It is

only about a year since the English company purchased it, so it is not correct to say that everything at the mine has been imported. Of course, much of the machinery is such as could not be made in Australia, because it is covered by patents. I do not hold a brief for the company, but I feel bound to correct a misstatement.

Mr. KNOX (Kooyong) [12.3 a.m.].—It is appalling to hear some of the statements made in this Committee. The Great Cobar mine invited tenders in Australia, England, and America for its requirements.

Mr. STORRER (Bass) [12.4 a.m.].—I opposed the reduction of the duty to 15 per cent., but the proposed rate having been struck out, I accept the defeat as regards the higher duty, and am now prepared to vote for a duty of 20 per cent. Although mining is a very important industry in my district, I do not propose to speak at length on this subject, because I always bear in mind the value of our time, and the need in the country's interest for getting through the Tariff as quickly as possible. Therefore I make my remarks as short as I can.

Question—That the blank created in the amendment be filled by the figures "15" (Mr. THOMAS BROWN'S amendment)—put. The Committee divided.

Ayes	13
Noes	28
<hr/>			
Majority	15

AYES.

Archer, E. W.	McWilliams, W. J.
Atkinson, L.	Poynton, A.
Brown, Thomas	Spence, W. G.
Brown, Tilley	Willis, Henry
Cook, Joseph	<i>Tellers:</i>
Forrest, Sir John	Bowden, E. K.
Glynn, P. McM.	Johnson, W. E.

NOES.

Batchelor, E. L.	Palmer, A. C.
Carr, E. S.	Quick, Sir John
Chapman, Austin	Salmon, C. C.
Deakin, A.	Sinclair, H.
Ewing, T. T.	Storrer, D.
Foster, F. J.	Tudor, F. G.
Groom, L. E.	Watkins, D.
Hedges, W. N.	Watson, J. C.
Hutchison, J.	Webster, W.
Irvine, W. H.	Wilson, J. G.
Knox, W.	Wise, G. H.
Lyne, Sir William	<i>Tellers:</i>
Maloney, W. R. N.	Cook, Hume
Mathews, J.	Coon, J.
McDougall, J. K.	

PAIRS.

Kelly, W. H.
Smith, Bruce
Reid, G. H.
Fuller, G. W.
Foxton, Colonel
Thomas, J.
Edwards, R.
Livingston, J.
Thomson, Dugald
Mahon, H.
Fysh, Sir Philip
Irvine, Hans

Kingston, C. C.
Hall, D. R.
Harper, R.
Bamford, F. W.
Crouch, R. A.
Catts, J. H.
Hughes, W. M.
Wilks, W. H.
Fairbairn, G.
Thomson, John
Mauger, S.
Sampson, S.

Question so resolved in the negative.

Amendment of the amendment negatived.

Amendment (by Mr. STORRER) agreed to—

That the amendment be amended by inserting the figures "20" in the blank created by leaving out the figures "25."

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) proposed—

That the following new paragraph be added—
D. Rock boring machines, ad val. (General Tariff), 25 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 20 per cent.

Mr. FRAZER (Kalgoorlie) [12.11 a.m.].—I move—

That the amendment be amended by leaving out the figures "25" and "20," with a view to insert in lieu thereof in each case the figures "15."

This item is, I think, on all-fours with item 166, as to which we accepted this morning in regard to several industries the duties I now propose. In my opinion, all these items ought to be treated on the same basis.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [12.12 a.m.].—The honorable member for Kalgoorlie is mistaken, because this item is not identical with item 166. The word "boring" was struck out of paragraph A of this item—I did not oppose it—in order to give an opportunity not to deal with this particular amendment but with rotary and percussion drills, coal-cutting machines and diamond-drill machines.

Mr. FRAZER.—What did the honorable gentleman propose to do?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—By striking out the word "boring," we limited the extent of paragraph A, and what I have just proposed is practically to re-instate the duty on rock-boring machines.

Mr. FRAZER.—Do I understand that the new paragraph has no relation to the percussive rock drill which created all the discussion this evening?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I shall ascertain for the honorable member.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [12.13 a.m.].—I suggested to the Treasurer to omit the word "boring" in paragraph A. with a view of testing the duty on rock boring machines in a separate paragraph.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—The honorable member is not proposing to increase the duty, is he?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—The Minister has proposed a duty of 25 per cent., and I suggest that the difference should be compromised with a duty of 20 per cent.

Mr. HUTCHISON (Hindmarsh) [12.14 a.m.].—I wish to say a few words in reply to the honorable member for Kalgoorlie. The protectionist section of the Committee were generous enough to say that special machinery should go on the 15 per cent. list, but now honorable members opposite—some of whom came here claiming to be protectionists—want us to put all lines on that list. The sooner we put an end to that sort of thing the better, I think. Rather than vote for a duty of 15 per cent., I shall vote for these articles to be free. Either we ought to give protection, or we ought not to penalize the users of any machinery. A duty of 15 per cent. is not a protective, but a revenue duty. Some of us who voted for a duty of 15 per cent. did so by way of concession in regard to special machinery. But we are now dealing with machinery that can easily be made within the Commonwealth. I now admit that those of us who believe in protection made a mistake in the previous case in voting for 15 per cent., because it is evident that advantage is being taken of our generosity. I trust that the higher rate of duty will be agreed to. Personally, I should vote for duties of 35 and 30 per cent. if I had an opportunity.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [12.17 a.m.].—To meet the convenience of the honorable member for Kalgoorlie, I will temporarily withdraw my amendment, in order to enable him to move one to test the opinion of the Committee as to drills.

Amendments, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment (by Mr. FRAZER) proposed—

That the following new paragraph be added:—
D. Rotary and percussive rock drills, ad val. (General Tariff), 15 per cent."

Amendment (by Sir JOHN QUICK) proposed—

That the amendment be amended by leaving out the figures "15," with a view to insert in lieu thereof the figures "20."

Question—That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the proposed amendment—put.

The Committee divided.

Ayes	20
Noes	25
Majority	5

AYES.

Archer, E. W.	Sinclair, H.
Atkinson, L.	Spence, W. G.
Brown, Tilley	Storrer, D.
Brown, Thomas	Thomas, J.
Cook, Joseph	Thomson, Dugald
Forrest, Sir John	Willis, Henry
Frazer, C. E.	Wilson, J. G.
Hedges, W. N.	
Johnson, W. E.	<i>Tellers:</i>
Knox, W.	Bowden, E. K.
Poynton, A.	McWilliams, W. J.

NOES.

Batchelor, E. L.	Mathews, J.
Carr, E. S.	Mauger, S.
Catts, J. H.	Palmer, A. C.
Chapman, A.	Quick, Sir John
Coon, J.	Salmon, C. C.
Deakin, A.	Tudor, F. G.
Ewing, T. T.	Watkins, D.
Foster, F. J.	Watson, J. C.
Groom, L. E.	Webster, W.
Hutchison, J.	Wise, G. H.
Irvine, W. H.	<i>Tellers:</i>
Lyne, Sir William	Cook, Hume
Maloney, W. R. N.	Sampson, S.

PAIRS.

Kelly, W. H.	Kingston, C. C.
Smith, Bruce	Hall, D. R.
Reid, G. H.	Harper, R.
Fuller, G. W.	Bamford, F. W.
Fysh, Sir Philip	Chanter, J. M.
Edwards, R.	Hughes, W. M.
Irvine, Hans	Fairbairn, G.
Livingston, J.	Wilks, W. H.
Mahon, H.	Thomson, John
Fisher, A.	McDougall, J. K.
Fowler, J. M.	O'Malley, King
Glynn, P. McM.	Wynne, A.
Page, J.	Crouch, R. A.

Question so resolved in the negative.

Amendment (Mr. FRAZER'S) of the amendment (Sir WILLIAM LYNE'S) agreed to.

Mr. FRAZER (Kalgoorlie) [12.28 a.m.].—I hope that the Government are not going to endeavour to secure a duty of 20 per cent., as against imports from the United Kingdom. We should take into consideration the fact that rock drills were free under the old Tariff, and that this duty will apply to an industry, the raw materials of which cannot be admitted free but have to be sought for. I think that we have gone far enough to satisfy the if protectionists by imposing a duty

of 20 per cent. against foreign countries, and I hope that the Committee will agree to a duty of not more than 15 per cent. as against imports from Great Britain. I move—

That the amendment be amended by adding the words "ad val. (United Kingdom), 15 per cent."

Mr. MATHEWS (Melbourne Ports) [12.30 a.m.].—In this House, as in others, arrangements or compacts are often arrived at. Those who desired that rock drills should be subjected to a low rate of duty promised that if some of us would agree to their being dealt with in a separate paragraph they would support duties of 25 per cent. and 20 per cent. When we went to a division, however, they broke their compact, and therefore I think we have a right to insist on the highest rate of duty that we can secure.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—There was no compact.

Mr. MATHEWS.—There was. Honorable members who promised to vote for 25 per cent. and 20 per cent. duties if rock drills were placed in a separate paragraph failed to do so, and I hope that the Committee will agree to an all-round duty of 20 per cent.

Mr. HEDGES (Fremantle) [12.32 a.m.].—We have been told that a big American combine is dumping drills into Australia. I would remind honorable members that if they support a duty of 15 per cent. preference they will be fighting against the Combine, and that if they support a duty of 20 per cent. without preference they will be fighting for the Combine.

Amendment (by Mr. MATHEWS) proposed—

That the amendment of the amendment be amended by leaving out the figures "15," with a view to insert in lieu thereof the figures "20."

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [12.33 a.m.].—I think that the Government might well compromise by agreeing to duties of 20 per cent. and 15 per cent. I shall support the proposal that the duty on importations from the United Kingdom be 15 per cent.

Mr. HUTCHISON (Hindmarsh) [12.34 a.m.].—Can the honorable member for Bendigo refer us to a case in which the protectionist section of the Tariff Commission recommended the imposition of a duty of 15 per cent.?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—No.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—The Chairman of the Tariff Commission has taunted the

Government with proposing duties 5 per cent. in excess of those recommended by the protectionist section of the Commission, and that being so, I think we are entitled to hurl at him the taunt that he proposes to vote for a duty 5 per cent. lower than that which he recommended. If the honorable member votes for a duty of 15 per cent., he will invite the Opposition to continue fighting, as they have been all day long, with a view to securing further reductions.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—The honorable member did not do much to secure the imposition of a duty of 20 per cent. as against foreign imports.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—I hope that we shall have an all-round duty of 20 per cent. in this case, but if such a leading protectionist as the honorable member for Bendigo is going to desert the protectionist cause we do not know what will happen.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [12.36 a.m.].—I wish to enter my protest against this girding at the Opposition. During the last few days scarcely an amendment has been submitted by a member of our party.

Mr. MATHEWS.—No. A lead has been given by protectionists.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Exactly. We are following the protectionist lead all through; but do what we will, we cannot satisfy some of our honorable friends.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—They are spotted.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I am glad to think that they are as clean and as free from spots as is the honorable member.

Question.—That the figures "15" proposed to be left out stand part of the proposed amendment (Mr. MATHEWS' amendment of Mr. FRAZER's amendment)—put. The Committee divided.

Ayes	26
Noes	18

Majority	8
----------	-----	-----	-----	---

AYES.

Archef, E. W.
Atkinson, L.
Batchelor, E. L.
Brown, Thomas
Brown, Tilley
Cook, J.
Forrest, Sir J.
Foster, F. J.
Frazer, C. E.
Hedges, W. N.
Irvine, W. H.
Johnson, W. E.
Knox, W.
McWilliams, W. J.

Poynton, A.
Palmer, A. C.
Quick, Sir John
Sinclair, H.
Spence, W. G.
Storror, D.
Thomas, J.
Thomson, Dugald
Willis, Henry
Wilson, J. G.

Tellers:

Bowden, E. K.
Sampson, S.

NOES.

Catts, J. H.
Chapman, Austin
Coon, J.
Croom, L. E.
Hutchison, J.
Lyne, Sir William
Maloney, W. R. N.
Mathews, J.
Mauger, S.
McDougall, J. K.

Salmon, C. C.
Tudor, F. G.
Watkins, D.
Watson, J. C.
Webster, W.
Wise, G. H.

Tellers:

Carr, E. S.
Cook, Hume

PAIRS.

Kelly, W. H.
Livingston, J.
Fuller, G. W.
Page, J.
Fisher, A.
Fowler, J. M.
Smith, Bruce
Fysh, Sir Philip
Mahon, H.
Reid, G. H.

Kingston, C. C.
Wilks, W. H.
Bamford, F. W.
Chanter, J. M.
Ewing, T. T.
O'Malley, King
Hall, D. R.
Harper, R.
Thomson, John
Crouch, R. A.

Question so resolved in the affirmative.

Amendment (Mr. MATHEWS) of the amendment (Mr. FRAZER's) negatived.

Amendment (Mr. FRAZER's) of Sir WILLIAM LYNE's amendment amended and agreed to.

Mr. WATKINS (Newcastle) [12.40 a.m.].—I move—

That the following new paragraph be added:—"E. Coal-cutting machines, ad val. (General Tariff), 5 per cent.; (United Kingdom), free." Those machines are not and never will be made here.

Mr. KNOX (Kooyong) [12.41 a.m.].—I wish to add some words. I move—

That the amendment be amended by inserting after the word "machines" the words "side plates and balls for ball mills."

The frame of the ball mill can be made anywhere, but the special parts to which my amendment refers can be made only in three manufactories in the Old Country. A particular kind of steel is required, and these parts made elsewhere will not stand wear and tear.

Mr. COON.—Are they not being made here now?

Mr. KNOX.—No.

Amendment of the amendment agreed to.

Amendment, as amended, agreed to.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That the following new paragraph be added:—

"F. Rock-boring machines, n.e.i., ad val. (General Tariff), 25 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 20 per cent."

Amendment (substituting new item 177) as amended, agreed to.
Item, as amended, agreed to.

Postponed item 178. Electrical Machinery, viz. :—

- (A) Generators; Motors up to the capacity of 500 H.P.; Fans; Starting and Regulating Rheostats, ad val. (General Tariff), 30 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 25 per cent.
- (B) N.E.L., ad val. (General Tariff), 17½ per cent.; (United Kingdom), 12½ per cent.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) proposed—

That the following words be added :—“ and on and after 29th November, 1907.

Item 178. Electrical Machines, Appliances, and parts thereof :—

- (A) Dynamo Electric Machines, including Static Transformers and Induction Coils for all purposes; Electric Fans, ad val. (General Tariff), 25 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 20 per cent.
- (B) Regulating, Starting, and Controlling Apparatus for all electrical purposes, including Distributing Boards and Switchboards, except Telephone Switchboards, ad val. (General Tariff), 25 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 20 per cent.
- (C) Electric Apparatus and Fittings consisting wholly or partly of metal, n.e.i., including Switches, Fuses, and Lightning Arresters, ad val. (General Tariff), 17½ per cent.; (United Kingdom), 12½ per cent.
- (D) Electric Heating and Cooking Appliances, ad val. (General Tariff), 20 per cent.
- (E) Electric Fittings not containing metal to be dutiable according to material.”

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [12.48 a.m.].—Does the Minister propose to deal with electrical machinery?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—We must finish this to-night.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—I have been here as long as the Minister has, and I cannot stand it much longer.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [12.49 a.m.].—I understand that this item requires a great deal of rearrangement. Some honorable members decidedly object to the Treasurer's new proposals, as circulated. Would it not be better for the honorable gentleman to postpone the item until to-morrow, and in the meantime confer with those honorable members?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I am not going to confer any more. I have conferred, and tried in every way possible to meet objections, and I find that whenever I come to an arrangement it is broken off.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Is the honorable member for South Sydney in favour of going on?

Mr. WATSON.—I think it is time that we got the Tariff through.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Then we must go on.

Mr. KNOX (Kooyong) [12.50 a.m.].—The Minister and the Department have endeavoured in every way to assist those concerned in electrical machinery in order to arrive at some satisfactory arrangement.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—We had better have a quorum to begin with. [*Quorum formed.*]

Mr. BATCHELOR.—On a point of order, I draw attention to the fact that the honorable member for Echuca left the chamber when the bells were ringing. The honorable member should be warned that he is breaking the rules of the House.

Mr. WATSON.—The honorable member for Indi also left the chamber. He should be brought back.

The CHAIRMAN. — The Standing Orders provide that no honorable member must leave the chamber when a quorum has been called for. The honorable member for Indi left the chamber after attention was called to the absence of a quorum, as did the honorable member for Melbourne Ports, who has since returned. The course that I should generally take in the circumstances would be to report the action of the honorable member for Indi to the Speaker, but probably the honorable member acted inadvertently.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Let the Chairman report. What can be done if he does report?

The CHAIRMAN.—I must point out to the honorable member for Parramatta that he is disrespectful to the Chair. The honorable member appears by his remarks to think that I am making this a personal matter, but that is not so. I am merely trying to carry out the duties of the position in which the House has placed me.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Is it not equally disrespectful to you for honorable members opposite to be going on as they are?

The CHAIRMAN.—It was owing to the honorable member's interjections that all the noise on the other side occurred. There is now a quorum present. I think that it is probable the honorable member for Indi left the chamber under a misapprehension. I shall request the Serjeant-at-Arms merely to remind the honorable member of the fact; and I hope that that will get over the difficulty.

The honorable member for Indi having entered the chamber—

The CHAIRMAN.—I must remind the honorable member that when a quorum has been called for, honorable members must not leave the chamber. Probably the honorable member did not hear what I said when he was leaving the chamber. I merely wish to warn the honorable member that he must not leave the chamber again under such circumstances.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—As a matter of fact, I did not know that a division was about to be taken.

The CHAIRMAN.—There was no division, but a quorum was required.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—I was not quite so sure as to its being a quorum which was being called, and it must have been inadvertence on my part.

Mr. KNOX (Kooyong) [12.59 a.m.].—I desired to have some re-arrangement of these items, and gave notice accordingly. The Treasurer, after consultation with his officers, has introduced the proposals in a way which I know is satisfying to those interested in New South Wales, Victoria, and South Australia. There is no justification for the charge that the officers have not endeavoured in every way to put these complex items on a sound footing. As the arrangement has the substantial approval of those interested in the manufacture and importation of the items, it is scarcely necessary for me to remind honorable members that many of the appliances are only in a state of development, considerably more so than is ordinary mining machinery. Day by day, the application of electricity to every branch of industry, and almost every department of life, is extending, and many of the appliances are very necessary in connexion with the mining industry. I desire to move as a reasonable compromise that the duties be 20 per cent. and 15 per cent. I know there is a desire on the part of some honorable members for a lower duty, but I think my suggestion ought to meet the case. I wish to move—

That the amendment be amended by leaving out the figures "25," paragraph A, with a view to insert in lieu thereof the figures "20."

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I should like to know if you, sir, directed the Serjeant-at-Arms to bring the honorable member for Indi into the chamber? I understood that you had merely asked that officer to remind him of what had happened.

The CHAIRMAN.—That is so.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I understand that the honorable member for Indi has been

brought to the chamber by the Serjeant-at-Arms, and if so, he has been subjected to an indignity.

The CHAIRMAN.—I would point out to the honorable member that the honorable member for Indi was not brought here by the Serjeant-at-Arms.

Mr. J. H. CATTS (Cook) [1.6 a.m.].—I desire to ask if item 178, dealing with electrical machinery, has been further amended.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Only by my own proposal.

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—I really think that we ought to have the Treasurer's proposals before us in print.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The only alteration that has been made in the item is in the amount of the duties proposed in the first and second columns. The reason the alteration has been made is that during the past two days the Committee have objected to impose a higher duty than 25 per cent., and consequently I did not see the utility of debating a proposal in favour of 30 per cent.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE. — To what paragraphs do the new rates apply?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—To paragraphs A, B, and C.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [1.9 a.m.].—The new scheme of duties proposed by the Government upon electrical machinery differs somewhat materially from the scheme that was originally embodied in the Tariff. Originally electrical appliances were covered by items 178, 179, and 180, and the duties imposed upon them were based upon the recommendations of the protectionist section of the Tariff Commission. In dealing with this question, which is a very important and complicated one—

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I think that there ought to be a quorum present. [*Quorum formed.*]

Sir JOHN QUICK.—In dealing with this very important and complicated question of electrical machinery and appliances, we were at a considerable disadvantage by reason of the fact that very few witnesses appeared before us to give us any information. As a matter of fact, we heard no witnesses from Victoria. In Western Australia, however, evidence was tendered by the representative of the mining companies, who strongly protested against any duties being levied upon electrical machinery and appliances. The only evidence forthcoming in support of any change in the direction

of protective duties was that given by Mr. Barton, in Queensland. That gentleman stated that under the old Queensland Tariff, which imposed a duty of 25 per cent. upon electrical machinery, he had been able to manufacture motors, &c., but that he was unable to compete successfully under the Commonwealth Tariff of 12½ per cent.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—There is no quorum present, and we must have one [*Quorum formed.*]

Sir JOHN QUICK.—The Commission were informed that—

It would not pay to establish a plant at Brisbane to manufacture electrical appliances for local use; but it might be advantageous to provide works in large cities, such as Melbourne and Sydney, to supply the needs of the Commonwealth. With a duty of 25 per cent. heavy engineering portion of electrical appliances could be made here at a profit.

The Tariff Commission arrived at certain conclusions in respect of this industry, one or two of which I propose to read. It is greatly to be regretted that a question of such magnitude—a question dealing with the advanced guard of scientific engineering, and exercising such a momentous influence upon our industrial system, has to be dealt with at this early hour of the morning, and in such a thin Committee. Among our conclusions we found that—electrical generators, motors, and fans, and other machinery and appliances have been made in Victoria and Queensland under 25 per cent. protective Tariffs, which were in operation at some period prior to Federation.

We also found that—

there seems to be no reason why electrical generators and motors, probably up to a high capacity, and certainly up to 500 horse-power, should not in the future be made in Australia, provided the insulated conductors, and insulating materials required are admitted free.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—There is no quorum, Mr. Chairman. [*Quorum formed.*]

Sir JOHN QUICK.—We recommended that generators, motors up to the capacity of 500 horse-power, fans, and starting and regulating rheostats should be dutiable at the rate of 25 per cent. *ad valorem*. I ask honorable members to give attention to this recommendation.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—The honorable member cannot expect us to listen at this hour of the morning.

Mr. THOMAS.—It is altogether unreasonable. We have been here since 11 yesterday morning.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—It is hard to do justice to so important a subject at this hour.

Mr. MAUGER.—Let us get to a vote.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—Apparently the Minister wishes us to vote blindly.

Mr. MALONEY.—Does the honorable member think that his speech will alter one vote?

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—Surely the Chairman of the Tariff Commission is entitled to a hearing.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—The Commission were of opinion that only two or three classes of electrical machinery could reasonably be expected to be made in Australia under existing conditions. We therefore recommended a duty of 25 per cent. on the machinery which I have named. The Government in its first proposals in regard to electrical machinery adopted our recommendation except as to rates, confining the higher duties to generators, motors up to the capacity of 500 horse-power, fans, and starting and regulating rheostats. But in the proposals now before the Committee they apply the duties to all electrical motive power and machinery, irrespective of horse-power. Motors of a capacity of over 500 horse-power, and other big electrical machinery, are not likely to be made in Australia for many years to come, and any duty imposed upon them will be merely revenue producing and oppressive to the industries that have to use this machinery. But duties on small motors and generators may give a stimulus to local manufacturers. I am desirous of doing all I can to encourage the manufacture of electrical machinery in Australia; but I do not wish to go beyond what is fair and reasonable. Senator McGregor, ex-Senator Higgs, Mr. Francis Clarke, and myself talked this matter over and came to the conclusion that the highest duty that should be imposed on the machinery I have mentioned was 25 per cent., and that bigger machinery should be dutiable at 12½ per cent. The proposals of the Government will do more harm than good, and will tend to make the Tariff objectionable. I do not wish to make enemies for the Tariff, my desire being to secure the greatest good for the greatest number, with the least amount of friction. In order to bring matters to an issue, and to restore the limitation originally recommended, I move—

That the amendment be amended by inserting after the word "machines," in paragraph A, the words "up to the capacity of 500 horse-power." I intend, if that is carried, to move to make machinery of larger horse-power

dutiable at 12½ per cent. or whatever lower rate the Committee may decide upon. Mr. Sluyterman, electrical engineer, of Bendigo, when referred to as to the possibility of the differentiation which I propose, wrote to me—his letter is an appendix to the report of the Commission on the subject—that—

electrical generators and motors can be made in Australia up to almost any capacity, say 500 horse-power, provided the insulated conductors and insulating materials, such as covered wire, mica, insulating varnishes, prepared tapes and papers, vulcanite fibre, rubber and all insulating compounds, also platenoid and manganin wires (for XXX rheostats) were kept on the free list.

Mr. FOSTER.—How many makers of electrical machinery are there in Australia?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—There are two or three in Melbourne — Mr. Weymouth and Mr. Joel, and one in Brisbane. Mr. Barton, a Brisbane electrical engineer, wants a duty of 25 per cent. imposed on small motors and rheostats. I am sorry that I cannot do justice to the item at this late hour.

Mr. THOMAS.—If the honorable member will move that the item be postponed, we will support him.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—I have asked for a postponement of the item, and that has been refused.

Mr. THOMAS.—Move it.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—I move the amendment, in the hope that the Government will see their way to accept it.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Yes.

Mr. J. H. CATTS (Cook) [1.26 a.m.].—I also am very sorry that, after having been here for fourteen hours, the Government cannot see their way to allow us to go home.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—We will settle the item in two or three minutes.

Mr. WATSON.—Let us finish this item; it is all fixed up.

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—This is a very important item and it is not right that it should be fixed up without receiving any consideration.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I have been considering it for a month.

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—It has been pointed out by the Chairman of the Tarif Commission that it is not reasonable to suppose that electric motors and generators over 500 horse-power will be manufactured in Australia for a considerable time. He has also shown that the Government have altered their first proposal in order to make dutiable,

at 25 and 20 per cent. respectively, the whole of the electrical motor power which is used in the Commonwealth. Several interjections have been made which would imply that this class of machinery over 500 horse-power is used by only wealthy capitalists in mining operations. But let me point out that it is used in connexion with electric-lighting plants and tramway systems in large cities. To impose duties of 25 per cent. and 20 per cent. on such machinery, which cannot be made here, is simply to place a burden upon the great majority of the people who use electric tramways and electric light. I was expecting to hear a few words on this item from some of those who pretend to stand up for the rights of New South Wales, and, seeing that no one has risen to speak, not even on the Opposition side, I wish to bring before the Committee a letter which I have received from the Sydney Municipal Council. The letter reads as follows:—

Mr. J. H. CATTS, M.H.R., Federal Parliament, Melbourne.

DEAR SIR,

I have the honour, by direction of the Sydney Municipal Council, to invite your attention to the fact that by reason of the new Customs Tarif the Council is likely to be involved in a very considerable outlay of money to cover the new duty on certain electric motors and other electric machinery and apparatus which are being imported from England for the Sydney Electric Light undertaking.

This machinery and motors cannot be reasonably manufactured in the Commonwealth, otherwise purchases would be made accordingly, and the Council is, therefore, obliged to import.

In these circumstances I am to represent to you, as one of the New South Wales members of the Federal Legislature, the great hardship under which the Council labours in this connexion, and to request you to kindly use every endeavour to have electric motors placed on the free list, and the duties on electric machinery and apparatus largely reduced.

Thanking you in anticipation,

I have the honour to be, Dear Sir,
Your obedient servant,

F. H. NESBITT,
Town Clerk.

As it is pointed out by the Council that the electrical machinery which they want for the lighting of Sydney cannot be reasonably made in Australia, I presume that it is over 500 horse-power. If it cannot be made here, then duties of 25 per cent. and 20 per cent. should not be imposed. The honorable member for Hindmarsh, who is interrupting me, has spoken here time after time.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—During the last two days I have spoken for only two minutes.

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—The honorable member has talked on the Tariff at least an hour for every minute that I have occupied, and I object to him indicating what I should do. If I want to speak, I shall speak without asking his permission. I owe a duty to my constituents as well as he does. I was waiting patiently in my place to hear some of those who pretend that they are the guardians of New South Wales in order to find out whether they were going to refer to the letter.

The CHAIRMAN.—Order! I ask honorable members to cease their continuous talk.

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—I was waiting to hear whether the representations of the Sydney Municipal Council would be placed before the Committee by some honorable members representing New South Wales, particularly those who are always making a tremendous noise about their loyalty to that State. As the matter has not been referred to by them—

The CHAIRMAN. — Order! I again appeal to honorable members to cease their continuous talk. It is impossible for me to understand what the honorable member for Cook is saying. I hope that honorable members will have some respect for at least the Chamber.

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—The very members who ought to be supporting me are not even helping to maintain order, but are trying, with others, to drown my voice, and so prevent the representations of the Sydney Municipal Council from reaching the proper quarter. I appeal to the Minister to accede to the request of that body, that electrical machinery which cannot reasonably be made in the Commonwealth should be placed upon the free list. The duty should at least be made as low as possible. It means a tax upon the working people of Sydney and suburbs, to whom the municipal council are endeavouring to supply cheap electric light in opposition to the Gas Company of Sydney—a huge monopoly which has been charging too high a price for a very long time. The Minister having, as I know, sympathy with the great working population of Sydney, will, I trust, see his way clear to assist the Sydney Council by allowing it to import its machinery at the lowest possible rate of duty.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [1.36 a.m.].—The honorable member for Cook who has just sat down, the honorable member for Melbourne,

and the honorable member for West Sydney, have interviewed me more than once in regard to the position of the cities of Melbourne and Sydney in reference to electric lighting machinery.

Mr. THOMAS.—Has not any one spoken to the Minister about Adelaide?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The cases of the two cities I have mentioned were brought prominently before me. I have considered the matter in the light of the representations made to me, and am prepared to consent to a lower rate of duty than I was at first inclined to accept. I am prepared to accept a duty of 20 per cent. in each column. The honorable member for Bendigo has moved an amendment with the object of limiting the duty to 500 horse-power machinery. On machinery beyond that power I am prepared to take a lower duty than 20 per cent. I am prepared to agree to duties of 15 and 20 per cent. in reference to some of these paragraphs in consequence of the representations made to me.

Mr. FRAZER (Kalgoorlie) [1.38 a.m.].—I join with the honorable member for Bendigo in regretting the necessity for dealing with such items as this at such an hour. The business done at all sittings after midnight which I have attended has always been unsatisfactory. We have never been able to arrive at a reasonable conclusion. Every one is in a bad temper.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I am sure that I am not.

Mr. FRAZER.—The Minister may feel in his usual condition, but the majority of honorable members are not in a frame of mind conducive to the satisfactory transaction of business. I understood that we were to adjourn every night at 11 o'clock in consideration of sitting so early in the morning.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Yes, if progress is made.

Mr. FRAZER.—Very reasonable progress has been made at this sitting, in my opinion. We have agreed to items involving many thousands of pounds to the industrial community, and although they may not have been many in number they were of greater importance than perhaps ten times as many other items in the schedule. It is regrettable that we have not many electrical experts to advise us. The best advice that I have been able to obtain leads me to say that we shall be perfectly safe in making the lower rate of

duty operate on machinery over 500 horse-power. The largest dynamo that I can see catalogued as made in Australia is one of 200 horse-power. I think we shall adopt a very fair standard in accepting the suggestion of the honorable member for Bendigo. Our requirements in the way of electrical machinery are so limited that in all probability a dynamo of 500 horse-power will prove to be the maximum required. An increase of duty from $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. to 20 per cent. is as much protection as an industry that has reached the stage of development of the one we are considering can expect from any Parliament. Recognising the impossibility of making a successful appeal to the Committee at this time in the morning, when we ought to be in bed, I feel disposed to accept the suggestion of the Minister.

Mr. JOHNSON (Lang) [1.43 a.m.]—The honorable and juvenile member for Cook, although so newly a member of this House, has constituted himself lecturer-general to the Committee, and has admonished the representatives of New South Wales for not protesting against the proposed duty on electrical machinery and appliances. He also upbraided some honorable members for trying to drown his voice. But whatever noise was being made while he was speaking, came from his own corner; and if honorable members representing New South Wales have not hitherto spoken on this subject, it was simply because they were anxious to assist the Government in getting through the Tariff as quickly as possible, by trying to come to an understanding with the Government to secure a substantial reduction of duty. I venture to say that, so far as this part of the division is concerned, the Opposition cannot be accused of having unduly occupied the time of the Committee. The debate has been carried on either by Government supporters or their allies in the Ministerial corner, and if the Treasurer has any cause of complaint, he certainly has no complaint against the Opposition. Since both the honorable member for Cook and the honorable member for Barrier seem to think that the representatives of New South Wales on the Opposition benches should have made themselves heard more frequently, and at greater length than they have done, I propose, so far as I am concerned, to leave them no ground for complaint. The honorable member for Cook read a circular letter

from the municipal council of Sydney which was sent to all the representatives of New South Wales.

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—The honorable member for Cook was the first to make any forcible representation in regard to it.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Yes, simply because he first caught the Chairman's eye, although other members rose. I intend also to make some equally forcible observations regarding it. I should like to know whether the Minister of Trade and Customs received a copy of the circular letter from the municipal council of Sydney protesting against this duty, and pointing out the disabilities under which municipal bodies will labour if it be carried. Will the Minister agree to the reduction proposed by the honorable member for Bendigo?

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—I understand that the Treasurer has said that he will comply with some of the requests made by the honorable member for Cook and by the honorable member for Melbourne, and that he is prepared to agree to a reduction of the duties to 20 per cent.

Mr. JOHNSON.—With a proposal that a duty of $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. be imposed in some of the other cases?

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—No; to duties of 20 per cent. and of 15 per cent., and 10 per cent. in respect of another item.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Is the Minister going to accept that proposal?

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—Yes, if honorable members are agreeable.

Mr. JOHNSON.—I should like the Treasurer, who is in charge of the Tariff, to inform us what he proposes to do, because the Minister of Trade and Customs has no responsibility in this matter. In the letter from the Town Clerk of Sydney it is pointed out that—

The Council is likely to be involved in a very considerable outlay of money to cover the new duty on certain electric motors and other electric machinery and apparatus which are being imported from England for the Sydney electric light undertaking.

This machinery and motors cannot be reasonably manufactured in the Commonwealth, otherwise purchases would be made accordingly, and the Council is, therefore, obliged to import.

The municipal councils, representing as they do the most democratic bodies within the limits of their jurisdiction, would be glad to purchase locally made electrical machinery and appliances, but since they are not made here they must have recourse to imported articles to supply their wants.

Mr. WEBSTER.—The Treasurer has already agreed to the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON.—We have not heard the Treasurer say so.

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—I am quite prepared to accept it now.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Where is the Treasurer? I should like to address my remarks to him, as he is in charge of the Tariff. In the honorable gentleman's absence, and knowing the sharp tactics with which we have had to deal in connexion with Tariff matters, I am compelled to put before the Committee my arguments in support of the proposal made by the honorable member for Bendigo.

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—A proposal which the Government have already agreed to. If that honorable member will let the Chairman put the question, we are prepared to allow it to go at once.

Mr. JOHNSON.—I remind the Minister of Trade and Customs that the responsible Minister in charge of the Tariff is not here, and has not definitely told the Committee what reductions he is willing to agree to respecting several of the articles included in the item, and that honorable members on this side representing New South Wales have been upbraided for not having put their views on this subject before the Committee. I have promised to remove all cause of complaint on that score, and I intend to do so. I find, on referring to the Customs returns for 1906, that from the United Kingdom we imported this class of material to the value of £117,852, equal to 55.57 per cent. of the total imports. Our imports from Germany amounted in value to £21,181 equal to 10.32 per cent. From Sweden, £12,966; from the United States, £52,426, equal to 24.72 per cent.; and from all other countries, £6,845 worth of these materials. The total value of these importations amounted to £212,570. Turning to the evidence taken by the Tariff Commission in connexion with these matters, we find that it clearly proves that no duty we could impose would enable the majority of these articles to be manufactured locally, unless the manufacture were preceded by a very large increase in consumption, and also that the few articles that could be made here could only be produced at an excessive cost. At page 2240 of the Tariff Commission report, it will be found that Mr. Crocker, of the Kalgoorlie Electric

Power and Lighting Company, gave this evidence—

Practically none of the machinery and appliances used for producing and dealing with electricity are made in Australia.

That is the sworn evidence of an expert in this particular business. Mr. Crocker said in his evidence that Weymouth and Company, of Melbourne, did a little manufacturing, but added, "We endeavoured to use one of their motors, but we did not find it working satisfactorily. Moreover, the price was £67 9s. 3d., while the invoice price of similar imported articles was £17 10s. 10d." Evidently, therefore, there was a desire to give a preference to the local article, but the deal was found most unsatisfactory, and there was a great discrepancy between the two prices. The figures are so important that I should like to have a quorum present before proceeding. [*Quorum formed.*] So great a difference in price must have weight with municipal councils and similar bodies, who are responsible for the lighting of cities and answerable to the ratepayers for the proper and economical expenditure of the rates. If they bought articles at such vastly increased prices they would have to increase the rates. If they find that they cannot get appliances manufactured locally in a satisfactory manner or at a reasonable price they must, to conserve the interests of the ratepayers, go to the cheapest market. Mr. Crocker stated in his evidence that at such a price as he quoted it was impossible to use electrical machinery for mining purposes. This is, therefore, a matter of the gravest concern to those engaged in mining enterprises. Now that the Treasurer is present, I shall be glad to hear what he proposes.

Mr. STORRER (Bass) [2.14].—I desire to make an explanation with regard to the honorable member for West Sydney, who spoke to me a few days ago regarding this item, as he was very anxious that the duties proposed by the Government should be reduced. Earlier in the sitting, when the honorable member for Cook rose, I rose at the same time, intending to speak on behalf of the honorable member for West Sydney. Then the honorable member for Cook pointed indignantly to the fact that no Sydney representative had taken up the claims of Sydney!

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—I was referring to members of the Opposition. I know that the honorable member for West Sydney has been very active in the matter.

Mr. STORRER.—I am prepared to support duties of 20 per cent. and 15 per cent. on all items in connexion with electrical appliances. Although I have had nine years' experience in a municipal council which has one of the best electric light plants in Australia, I shall not trouble the Committee with details. These articles can be manufactured here, and we should give a certain amount of protection; but I am not an extremist.

Mr. FOSTER (New England) [2.16 a.m.].—I do not seriously resent the imputation of the honorable member for Cook that New South Wales members are neglectful in this matter.

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—I spoke of the New South Wales members of the Opposition.

Mr. FOSTER.—The honorable member spoke of New South Wales representatives, and, as one, I should like to inform him that I approached the Treasurer over two months ago, and got a promise from him that he would do his best to see that all the articles that cannot be made here were placed on the free list.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—That is quite true. I had forgotten the fact. That was about the time I sought the assistance of professional men.

Mr. FOSTER.—I was quite satisfied with the promise of the Treasurer; and I am pleased at the present attitude of the honorable gentleman. Electrical machinery is going to overtake other machinery; and we know that in many mining districts, where wood is becoming scarce, water power is being used, wherever possible, to generate electricity. The honorable member for Bendigo has pointed out that in the item as it stands are articles which should not be included; and I shall have much pleasure in supporting their elimination. I am not prepared, however, to suggest a lower Tariff than 20 per cent. We should either have a protective Tariff or make the articles free; and 15 per cent. is simply a revenue duty.

Mr. JOHNSON.—The Treasurer says he requires revenue.

Mr. FOSTER.—I am willing to assist the Treasurer in obtaining revenue from other sources than mining plant.

Mr. MCWILLIAMS (Franklin) [2.19 a.m.].—The arrangement arrived at seems to be about the best possible under the circumstances; but if there were any hope of getting a still further reduction, I should be content to remain here much longer. Electricity is not the power of the future

but the power of the present; and in Tasmania there is a project on foot by which enormous electrical power is to be generated for lighting and motive-power purposes. Just when these enterprises are being attempted a paternal Government steps in and imposes taxation to the extent of 4s. in the £1 on necessary articles, which cannot be made in Australia profitably for many years to come. Launceston, which is one of the most up-to-date cities in Australia, has a splendid system of electric lighting, and electric trams are being introduced; and similar progress is being made in South Australia. The proposed duty is wrong from the point of view of progress, and wrong even from a protectionist standpoint. I should strongly favour a lower duty; but, believing that those holding the same views as myself have made the best bargain possible, I reluctantly fall in with the arrangement.

Amendment (Sir JOHN QUICK's) agreed to.

Amendment (by Mr. KNOX) agreed to—

That the amendment be amended by leaving out the figures "25," with a view to insert in lieu thereof the figures "20."

Amendment (by Sir JOHN QUICK) agreed to—

That the amendment be amended by inserting after paragraph A the words:—"AA. Dynamos, electric machines over the capacity of 500 horsepower, ad val. (General Tariff and United Kingdom), 12½ per cent."

Amendment (by Mr. WATSON) proposed—

That the amendment be amended by leaving out the figures "25," paragraph B, with a view to insert in lieu thereof the figures "20."

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [2.24 a.m.].—In agreeing to the arrangement by which a substantial reduction has been made, I regret that the Treasurer does not see his way to make a still further reduction, because these duties are altogether too high. A great deal of the machinery cannot, and will not, be made here; and any duty will be largely a revenue duty. I think that the Treasurer is acting unfairly in going beyond the recommendations of the A section of the Tariff Commission. However, as there appears to be no chance of securing anything more, I am forced to agree to what has been arranged. But I extremely regret that the Treasurer has not made more substantial concessions.

Mr. KNOX (Kooyong) [2.26 a.m.].—I am sorry that the Treasurer has not seen his way to agree to my amendment of the duties proposed. In order to secure

uniformity, I have been reluctantly obliged to agree to the compromise which has been effected.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. KNOX (Kooyong) [2.29 a.m.]—I wish to know why telephone switch boards are exempted?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—They are only imported by the Government, not by private individuals.

Amendments (by Mr. WATSON) proposed—

That the amendment be amended by leaving out the figures "17½," paragraph C, with a view to insert in lieu thereof the figures "15"; and that the figures "12½," paragraph C, be left out, with a view to insert in lieu thereof the figures "10."

Mr. STORRER (Bass) [2.32 a.m.]—The arrangement which has been arrived at in respect of the articles specified in these paragraphs seems to be a peculiar one, inasmuch as it permits of the admission of the electric appliances which can be made within the Commonwealth, at the lowest rate of duty.

Amendments agreed to.

Amendment (by Mr. WATSON) agreed to—

That the amendment be amended by leaving out the figures "20," paragraph D, with a view to insert in lieu thereof the figures "15"; and by adding to paragraph D the words "ad val. (United Kingdom), 10 per cent."

Amendment (by Mr. KNOX) agreed to—

That the amendment be amended by adding the words—"F. Generators for direct coupling to steam turbines, ad val. (General Tariff), 5 per cent.; (United Kingdom), free."

Amendment (substituting new item 178), as amended, agreed to.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Postponed item 179. Electrical and Gas Appliances, viz. :—

(A) Electroliers; Gasaliers; Chandeliers; Pendants; Brackets; Switches; Controlling Devices, n.e.i.; Radiators; and Zinc Tubing, ad val. (General Tariff), 25 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 20 per cent.

(B) N.E.I., ad val. (General Tariff), 17½ per cent.; (United Kingdom), 12½ per cent.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) proposed—

That the words "and on and after 29th November, 1907, item 179. Electrical and Gas Appliances, viz. :—

(A) Electroliers, Gasaliers; Chandeliers; Pendants; Brackets; Zinc Tubing, ad val. (General Tariff), 25 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 20 per cent.

(B) N.E.I., ad val. (General Tariff), 17½ per cent.; (United Kingdom), 12½ per cent.," be added.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [2.37 a.m.]—Electrical meters, that is machines for measuring and recording electric power, are made dutiable under item 180 at 5 per cent., if imported from foreign countries, but they may be imported free from Great Britain. I wish to have water and gas meters treated in the same way. Electrical works are partly municipal undertakings and partly private enterprises, and so, too, are gas-works, though there are more gas-works than electrical works under municipal control. The meters are not instruments which can be made in Australia.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not think that an amendment such as the honorable member proposes can be moved in this item. These meters were dealt with as manufactures of metal under a previous item.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—There was some confusion in regard to the matter, because they were taken out of item 164, but were not inserted in the new item. Although we have dealt with manufactures of metals, the machines included in this item also come under that designation, and there are other items embracing manufactures of metal with which we have yet to deal. These meters are not made here.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I am informed that they are.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Where?

Mr. MAUGER.—In Little Collins-street, not one hundred yards from here.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The imported parts are put together; but the meters are not made here.

Mr. STORRER.—There is nothing to prevent them from being made here.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—They are covered by patent rights, and are not made even in the large provincial towns of the United Kingdom, partly because powerful, exact and costly machinery is necessary for the striking out of the different parts. This machinery is very expensive, but is capable of turning out so much work when it is put into operation that it is not necessary, and would not pay, to have many plants. Consequently these parts are struck out in London, and sent to Edinburgh and other cities to be put together. There is no likelihood of their being made in Australia, because the number of meters required annually is not great, after the

first supply has been placed in position. They should be put on the same footing as electrical meters.

Mr. WATKINS (Newcastle) [2.41 a.m.].—I mentioned this matter when we were dealing with an earlier item, and was told that, because of a re-arrangement that was being-made, it should be brought on later. I think that this is the proper place to make the amendment. I understand that the Metropolitan Gas Company of Melbourne puts together its own gas meters; but there are numbers of small gas works, owned largely by municipalities, that cannot do this. I understand that the parts of gas meters are covered by patent rights, so that they cannot be made here, and therefore it would be unfair to put a big revenue duty on them, which would have to be borne chiefly by the municipalities.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I will accept an amendment, if it be made to apply only to gas meters.

Mr. McWILLIAMS (Franklin) [2.45 a.m.].—Throughout the country districts acetylene gas is being used very largely, and I desire to know from the Treasurer whether this item will cover acetylene gas appliances and fittings as well as coal gas appliances and fittings?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Yes.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [2.46 a.m.].—Does the Treasurer intend to insist upon the rates of duty he has proposed in this item?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I made no arrangement about the rates of duty on these items.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Then I propose to move that the item be postponed. The honorable gentleman is going back on the spirit if not the letter of the compact. Otherwise why is he asking the Committee to take these items at all?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Very well, let it go at 20 per cent. in each column.

Amendment (by Mr. JOSEPH COOK) agreed to—

That the amendment be amended by leaving out the figures "25," paragraph A, with a view to insert in lieu thereof the figures "20."

Amendment (by Mr. DUGALD THOMSON) agreed to—

That the amendment be amended by inserting after paragraph A the words:—"AA. Gas meters, ad val. (General Tariff), 5 per cent.; (United Kingdom), free."

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [2.49 a.m.].—The honorable mem-

ber for Melbourne Ports desires to bring incandescent filament lamps and vapour lamps under this item.

Mr. MATHEWS (Melbourne Ports) [2.49 a.m.].—I move—

That the amendment be amended by inserting after paragraph AA just inserted the words:—"AAA. Incandescent filament lamps and vapour lamps, ad val. (General Tariff), 20 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 20 per cent."

We ought to encourage the manufacture of these lamps here, seeing that other lamps are made here. Without doubt, electric light is superseding other forms of light, and unless we make preparations now for the manufacture of these particular lamps, a great deal of our lamp industry will be lost.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—If the honorable member is going to open up this question, we might as well sit here all night. This amendment has nothing to do with electricity.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Yes, it has.

Mr. MATHEWS.—I am simply asking the Committee to transfer these articles from item 180, with the object of getting such a duty imposed that they can be manufactured here.

Mr. JOHNSON (Lang) [2.52 a.m.].—Perhaps it would be as well to point out that the object of the honorable member for Melbourne Ports is to remove these articles from the 5 per cent. and free lists to the 20 per cent. list without any differentiation. By an artful manœuvre he proposes to bring these lamps under a duty of 20 per cent. I for one resent such a proposition. It is trying the patience of members of the Opposition a little too far. These subterfuges, for they can be called nothing else, have been resorted to too often.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—We have given way quite enough already.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. BATCHELOR).—I point out to the honorable member for Melbourne Ports that he has proposed an increased duty. A private member is unable to do that, and, therefore, the amendment is out of order.

Amendment (by Mr. JOSEPH COOK) agreed to—

That the amendment be amended by leaving out the figures "17½," paragraph B, with a view to insert in lieu thereof the figures "15"; and by leaving out the figures "12½," with a view to insert in lieu thereof the figures "10."

Amendment, as amended, agreed to.
Item, as amended, agreed to.

Postponed item 180. Electrical Materials, viz. :—

Accumulators or Storage Batteries, including Glass Cells used therewith; Cable and Wire (covered); Carbons; Testing Meters and Instruments; Translators Insulating Tapes; Meters, Resistance Coils; Static Transformers and Terminals; Photometers for Gas and Electricity, ad val. (General Tariff), 5 per cent.; (United Kingdom), free.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) proposed—

That the words “and on and after 29th November, 1907.

180. Electrical Articles and Materials, viz. :—

Accumulators or Storage Batteries; Arc Lamps, Arc Lamp Carbons; Cable and Wire (covered); Carbon in Blocks of 12 square inches and over; Electric Vacuum Tubes; Incandescent Filament Lamps; Measuring and Recording Instruments; Prepared Insulating Tape; Vapour Lamps, ad val. (General Tariff), 5 per cent.; (United Kingdom), free.”

Mr. MATHEWS.—I desire to move that the words “incandescent filament lamps” and “vapour lamps” be left out.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—Would not the omission of the words quoted by the honorable member for Melbourne Ports involve increasing the duty?

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. BATCHELOR).—I have no knowledge as to whether the effect of omitting the words would be to increase the duty or not.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—I should like to ask the Treasurer whether the omission of the words in question would not have the effect of increasing the burdens upon the people?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The honorable member is quite right.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. BATCHELOR).—Then the honorable member for Melbourne Ports cannot move such an amendment.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I will move it for him. I think he is quite right.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) proposed—

That the amendment be amended by leaving out the words “incandescent filament lamps” and “vapour lamps.”

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [3.0 a.m.].—I shall support the amendment upon the amendment. I congratulate the honorable member for Melbourne Ports on having such influence with the Minister as to be able to get such an amendment made.

Mr. MATHEWS.—The Opposition have had a very good innings to-night.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—We have perforce had to agree to duties far beyond those suggested by the A section of the Tariff Commission. Perhaps the honorable member is not aware of that. I congratulate him on his good fortune in being able to get what he wants from the Minister.

Amendment of the amendment agreed to.

Amendment, as amended, agreed to.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Progress reported.

SPECIAL ADJOURNMENT.

Motion (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That the House at its rising adjourn until 2.30 p.m. this day.

ADJOURNMENT.

DAYS OF MEETING.

Motion (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) proposed—

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [3.6 a.m.].—Is the Treasurer prepared at this stage to state what he proposes to do with regard to Saturday sittings, so that we may make our arrangements accordingly?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [3.7 a.m.].—I wish the Committee to deal this week with the division of the Tariff that we have just been considering. There are not many items to be dealt with that are likely to involve much discussion, and I propose to ask the House to sit this evening. If we can dispose of the division to-morrow night we shall not meet on Saturday; otherwise, I shall have to ask honorable members to meet on that day.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—If we are to sit to-morrow night I hope that we shall meet on Saturday.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—If we can deal to-morrow with the division relating to metals and machinery we shall not sit on Saturday.

Mr. JOHNSON.—At what hour shall we meet on Monday?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I cannot make any further statement at this stage.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

House adjourned at 3.8 a.m. (Friday).

House of Representatives.

Friday, 29 November, 1907.

Mr. SPEAKER took the chair at 2.30 p.m., and read prayers.

PETITIONS.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON presented a petition from the Sydney Chamber of Commerce, praying that the Australian Industries Preservation Bill be set aside.

Mr. MALONEY presented a petition from persons engaged in the musical instrument trade, praying the House not to sanction any duty on pianos higher than that levied under the first Federal Tariff.

Petitions received and read.

CABLE TO TASMANIA.

Mr. KING O'MALLEY. — I desire to ask the Postmaster-General, without notice, whether, as it is rumoured that the Government intend to construct a new cable to Tasmania, the shortest route will be selected, making Stanley on the north-west coast of Tasmania the terminus, and thus saving the cost of at least 80 to 100 miles of cable, and of the laying of it?

Mr. MAUGER. — Negotiations are in progress, and inquiry is being made. It is premature yet to say what will be done.

INCOME TAX: FEDERAL SALARIES.

Mr. CROUCH. — In some income tax cases recently heard as between the States of New South Wales and Victoria and certain taxpayers, the question of the status of the High Court was raised, and applications were made for leave to appeal to the Privy Council. Can the Attorney-General inform the House as to the result of those appeals?

Mr. GROOM. — A cablegram has just been received to the effect that the petitions in Baxter, Flint, and Crouch's case have all been dismissed, but the reasons for the judgment will not be given until a later date.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE. — Those were petitions for leave to appeal?

Mr. GROOM. — Yes. The position, shortly, is that the High Court held that Federal officers' salaries were not liable to taxation by the States. That was held in Deakin's and Lyne's case. The matter

was brought up again before one of the State Judges, who followed the decision of the High Court, but gave leave to appeal to the Privy Council. The Privy Council held that Federal incomes were liable to be assessed for purposes of taxation by the States. The matter arose again in Baxter's case before the High Court in Sydney, and in Flint's case in Melbourne. The High Court re-affirmed its decision, and refused a certificate for leave to appeal to the Privy Council. A petition was then filed with the Privy Council for leave to appeal by the State of New South Wales in Baxter's case, and, I understand, by the Government of Victoria in Flint and Crouch's case.

Mr. WATSON. — Were the circumstances similar in each case?

Mr. GROOM. — They were in Flint and Baxter's case. I believe there was a difference in Crouch's case, simply from the fact that the remuneration of a member was involved, instead of a public servant's salary.

Mr. WATSON. — Then, does Crouch win or lose?

Mr. GROOM. — In Crouch's case the petition has been dismissed. The petitions in these three cases have been dismissed. The position, therefore, is that the judgments of the High Court remain.

EXCISE TARIFF (AGRICULTURAL MACHINERY) ACT.

Mr. HUTCHISON. — I desire to ask the Minister of Trade and Customs whether any of the agricultural implement makers have yet furnished the security demanded by the Department, and, if so, how many?

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN. — I do not know whether any securities have yet been given, but the time allowed—fourteen days—has not yet expired. When the time is up, I shall give the honorable member the information asked for.

TARIFF.

CIRCULATION OF COMMITTEE'S DECISIONS.

Mr. GLYNN. — I wish to ask a question of the Minister of Trade and Customs, and, in doing so, to make a short explanation. I understand that each day the only information, except the very ample reports—which are not official—of the press, given to merchants as to the duties fixed by

the Committee of Ways and Means is contained in a copy of the items dealt with posted at the Customs House. Some merchants have drawn my attention to the fact that, however desirous they are of preventing errors in their entries, they find it impossible, in the circumstances, to keep absolutely up to the Customs regulations. I, therefore, ask the Minister whether, as each division of the Tariff is dealt with, he will cause the result to be published in a handy form, so that it may be circulated amongst merchants. I am told that would be a great convenience if it were done.

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—The honorable member's request appears to be reasonable, and I shall endeavour to comply with it as soon as possible.

EXCISE PROCEDURE BILL.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—I wish to ask the Prime Minister whether it is the intention of the Government to proceed with the Excise Procedure Bill before the adjournment for Christmas? I understood from the honorable gentleman's recent statement that he proposes to give a general outline of the new protection policy of the Government before the House rises, and that any measures relating to that question are to be dealt with subsequently.

Mr. DEAKIN.—If time permits—which I doubt—we should certainly deal with the Bill to which the honorable member refers, but before it is dealt with the statement in relation to the new protection will be made.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—Will not the Bill be dealt with until after the Tariff is disposed of?

Mr. DEAKIN.—It will not be dealt with until after the statement is made. If time permitted, and the Tariff were disposed of—which is a contingency I am afraid that I cannot contemplate—

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—The Bill is not likely to be dealt with before the Christmas adjournment?

Mr. DEAKIN.—No.

PUBLIC SERVICE: INCREMENTS.

Mr. MATHEWS.—I desire to ask the Treasurer whether, as increments recommended by the Public Service Commissioners, as from the 1st July last, are being withheld until the Estimates are passed, is it not rather hard upon the officers concerned, who, in most cases, although they looked forward to receiving the increments, will not be likely to get them

now until next July? Could not the Treasurer make provision that all increments shall be paid to those in receipt of under £300 a year, as I understand has been done already in the case of officers receiving under £160?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The matter has been before me, but at present I do not feel disposed to deal with the whole of those increments before Parliament passes them in the ordinary way in the Estimates. The amount is considerable. I will look into the matter again, but I am not at present prepared to take the responsibility of paying them.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. MAUGER.—I am sorry to have to trouble the House with a short personal explanation. A small newspaper, published in Melbourne, has made a statement to the effect that I have used my Ministerial influence to get leathers for hats, and machinery for hat-making, placed on the free list, and also to obtain a heavy duty upon hats and caps, and that the result means thousands of pounds to me personally. I should have taken no notice of the statement in the newspaper to which I refer, had not the lying statement been reprinted in quite a number of country papers in Victoria, and, as I learn now, in some New South Wales papers. I have to repeat what I said before, that neither in the case of material nor in the case of manufactured goods in the hat-making, or any other industry have I a penny of interest, directly or indirectly.

MESSENGERS: LATE HOURS.

Mr. TUDOR. — I desire to ask the Prime Minister whether the boys employed as messengers at the Government Printing Office, and also the telegraph messengers, who are compelled to remain on duty at Parliament House during the present extraordinary hours of sitting, are receiving any extra payment. During last session, when there were all-night sittings, the Prime Minister promised that some arrangement would be made to recompense these boys; and I desire to know whether any arrangement, if made, has been carried out?

Mr. DEAKIN. — The customary time for considering this matter—and I am sure it will be considered in the best possible spirit—is Christmas Eve.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK. — Is the Prime Minister aware that Parliament is being thoroughly sweated, and, if so, will he say what is proposed to be done regarding payment for overtime? Are we to have leave of absence in lieu of payment, or how do we stand generally in this connexion?

Mr. DEAKIN.—I think the question is a very fair one. Speaking for the Government, we are prepared to give the Opposition leave of absence from this time forward until the end of the session.

PAPUA: TAXATION OF NATIVES.

Mr. CROUCH.—I desire to know from the Prime Minister whether it is the intention of the Government to impose a poll tax, or hut tax on the natives of Papua, and, if so, whether it will be under the authority of legislative or of Executive action?

Mr. DEAKIN. — The question of the taxation of the native population of Papua will come before this House prior to any steps being taken by the Government.

Mr. CROUCH. — There will be a statement made beforehand?

Mr. DEAKIN.—Yes.

NEW SOUTH WALES GOVERNMENT PRINTING.

Mr. J. H. CATTS asked the Treasurer, *upon notice*—

1. What was the amount paid to the New South Wales Government Printing Office for printing the report of the Colonial Conference and the report of Mr. Beale in connexion with Patent Medicines respectively?

2. What is the value of Commonwealth printing executed by the New South Wales Government Printing Office from 1st January to 31st October of the current year?

3. Is he aware that in many cases boys are engaged doing men's work in the Government Printing Office, Sydney?

4. Is he aware that a married man with a wife and two children and ten years' service is being paid 25s. per week, and another, thirty years of age with a large family and sixteen years' service, is in receipt of 35s. per week, and that in many instances wages are being paid which are not fair and reasonable?

5. Under such circumstances will he consider the advisability of withholding any Commonwealth work from the Government Printing Office, Sydney, until the State Government see that existing sweating is abolished?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—In answer to the honorable member's questions, I beg to state—

1. £270 and £487 respectively.

2. £16,690 10s. 10d.

3. No. I understand that boys are not engaged doing men's work.

4. This is a question which it would not be proper for me to officially ask the State Minister to reply to. I, however, happen to know that there is a young man in the Government Printing Office, Sydney, who married very early, and whose promotion was delayed in consequence of his inability to qualify himself. I understand that he has now passed the necessary examination, and that he will receive promotion. I have no knowledge of any other case.

5. I have not ascertained that there is any "sweating" in the Government Printing Office, Sydney, nor do I believe that it exists. I do not consider that there is any necessity for action on the part of this Government.

TARIFF: REBATES ON MACHINERY.

Mr. JOHNSON asked the Minister of Trade and Customs, *upon notice*—

Referring to his answer to paragraph 2 of question No. 1 of yesterday, regarding rebate of duties on machinery used in the various processes of manufacture of fibrous materials for the production of hats—

1. Does the Minister realize that his reply discloses a serious defect in the method of keeping the accounts of his Department as it appears that though duties are rebated to importers there appears to be no record of the amounts so remitted to individual importers, or even of the total amount of rebates?

2. Has the Auditor-General offered no comment on the loose system of bookkeeping which, from the reply, appears to prevail?

3. What means, if any, are employed by the Department to trace rebates of duty in connexion with different descriptions of imports?

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN. — The answers to the honorable member's questions are as follow:—

1. It has already been explained to the honorable member that no rebates were given under the 1902 Tariff. As this was the case it is evident that no record was possible. The goods being free of duty in common with a great number of other goods, no occasion arose for any special record. None was required or necessary.

2 and 3. See reply to No. 1.

GERMAN ISLANDS, PACIFIC: CLAIM OF BURNS, PHILP, & CO.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON asked the Prime Minister, *upon notice*—

1. Whether it is a fact that the Australian claim made upon the German Government in connexion with the treatment of vessels trading from Australia to the Marshall and other German Islands is, after years of waiting, no nearer settlement?

2. Does the British Government indorse the claim?

3. Does Germany refuse to arbitrate or make a settlement unless Great Britain includes in the arbitration some resuscitated claims by Germany upon Great Britain?

Mr. DEAKIN.—The answers to the honorable member's questions are as follow—

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. Yes. I may add that when information to this effect reached me on Tuesday last I asked His Excellency the Governor-General to despatch a cable to the Secretary of State for the Colonies to the following effect:—

“Ministers have received no information from Secretary of State, but learn that German Government make it condition of agreeing to arbitrate on Burns, Philp's claim that claims by Germany against Great Britain should be treated similarly. Ministers are unaware what German claims are referred to, but hope His Majesty's Government will not acquiesce in any course that will involve further delay.”

TEMPORARY EMPLOYEES, POSTAL DEPARTMENT.

Mr. CARR (for Mr. WEBSTER) asked the Postmaster-General, *upon notice*—

1. How many temporary and casual hands have been employed in the Post and Telegraph Department in New South Wales during the present year up to date?
2. What is the total cost of this labour?
3. How many similar hands were employed during the financial years 1903-4, 4-5, 5-6, 6-7, and what was the cost involved?
4. What amount has been provided on the Estimates for temporary assistance for the current financial year?
5. What amount, in view of the present state of expenditure, is it estimated the employment of temporary and casual employment will amount to for 1907-8?

Mr. MAUGER.—In reply to the honorable member's questions, I have to state that inquiries are being made, and the desired information will be furnished as early as practicable.

OVERWORK, SYDNEY POST OFFICE.

Mr. J. H. CATTS asked the Postmaster-General, *upon notice*—

1. Why are not telegraphists appointed, considering the alleged inadequate and overworked staff of the G.P.O., Sydney, and the numerous complaints by the public appearing in the columns of the daily press in New South Wales?
2. Is it a fact that officers of the General Division who qualified for positions of telegraphists over eighteen months ago are still kept at their present grade and salaries, notwithstanding the fact that they are, and have been, performing telegraphists' work. If so, why are these officers not appointed, and their rightful increases allowed them?

Mr. MAUGER.—The answers to the honorable member's questions are as follow—

1. The Public Service Commissioner has concurred in the creation of four new positions of Telegraphist and has intimated that steps are being taken to make the appointments.

2. Inquiries are being made and the required information will be furnished as early as possible.

I may add that I have had a conference with the Public Service Commissioner this morning, and he is co-operating with me to as quickly as possible relieve the pressure in the New South Wales Post Office.

TARIFF.

In Committee of Ways and Means (Consideration resumed from 28th November, *vide* page 6810):

Postponed item 18r. Rails, Fish Plates, Fish Bolts, Tie Plates and Rods, Switches, Points, Crossings, and Intersections, for Railways and Tramways, ad val., 12½ per cent.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [2.56].—My desire is to move that the duties on this item be 17½ per cent. and 12½ per cent. The recommendation of the A section of the Tariff Commission was that the duty should be 12½ per cent., but I desire to give a preference on this item, as the importations from foreign countries are much larger than from the United Kingdom. In 1906 the importations from the United Kingdom were represented by £134,848, out of a total of £340,435; and in the previous year by £132,522 out of a total of £340,535. This shows a large proportion as against Great Britain, and I desire, by my amendment, to give a preference in favour of the Old Country. I move—

That the words “and on and after 30th November, 1907, ad val., 17½ per cent.” be added.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Surely there can be a preference without the amendment.

Mr. GLYNN (Angas) [2.58].—I thought the Treasurer was rising to propose that the item should be made free, but, as a matter of fact, the amendment means a fairly substantial increase of duty on about two-thirds of the imports.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Under the old Tariff the duties were 20 per cent. and 12½ per cent.

Mr. GLYNN.—We ought to improve as we go along. This is a tax on mining, an industry which is entitled to fair consideration, representing as it does about £32,000,000 per annum out of a total

production of £125,000,000 per annum. Not only so, but this duty is a fairly stiff tax on the States Governments, who are, of course, the largest importers and consumers of rails. This means a levy on the loan moneys, which, of course, come here from England in the form of goods. I remind the Committee that while we do not acknowledge that the States Governments, under the Constitution, are exempt from the payment of import duties, we take very great care that nothing imported by the Commonwealth shall be subject to any duty. Of course, this is a matter which affects the merits of the particular duty under consideration. I suggest that the Treasurer should allow rails to be admitted free.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Certainly not. I am practically reducing the duty which was levied upon them under the old Tariff.

Mr. GLYNN.—The Treasurer wishes to increase the rate which he first proposed by 5 per cent., and this higher impost, according to his own figures, will affect two-thirds of the imports. I contend that the increased duty proposed will prove a very severe impost upon mines, and it will fall particularly heavy upon such semi-public bodies as the Adelaide Tramways Trust. The true policy would be to postpone the imposition of the duty, if one be desired, until we are assured that the local consumption can be met by local production. I understand that this is not the case at present, and is not likely to be for some years to come.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [3.3].—I think that we might shorten the debate upon this item very materially if the Treasurer would only be reasonable.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I am very reasonable.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The Treasurer proposes to increase the rate upon rails against the foreigner to $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. I am quite agreeable to agree to the imposition of a duty of 15 per cent. under the General Tariff if he will reduce the rate against the United Kingdom to 10 per cent.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Oh, no.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The Treasurer must not forget that a bounty is also payable upon rails.

Mr. WATKINS.—There is no bounty upon the articles specified in this item.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—There is a bounty payable upon the raw product from which they are made?

Mr. WATKINS.—Yes.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The Treasurer might very well agree to the compromise which I have suggested, and thus save time.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE (Flinders) [3.5].—As the honorable member for Parramatta has pointed out, the fact should not be overlooked that it is proposed to grant a bounty upon the raw material from which the articles specified in this item are made until the iron industry has been sufficiently established. Perhaps the most important of these articles is rails, and it seems to me that they ought not to be subjected to a duty until the time arrives when the Government are satisfied that the iron industry has been established.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Why not.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—The process of making rails, and especially steel rails, is one which will come last in the production of iron. To make steel rails, heavier and more expensive machinery is required than is necessary in connexion with any other primary process of iron production.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I understand that, in connexion with the contract into which Mr. Sandford has entered with the New South Wales Government, that gentleman intends to erect a mill for the manufacture of steel rails.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—I have no desire to mention Mr. Sandford's name in this debate, but seeing that it has been introduced, I would point out that under the proposals of the Government he will get the advantage of a bounty of 12s. per ton upon the pig iron that he produces.

Mr. WATSON.—Which amount will go to the State.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—That is the amount which will be paid upon the pig iron that he produces. But in addition he will get 12s. per ton for converting that pig iron into steel rails.

Mr. WATKINS.—No.

Mr. WATSON.—So far as the articles specified in this item are supplied to the New South Wales Government by Mr. Sandford, the bounty payable in respect of them will be paid into the State Treasury.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—Under an arrangement between Mr. Sandford and the State?

Mr. WATSON.—Yes.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—But I am dealing with general principles, and I think it would be wise to discuss this matter

without reference to any particular person. I desire to assist the Treasurer in disposing speedily of the remaining items in this division. All that he desires is that the manufacture of steel rails shall be established in Australia. We all desire that, and nobody wishes it more strongly than I do. But the way in which the Government propose to encourage the industry is by offering a substantial bounty upon the production of iron until it has been established, and subsequently by extending to it a substantial protective duty. I think that the same line of reasoning is applicable to a good many things other than steel rails, but I confine my remarks to rails because they seem to me of most importance. It has been pointed out that it may be decided that State imports, under this heading, are not subject to duty. If that view should be upheld it is apparent that the duties which we impose upon steel rails will be a considerable tax upon those who have contracted to construct private railways and tramways, and that at a time when admittedly the industry is not capable of manufacturing them. As soon as the Ministry are prepared to come to the House and say, "Mr. Sandford is in a position to manufacture these rails and the industry has been established; let us extend to him a protective duty," I shall be prepared to support their proposal. But until then I think it would be a serious thing to impose this duty on rails. It will be a purely revenue duty for the time being, and will probably be collected only upon the small quantity of rails which is imported by private enterprise. I ask the Treasurer to consider whether it would not be wise at this stage to omit the word "rails" from this item with a view to its insertion in division VIb.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—No; I intend to postpone that division until after the Manufactures Encouragement Bill has been dealt with.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—If the measure in question be not passed the Treasurer will still be in a position to recommit the item for the purpose of re-inserting rails, and I shall be found supporting him.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [3.10].—I wish to emphasize the exact position in regard to this matter. The articles here mentioned which are annually imported into the Commonwealth valued at £340,000. Of this amount 939 worth comes from Belgium; Ger-

many, £36,575; Netherlands, £255; and the United States, £75,145, or in all £207,913, out of a total of £344,435. The British imports were valued at £132,522.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Can the honorable gentleman distinguish between the items?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—No, because all the importations come under the same heading.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—The honorable gentleman has not separate figures for the importations of rails?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—No; I wanted to get those figures, but they could not be supplied to me by the Department. I do not wish to detain the Committee. Whatever is going to be done, I ask honorable members to come to a vote. The States get back three-fourths of the duty paid upon their importation of these items.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—Yes; but the money for the Customs duty comes out of Loan Account, and the three-fourths share is paid into the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE. — That is a matter for the consideration of, not the Commonwealth Government, but the States. If a certain sum is raised from the importation of these articles, the States get back three-fourths of the money paid in Customs duty.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—At least that proportion.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Yes.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—Practically, they get back the whole of the duty.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—No; but in the past the States have been paid back a great deal more than three-fourths of the Customs duty. Therefore, they cannot, or should not, complain.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE. — The difficulty arises, not with regard to State imports but with regard to imports by corporations or private persons.

Mr. GLYNN.—The Adelaide Tramway Trust does not get back a penny of the duty.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—No. I do not think that either the Adelaide Tramway Trust, the Melbourne Tramway Trust, or any private corporation should get back anything.

Mr. GLYNN.—The Adelaide Tramway Trust is a public body.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Under the old Tariff, the duties on these items were 12½ and 20 per cent.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—Only £20,000 worth of imports were liable to the 20 per cent. duty.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I quite admit that the 20 per cent. duty was imposed on only tie rods. In order to save time, if honorable members are agreeable, I am prepared to take duties of 15 and 12½ per cent. respectively. I will not go below 15 per cent., and I am prepared to take that rate in order to get rid of the item without further discussion.

Mr. HEDGES.—The honorable gentleman will have to come down.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I am not going to come down below that rate. If it takes until to-morrow morning to get to a division I shall not give way. What I want to do is to get rid of this item, if possible, in order to enable those honorable members who wish to go away to-night to catch the trains. I have informed the deputy leader of the Opposition that if he will mention two or three items which they wish to have dealt with before they go away, I will take those items out of their turn so that those items which are not contentious in any way may be dealt with afterwards, if necessary. I am willing to do that with a view to conveniencing honorable members, and enabling them to get away by the trains if they wish to go to-night.

Mr. WATSON (South Sydney) [3.15].—I suggest to the Treasurer that rails generally will be the subject of consideration under Division VIA., and under the bounty provisions. And with regard to the larger form of rail, which is used by railway companies, as well as by State Governments, it does seem to me that we are giving unnecessary assistance if we impose a duty under this division, and then give a bounty under another proposal which the Government have in hand.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—In any case, as a matter of classification, it should go with the other iron items.

Mr. WATSON.—To my regret the House has agreed to the bounty provision. I think it is unwise to propose so much bounty, and so much duty, at the same time. I suggest either that rails should be eliminated, or that the duties should be confined to the smaller description of rails.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—No; let us go to a division, if I must be beaten on it.

Mr. WATSON.—I hold that the inclusion of the larger classes of rail—and there is a distinction to be drawn—is a distinct

going back upon the policy which the honorable gentleman indicated only a short time ago, namely, that the duty should follow the bounty.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I did not say that.

Mr. WATSON.—It was announced in regard to the Manufactures Encouragement Bill.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I am going to propose an additional duty, and when I get to that Bill, the bounty, too.

Mr. WATSON.—The honorable gentleman is not going to get this item put through without a little delay, because he himself announced that there would be no bounty and duty running concurrently. I do not see why steel rails should be the subject of a duty and a bounty concurrently.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I have never said anything of the sort.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I am afraid that the honorable member for South Sydney has voted for it.

Mr. WATSON.—Certainly not, knowingly. I do not remember an instance of that kind.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Yes. We pointed it out on several occasions, but the vote was carried against us.

Mr. WATSON.—I must have missed the eloquence of the honorable member. I do not remember any such incident. Therefore I must have been out of the chamber at the time. What I want to do is to limit the weight of the rail on which duty is to be charged. That will achieve practically the same object. A large number of small iron rails are now manufactured locally, and I do not see why they should not receive some degree of protection.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Why cannot the item of rails be postponed?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I am not going to postpone a single item. They have to be either reduced or dealt with otherwise.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Why not fix the duties at 15 and 12½ per cent.?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—No; that is going below the duties in the old Tariff.

Mr. WATSON.—I think the Government ought to try to draw a distinction between the light rail which is at present manufactured and the heavier rail which will be the subject of a bounty in the near future if their own proposals are carried out. Why they should now propose to give a duty plus a bounty I cannot understand.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—For the simple reason that the manufacturers will not get the bounty until a certain time.

Mr. WATSON.—Surely the honorable member must recollect that he promised the House that there would not be a duty and a bounty running together.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I beg the honorable member's pardon; I have never said anything of the kind.

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—We understood that the honorable gentleman did.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I have never said it.

Mr. WATSON.—It is a strange thing—

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do like these protectionists. Upon my word, they will drive me mad.

Mr. WILKS.—The honorable gentleman is pelting his joss.

Mr. WATSON.—I must say that the kind of protection which involves the present to a private manufacturer of a sum directly from the Treasury as well as a protective duty does not commend itself to me, nor has it ever done so. I may be wrong in my opinion, but still I have been consistent in my wrong-doing whatever it has been. I have always objected to that kind of treatment.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Let the honorable member go to the other side and take charge of the House—that is the best thing for him to do. I do not want him.

Mr. WATSON.—Whether steel made from Australian pig iron takes the shape of rails or blooms, it is to be given an encouragement—

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—It does not matter what form the steel takes; there is a double bounty.

Mr. WATSON.—I fear that not one of us is sufficiently expert to be able to say what the proper difference in value should be, so far as the bounty is concerned, between pig iron and steel. I do not know. But I do object to steel rails getting a bounty and a protective duty at one and the same time.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Why did the honorable member come to me and advocate duties of 15 per cent. and $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.?

Mr. WATSON.—I did nothing of the sort.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—It is very dishonorable for the Treasurer to say so, anyhow.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The honorable member came to me and asked me if I would take 15 per cent. and $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.

Mr. WATSON.—I want to get away before Christmas, and I will do a number of things by way of compromise that I should not otherwise be disposed to do in order to get away. But the Treasurer cannot say that I "advocated" 15 per cent. and $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. I asked him at the same time to make a qualification so far as the weight of rails was concerned. I think that it would be a proper thing to do to exempt steel rails from the operation of this item altogether.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—All rails?

Mr. WATSON.—Iron rails used for tramway purposes are made locally, and I do not want to deprive those who make them of any protection which they may enjoy.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—The honorable member could achieve his object by inserting the words "except steel."

Mr. WATSON.—Very well; I will do that. If the Treasurer will temporarily withdraw his own amendment, I will move to that effect.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment (by Mr. WATSON) proposed—

That after the word "Rails" the words "except steel" be inserted.

Mr. ARCHER (Capricornia) [3.21].—I should like to ask the honorable member for South Sydney where he proposes to bring in steel rails if they are omitted from the present item?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—He wants to bring them in from Germany.

Mr. ARCHER.—Does the honorable member for South Sydney propose to put them in another item? I wish to know, because I also have an amendment to move.

Mr. WATSON.—I propose to make them free.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Oh, let us make everything in the Tariff free!

Mr. WATSON.—Let the Minister withdraw the Bounty Bill, and we will give him any duty he wants.

Mr. ARCHER.—It is, I think, very necessary to grant a preference to rails that are made in the United Kingdom.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Honorable members opposite do not want any preference on any thing.

Mr. ARCHER.—They do, I think, want to grant a preference on account of steel rails. I should like to read to the Committee the following statement bearing

upon the matter of the importation of steel rails, fish plates, bolts and nuts, and dog spikes.

Supplies for Australia come principally from America and Germany in addition to those from Great Britain. Preference should undoubtedly be given in favour of British goods for these reasons. Supplies come through the resident representative in Sydney of the United States Steel Trust, the biggest trust in the world. If business in American rails is to be allowed, then let the business be done through Australian merchants, who are now completely shut out by reason of the presence of this trust in the country. During the last two or three years a war of freights between America and Australia has resulted in supplies coming from America at as low a freight as 7s. 6d. per ton as against 25s. to 30s. per ton from England. Almost the same remarks apply as to Germany, with this difference that the lower wages in Germany should not be lost sight of. Australian politicians claim as the basic reason of protection against British-made goods that the highly paid Australian workman must be protected against the lower paid British workman. This principle, therefore, should be carried out to a logical conclusion by a preference or protection for the British steam-ship owners against the heavily-subsidized German steamers, and for the higher price of labour in the United Kingdom than in Germany.

In New Zealand a preference of 20 per cent. is given in favour of British rails. Previous to that being given, the rails imported into New Zealand came almost entirely from Germany and the United States. Since then they have come from Great Britain. I would ask the honorable member for South Sydney, in particular, to support a preference to Great Britain, as otherwise it seems to be a foregone conclusion that a great proportion of the rails will come from Germany and America.

Mr. WATSON.—I am quite agreeable to give some preference to Great Britain.

Mr. ARCHER.—There is another matter which I should like to mention in connexion with the item. I desire to ask you, Mr. Chairman, whether I should be in order in moving an amendment now, or later on, in connexion with steel sleepers imported as tramway material. At the present time steel sleepers are separated from the rest of tramway material. They come in as metals n.e.i. I propose to move an amendment so as to make steel sleepers come in on the same basis as steel rails and other tramway material. Suppose, for instance, that I wanted to let a contract for a tramway in a mine. It would be very awkward if the sleepers came in under one heading of the Tariff and the rails and the rest of the equipment under another heading. I understand from the departmental

officers that they have no objection whatever to what I propose, if the Minister is agreeable.

The CHAIRMAN.—Does the honorable member desire to move a separate item?

Mr. ARCHER.—No. I think what I desire can be obtained by way of an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. — The honorable member can move it as soon as the present amendment is disposed of.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Where are steel sleepers included now?

Mr. ARCHER.—Under manufactures of metal n.e.i., item 171; whilst the rest of tramway equipment comes in under item 181. I hope that the Minister will accept such an amendment when I move it.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS (Robertson) [3.30].—It seems to me that this will be a severe impost upon private tramways and railways whether for public convenience or for mining purposes. It is only in such cases that it will actually be felt. If we remove steel rails from the item we shall have left materials used largely by the States Governments, who will have returned to them a very large proportion of the revenue collected in respect of the duty. In this way local manufacturers will be disadvantaged rather than benefited, inasmuch as the States Governments in calling for tenders for the supply of material of this kind will take into consideration the fact that if they accept a foreign tender they will secure a good deal of revenue from the duty. I do not think that the item is worth the time that the Treasurer has devoted to it. If he is prepared to agree to duties of 15 per cent and 10 per cent. I shall have nothing more to say.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Ten per cent. would be lower than the old Tariff. I am prepared to accept duties of 15 per cent. and 12½ per cent.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—If there is anything at all in preferential trade we should have a preference of at least 5 per cent. The Treasurer has shown that two-thirds of the imports do not come from the United Kingdom, and if he will agree to duties of 15 per cent. and 10 per cent. I shall be satisfied.

Mr. FRAZER (Kalgoorlie) [3.34].—It appears to me that since steel rails have not yet been made in Australia, the only effect of the duty, if the item be passed in the form proposed by the Treasurer, will be

to raise revenue. There is, of course, the further consideration that steel rails may be made in a New South Wales foundry.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—There is no doubt about that.

Mr. FRAZER.—I am prepared to give the iron industry to which this item relates very considerable protection by way of bounties; but I am not prepared to penalize other industries—and particularly railway and tramway construction schemes for the development of the Commonwealth—by imposing a duty. I shall vote for the Manufactures Encouragement Bill, but not for a duty to operate concurrently with the bounty, and I think that the proposal submitted by the honorable member for South Sydney to insert after “rails” the words “except steel”——

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Rails are not the subject of bounty.

Mr. WATSON.—But steel is.

Mr. FRAZER.—Once we produce the necessary steel we shall soon manufacture the rails. The proposal of the honorable member for South Sydney to insert after the word “rails” “except steel,” and then to add a new paragraph providing that steel rails and sleepers imported from the United Kingdom shall be free and that those imported from the rest of the world shall be dutiable at 5 per cent., will have my hearty support.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Anything to oppose the Government.

Mr. FRAZER.—If the Treasurer had his deserts I should be taking up that position.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [3.36].—The honorable member for South Sydney said that he objects to a duty being imposed on this item, because we have already agreed to the second reading of the Manufactures Encouragement Bill, under which a bounty is to be given on the production of iron and steel. In reply to that contention I would point out that under another measure we have granted bounties on the production of coffee, tobacco, tobacco leaf, fish, dried fruits, and other things, and that in spite of the representations of some honorable members of the Opposition duties have been imposed upon those commodities. The honorable member for South Sydney himself voted for some of those duties in proportion to the value of the goods which they relate, are much higher than are these. I have never

objected unless on the grounds of fair play to vote against protective duties affecting industries in even my own State, but many other honorable members have invariably voted for high duties on goods and have done so regardless of whether or not they were the subject of bounty. I have said on several occasions that, in the absence of good reasons to the contrary, I would accept the old duties, and I have not endeavoured to reduce them. I have recognised that where an industry has risen with that assistance, and has since been working under the old duties it would be to some degree unjust to those engaged in it if the duties were so soon removed. Whilst, personally, I should be quite willing under ordinary circumstances to agree to rails being admitted free, I am faced with the situation that just as the iron industry, which has been working under great difficulties, is about to produce steel rails, it is proposed, by the very honorable members who have supported much higher duties on imports affecting other industries, that it shall be treated differently from every other industry. I am not inclined to fall into that trap, more particularly as we have accepted as a compromise much higher duties on other iron manufactures than are those now under consideration. This particular article is produced in one State, and apparently a different treatment is to be given to it than is meted out to industries in another State. I do not think that is right. I agree with the position taken up by the honorable member for South Sydney, that where a bounty has been given there should not be duties. If the honorable member had carried out that principle his position would be perfectly sound. But he has not done so. He has voted for duties on articles in connexion with which we are not merely considering, but have actually passed a measure granting bounties. I am quite willing that there should be an adjustment providing for the imposition of duties of 15 per cent. under the general Tariff and 10 per cent. on imports from the United Kingdom. That would represent an average of 12½ per cent., which was the duty imposed under the old Tariff.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I should prefer to take 12½ per cent. all round.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Will the Treasurer take 12½ per cent. all round?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Yes, I will.

Mr. WATSON.—I am prepared to accept that—12½ per cent. was the duty under the old Tariff, and would leave things as they were.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I shall not object to that. I am quite willing to fall in with the views of honorable members if they agree to revert to the duty under the old Tariff, but I certainly do object on the grounds of fairness to the other proposals that were made.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [3.42].—I think that this is an item in connexion with which a preference should be provided. I have submitted the item, and we have had a proposition to leave out rails, which I absolutely object to. Then a proposal was made to make the duty 10 per cent., which would be lower than the recommendation of the Tariff Commission and lower than the old duty. In the circumstances I would very much rather agree to a duty of 12½ per cent. all round, which is the duty that was imposed under the old Tariff. If honorable members are prepared to accept that I shall not press the Government proposal any longer. I do not wish to detain the Committee, but I should like to know at once whether a majority of honorable members are inclined to accept the suggestion that the duty should be 12½ per cent. all round and let the matter drop.

Mr. HEDGES (Fremantle) [3.43].—There is some misapprehension as to what is included in this item. Some honorable members appear to think that steel rails are not included. I remind the Committee of the importance of steel rails to Australia. We have in the whole of the Commonwealth less than 15,000 miles of railway. In Victoria alone there are 3,342 miles of railway, and if the mileage laid down in the other States were in proportion we should have in Australia 113,000 miles of railway. It is all very well for Victorian members to propose to tax steel rails which have to be laid in the other States.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—Why say Victorian members?

Mr. HEDGES.—Because they go in for taxing everything.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—In this instance we wish to assist a New South Wales industry.

Mr. HEDGES.—As compared with the other States Victoria is covered by a network of railways.

Mr. STORRER.—The people of the State have paid for them.

Mr. HEDGES.—But they have paid no duty to Western Australia to be allowed to

lay them. We are being asked under this item to contribute to the revenue of the Commonwealth before we can lay a mile of railway. We can only afford in Western Australia to build railways out of loan money, and honorable members would appear not to mind our borrowing money and handing it over to the Commonwealth to spend on the richest States, which last year had huge surpluses of revenue. Queensland has 3,114 miles of railway; Western Australia, with an area one-third larger than Queensland, has only 2,312 miles, including 700 miles of private lines. New Zealand has 2,520 miles of railways, and the United States, with an area considerably less than that of Australia, has 217,000 miles of railways. We have heard a good deal of talk in this House about the necessity of opening up the country, but taxing the construction of railways is not likely to bring that about. People have been walking about Australia long enough, while the members of various Parliaments have been talking about what they were going to do to open up the interior. We have an opportunity here to do something practical by allowing steel rails to be imported free. We cannot open up a country with cheap whisky, yet 2s. a gallon has been taken off whisky in Western Australia, whilst a proposal is made to increase the duty on steel rails. If I wished to prevent the opening up of a country, I would give people cheap whisky, and I guarantee many would not get far into the interior. They would be kept down near the coast. The policy of the present Government would appear to be dear rails and cheap whisky. There is no sense in it. If we could make steel rails in Australia I would say that we ought to do so. I should be prepared to vote for the highest bounty necessary to secure the manufacture of rails in Australia, but I am not prepared to vote for a high duty on rails when they are not made here. In Western Australia the Government are borrowing money to build railways, whilst the Commonwealth Government are retaining 25 per cent. of the duties collected from Customs and Excise.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—What are they doing with that 25 per cent.? It goes back to the States.

Mr. HEDGES.—They are playing with it, or are spending it in the richest States. Let me tell the honorable member that in Western Australia last year we built between 400 and 500 miles of railways, and

this year money has been voted for nearly 400 miles of railway construction.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—The honorable member forgets that Western Australia gets back the money that he says is retained by the Commonwealth.

Mr. HEDGES.—Is it our own before we get it back? It is borrowed money. In Australia we have only two-thirds of the railway mileage that has been constructed in Canada. Is it any wonder that we so often hear so much of the prosperity of Canada when we learn that the railway mileage constructed in the Dominion is one-third more than we can claim for Australia?

Mr. SAMPSON.—Australia is twice as progressive as Canada.

Mr. HEDGES.—I am speaking of the number of miles of railways constructed in the two countries. Natal is but a little country, comprising not more than one-eighth of the area of Australia. Yet, in proportion, Natal has eighteen times our length of railways per square mile. The area of Australia is ten times that of Cape Colony, and yet that country has in proportion four times our length of railways. Japan, a country that we have to fear in the future, is another instance. If we had railways in the same proportion as Japan has, we should have a million miles of them. Japan on an area of 13,000 square miles has 5,000 miles of railway.

Mr. FOSTER.—Do they import the rails or make them there?

Mr. HEDGES.—They are now putting up a big steel plant, where they will be making something that we will not like if we are not ourselves careful in the same direction. The United States of America have 20,000,000 tons of rails laid down more than we have. They have paid no tax or duty on them to any other country. Let us make the rails here. I will help the Government to give a bounty to encourage their manufacture, but I shall not vote for a duty on them. We must open up Australia, and must have rails to do it. Look at the huge Northern Territory, and the immense areas of land between here and there. Those honorable members who paid a visit to the Territory recently went by water. Think of the senselessness of people who, instead of laying rails to open up a country, travel round the edge of it by sea. Within the last six weeks, I saw train loads of cattle which had come down

from the Cooper Creek country. They had been brought *via* Oodnadatta to Adelaide, and then across to Melbourne to feed the Melbourne people. Why should we not have rails laid to those splendid areas of country? There is not a rail laid there to-day.

Mr. EDWARDS.—Are there any people there?

Mr. HEDGES.—How could people live there if we forbid the laying of rails? People will go wherever the railways go. Open up the country, and people will follow. They could not possibly live in that country without rails. In the interests of settlement, people should be given facilities for travelling about the country, and for sending their produce to market. They must have rails for those purposes. This country is a finer one than people recognise. There is not a railway that has ever been built in Australia but has developed country which has turned out a credit to the people who authorized the building of the line. I know of many railways which it was said would ruin the State when they were built, and yet every one of them has helped hundreds and thousands of people to settle on the land, and so turn the interior of Australia to proper use. In America, where there are so many fine rivers, the water is used for irrigating, and rails are laid alongside the rivers to carry the produce. The policy of America from the start has been cheap rails and cheap carriage. We must recognise that we can hold Australia only by developing it with railways. We shall never hold it against the great Eastern powers if we are to tax railway construction. It is disgraceful for any man who pretends to legislate for the benefit of Australia to vote for one penny of duty on steel rails. We should do our best to devise some means by which we can make rails in Australia. That would be sensible. But we must within the next twenty years lay in Australia at least another 15,000 or 20,000 miles of rails. I ask the Committee to support the amendment of the honorable member for South Sydney, to place steel rails on the free list.

Mr. J. H. CATTS (Cook) [3.56]. — Throughout the discussion of the Tariff, I have not voted for a single duty where a bounty is being paid, and I am not going to do it in this instance. One cannot be surprised at speeches such as the honorable member for North Sydney delivered just now, because it is characteristic of the

House as at present constituted. Taking the House as a whole, there is practically no out-and-out fiscal conscience at all. Members are going for what happens to suit them on every individual item, which, of course, I do not disagree with.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—Does not the honorable member think that he might leave other members' consciences to themselves?

Mr. J. H. CATTS. — I am referring more particularly to the honorable member for North Sydney, who has been a life-long free-trader, and yet is prepared to vote for a duty on an article which cannot be manufactured in the Commonwealth, in addition to the huge bounty that is to be paid.

Mr. STORER.—The honorable member for North Sydney is consistent.

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—If the honorable member for Bass thinks that it is consistent for a free-trader to support a duty as well as a bounty on an article that cannot be made in Australia, he has a peculiar idea of consistency. On any item as to which a bounty has been passed, I absolutely object to voting for a duty.

HONORABLE MEMBERS.—Divide! Divide!

Mr. FRAZER (Kalgoorlie) [3.58]. — It is all very well to cry "divide," but when I previously spoke, I thought that there was going to be an almost unanimous vote to place steel rails on the free list. I am afraid that developments have occurred which seem to indicate the possibility that that will not be done. I cannot understand the attitude of the Committee in being prepared to vote for a revenue or protective duty upon a commodity, of which the Minister himself admits that not a single pound has been produced in Australia yet, especially when we are assured that there is to be a bounty to encourage its manufacture. I am prepared to support that bounty, but, apparently, a number of honorable members are ready to sneak a duty on to the article in addition.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The bounty and duty should not be concurrent.

Mr. FRAZER.—They should not be. We committed ourselves the other night to a proposal for a bounty. Now it is proposed that one of the commodities, which is to be the subject of a bounty, shall receive additional consideration.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—We are all opposed to "double banking"; and is not the question now whether, before steel rails are

actually made, there should be a revenue duty on imported rails, or whether there should be a bounty when they are manufactured with no duty in the meantime?

Mr. FRAZER.—I unhesitatingly accept the latter alternative. There ought to be no revenue duties which tend to discourage the opening up of the country, especially in view of the fact, in the present instance, that no one suggests that steel rails are made within Australia.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The honorable member has voted time after time for duties upon constructional material.

Mr. FRAZER.—The honorable member has been with me in many divisions, and if his conscience is clear we may take it that my conscience is clear also. I have certainly not intentionally voted for a duty when we are paying a bounty. We ought to adopt the suggestion of the honorable member for South Sydney, and make rails subject to duty by proclamation, so as not to penalize users of rails that are not made in Australia. It is unaccountable to me how a duty of $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. was ever imposed; and I take the view that having perpetrated a blunder, we ought not to perpetuate it.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [4.2].—The honorable member will observe that this item relates to rails—not necessarily big, heavy rails, but rails of any sort; the term covers all the small rails used in mines for skips, and so forth.

Mr. FRAZER.—Would the honorable member approve of exempting steel rails from duty?

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I shall not vote for any exemption, because I prefer a duty of $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. to a bounty. I shall vote for a duty, and endeavour to eliminate the bounty.

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—A bounty has been agreed upon; the second reading of the Manufactures Encouragement Bill has been passed.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Though the second reading is passed, every provision in the Bill is subject to consideration, and may be altered.

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—The honorable member knows that the Bill will not be thrown out.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I do not; the honorable member may find the Bill thrown out, because of some provisions made in the meantime. All we have done has been to affirm the principle of a bounty, but no details whatever have yet been dealt with.

If the duty be fixed at $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., the scope of the Bill may be so altered as to exclude steel rails from any benefit under the measure.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—But we have been invited to discuss the Tariff on the assumption that the Manufactures Encouragement Bill will pass through as placed before the House.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—But the further consideration of the Bill has been deferred, so that we may consider it after the duties have been fixed.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—We have sanctioned a bounty.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—We have sanctioned the principle of a bounty on iron.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—I suggest that if the Bill be not passed in the form in which it has been sanctioned in principle, we should support the Government in recommending the item in the Tariff now before us.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I, on the other hand, suggest that we should vote for a duty of $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on steel rails, and alter the bounty accordingly.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—Then the whole thing must go into the melting pot, and we shall not know where we are.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—As I did not vote for a bounty on iron, I am now taking a consistent course. A duty of $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. has been in operation for the last six years. In discussing this question, I am bound to mention Mr. Sandford, since he owns the only large iron-works in Australia; and I point out, that now he is about to manufacture steel rails, it is suggested that he should be deprived of the benefit of this revenue duty of $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. I understand that the £70,000 he received from the New South Wales Government was to enable him to erect mills for the special purpose of making rails. Mr. Sandford rolled steel rails at Eskbank nearly twenty years ago for the State Government. I may explain, however, that he simply rolled old rails after they had been cut up and melted; in other words, he made steel rails from scrap. That work was put an end to when Mr. Eddy became railway commissioner in New South Wales. That gentleman at once introduced larger engines, which, instead of 60-lb. rails, which Mr. Sandford used to roll, required 85-lb.

Mr. Sandford, I may say, was given compensation by the State Government for the termination of his contract.

To Mr. Sandford I owe nothing, for he has been a bitter opponent of mine all my political life; but, in justice, I must recognise that he has made a brave fight for this industry.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—If Mr. Sandford is paid a bounty in the meantime, he will have the benefit of at least 20 per cent. instead of $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Mr. Sandford told the Tariff Commission that he did not desire a bounty, and he gave the reason. He had to give an undertaking to the State Government, under the arrangement I have mentioned, that any bounty must be handed over to the Government; and, under the circumstances, he naturally prefers a small duty of $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—That is because Mr. Sandford made a bad bargain with the State Government.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Mr. Sandford made a bargain which has resulted in the erection of the first blast furnace in Australia. I am inclined to think, however, that it was not a good bargain for himself; and, if that be the case, there is no reason why we should further penalize him.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—Penalize him? We are proposing to give him the benefit of what is tantamount to 20 per cent.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I am referring to that provision in his agreement. I opposed the Manufactures Encouragement Bill, because, as I said before, I prefer a small duty to a bonus.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—Have we to discuss the Tariff on the assumption that that Bill is to pass, or on the assumption that it is not to pass?

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—There seems a desire to discuss the Tariff on the assumption that Mr. Sandford will receive a bounty on steel rails.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—That is because the House has sanctioned a bounty.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Not at all; the House has approved of the principle of a bounty, but the details have yet to be agreed upon.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—If the bounty is cut down I shall be with the honorable member.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—That result is very likely to be arrived at when the matter is thoroughly discussed in Committee.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—We may limit the bounty to the production of steel ingots.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Yes. We have merely approved the broad principle

of granting a bounty upon the production of iron, and it does not follow that we shall extend that bounty to the manufacture of steel rails. Therefore we shall be doing a fair thing if we continue to Mr. Sandford the duty which has been operative for six years past, but of which he has not been able to take advantage until this moment.

Mr. KING O'MALLEY.—Let us fight to knock out the bounty.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I shall certainly oppose it. Meantime we ought to continue this small duty upon steel rails.

Mr. STORRER (Bass) [4.12].—I was under the impression that the debate upon this item would not occupy more than a few minutes, and why so much heat has been imported into it, I cannot understand. For the past six years a duty of 12½ per cent. has been levied upon iron, and we have also determined that it is necessary to grant a bounty upon the production of that commodity in order to encourage the establishment of the iron industry. Yet it is now proposed that the duty shall be remitted. It is like giving a man a pound with one hand and taking 25s. away from him with the other. If we wish the iron industry to prosper we ought not to abolish the duty upon rails. I trust that the old rate will be retained.

Mr. KNOX (Kooyong) [4.13]. — The Committee is apparently of opinion that it is of the first importance that the iron industry should be established in the Commonwealth. But notwithstanding that the Manufactures Encouragement Bill has passed its second reading it has a perilous time in front of it. I think it is dawning upon the minds of several honorable members that if we desire to assist the establishment of the iron industry we ought to view this question from the stand-point of whether or not the operation of a duty will have that effect. I think that the policy of the Labour Party will be to prevent the Manufactures Encouragement Bill from passing.

Mr. FRAZER.—I do not know why the honorable member should say that.

Mr. KNOX.—I think that a majority of the party are opposed to the Bill. Personally, I favour the imposition of a reasonable duty upon rails, altogether apart from the fact that we have already committed ourselves to the general principle embodied in the Manufactures Encouragement Bill, the passing of which is, however, exceedingly doubtful. I am satisfied

that honorable members do not desire that a bounty and a protective duty shall be simultaneously operative.

Sir JOHN FORREST (Swan) [4.18].—If we wish to develop the iron industry in the Commonwealth, we should develop it in the way the House has agreed to, namely, by means of a bounty. We ought in this matter to adopt a straightforward course, and ought not to consider the fact that Mr. Sandford has concluded an arrangement with the New South Wales Government under which any bounty that he may receive will be paid into the State Treasury.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK. — I think that we ought to consider that.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—I cannot see why we should retard the progress of Australia by placing a duty upon an article which is absolutely necessary to its development. Steel rails are not made here, and we desire to encourage their production by the granting of a bounty. Why we should be asked to tax all the States Governments and others by imposing a revenue duty upon steel rails is beyond my comprehension. The time has arrived when we should endeavour to establish the industry in a straightforward way, namely, by means of the granting of a bounty. If we adopt that course, we shall not injure any of the States, or any of those persons who are engaged in railway enterprise. On the other hand, if we levy a tax upon rails, we shall inevitably retard the progress of the whole Commonwealth.

Mr. WILKS (Dalley) [4.20].—The honorable member for Swan has said that there is nothing like a straightforward course. I also believe in a straightforward course, and I voted for a bounty as the least objectionable method of assisting to develop the iron industry of Australia. I have voted for a bounty system which will apply not only to Mr. Sandford, but to any other maker of iron who may put in a claim. It was not passed in the interests of Mr. Sandford only, but in the interests of Australian manufacturers, and it extends to the production of steel rails. It may be that a friend of the right honorable gentleman in Western Australia will claim the bounty. I certainly agree with the right honorable gentleman that the imposition of a revenue duty on an article when we are unable to produce it is not only absurd, but also a tax upon the community generally. The chief users of

steel rails in Australia are the States Governments. They practically use the bulk of the imported rails in the construction of railways, which are designed for the development of their territories. If we impose a duty of a revenue character, we shall get no compensating advantage in the way of assisting the iron industry, but we shall compel every person in each State to carry a burden which will tend to retard the process of developing its resources. Because, after all, there is a limit to the borrowing capacity of each State, and to the amount which it can afford to expend on railway construction. Every tax of a needless character which we impose is a tax upon the States. The honorable member for Swan prefaced his remarks with the statement that he likes a straightforward policy. So do I. I am sorry that the right honorable gentleman was a member of the Ministry which imposed a duty of $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on steel rails in the old Tariff. That duty, which is certainly not consistent with a straightforward policy, was imposed upon Australia by the Barton Administration, in which the right honorable gentleman took a prominent part.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—That seems to be about the only argument which the honorable gentleman can use.

Mr. WILKS.—I remind the downy member for Swan—because the swan has more down than has any other bird that I know of—that the Government of which he was a prominent member wanted to impose a duty of 15 per cent. Now, in the name of the sacred frog, if, as the honorable gentleman states, a duty of $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. is a severe impost upon the users of iron, what would be a duty of 15 per cent.?

Sir JOHN FORREST.—That is a very poor argument.

Mr. WILKS.—I admit that it is a very poor argument; but what a poor illustration of a straightforward course it is! The right honorable gentleman has referred to the conduct of the honorable member for Parramatta. But the former is a protectionist or a free-trader when it suits him. On this particular item he and I happen to be in accord, but I am sorry that his straightforward policy was not initiated five years ago, when this item was under consideration.

Sir JOHN FORREST. — The honorable member should not destroy his friends.

Mr. WILKS.—I do not know who are my friends. The party of which I am a prominent member has no friends.

Sir JOHN FORREST. — The honorable member has one friend, any way.

Mr. WILKS.—I may tell the right honorable gentleman that the party in which I am a prominent member is very solid. Every morning we have our caucus in the train, and the great trouble is that invariably the party make me their spokesman; but we do not quarrel either here or outside. I think that the straightforward policy to which the right honorable gentleman has professed to be so much attached is rather belated. I wish that it had been practised in the time of the Barton Administration.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—The honorable member has changed his views since then.

Mr. WILKS.—They are not the only things changed. The right honorable gentleman has changed his supporters since then. I remember the time when he was very much attached to the Labour Party, but he will not have their support now. I suggest to the Treasurer that if he is prepared to accept a duty of $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., as I am told he is, he may as well climb down to the dead level. If he is prepared to accept a duty of $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. he cannot justify it as a protectionist duty.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—It is not in the true sense.

Mr. WILKS.—Then what the deuce is it?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I wanted to get duties of $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., and $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., and it was only to settle the matter that I said that I was prepared to take the lower duties. I thought that I had made a liberal arrangement which would be generally accepted and stop further debate, but it seems that the disease of talking is spreading.

Mr. WILKS. —I am opposed to a bounty and a duty. On general principles, I oppose an import duty on iron; it is a tax upon the users. We should not levy a revenue duty; in this case, as in others, it can be of no assistance to the local industry. I hope that the bounty will be effective for the purpose which we intend.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [4.25].—I rise to say a few words in reply to a remark by the honorable member for Swan. Another honorable member made a somewhat similar statement, but I decline to take any notice of it from him.

The right honorable gentleman said that some honorable members who have been free-traders all their lives were voting for protection in this instance. May I tell the honorable member that throughout this Tariff I have been voting for what I call protective duties simply because we could not get anything else.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—That is not so in this case.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I recognised that those who were induced to start industries under the old duties had some claim for the continuance of those duties, at any rate for a time. I have often voted what I call protectionist duties, partly because, in some cases, I could not get less—that is where I did not think that there was any claim—and partly because in other cases I thought that there was a just claim owing to the encouragement which had been deliberately given by our policy. Throughout the Tariff I have been acting on that principle, and with regard to industries everywhere. I have opposed, and shall continue to oppose, a bounty upon the production of iron. The bounty would give assistance to the makers of some articles which are now free. Although those articles are duty free, yet I shall oppose the bounty, and give no assistance which has not been already given.

Mr. WATSON.—I would vote this duty cheerfully if there were to be no bounties.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—There should be no duplication. If a bounty is carried, then the duty ought to be remitted, or we should put in a provision that it shall be deducted from the bounty. When I am asked to vote differently in the case of this industry, and to give no recognition to a duty which has been in existence, I am asked to do an injustice which I have not attempted to do in the case of other manufacturers. I do not think that I am inconsistent in the least degree. I believe that, as a rule, honorable members know how I intend to vote on a Tariff question before I have voted. Therefore I think that the honorable member for Swan is quite wrong in his statement. I shall not reproach him with having supported the imposition of a higher duty when he was a member of the Barton Government.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—Do not do that.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I do not intend to.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—My statement was only used by me as an argument, and I do not want to press it.

Mr. WATSON.—It should be remembered that we are producing a number of the articles which are to be the subject of a bounty, but not steel rails.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I admit that. I do not wish to see a duty and a bounty, because that is going beyond either what is necessary or desirable.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—Does the honorable member think that a duty on steel rails is justifiable under any conditions—in the present state of this country?

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—What a question for the right honorable member to ask me. Can he be thinking? He has been voting duty after duty on articles which affect construction in this country far more than do rails.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—When and where?

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Let the honorable member consider the votes that he has given for duties on cement, other machinery, and iron work, and many other items.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—We make them in the country, but we do not make any of these rails.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The rails are proposed to be made here, whilst many of the things for duties on which the honorable member voted are not made in Australia.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—I should like to know which.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The claim made on their behalf was that they would be made in Australia if we imposed a duty.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—What is the honorable member referring to?

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—All through the Tariff that has been the case. Then the right honorable member speaks of steel rails as if they were all important.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—They are more important than nine-tenths of the other items in the Tariff.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Consider the return of duty paid as shown in the figures supplied to us. I could, if need be, point to items that we have already carried affecting the developmental policy of the country infinitely more than this duty does.

Mr. SAMPSON (Wimmera) [4.32].—I intend to vote for the continuance of the old duty. Under the proposal accepted

by the Treasurer there will be no change. I cannot understand why it is that some protectionists intend to vote to wipe out the duty on steel rails. A great deal has been said about the granting of the bounty. Presuming that the Manufactures Encouragement Bill gets into Committee, and becomes law, it will merely involve the payment of the bounty on the production of pig iron, and steel made from it. But what about the manufacture of rails from the raw material? Surely the manufacture of steel rails from the simple steel is in itself an industry as much entitled to a duty as any other commodity included in the Tariff. So far as the amount of the bounty proposed to be paid is concerned, I must say that I am not very much impressed by its value. The amount proposed to be paid is very small if we really desire to establish a great industry. The probability is that Mr. Sandford under present conditions will be able to obtain the whole bounty paid. The capacity of his blast furnaces enables him to turn out about 50,000 tons per annum, and his resources in reference to the two processes through which steel has to go, would enable him to obtain the whole amount. Even if he were to do that, however, he would be able to produce only about one-eighth or one-tenth of the total requirements of Australia. So that the bounty proposed to be granted for the development of the iron industry is a mere infinitesimal proportion. I shall vote for the continuance of the duty of 12½ per cent. on steel rails, because I consider that it is a branch of industry the claims of which for a measure of protection are as great as are those of any other item in the Tariff.

Question—That the words “except steel” proposed to be inserted after the word “rails” be so inserted (Mr. WATSON’S amendment)—put. The Committee divided.

Ayes 15

Noes 27

Majority 12

AYES.

Archer, E. W.
Batchelor, E. L.
Brown, Thomas
Catts, J. H.
Fairbairn, G.
Forrest, Sir John
Frazer, C. E.
Hedges, W. M.
Irvine, W. H.
Mahon, H.
Palmer, A. C.
Spence, W. G.
Watson, J. C.
Tellers:
Johnson, W. E.
Wilks, W. H.

Mr. Sampson.

Bowden, E. K.
Brown, Tilley
Chapman, Austin
Cook, Joseph
Coon, J.
Crouch, R. A.
Edwards, R.
Foster, F. J.
Knox, W.
Livingston, J.
Lyne, Sir William
Maloney, W. R. N.
Mathews, J.
Mauger, S.

NOES.

McDougall, J. K.
Page, J.
Quick, Sir John
Sampson, S.
Storrer, D.
Thomson, Dugald
Tudor, F. G.
Watkins, D.
Webster, W.
Wise, G. H.
Wynne, A.
Tellers:
Chanter, J. M.
Cook, Hume

PAIRS.

Kelly, W. H.
Atkinson, L.
Fuller, G. W.
Hughes, W. M.
Glynn, P. McM.
Fowler, J. M.
Reid, G. H.
Fysh, Sir Philip
Liddell, F.
McWilliams, W. J.
Sinclair, H.
Smith, Bruce
Willis, Henry
Wilson, J. G.
Poynton, A.
Kingston, C. C.
Carr, E. S.
Bamford, F. W.
Deakin, A.
Ewing, T. T.
Groom, L. E.
Hall, D. R.
Harper, R.
Salmon, C. C.
O'Malley, King
Thomas, J.
Hutchison, J.
Thomson, John
Fisher, A.
Irvine, Hans

Question so resolved in the negative.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. ARCHER (Capricornia) [4.40].—
I move—

That after the word “Rods” the words “and steel sleepers” be inserted.

Steel sleepers are part of tramway equipment, and should come under the same heading. Otherwise, they will be included under manufactures of metals n.e.i.

Question put. The Committee divided.

Ayes 16

Noes 18

Majority 2

AYES.

Archer, E. W.
Batchelor, E. L.
Brown, Tilley
Catts, J. H.
Cook, Joseph
Edwards, R.
Fairbairn, G.
Forrest, Sir John
Frazer, C. E.
Hedges, W. M.
Knox, W.
Thomson, Dugald
Wilks, W. H.
Wynne, A.
Tellers:
Bowden, E. K.
Livingston, J.

NOES.

Chanter, J. M.
Chapman, Austin
Coon, J.
Crouch, R. A.
Harper, R.
Lyne, Sir William
Maloney, W. R. N.
Mauger, S.
McDougall, J. K.
Page, J.

Quick, Sir John
Sampson, S.
Storrer, D.
Tudor, F. G.
Webster, W.
Wise, G. H.

Tellers:

Cook, Hume
Mathews, J.

PAIRS.

Kelly, W. H.
Atkinson, L.
Johnson, W. E.
Fuller, G. W.
Hughes, W. M.
Mahon, H.
Glynn, P. McM.
Fowler, J. M.
Reid, G. H.
Lidell, F.
McWilliams, W. J.
Sinclair, H.
Smith, Bruce
Willis, Henry
Wilson, J. G.
Poynton, A.
Brown, Thomas
Fysh, Sir Philip

Kingston, C. C.
Carr, E. S.
Spence, W. G.
Bamford, F. W.
Deakin, A.
Watkins, D.
Ewing, T. T.
Groom, L. E.
Hall, D. R.
Irvine, Hans
O'Malley, King
Thomas, J.
Hutchison, J.
Thomson, John
Fisher, A.
Salmon, C. C.
Foster, F. J.
Irvine, W. H.

Question so resolved in the negative.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [4.47].—I would suggest to the Treasurer that a much better apportionment of this duty, and one more satisfactory to all concerned, would be to provide for a general Tariff of 15 per cent. and for a duty of 10 per cent. on imports from the United Kingdom.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—But we already have a duty of 12½ per cent.

Mr. MATHEWS.—I thought we were to have duties of 15 per cent. and 10 per cent.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [4.48].—I do not object to the honorable member's proposition. I told some honorable members that I would agree to an all round duty of 12½ per cent; yet, whilst I do not like to go below the old Tariff by providing for a duty of 10 per cent. on imports from the United Kingdom, if it is thought desirable that we should have duties of 15 per cent. and 10 per cent., I shall offer no objection. I move—

That the words "and on and after 30th November, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 15 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 10 per cent.," be added.

Amendment agreed to.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Postponed item 182. Iron pipes, Cast and Wrought, n.e.i., ad val. (General Tariff), 30 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 25 per cent.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [4.50].—I had intended to propose duties of 25 per cent. and 20 per cent. on this item, but I was asked last night to propose instead fixed duties of £2 in the General Tariff and £1 10s. on imports from the United Kingdom. These fixed duties would be about equal to *ad valorem* duties of 25 per cent. and 20 per cent., and I am quite agreeable to move them, as that would be a better method of collecting the duty, and one more acceptable to those who import the pipes. I move—

That after the words "30 per cent." the words "and on and after 30th November, 1907, per ton. (General Tariff), 40s.," be inserted.

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That after the words "25 per cent." the words "and on and after 30th November, 1907, per ton (United Kingdom), 30s.," be added.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Postponed item 183. Iron and Steel Tubes or Pipes (except riveted or cast) not more than 4 inches internal diameter; including Flexible Metal Tubes; Galloway and Vertical parallel Boiler Tubes; Water Bore Casings; Wrought Iron Fittings for pipes, free.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [4.53].—I was asked by a number of honorable members to make the item apply to pipes not exceeding 6 inches internal diameter, instead of 4 inches as stated in the item. I have heard no good reason why that should not be done, and I move—

That the figure "4," line 2, be left out, with a view to insert in lieu thereof the figure "6."

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That after the word "Wrought," line 5, the words "and Malleable" be inserted.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Postponed item 184 (Rolled Iron or Steel Beams, &c.) agreed to.

Postponed item 185. Bolts, Nuts, Rivets, and Washers, n.e.i., ad val. (General Tariff), 30 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 25 per cent.

Amendments (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That after the words "30 per cent." the words "and on and after 30th November, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 25 per cent." be inserted.

That after the words "25 per cent." the words "and on and after 30th November, 1907, ad val. (United Kingdom), 20 per cent." be added.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Postponed item 186. Barbed Wire, ad val. (General Tariff), 30 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 20 per cent.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [4.54].—I had thought of proposing duties of 25 per cent. and 20 per cent., but I am prepared in this case to accept duties of 25 per cent. and 15 per cent.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—Why not make the duty the same as that on wire-netting?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—This is very different from wire-netting.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [4.55].—I am reminded by this item that on a previous occasion we had a big fight, and decided then that wire-netting, in connexion with which there is a big local industry, employing many hands, should be dutiable at 5 per cent.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The honorable member knows the circumstances under which that was agreed to.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—On the principle on which we have acted throughout, I am willing to admit that there should be a duty of 10 per cent. on barbed wire.

Mr. HUME COOK.—The Tariff Commission recommended a duty of 25 per cent.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Certainly the industry is not one of much importance. The manufacture of barbed wire involves merely the importing of wire, and with a machine twisting in the barb. There are not many persons engaged in the industry, whilst the wire-netting industry provides employment for comparatively a great many hands.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The honorable member should not use the duty on wire-netting to support his argument, because the chances are that I shall ask for the recommitment of that item.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Barbed wire and wire-netting are used practically by the same people, and both for fences, and yet an increased duty is proposed on barbed wire. I think that a duty of 10 per cent. would be sufficient, and it is really too much when compared with the duty on wire-netting. I should like to know if the Treasurer is prepared to accept 10 per cent.? I am willing to agree to duties of 15 per cent. and 10 per cent.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—All right.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Then, I move—

That after the words "30 per cent." the words "and on and after 30th November, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 15 per cent." be inserted.

That after the words "20 per cent." the words "and on and after 30th November, 1907, ad val. (United Kingdom), 10 per cent." be added.

Amendments agreed to.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Postponed item 190. Plates (except plain tin) and Sheets and Pipes and Tubes of any Metal, tinned, plated, polished or decorated, ad val., 15 per cent.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [4.58].—I wish to direct the attention of the Treasurer to a promise made that item 189 would be recommitted if the duties on machinery and machines were altered.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Yes, but we cannot recommit the item now.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I wish only to remind the honorable gentleman of the promise, and of the fact that reductions have since been made on machinery and machines.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Yes, I understand that.

Amendments (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That the word "tinned," line 3, be left out.
That after the word "polished," line 3, the words "metal cased" be inserted.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [5.0].—I move—

That the following new item be inserted:—
"190a. On and after 30th November, 1907, Antimony, known as star antimony, and antimonial and lead compounds, namely, type metal, linotype metal, anti-friction and plastic metals, ad val., 25 per cent."

This is in connexion with an industry established at Balmain, and producing star antimony, &c. There is a system under which buyers in London will not buy here. The article goes to England, and has to be purchased there, and then is re-imported here for use. I do not think that that is a proper practice. It is about time it was stopped. That is why I am proposing this item.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [5.4].—The Minister ought not to ask us to try to pass the Tariff promptly, and then spring these unexpected items on us, when we are doing our best to assist him. The proposal had better be postponed.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I want to get rid of this division to-night.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The Minister has to recommit one item in the division.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE. — I am not sure whether I will recommit anything.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The honorable gentleman promised.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I said that I would have it altered, and I will see that that is carried out.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—We do not know how far the effects of this new proposal may extend. It may upset a whole industry.

Mr. HARPER.—Make it 15 per cent.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON. — I will raise no objection if the Treasurer will agree to a duty of 15 per cent. in the second column.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I will agree to that. I will make the rates 20 per cent. in the general Tariff, and 15 per cent. against the United Kingdom.

Proposed new item amended accordingly, and agreed to.

Postponed item 194. Bolts, Carriage ($\frac{3}{8}$ of an inch and under in diameter and 4 inches and under in length), ad val. (General Tariff), 5 per cent.; (United Kingdom), free.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [5.6].—This item was postponed by me at the request of the honorable member for Boothby, who said that he desired to make further inquiry. I do not know that there is any objection to it now.

Item agreed to.

Postponed item 200. Droppers, patent steel of all lengths, ad val. (General Tariff), 5 per cent.; (United Kingdom), free.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [5.7].—I propose to ask the Committee to negative this item. The articles will then come in, I believe, under a duty of 20 per cent. in another item.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [5.8].—If the item is omitted, steel droppers will become dutiable at 25 per cent. and 20 per cent. Why should that be?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Because they are made here in tens of thousands.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—There is no difficulty about making them, and a high duty is not required. The only effect will be to cause greater expense in fencing.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—They have not increased in price through being made locally.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I am certain that they will be made more expensive by a high duty, but, having protested, I shall not detain the Committee longer, as it is not a large item.

Mr. FISHER (Wide Bay) [5.9].—Some honorable members who are away would probably take a very different view of this proposal. There has been no intimation that these articles were to be transferred to a more highly dutiable item. It is a

dangerous practice to make that proposal on a Friday afternoon, when a number of honorable members have gone away. I have seen nothing published to indicate that the Treasurer intended to take this step.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—When the item was postponed, I said that I intended to make an alteration, and put these articles into another item. That was really why it was postponed.

Mr. FISHER.—It is a big jump from 5 per cent. and free to 25 per cent. and 20 per cent.

Sir JOHN FORREST (Swan) [5.10].—I cannot understand the Treasurer proposing to put a high duty on an article which is so much in use for fencing all over Australia.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Tens of thousands of them are made all over the Commonwealth.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—Then how was it that no request for a duty was preferred to the Tariff Commission? The protectionist section of the Commission recommended that they should be free. The free-trade section, on some principle of their own, recommended a 10 per cent. duty. The articles were free previously. The Government should give some very good reasons for proposing to increase the duty so greatly.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE. — I said when I postponed the item that I was going to raise the duty.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—Not, surely, to such an extent as is now proposed.

Mr. LIVINGSTON (Barker) [5.12].—I hope the Treasurer will not insist on raising the duty on steel droppers to 25 per cent. All over Australia it is necessary to use them for fencing, and it is often difficult to get posts. These articles should be allowed to come in free, if anything does.

Mr. FAIRBAIRN (Fawkner) [5.13].—The Treasurer might make the rates 15 per cent. in the General Tariff and 10 per cent. against the United Kingdom.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I will make them 20 per cent. and 15 per cent.

Mr. FAIRBAIRN.—A great many of these articles are made here now. The metal comes in free, and there is not a great deal of difficulty in moulding it into droppers. They were free under the old Tariff, and we might now give a small duty.

Mr. STORRER (Bass) [5.14].—We have imposed duties of 25 per cent. (General Tariff) and 20 per cent. (United Kingdom) on kindred items, and these articles ought to stand the same amount. They can be made here. When the matter was previously referred to, I stated that they could be made here well. I am willing to vote for duties of 20 per cent. and 15 per cent., if the Treasurer is agreeable.

Mr. WILKS (Dalley) [5.15].—The Treasurer asks the Committee to strike the item out. Therefore we must either accept the item as it stands, with a duty of 5 per cent. and free, by affirming that the item shall stand as printed, or else, if we negative the item, we will leave it to the sweet will of the Treasurer to include the articles in any other item he likes. In those circumstances, it will be difficult for any honorable member to move for duties of 15 per cent. and 10 per cent.

Mr. BATCHELOR (Boothby) [5.16].—I suggest that this item be placed on the same scale as item 184, namely, 17½ per cent., and 12½ per cent. Each item represents about the same amount of manipulation of the raw material.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—To stop debate. I accept the suggestion.

Amendments (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) proposed—

That after the words "5 per cent." the words "and on and after 30th November, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 17½ per cent.," be inserted.

That after the word "free" the words "and on and after 30th November, 1907, ad val. (United Kingdom), 12½ per cent.," be added.

Sir JOHN FORREST (Swan) [5.18].—I notice that standards and steel fencing, item 216, are 5 per cent., and free. Why should we place a different duty on another portion of what is practically the same fence? I shall certainly vote against any alteration being made in the duty on droppers.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [5.19].—I have here a memorandum which states that if item 200 were struck out, as was suggested, it would be necessary to reconsider item 216, and that standards and pillars are very similar to droppers, but are more easily made. If an alteration be made in item 200, it will be necessary to recommit item 216 in order that the duties on that item may be increased to 17½ per cent., and 12½ per cent.

Mr. FISHER (Wide Bay) [5.21].—The r reminds me of certain sellers of
y country who always ask about

double what they expect to get, and ultimately philanthropically hand over the goods at far more than their value. I rose merely to point out that important alterations are being made in the Tariff in the absence of honorable members who have gone away to seek that relaxation to which they are entitled.

Amendments agreed to.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Postponed item 210 (Traps) agreed to.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) proposed—

That the following new item be inserted:—
"210A. Rivets bifurcated, on and after 30th November, 1907," free.

Mr. WILKS.—It seems very strange that bifurcated rivets cannot be made here.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—These are patent rivets.

Proposed new item agreed to.

* Postponed item 213. Scrap iron and Steel, and, subject to Departmental by-laws, Materials for use as Scrap Iron, free.

* To continue only until the coming into force of Division VI.(A), Metals.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) proposed—

That the asterisk be left out.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [5.25].—I do not know whether, on the striking out of the asterisk, the footnote can be consequently struck out.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The Chairman has ruled that the striking out of an asterisk destroys the footnote.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—But if, after the asterisk has been struck out, the footnote remains, it will prove confusing.

The CHAIRMAN.—When the asterisk disappears, the footnote can have no meaning.

Amendment agreed to.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) proposed—

That the following new item be inserted:—
"220A. Steel, and steel rimmed wheels, of over 16 inches diameter in the tread, for trucks and waggons, and all steel parts for such wheels, on and after 30th November, 1907, free."

Mr. FISHER (Wide Bay) [5.28].—I feel some concern for the Mother Country in connexion with this item.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Then let us make the duty 5 per cent. and free.

Mr. FISHER.—I do not believe in preference. The Prime Minister said the other night that some honorable members

were against every country but their own, and I think that the Treasurer is quite right in proposing that these articles shall be admitted from all countries.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—Make the duty 5 per cent. and free.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—If honorable members think that the general Tariff should be 5 per cent. with no duty against Great Britain I have no objection. I ask leave to amend my amendment in that direction.

Proposed new item amended accordingly, and agreed to.

Postponed item 221. Tin plates, plain, ad val. (General Tariff), 5 per cent.; (United Kingdom), free.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [5.30].—I would point out that tinned copper or all tinned sheets should be included in this item. They were on the free list under the old Tariff, but they appear to have been made dutiable owing to the arrangement of duties under the Tariff now before us.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That the word "Tin" be left out, with a view to insert in lieu thereof the word "Tinned."

Amendment (by Mr. DUGALD THOMSON) agreed to—

That after the word "plates" the words "and tinned sheets" be inserted.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Postponed item 225. Wire cloth, wire gauze, ad val. (General Tariff), 5 per cent.; (United Kingdom), free.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [5.33].—I propose to negative this item. I take this course with a view to embodying these materials in item 171. They will then be dutiable at 25 per cent. under the general Tariff, and at 20 per cent. under the Tariff for the United Kingdom.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [5.34].—I should like to know why the Treasurer proposes to adopt this course?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Because these materials are being made in the Commonwealth in considerable quantity, and ought therefore to be protected.

Mr. TUDOR (Yarra) [5.35].—Some days ago I asked the Treasurer to postpone this item because I was aware that a large quantity of wire gauze and wire cloth was being manufactured in Australia. The Treasurer himself is now in possession of several samples. There are about 200 men engaged in the industry,

and I think that the item should be omitted with a view to its inclusion under manufactures of metals.

Item negatived.

Motion (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) proposed—

That the consideration of postponed items 152, 153, and 154 be further postponed until the remaining duties have been dealt with.

Mr. WILKS (Dalley) [5.37].—The other day the Treasurer stated that he would not proceed with the consideration of the duty upon stripper harvesters until he had laid upon the table of the House a memorandum relating to the salient points of the new protection proposals of the Government. Are we to infer from this motion that the announcement of those proposals is to be postponed until the remainder of the Tariff has been dealt with?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I cannot say. I do not know what the Prime Minister intends to do.

Mr. WILKS.—It looks very much like it.

Motion agreed to; items postponed.

Division VIa.—Metals and Machinery.

To come into operation on dates to be fixed by Proclamation, and exempt from duty in the meantime. Proclamation to issue so soon as it is certified to Parliament by the Minister that the Manufacture to which the Proclamation refers has been sufficiently established in the Commonwealth.

229. Iron and Steel—

- (A) Scrap Iron and Steel, and Pig Iron, ad val., 12½ per cent.
- (B) Ingots; Blooms; Slabs; Billets; Puddled Bars and Loops; or like crude Manufactures, less finished than Iron or Steel bars, but more advanced than Pig Iron (except Castings), ad val., 12½ per cent.
- (C) Bar; Rod; Angle; Tee; Sheet and Plate (plain); Wire and Hoop, ad val., 12½ per cent.
- (D) Machinery, Machines, and Parts—Mowers; Reapers; and Reapers and Binders, ad val., 17½ per cent.
- (E) Iron and Steel Tubes and Pipes, not dutiable under Division VI., ad val., 12½ per cent.
- (F) Spelter, ad val., 10 per cent.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [5.39].—I informed some honorable members before they left for their homes this afternoon that I intended to ask the Committee to merely complete the consideration of Division VI. of the Tariff, and under the circumstances it would scarcely be fair for me to proceed with the consideration of Division VIa. At the same time, I should very much like to do so.

Mr. WILKS.—If the Treasurer did so, it would only cause more trouble next week.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE. — I have been asked to push on with Division VIA., but under the circumstances I do not feel justified in doing so, and consequently I shall report progress.

Progress reported.

BOUNTIES BILL.

Assent reported.

SPECIAL ADJOURNMENT.

Motion (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That the House, at its rising, adjourn until 2.30 p.m. on Monday next.

ADJOURNMENT.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Motion (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) proposed—

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. PAGE (Maranoa) [5.42].—I desire to know the business to which the Treasurer purposes to give precedence on Monday?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The first business will be the consideration of Division VIA. of the Tariff.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

House adjourned at 5.43 p.m.

House of Representatives.

Monday, 2 December, 1907.

Mr. SPEAKER took the chair at 2.30 p.m. and read prayers.

TARIFF ALTERATIONS.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Will the Treasurer have printed and distributed a list of any alterations he intends to propose in the Tariff schedule so that honorable members can give their attention to them beforehand? I think that this course should be taken in order to avoid serious stoppages.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not know that any serious stoppages have taken place in consequence of intended alterations not having been circulated.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—No; but they may occur.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I cannot give an absolute promise that I will not alter anything; but so far as I can give timely information as to any proposed alteration I shall do so.

STANDING ORDERS.

Mr. BOWDEN.—I desire to ask the Prime Minister whether the Government intend to take any action with reference to the report of the Standing Orders Committee which was presented to the House some time ago, and which recommended for its approval a new set of Standing Orders.

Mr. DEAKIN.—I have already replied to this question—that if there be time before the close of the session it can be very well spent in considering the report referred to.

CHRISTMAS RECESS.

Mr. LIDDELL.—Can the Prime Minister inform the House as to the probable date on which it will be asked to adjourn for the Christmas recess?

Mr. DEAKIN.—As soon as the consideration of the Tariff has been concluded, a step which it is hoped can be reached by the end of next week.

GOVERNMENT PROPERTY— INSURANCE.

Mr. FOWLER.—I find that as one result of the recent fire in Melbourne about £20,000 worth of Commonwealth property has been destroyed, and it is stated that it was not insured. I wish to ask the Postmaster-General whether it is not the rule of his Department to insure its property, and, if so, why it was neglected in that instance?

Mr. MAUGER.—I intend to go fully into the matter, which I may say was brought before me this morning by the honorable member for Bourke. The Government have always taken up the position that they should not insure their property. What I think we should do is to establish an insurance fund for the purpose of meeting such risks.

TELEPHONE SERVICE—FIRE.

Mr. WEBSTER.—Is the Prime Minister aware that it has been reported that the great fire in Melbourne was largely owing to the fact that a person could not get connected with the Fire Brigade Station for ten minutes?

Mr. MAUGER.—I have made inquiries and ascertained that that theory, which is not backed up by any evidence, is as ill-founded as the theory that the fire was originated by the lighting of cases in a lane, which is quite contrary to fact.

FANNING ISLAND.

Mr. BOWDEN.—Can the Prime Minister give the House any information with reference to the reported transfer or sale of Fanning Island?

Mr. DEAKIN.—There is no news of any recent date. The question was considered, I should think two years ago, when it appeared to be believed that there was no power to transfer the island, although certain property on it might be sold. However, we called attention at that time to the risk which was being run, and I think that the Pacific Cable Board, which has a station there, must have kept itself informed of the progress of events.

PAPER.

Mr. MAUGER laid upon the table the following paper:—

Lands Acquisition Act—Land acquired under, at Darling Island, New South Wales—For Defence purposes.

TARIFF.

In Committee of Ways and Means
(Consideration resumed from 29th November, *vide* page 6834):

Division VIa.—Metals and Machinery.

To come into operation on dates to be fixed by Proclamation, and exempt from duty in the meantime. Proclamation to issue so soon as it is certified to Parliament by the Minister that the manufacture to which the Proclamation refers has been sufficiently established in the Commonwealth.

229. Iron and Steel—

- (A) Scrap Iron and Steel, and Pig Iron, ad val. $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.
- (B) Ingots; Blooms; Slabs; Billets; Puddled Bars and Loops; or like crude Manufactures, less finished than Iron or Steel Bars, but more advanced than Pig Iron (except Castings), ad val., $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.
- (C) Bar; Rod; Angle; Tee; Sheet and Plate (plain); Wire and Hoop, ad val., $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.
- (D) Machinery, Machines, and Parts—Mowers; Reapers; and Reapers and Binders, ad val., $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.
- (E) Iron and Steel Tubes and Pipes, not dutiable under Division VI., ad val., $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.
- (F) Spelter, ad val., 10 per cent.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [2.37].—I wish to postpone the consideration of the descriptive paragraph at the commencement of this division until the duties have been considered.

Paragraph postponed accordingly.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—As honorable members know, it is not intended that this division of the Tariff shall come into operation until some time hence. The Manufactures Encouragement Bill hinges on this division. It is very likely that when the Bill is submitted, I shall alter the dates as to the running of the bounties. If that Bill is passed—and I hope that it will be passed—it will operate for a certain period, and I do not think it will be very long before either Mr. Sandford or some other person will have sufficiently established an industry to warrant the Government in issuing a proclamation to bring into force this division of the Tariff. Had I thought of it before, I think I should have proposed to increase the duties under Division VIa.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—They have been increased.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Only in one case, and very slightly. I think they ought to be 25 and 20 per cent. in comparison with the duties on other items in the Tariff. However, that is a matter which I am not going to deal with at the present stage. The alteration will be in plenty of time four and five years hence—which period will, I expect, elapse before these duties will come into operation. They will not operate in the meantime. I intend to propose to delete the paragraph *f*—spelter. From the information which I have been able to gather, I do not think that there is any necessity at the present time to retain that duty. It is being produced at Cockle Creek, and there is no doubt that there is a considerable demand for it in Australia. I am informed that there is a market for the whole of the spelter that can be made here. I do not think that there is any occasion to go out of our way to impose a duty at the present time; though I may change my opinion if I receive further information. I wish to say that I regard these duties as the most important in the Tariff. Iron and steel are the base of all manufactures in Australia. If we can produce enough iron and steel to supply Australia without the importation of any large quantity we shall be laying the foundation of one of the greatest industries—

probably the greatest of all—in this country. I believe that honorable members will feel that it is absolutely necessary to carry these duties into effect. I am not asking for increased duties at present, because I believe that those proposed will be sufficient for the purpose, and also because I desire to finish the Tariff before Christmas.

Mr. JOHNSON.—What is the Minister proposing to do in reference to the bounty? Does he propose that the bounty and the duty shall operate together?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The bounty ceases when the duty comes into operation. The two do not run together. The honorable member will find that the heading to the division provides that the matter is to be dealt with in a certain way. I do not know whether it is wise to discuss that question now, as the heading has been postponed. But certain words have been left out of the heading as it formerly stood, to the effect that a vote of both Houses of Parliament is required before the duties come into operation. Strong objection has been taken to that provision by those who wish to invest their capital in the iron and steel industry. In this Tariff we are proposing to leave the responsibility of bringing the duties into operation to the Minister of the day.

Mr. FISHER.—That is an absolutely novel thing in Tariff matters—to leave to the Minister the power to impose duties.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not intend to discuss that matter now, although I think that there is a great deal to be said in favour of leaving this power in the hands of the Minister. Parliament cannot deal with the details.

Mr. JOHNSON.—It will be a very dangerous thing to do.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I am disposed to think that people will not be inclined to invest their money in the iron industry unless they know exactly what is going to happen.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—If our Minister of Trade and Customs has not sufficient power already, and is to be granted further power, it will be a poor look out.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Honorable members are sometimes unwisely disinclined to trust those in authority.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—We might as well shut up Parliament, as they have done in Portugal.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—It is not a fair thing to say that we will do certain

things under certain conditions without giving security to those who invest their capital. A million of money might be invested in the iron industry, and then a new Ministry might come into power and say "We will not do what you ask of us," or "we will not ask Parliament to do it," or "we have not time to do it."

Mr. JOHNSON.—It is a dangerous power to give to any Minister.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Well, it is a dangerous thing to give honorable members licence to talk as long as they like.

Mr. JOHNSON.—The Minister is enjoying that licence just now.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not say much, unless there is occasion to say it; and I do not intend to deal with this matter any further.

Mr. KNOX (Kooyong) [2.48].—I offer no objection to the course which the Minister has proposed to take, but he has commenced to debate the matter which he has postponed. I did not expect that he would do that. I unhesitatingly say that I should have preferred that my amendment should receive consideration now.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—It will be dealt with afterwards.

Mr. KNOX.—But the Minister has commenced to debate the matter. I therefore see no reason why I should not continue the discussion.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I referred to it only incidentally.

Mr. KNOX.—The Treasurer indicated that he was going to oppose the policy which my amendment embodies. I have consistently expressed my belief that we should ardently endeavour to establish the iron industry in Australia. But I am not prepared to say at the present moment what duty I shall support. I do feel, however, that it should be distinctly stated in the Tariff that the bounty and the duty are not to be concurrent. Personally, I believe that the manufacturers would prefer a duty to the bounty, and I have already indicated that, in my opinion, the Manufactures Encouragement Bill has a very precarious career in front of it. I shall discuss the details at greater length on a future occasion, simply contenting myself now with expressing the opinion that we should have a specific declaration in the Tariff, that if duties are agreed to by the Committee, they should not be concurrent with the bounty to be paid under the Manufactures Encouragement Bill.

Mr. FISHER (Wide Bay) [2 49].—I take it that the only matter before us now is whether we are in favour of duties being imposed under item 229, after the iron industry has been sufficiently established in Australia. I wish to say, at the outset, that in dealing with the subject as I shall do, I do not desire to reflect upon any Minister. I do not agree with the honorable member for Kooyong that the manufacturers would prefer a duty to a bounty. With the exception of those who were only turning out iron I do not think that manufacturers would prefer a duty to a bounty, and cannot understand the honorable member suggesting that they would.

Mr. KNOX.—One manufacturer of iron might.

Mr. FISHER.—Naturally, if there were only one manufacturer of iron, he would prefer a duty to a bounty; but every user of iron would be of a different opinion. For that reason I think that the granting of a bounty is a much better method of encouraging the industry than is the imposition of a duty. I am not averse to a duty being imposed if the industry is established. The creation of the industry would more than compensate for any drawback that might arise from the collection of such duties as these.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not desire that the bounty and the duty should be concurrent.

Mr. FISHER.—I should oppose their running concurrently.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—So should I.

Mr. BOWDEN.—And yet we have bounties and duties operating concurrently in relation to a number of Queensland industries.

Mr. FISHER.—I was ready to do something more for the iron industry than to agree to the imposition of a duty, but the honorable member would not support me. I am prepared to support these proposals, but do not think there should be any lengthy debate upon them. When we have to deal with the material question of whether the Minister shall have power by proclamation to direct duties on metals and machinery to be collected, or whether such a direction should be given only by Parliament, which alone has the power to impose duties, I shall be found objecting to the first-named proposal.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That paragraph F be left out.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [2.53].—We have now to deal with the heading to this division, which reads—

To come into operation on dates to be fixed by proclamation, and exempt from duty in the meantime. Proclamation to issue as soon as it is certified to Parliament by the Minister that the manufacture to which the proclamation refers has been sufficiently established in the Commonwealth.

As I explained a few minutes ago, this provision is different from that which has been associated with a similar schedule in two other measures. On three prior occasions we have had under consideration a schedule of this kind, and in the last instance we varied the heading, using words similar to, if not exactly the same, as those now under consideration. In the Tariff of 1902, it was provided that the duties should come into operation by a resolution passed by both Houses of the Parliament. I have been advised all round, however, that the uncertainty attaching to such a provision would militate against the establishment of the industry.

Mr. FISHER.—This is not debatable.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not agree with the honorable member; I think that it is.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—The honorable member wishes to carry on legislation by Government.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I hope the honorable member will not grumble. Under the Manufactures Encouragement Bill, up to the 1st January, 1913, a certain sum of money will annually be expended by way of bounties on the production of pig iron. If at that time, or before the expiration of that time, it appeared to the Ministry that the production of pig iron in Australia was sufficient to supply the requirements of the Commonwealth then, under this proposal, a proclamation could be issued providing that the duty of 12½ per cent. should come into operation. As soon as the duty comes into operation, the bounty will cease. I wish at once to disabuse the minds of honorable members as to there being any desire on the part of the Government that the duty and the bounty shall be concurrent.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—That is not the point.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The honorable member for Kooyong referred specially to that point. I should be prepared to trust any Ministry to honestly carry out the intention of Parliament by issuing a proclamation when satisfied that the quantity of

pig iron being produced in Australia was sufficient to supply local requirements.

Mr. FRAZER.—Why not trust the Parliament?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I am prepared to trust the Parliament; but I would remind honorable members that occasionally it takes a long time to secure the passing of such a resolution. Personally, this provision is nothing to me.

Mr. KNOX.—Hear, hear; no one suggests that it is.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I speak as I feel in regard to this matter; and I recognise that there is a difference of opinion on the subject. If it be decided that these duties shall not come into operation except upon a resolution of both Houses of Parliament, I shall have to submit to that decision; but I think that such a condition would hamper the investment of money in the industry, and that it would be better to adopt the Government proposal. We use the words "sufficiently established." The question of how best to express our intentions in this regard has always been a troublesome one; even when the right honorable member for Adelaide was Minister of Trade and Customs great difficulty was experienced in determining what would be the most suitable words to use as a direction to the Minister. On one occasion it was proposed that the duties should come into operation when it was shown that sufficient pig iron was produced to supply Australian requirements.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—Such a provision would not do, because whilst we might be producing a small quantity of pig iron, we might have no machinery in the Commonwealth for carrying on the rolling and other necessary processes.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—If we grant a bounty the production of pig iron will quickly be followed by the erection of the machinery necessary for rolling it out and turning it into an improved marketable commodity. We provide for a duty of $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on pig iron, ingots, blooms, slabs, and so forth. There would be $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. duty on pig iron and $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on puddled bars. If any manufacturer produced pig iron in sufficient quantities he would secure that amount. If he successfully carried out the process of converting that pig iron into puddled bars he would get another $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on that form of the iron.

Mr. ATKINSON.—If he does it.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—He could do it.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—There is no doubt he could do it, and he would do it.

Mr. ATKINSON.—He might be doing so well on the production of pig iron that he would go no further.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Not at all. He would know that he would get the extra $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on the iron converted into puddled bars. If we could induce any person to produce a sufficient quantity of pig iron to meet Australian demands, there would be no difficulty in inducing them to take up the processes of converting the pig iron into the other forms of iron upon which they would afterwards be able to obtain the advantage of the duties set out in item 229.

Mr. ATKINSON.—I hope the honorable gentleman is not too sanguine.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not know whether I can be regarded as a sanguine man, but I believe in Australia and in developing Australia.

Mr. ATKINSON.—So do we.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—And I believe in developing first of all the production of pig iron in Australia.

Mr. ATKINSON.—The question is whether the manufacturers of pig iron will necessarily go on from that to the other processes.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Of course they will, if they are assured that they will not be swamped by the American Steel Trust with steel and iron imported from Pittsburgh. Unless we can give them that assurance they certainly will not proceed.

Mr. JOHNSON.—The import returns, as the honorable gentleman is aware, show that there is no serious competition by the American Steel Trust.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—There is serious competition in every industry of iron and steel manufactures.

Mr. FISHER.—So there will be to the end.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—There will be until we put a stop to it.

Mr. FRAZER.—What has this to do with the question whether the proclamation is to be issued on the authority of the Minister or of Parliament?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I admit that I have been led a little away from that.

Mr. FISHER.—Think of Christmas.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do; but I wish to have this matter dealt with in a way which will not have the effect of delaying the establishment of the iron industry. I have said that I am in the hands of the Committee in the matter.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Is it worth while for the Minister to provoke a debate on the subject when we know that even if we passed the proposal here, another place would not agree to it?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not know what another place would do, and I do not think that the honorable member knows.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Another place would never think of leaving such a matter in the hands of a Minister in this Chamber.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—It would not be in the hands of a Minister, but in the hands of the Executive. I am in the hands of the Committee. I submit the proposition, and I hope that honorable members will deal with it as soon as possible.

Mr. KNOX (Kooyong) [3.3].—I wish to move—

That after the word "Commonwealth" the following words be added:—"But no proclamation to issue, except in pursuance of a joint address passed on the motion of Ministers by both Houses of Parliament stating that such manufacture is sufficiently established."

May I at once say that in moving this amendment, I intend no reflection upon the present or any future Minister.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I quite understand that.

Mr. KNOX.—Let me further say that if the Minister will at once say that he is prepared to leave the matter to Parliament I shall withdraw the amendment, and let him propose the necessary alteration, as I have no special desire to be personally associated with the amendment of the proposal. I think the Minister must admit that the feeling of the Committee is against so great a change as he proposes. Honorable members are not at all likely to agree that it should be left to the discretion of the Minister to say when the industry has been sufficiently established. That would be an enormous power to place in the hands of any Minister or Government. The question at issue is certainly one upon which honorable members should have an opportunity of expressing an opinion.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The honorable member is not moving his amendment.

Mr. KNOX.—I have moved it.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I have a prior amendment to move.

Mr. KNOX.—Then I am prepared to withhold my amendment for the present and to give notice of my intention to move it.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I might ask the honorable member for North Sydney to give me notice of his amendment.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—It is in accordance with the Minister's own desire.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Then I shall be sure to agree to it.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [3.5].—There is a question which I should like to raise before we deal with any amendment, though I should like to say that I am heartily in accord with that suggested by the honorable member for Kooyong. Listening to the Minister I began to wonder whether we were not approaching a similar condition of things to that existing at the present time in Portugal, where Parliament has been altogether dispensed with.

Mr. FISHER.—Queensland is not so far away.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—It was not the Minister there, but the Governor.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The cases are very different. I hope the Committee will not agree to the Minister's proposal. It seems to me to be a distinct step towards personal government, which I hope will never be adopted in Australia. It would be a sorry day for the democracy if we gave these large powers affecting the vitals of our form of government into the hands of any Ministry or Cabinet except in the most urgent circumstances.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—The Minister is not really serious.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I am serious.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I should not think so. When I first looked at the proposal I wondered if it had been submitted for the purpose of protecting the revenue. I have not heard the Minister say anything about that phase of the question. I take it that if the Cabinet did arrive at the conclusion that any of these industries were sufficiently established to warrant the imposition of the duties, it would be their duty to bring down a schedule of the duties in the ordinary way, imposing them at the same time. That would be necessary for the protection of the revenue. I do not think we should loose our hold of the right to consider the matter *de novo* when that time arrives. I should like to direct the attention of the Minister to two or three of these items. Paragraph A includes scrap iron and steel and pig iron. Paragraph B includes ingots, blooms, slabs, billets, puddled bars and loops, or like crude manufactures, less finished than iron or steel bars, but more advanced than pig

iron. Then, in paragraph c we have bar, rod, angle, tee, plain, sheet and plate, wire and hoop.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Those paragraphs have been passed.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I am aware of that, but the item is not through yet. I wish to ask the Minister whether these duties are to be cumulative.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I explained that matter.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I point out that these paragraphs refer to forms of iron in three different stages of manufacture, each dutiable at 12½ per cent.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—The duty would be charged upon them in the condition in which they arrived.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—They would arrive in all these three conditions.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—One piece of iron could not arrive in all three conditions.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The honorable member is quite right. I was thinking of the bounties. These duties cannot be cumulative.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I said that they were in this way. If a man produced pig iron he would get the advantage of the duty on pig iron, and if he afterwards erected machinery and produced iron in the second form, included in paragraph B, he would get the advantage of the two duties.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The point to which I have referred should be made clear, and I believe that is the object of the amendment to be proposed by the honorable member for North Sydney.

Mr. FISHER (Wide Bay) [3.10].—This is not a matter over which it is necessary to indulge in heroics. It is simply a question of whether Parliament is to rule, or be ruled by Ministers.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Parliament always rules the Ministry.

Mr. FISHER.—Unfortunately, if a Minister makes a mistake, Parliament is exceedingly generous and stands by him. But that is not the point. This idea of the Government proceeding by proclamation, is an old familiar friend. Every Government and every member desires to have the power to control Parliament. Perhaps there is not a member in this Chamber who would not do so if he were given the power—and I suppose those of us with the least ability would desire it most. The Treasurer said that if Parliament reserved this power to itself, speculators or business men might hesitate to put their money

into an industry. But why should they be afraid of Parliament? What Ministry would hesitate to bring down a motion if they thought that an industry was sufficiently established for the duties to be imposed?

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—A good many of them are afraid of Parliament, but they are more afraid of the Ministry.

Mr. FISHER.—No Ministry would be afraid to ask Parliament to impose the duties if they thought the industry had been established. If any Ministry were afraid, it would be the duty of Parliament to obtain another Ministry that would not be afraid. I do not impugn the motives or integrity of Ministers. One of the worst features of our democratic form of government is to be found in the suggestions that are sometimes made against the probity of Ministers. That is a bad thing. I do not think that that accusation can be made at all. There is no reason why Ministers should have cast upon them such a responsibility as is proposed. A democratic Parliament should hesitate to hand over any of its powers to any Minister or Ministry. I trust the Committee will in no way bind itself by agreeing to a provision of this kind. Why should we bind Parliament for the two, three, four, or five years of which the Minister spoke? It must be obvious to the Minister that his difficulty in that direction will be increased by the length of time which may elapse before the proclamation is brought into operation. There is no reason why Parliament should not retain this power, even if the Minister's arguments were sound, because this Parliament is sitting, and appears to be destined to sit, for at least two-thirds of the year.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—It is to be hoped not.

Mr. LIVINGSTON.—If we are not smart, the year will not be long enough.

Mr. FISHER.—That is so, and I presume is brought about largely through the loquacity of the Opposition.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Or through the proposals which the honorable member's party are constantly forcing on the Ministry.

Mr. FISHER.—Any proposals that are submitted from this side are for the benefit of the people. The party that hesitates to bring forward proposals to benefit the people is not performing the duties which it was sent here to perform.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—My proposals are for the benefit of the people.

Mr. FISHER.—I give the Minister every credit for fighting for what he believes in, although I do not always agree with him. He still persists in fighting for his proposal in this case, although he knows the sense of the Committee is absolutely opposed to it. This is the third proposal of the kind that I have opposed, and I hope it will be the last that will be submitted to us.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [3.15].—I need not direct myself to the question of whether the Ministry should have the power by proclamation to impose the duties in this division. I think the Treasurer finds that the sense of the Committee is against him.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not know that. I would rather the Committee agreed with me.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—We cannot. A similar proposal has been defeated previously. I am as sure as I can be that even if we passed it another place would not, because the Minister of Trade and Customs will always be in this Chamber, and, while he may be able to feel the pulse of this Chamber, and know whether he would be safe in issuing a proclamation, the pulse of another place might be quite different.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—And the Minister is responsible to this Chamber only.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—That is so. I am sure the other place would regard the proposal as giving undue power to this Chamber, and refuse to accept it. The Treasurer stated that if the Committee were against him, he would not push his proposal. If he has ascertained the feeling of the Committee, I do not wish to debate the matter any longer, as I desire to save time. But I wish to have an amendment made prior to that proposed by the honorable member for Kooyong in order to make it clear that what the Minister said was his intention will be the law. I move—

That after the word "operation" the words "and any then existing bounty to cease" be inserted.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—That is to prevent the concurrence of bounty and duty?

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Yes; it is to prevent a bounty being paid after the imposition of a duty.

Mr. FRAZER (Kalgoorlie) [3.18].—If it is understood that the Minister intends to accept the proposal that Parliament and not the Minister shall fix by resolution the date

from which the bounty shall cease and the duty operate, I will sit down.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Then sit down.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE (Flinders) [3.19].—I do not propose to debate the general question as to whether Parliament should or should not have a say regarding a matter which is really one of legislation, because I gather from the Minister's attitude that he proposes to accept the amendment proposed by the honorable member for Koovong.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Yes; I am going to accept it. I am not going to keep the talk going if I can help it.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—The Treasurer cannot complain that I keep the talk going, but I wish to ask a question with a view to clearing up another matter which is left in a little uncertainty in this provision. It is quite possible, under its language, that we may have a proclamation referring to pig iron, or to ingots and blooms. I may be wrong, but, as I understand it, the object of the proclamation is to indicate that the Government have made up their mind that the iron and steel industry has got on to a sufficiently firm footing to do without a bounty, and to do with a duty.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—In regard to any particular branch of the industry.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—Is it intended to apply to any particular branch?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Yes.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—Each branch will be dealt with separately?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Yes.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—So long as we understand, that is all right.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—We may deal with pig iron but not with the other class of iron.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—I understand, then, that there may be bounties on pig iron, for instance, and not on the other classes of iron?

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The words "the manufacture to which the proclamation refers" show that a bounty is intended on the particular manufacture.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [3.21].—This seems a rather roundabout way of proceeding with the whole matter. It is the clear intention of the Committee, I believe, not to indulge in any double banking by way of both bounty and duty. If we dispose of the Manufactures Encouragement Bill in some way or other soon, we might very well simplify the whole procedure. For instance, if we pass that Bill, what need is there for this proviso?

Mr. FISHER.—There must be some provision for protection after the withdrawal of the bounty.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The bounty does not last very long.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Are we to proceed with the Bill and also impose protective duties?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—There will be no bounty while the duties are imposed.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I think this heading ought to be determined in the light of the passing or otherwise of the Manufactures Encouragement Bill. What I mean is that if we are determined not to give both bounty and duty, and the Bill does not pass, this division may be eliminated straight away.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—If the Manufactures Encouragement Bill does not pass, then I shall fall back on Division VIb.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—And what in the meantime?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I propose to postpone Division VIb. until the end of the Tariff; and then, if the Manufactures Encouragement Bill does not pass, I shall fall back on that division.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—The honorable gentleman will also have to fall back on Division VIa.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I shall eliminate that altogether.

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment (by Mr. KNOX) agreed to—

That after the word "Commonwealth" the following words be added—"But no proclamation to issue except in pursuance of a joint address passed on the motion of Ministers by both Houses of Parliament stating that such manufacture is sufficiently established."

Heading, as amended, agreed to.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [3.25].—I move—

That the consideration of Division VIb. be postponed until the remaining items have been disposed of.

Division VIb. depends upon the passing or otherwise of the Manufactures Encouragement Bill.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—That Bill cannot be passed before Christmas.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Never mind; I propose that the consideration of Division VIb. shall be postponed. If Parliament decides against the Manufactures Encouragement Bill, then Division VIb. will be proceeded with.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—Is not Division VIb. intended to come into operation as supplementary to Division VIa.?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—No.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—It says so in the heading.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—There is some mistake about the heading. The object is, if the Manufactures Encouragement Bill is not carried, to place extra duties on the items in Division VIa., and then to place correspondingly high duties, or higher duties, on the items in Division VIb. to protect manufacturers, who have to pay duty on their raw material.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—I understand that.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—That is the object; and there will be no necessity for Division VIb. if the Manufactures Encouragement Bill passes.

W. H. IRVINE (Flinders) [3.27].—Let me state my difficulty. As I understand the matter, the Government purpose, first of all, to foster the iron industry by giving bounties on certain items for a certain time—let us suppose for three years. Then as soon as the bounty period has expired, I understand that the proposal is, by proclamation, to give an additional percentage of protection on manufactures of iron and steel.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—That is not intended at all.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—That is exactly what is said in the Tariff.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The heading of the division is not properly worded.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—Supposing the Manufactures Encouragement Bill does not pass, then I understand that the Government will be prepared, as I think we shall all be prepared, to put the duties in Division VIa. into force at once.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—Would we?

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—If the Manufactures Encouragement Bill does not pass, I understand that the intention is in some way to give protection to the manufacture of iron in Australia. What was stated most distinctly by the Treasurer was that, either by bounty or duty, we are going to protect the industry.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—That is quite true.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—And with that I cordially agree. If anything were to happen to prevent the Manufactures Encouragement Bill becoming law, the Government would, I understand, seek to impose the duties in Division VIa. at once.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The honorable member is quite right.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—That is a matter for Parliament to decide.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—That intention has been distinctly stated by the Treasurer more than once.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Hear, hear.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—And the Treasurer declares it again now. If, by reason of the Manufactures Encouragement Bill not passing, the duties in Division VIA. are imposed at once, will it not also necessarily follow that we must impose increased duties under Division VIB.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Yes.

Mr. FRAZER.—There is a difference of opinion as to that.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—That may be; but at present I am merely endeavouring to ascertain what is the Government scheme, with which we may or may not agree.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—Does the honorable member agree with the scheme?

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—Whether we agree with it or not, we may clear the air by finding out what it is. If the Manufactures Encouragement Bill does not pass, it is admitted that the Government scheme involves the imposition at once of the duties in both Division VIA. and VIB.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—I do not think so.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—The Treasurer has just said that it is so.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Yes.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—All I am endeavouring to arrive at now is the policy of the Government; whether or not we agree with the policy. Then I think that the heading is accurate. If the Manufactures Encouragement Bill does not pass both Houses of the Legislature, it is the policy of the Government to bring into operation both Divisions VIA. and VIB. of the Tariff. But if, on the contrary, that measure becomes law, in that case until Division VIA. is brought into force by proclamation VIB. will not be operative. The bounty will be operative. The manufacturers of the metals specified in VIB. will not require any additional protection because their raw materials will not be taxed. Therefore, during that period, Division VIB. will not be operative any more than will Division VIA. But as soon as the bounty ceases, and Division VIA. is made operative by proclamation, Division VIB. must be brought into force—just as if the Manufactures Encouragement Bill had not been passed—in order to protect those manufacturers of metals whose raw mate-

rials will be rendered more expensive by reason of the operation of the provisions of Division VIA.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The claim of the Treasurer is that by that time the industry will have been so established that their raw materials will not be dearer.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—There is only one point upon which I differ from the honorable member. I agree with him in everything that he has said except as to the necessity of bringing Division VIB. into operation simply because Division VIA. becomes operative.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—The heading to Division VIB. reads—

To come into operation on dates to be fixed by proclamation, and subject to the duties specified in Division VI. in the meantime. Proclamation to issue—

That is the proclamation bringing Division VIB. into operation under which the present duties upon machinery will be increased by about $2\frac{1}{2}$ or $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.—

so soon as the duties specified in Division VIA. have been brought into operation.

Can anything be clearer than that? As soon as we bring into operation the duties under Division VIA., which will increase the price of the raw material to the manufacturers of machinery, Division VIB. also becomes operative.

Mr. FISHER.—The honorable member's point is that the Government have not made the position clear?

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—I think that it is clear, but the Treasurer now affirms that what I have outlined is not the Government scheme at all.

Mr. MATHEWS.—I understood that it was their scheme.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—I should like to know from the Treasurer what is the Government scheme.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [3.35].—I agree with everything that the honorable member for Flinders has said up to the last point which he put. Let us assume that the Manufactures Encouragement Bill has its intended effect, and that upon the authority of both Houses of Parliament a proclamation is issued, bringing Division VIA. into operation. By that time we shall have insured to those engaged in the manufacture of metals and machinery an adequate supply of raw materials. That being so, we shall not need Division VIB., because the intention of that division is to protect the

manufacturers, whilst their raw materials could not be manufactured locally.

Mr. FRAZER.—In the event of the Manufactures Encouragement Bill being agreed to by Parliament, and of Division VIa. being subsequently brought into operation, the Treasurer will not put into force the provisions of Division VIb.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I am not going to deal with that division at all.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—When is it to come into force?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Division VIb. will not come into force at all if the Manufactures Encouragement Bill is agreed to by Parliament, and if that measure has the effect of causing the production of all that we require in the shape of pig iron and other raw materials for the manufactures of this country. The object of inserting that division in the Tariff was to make the necessary provision in the event of the Manufactures Encouragement Bill being rejected, and a duty being imposed upon pig iron. It must be obvious to honorable members that the operation of such a duty would increase the price of pig iron to the manufacturers of machinery until such time as we were producing sufficient pig iron to supply their requirements. But the moment that we produce sufficient to supply their needs we shall need only to retain the duty upon their raw material.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—Then the heading of the division requires alteration?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Yes. The moment I saw it in print I told the Comptroller-General of Customs that it was wrong, and that it did not convey my ideas upon this matter at all. If the Manufactures Encouragement Bill is defeated we shall lose Division VIb.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—Division VIb. is in force now?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—No.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—Take item 143 as an illustration.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The honorable member will find that item 143 is embodied in Division VI., but that it is subjected to a lower duty than is proposed under item 143 in Division VIb.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—Only 5 per cent. lower.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Under Division VIb. it is proposed to levy increased duties for the purpose of protecting the manufacturers who, in the event of the Manufactures

Encouragement Bill being rejected, would be called upon to pay an increased price for their raw material in the shape of pig iron, bar iron, &c. But if the measure in question be carried, and if it has the effect of stimulating the production of pig iron, we shall not require to bring Division VIb. into operation, because the manufacturers will obtain their raw materials at a normal price.

Mr. MATHEWS.—The Treasurer is anticipating that when pig iron is being produced here in sufficient quantity its price will not be increased to the manufacturer?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Quite so. I feel sure that it will not. I am not going to proceed with Division VIb., provided that the Manufactures Encouragement Bill is agreed to. But should it be rejected I shall endeavour to pass that division into law, because its provisions will be required in the interests of the manufacturers of metals and machinery.

Mr. MATHEWS.—The Treasurer will then give them an additional $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. protection?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—From $2\frac{1}{2}$ to $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. additional.

Mr. FRAZER (Kalgoorlie) [3.39].—I think that the whole difficulty in connexion with this division is the result of the unsatisfactory heading which has been adopted in the case of Division VIb.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—It is not only unsatisfactory, but contradictory.

Mr. FRAZER.—If I understand the position, it is that in the event of the Manufactures Encouragement Bill being agreed to by Parliament, and running its term—

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—It may not have to run its term.

Mr. FRAZER.—But assuming that it runs to the point when the Minister recommends Parliament to impose the duties provided for under Division VIa., he will not then need to bring Division VIb. into operation at all.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—That is so.

Mr. FRAZER.—In the event of the Manufactures Encouragement Bill being passed in a form satisfactory to the Government, will they be prepared to abandon Division VIb.?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I am only holding it in abeyance.

Mr. FRAZER.—If the Manufactures Encouragement Bill is passed, will the Minister leave out Division VIb.?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Yes.

Mr. KNOX (Kooyong) [3.40].—Division VIIb. was framed in relation to the Tariff as introduced, and is misleading at the present time.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I admit that the heading is not correct.

Mr. KNOX.—Will the Treasurer, when the time comes, accept my suggestion in regard to the two Houses of Parliament as to that division also?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I have accepted that.

Mr. KNOX.—I agree with the honorable member for Flinders, that this division was inserted with a view to assisting those connected with the manufacture of iron. As soon as Division VIA. comes into operation, Division VIIb., unless we make a different arrangement, will automatically take effect, and will place the importers and users of iron in a very difficult position. However, I understand from the Minister that he will omit Division VIIb. if the Manufactures Encouragement Bill is passed, and that the matter will come up again for consideration at the end of the Tariff discussion.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Yes; if the Manufactures Encouragement Bill is not passed.

Motion agreed to; division postponed.

Division VII. Oils, Paints, and Varnishes.

Item 230. Blacking; including Dressings, Pastes, and Polishes for Leather; Furniture Oils; Pastes, and Polishes; and Bronzing and Metal Liquids, ad val. (General Tariff) 40 per cent. (United Kingdom) 35 per cent.

Mr. JOHNSON (Lang) [3.43].—Most of the dressings included in this item are the raw materials of manufacturers. Dressings, pastes, and polishes for leather are used almost entirely by boot manufacturers in preparing their goods for the market, while bronzing and metal liquids, which are not made in this country, being solvents for converting gold and bronze powders into paint for decorative purposes, are used mainly by decorators, who get no protection from the Tariff. I have received a letter from a business firm which says—

The item that affects us very seriously is Division VII., item 230, which reads—"Blacking, including all dressings, paste and polishes for leather, 40 per cent." We may mention that we introduced a scientific preparation for belting from America about ten years ago, and after some difficulty, have worked up a moderate business. The value of the importations, however, amount to £500 a year, and from what we can learn, they come under the heading already mentioned, although there is another item in the same Division, 233—cling surface being really a belt grease—under which it could

be classed; but with our knowledge of the Customs Department, having previously paid 20 per cent., it is evident that 40 per cent. would be claimed.

I understand that there is no locally manufactured preparation which seriously competes in quality with this, and that it is very popular with those who wish to reduce wear and tear by friction in the use of machinery.

Mr. TUDOR.—What is the name of the preparation?

Mr. JOHNSON.—"Cling surface." I have here several illustrations of machinery on which slack belting instead of tight belting is being used because the belts have been treated with "cling surface."

Mr. BATCHELOR.—Why is the preparation not made here?

Mr. JOHNSON. — Perhaps it is a patented preparation, and the Australian market is too small to allow it to be manufactured locally at a profit, the firm which makes it having the world's market. I have a communication from another firm in regard to the leather preserving boot polish.

Mr. WATSON.—There is plenty of that made here.

Mr. JOHNSON.—A number of boot polishes are made locally; but I wish to refer to some of the evidence given on this subject before the Tariff Commission. I want to show what this duty really means on the invoice cost of these goods. The Home cost of Durbar leather preserving boot polish, under the present Tariff, is £1. To that sum there have to be added 10 per cent. *ad valorem*, 2s.; 35 per cent. duty, 7s. 8½d.; freight, insurance, Customs clearance charges, which equal 10 per cent. on the Home cost, 2s.; and 35 per cent. duty on packing cases, equals 2½ per cent. on contents. A case containing £10 worth of goods costs 15s., and 35 per cent. on 15s. is 5s. 3d., being equal to 2½ per cent. on each £1 worth of goods in the case. The figures may be set out in this way—

Home cost	£1 0 0
Duty at 35 per cent.	0 7 8½
Duty on case, 35 per cent.	0 0 6
Customs clearance, freight, and insurance, &c.	0 2 0
Total	£1 10 2½

equal to 51½ per cent. on the Home cost of goods.

Mr. WATSON.—The packing cases must be included in the landed value.

Mr. JOHNSON. — The packing cases are practically of no value for other purposes; but the importers have to charge the duty on them, and add that to the cost of the article.

Mr. WATSON. — The packing cases should properly be included in the landed cost of the article.

Mr. JOHNSON. — I am not arguing whether they should properly or improperly be charged to the cost; but pointing out what the total cost, with these charges added, amounts to.

Mr. WATSON. — The honorable member must not overlook the value of the local cases.

Mr. JOHNSON. — There is no duty on the cases in which local goods are packed.

Mr. TUDOR. — There is a duty on the timber.

Mr. JOHNSON. — There is no duty on the manufactured case.

Mr. TUDOR. — What about the better wages paid here?

Mr. JOHNSON. — I do not think that the question of wages enters into the matter at all. I dare say that on comparison it will be found that the wages paid in America would be at least as high as, if not higher, than those paid in Australia.

Mr. BATCHELOR. — Do not talk, but move a reduction.

Mr. JOHNSON. — I intend to move a reduction; but I hope that honorable members will allow me to put the matter in my own way. The figures I have quoted have been compiled from an invoice of goods which arrived in the *Star of Scotland*, and the charges are equal to $5\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. on the Home cost. The figures show, I think, that the proposed duty is very much too high. I find that before the Tariff Commission Mr. Belcher, of Adelaide, stated that he had been in business for only four or five months, and was doing a fair trade, considering that he had just started. He wanted the duty to keep imports out of the market. The duty asked for, he admitted, was high; but he would ask for a higher one if he thought that he would get it. He wanted the duty because he desired to get a higher price. Mr. Spooner, of Melbourne, complained that the boot manufacturers would not take his goods through prejudice, but nevertheless the American price had fallen. He wanted a duty because the price of the imported article was lower than his price, and he represented that his product would be bought if the price of imported polish were doubled.

That disposes of the contention of the Treasurer that on several occasions the effect of a duty is really to reduce the price of the local article. In this case the manufacturers of the local article distinctly state that their object in asking for the duty is to shut out the importations, so that they can double their own prices. Mr. Spooner said that he did a large trade with New Zealand and sold f.o.b. there at a lower price than he charged buyers in the Commonwealth. I have made those references to the evidence to show the purpose of those who are asking for the duty, and to point out that, on their own admissions, they are doing very well indeed.

Mr. WATSON. — In free-trade England they quote a lower price for export. It is done everywhere.

Mr. JOHNSON. — I dare say it is. I am not complaining about it being done.

Mr. MATHEWS. — The honorable member, of course, is only putting the case for the foreigner.

Mr. JOHNSON. — I resent that interjection as wholly unwarranted, and contrary to fact. Importers who reside amongst us are not foreigners any more than are manufacturers who reside here. The same thing is done by Mr. McKay with his harvesters. He charges the foreigner far less for his machines than he charges the Australian farmer. It is done here, the same as it is done elsewhere. In almost all cases the local manufacturers charge the consumers in the countries to which they export their goods less than they charge the consumers in this country. That appears to be a general practice. I presume that when they do sell their goods at a lower price to outside persons they do not sell them at a loss, but at a profit.

Mr. WATSON. — Frequently it pays them to sell for export without getting a profit.

Mr. JOHNSON. — That is so in exceptional cases, I admit. We may, however, take it, I think, that where any local manufacturers are trying to develop an export trade they are doing so with the object of securing an additional profit.

Mr. WATSON. — They can sell their exported goods without getting a profit, and yet make an additional profit on their aggregate output.

Mr. JOHNSON. — That may be so in some cases; but I believe that it is not the general commercial rule. I do not think that the export of boot polishes has attained such large dimensions at the present time

that the local manufacturers are selling them at a loss outside. However, I do not want to prolong the discussion unduly; but to submit an amendment.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [3.57].—Before the honorable member for Lang submits an amendment, I wish to mention that it is the intention of the Government to see whether it is not possible to arrive at some method under which the duty shall not be charged on packages which are not worth anything, and shall only be charged on packages which are of some commercial value. That seems to me to be a fair way of dealing with the matter.

Mr. WATSON.—That means raising the *ad valorem* duty.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—It seems to me that when any person imports rubbish round a package which is of no value, it is not fair to charge a duty on that rubbish. On the value of the package the duty should be paid. Wooden packages may come into competition with various things; but I think it is fair to do as I have indicated. When I was in control of the Department I thought it was ridiculous to charge duty on something which was of no value. In a great many cases the packages are of no value. I have thrown out that suggestion to the Committee, because it may influence the honorable member for Lang in regard to something which he is proposing to do.

Mr. TUDOR (Yarra) [4.0].—The honorable member for Lang, as usual, wants the duty to be reduced. I want the duty to be so fixed that importers cannot do as they have been doing.

Mr. KNOX.—Hear, hear.

Mr. TUDOR.—I do not suppose that any one on the Opposition side will say that the honorable member for Kooyong is as bigoted a protectionist as I am, and when he cheers my remark that there should be a fixed duty his assent ought to carry some weight with it. I hope that the Government will agree to a fixed duty, which can easily be charged on the weight of the contents of the tin. The bulk of these importations—over two-thirds—come from the United Kingdom.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Sixty-five per cent.

Mr. TUDOR.—The percentage is increasing every year. Since 1904 the imports have increased over 50 per cent. In three years their value has increased from £41,180 to £63,861, with the result that the home trade has fallen off. Of course,

the £63,861 would represent a warehouse cost of no less than £80,000. The foreigner has secured seven-eighths of the trade. Undoubtedly the Nugget Polish Company Limited are the largest exporters of this class of material from the United Kingdom to Australia. I hold in my hand a copy of their wholesale export price lists. The wholesale price list quotes waterproof black or brown polish in sixpenny tins at 3s. per dozen. That is the price of the ordinary small tin which is well known to honorable members. On the back of this list I find the conditions of sale to the retail trade. It says—

This polish and the outfits, whether bought direct from us, or from any dealer, are sold on the express agreement—

- (a) That they shall not be retailed at less than 4½d. for 6d. tins; 5d. for 6d. bottles; 9d. for 1s. tins; 10d. for 1s. bottles; 1s. 3d. for 1s. 6d. outfits; 1s. 6d. for 1s. 9d. metal outfits and 2s. for 2s. 6d. outfits.
- (b) That the polish shall not be put into or sold with any outfit other than one supplied by us.
- (c) That our outfits are resold in exactly the same condition as they are when purchased from us;

and shall not be resold except subject to these conditions as a term of the sale, which conditions shall remain attached to every box or packet sold, and shall form part of the terms upon which the polish and outfits are resold.

The acceptance of the goods by any purchaser or sub-purchaser will be treated as an acknowledgment that they are sold to him on these conditions, and that he agrees with the vendor to him (as agent in this respect for us) to observe the same.

Mr. WILKS.—Does the honorable member think that the conditions are observed?

Mr. TUDOR.—The conditions are observed throughout the United Kingdom—that is, in their home market.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The conditions are not observed in Australia.

Mr. TUDOR.—That is what I complain of and I propose to deal with. In the case of the small tins the wholesale rates to the retail trade at Home are 36s. gross, and 28s. 10d. net. For the export trade the rates are 30s. gross, and 27s. net. The company are prepared to sell at 25 per cent. less for export to the trade than for home consumption.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The difference between the export and Home prices is not 25 per cent., but 1s. 10d. per gross.

Mr. TUDOR.—Nugget paste is sold at a cheaper rate for export than for home consumption. In Australia it can be

bought retail at one-half of the price which is charged in Great Britain. At the top of the document it is stated—

The export discount from the list prices of our goods is 25 per cent. from the prices of the polishes and creams, and 15 per cent. from the brushes and pads. For convenience, and to render invoices easier to check, please note that all goods are invoiced to export houses at the lowest net prices, as below, for cash, within seven days of despatch of goods.

I have here a letter from one of the largest importers in Melbourne sent to a firm of polish manufacturers, Messrs. Alfred Spooner and Co., Limited. The letter says—

Dear Sirs,

Concerning the prices sold to the retailers for Nugget Polish three years ago and the present day, we beg to make the following report, which the writer has investigated. Three years ago it was 4s. per dozen, and then it came down to 3s. 9d., and 3s. 6d., and retailed at 6d. per tin. The lowest wholesale price to-day is 37s. 6d., or 38s. 6d., less 2½ per cent. for parcels, and the retail price at the present time in the boot shops is 3½d. and 3d., and in some of the up country towns the line is retailed at 2d. per tin.

The retailers in Great Britain are compelled to sell at 4½d. per tin. Here, to enable the market to be swamped, they sell at as low as 2d. per tin. When the importers attain their object, they will no doubt do what they did before we had the local competition. They used to sell at 9d. and 1s. per bottle, but when the local men began to compete the price was reduced to 6d. The importers are naturally anxious to capture the market. If they succeed, the price will undoubtedly go up. I have here dozens of letters obtained from retailers in Melbourne to show the price of the article in former years and at present.

Mr. JOHNSON.—What particular article?

Mr. TUDOR.—I allude to Nugget Boot Polish, which represents more than 50 per cent. of the imports in this line. I will guarantee that for every tin of any other imported stuff which the honorable member can find in the shops in any of our leading streets, he will find a dozen tins of Nugget. I am very glad that there has been no detraction of the Australian article in the matter of quality, and, on the other hand, I point out that I am not saying a word against the quality of the imported stuff. What I maintain is, that the Australian polish is as good as any, and that the local makers can turn out all the goods we require.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Have they the capacity to supply the whole Australian market?

Mr. TUDOR.—There is no doubt at all about that. I have not spoken more than three or four times upon this Tariff, but when I find that this English firm is prepared to sell at 25 per cent. less for export, so as to capture our market, I think I am justified in bringing the facts prominently under the notice of the Committee. On former occasions when I have spoken I have been fairly successful, and I hope that I shall do the same on the present occasion. I intend to prove up to the hilt that the price of polish has been enormously cheapened in consequence of the local competition. I have before me a certificate from a business man whose premises are right opposite the place where the fire occurred on Saturday evening—Coutie, of 217 Elizabeth-street. He writes—

This is to certify that in 1905 I purchased Nugget Cream at 38s. 6d. per gross, and in 1906 at 33s. per gross.

He could not have bought it at that price in Great Britain; yet the price quoted in this certificate was duty paid at the rate of 20 per cent., and all charges paid.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—The honorable member's proposal is to impose a duty of 40 per cent. I understand.

Mr. TUDOR.—I trust that the Government will agree to a fixed duty, so that it will operate fairly, whether the stuff is imported in ounce, 2-oz., or 4-oz. tins, or in bulk. Another document before me shows that in 1907 Nugget Polish was sold in one shop at 3½d. per tin, and for 2½d. at Harris's, Elizabeth-street. The same stuff cannot be purchased in Great Britain for less than double those amounts. Only last week, in my own electorate, tins were purchased at the rate of two for 6d.—that is, 33 per cent. less than the price for which the same goods can be bought in Great Britain. Surely we have a right to protect our own manufacturers against competition like that.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Who gets the benefit of the cheapness?

Mr. TUDOR.—The point is, that directly the local manufacturers are shut out, up will go the price.

Mr. JOHNSON.—That is "a chestnut."

Mr. TUDOR.—I will guarantee that Nugget Polish does not sell in London for as low a price as that which I have quoted as the price at which it has been sold in Melbourne and in country towns. It has to be remembered that the local manufacturer is now paying increased prices for such of his raw materials as are not

produced in Australia. Under the new Tariff, he has to pay 2s. 6d. per lb. for his egg albumen, whereas under the old Tariff the article was free. Why did not the honorable member for Lang object to a duty on eggs?

Mr. JOHNSON.—I did.

Mr. TUDOR.—The honorable member was not game enough to move an amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON.—I am game to move an amendment on any item in this Tariff, if I can get any one to support me. The Treasurer knows that very well.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Besides, why should not our fowls be protected against the pauper fowls of China?

Mr. TUDOR.—The price of caseine has also gone up. It was formerly free, and now pays 2d. and 1½d. per lb. The duty on wax is now 1d., whereas formerly it was ½d. Polish pads now pay 30 per cent., against 15 per cent. under the old Tariff. Nickel caps now pay 30 per cent., as compared with 15 per cent. under the old Tariff. Those caps, which are placed on the tops of the bottles, are not manufactured here. Nickel zinc pays 15 per cent. under the new Tariff, whereas under the old one it was free. Acetic acid, which is used in the manufacture of these goods, now pays 3s. 9d. per gallon, as against 2s. 6d. per gallon under the old Tariff.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Surely these increased duties will cheapen the prices of the articles mentioned?

Mr. TUDOR.—If they were made here the increased duties would cheapen prices, but revenue duties will not. As we are not producing nickel in Australia, the article I have just mentioned will be dearer on account of the duty.

Mr. JOHNSON.—So that a duty at one and the same time reduces and increases prices?

Mr. TUDOR.—If an article is manufactured in Australia, prices will be reduced as the result of a duty; but until the article is manufactured here, a duty will have the effect of increasing the price.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Yet, in his evidence, Mr. Spooner said that he wanted a duty so as to increase prices.

Mr. TUDOR.—I do not think that prices will be increased; but the real point is that we do not want to see men driven out of business by the unscrupulous tactics of importers.

Mr. HEDGES.—Melbourne people are doing the same sort of thing over in Western Australia. They are dumping their goods there with the object of shutting up Western Australian manufacturers.

Mr. TUDOR.—Are they selling much cheaper in Western Australia than they are selling in Melbourne?

Mr. HEDGES.—They are, and will do so until they shut up the local factories.

Mr. TUDOR.—The conditions of manufacture are similar in both States, so that there is no reason why the local manufactures should be shut up. I trust that the Government will, in view of the facts which I have submitted, agree to fix a high rate of duty on this particular article. I have figures before me which show how the trade of one of our manufacturers has gone down consequent upon the dumping of goods from abroad.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Why did he not give evidence to that effect before the Tariff Commission?

Mr. TUDOR.—He did. I am referring to Mr. Spooner. The honorable member has quoted some of Mr. Spooner's evidence, carefully selected. I am not going to say that the honorable member selected it himself, because I understand that he has not had the time to go through the evidence and pick out what he wanted. It has been picked out for him by interested parties.

Mr. JOHNSON.—I have read the evidence myself.

Mr. TUDOR.—The honorable member may have read it, but he has had pieces selected for him by interested parties.

Mr. JOHNSON.—The honorable member is entirely mistaken.

Mr. TUDOR.—The honorable member need not tell me that. What has occurred on the present occasion was precisely the same sort of thing as we had when the last Tariff was before us; and probably the selection was made by the same person.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Does the honorable member think so?

Mr. TUDOR.—I do.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Then he is entirely wrong.

Mr. TUDOR.—I will take the honorable member's word for it. At any rate, the trade of this man's firm has decreased, as he is willing to prove from his own books. They show that from May, 1903, to April, 1904, his total trade was £10,614. But it decreased to £5,131

from May, 1906, to April, 1907. Those figures show a decrease of 50 per cent. While that trade was being diminished, the trade of the importers was growing. I believe that the honorable member for Kooying, who is familiar with the facts, is prepared to support me in this matter. He has gone into the case for himself, and honorable members know that he would not support a duty unless he believed that it was equitable.

Mr. JOHNSON (Lang) [4.18].—The burden of the argument of the honorable member for Yarra especially affected boot polish. He has been trying to show the Committee how a duty acts in two diametrically opposite ways. The effect of a duty on boot polish will be, he says, to cheapen prices, while the effect of a duty on the things which enter into the manufacture of boot polish is to increase prices. So that we have two antithetical objects attained by a duty—it raises prices and it reduces prices. Surely the honorable member does not ask the Committee to believe that the effect of duties on articles which are manufactured here will be to reduce the prices of those articles, in view of the fact that in their own evidence the manufacturers point out that one of the objects they have in view in asking for a duty is to increase prices because the prices against which they have to compete are so low? The honorable member urges that the effect of a duty will be to lower prices, whilst at the same time he emphasizes the fact that the effect of duties upon the raw material from which boot polish is made has been to increase them. The honorable member asks us to believe that a duty will at one and the same time reduce and increase prices. It was my intention to move that the duties be reduced to 20 per cent. and 15 per cent., but in view of the statement made by the Treasurer that he proposes to make some allowance in the matter of cases, which have practically no commercial value, I intend at a later stage to move that the duties be reduced to 25 per cent. and 20 per cent. They would thus be brought down to the level of the old duties. Before doing so, however, I intend to ask the Committee to eliminate the words "bronzing and metal liquids." These solvents, which are used in the manufacture of bronzes for painting—
—uses, are not manufactured here. I

the words "and bronzing and metal
be left out.

Mr. KNOX (Kooyong) [4.22].—The honorable member for Yarra has made a thorough explanation of the position of the local manufacturers, and I am disposed to think from the facts that he has submitted to the Committee that my brief is very similar to that which he holds. I am satisfied that a factory at Richmond is practically idle as the result of imported brands being sold, for the purpose of destroying the local industry, at prices considerably below those at which they are offered in England. I wish to emphasize the point made by the honorable member for Yarra that the importation of materials of this kind into Victoria considerably increased under what, as compared with the State Tariff was the low duty embodied in the first Federal Tariff. In 1901 the imports into this State were of the value of £5,155; in 1904 they had increased in value to £12,341, in 1905 to £15,248, and in 1906 to £19,698. I would also remind the Minister that the question of casings is an important consideration in determining what is a fair duty to impose. Blackings and polishes of excellent quality are being made here, and the industry would flourish but for the efforts of those who are adopting the tactics to which I have referred. I am satisfied that, in the special circumstances, even what might be regarded as an extravagant *ad valorem* duty would not meet the case.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—What fixed duties does the honorable member recommend?

Mr. KNOX.—I understand that the honorable member for Yarra intends to move duties representing practically half the rates which manufacturers requested when before the Tariff Commission. In consequence, I believe, of the representations made by the honorable member for Yarra and myself, the trade, with a desire to secure fixed duties, have agreed that the duty on blacking, &c., in bottles, tins, or in any other form containing under 1 oz. should be 1s. per dozen; on 1 oz. and under 2 oz., 1s. 6d. a dozen; on 2 oz. and under 6 oz., 2s. 6d. per dozen; and on 6 oz. and over or in bulk, 6s. per gallon.

Mr. HUME COOK.—Those proposals do not provide for a preference.

Mr. KNOX.—The question of preference has not been considered. The whole of the manufacturers have signed a petition urging that the duties I have mentioned be imposed. They have cut down their request to the very lowest level compatible

with their being able to keep their works going. Like the honorable member for Yarra, I know that the factory in Richmond was started with sufficient capital by capable men who knew their business, but they have been unable to cope with the competition I have mentioned. It is with a knowledge of the *bona fides* of the representations that have been made that I urge that a fixed duty would be preferable to the higher *ad valorem* duty which the manufacturers originally hoped to secure. I shall therefore support the amendment which I understand the honorable member for Yarra intends to submit.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN (Indi) [4.27].—I intend to support the reduction of the duty to 25 per cent. on the ground first of all that such a duty plus freightage and other charges ought to be and is sufficient protection for the local manufacturers. I have some knowledge of the business done in one of the imported boot polishes now on the market. I refer to what is known as "2 in 1." It is used so largely in Australia that something like £2,000 was last year paid by the importers by way of duty. I requested the parties concerned to furnish me with some information on the subject, and since the Committee has decided that duties should be imposed to encourage competition, as well as to enable local manufacturers to compete with the importers, I think that I could not do better than quote, first of all, their statement on that phase of the question—

"2 in 1" shoe polish does not, as has been represented by Australasian manufacturers, compete unfairly with those friends, inasmuch as it has not been sold to distributors at a less figure than 4s. 6d. per dozen; in fact, the majority of the sales up to the present have been made at 4s. 9d. per dozen, while local manufacturers have in the past been content with, and worked successfully on, prices ranging from 2s. 3d. per dozen to 4s. per dozen.

Local manufacturers have placed on the market a polish or blacking packed in a tin that is almost identical with the "2 in 1" tin. Those imitations are sold at from 2s. 6d. to 4s. per dozen.

Mr. CROUCH.—Imitations? They are originals.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—They are originals so far as their contents are concerned.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—But the tins are an imitation only in the matter of colour. Both tins are painted red, and that surely is a common colour.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—I shall not dispute that point. The letter continues—

It is not a matter of price that has successfully introduced "2 in 1" shoe polish into this market, but that of extreme and hitherto unknown quality. However, having been placed on the market and sold to the public as a 6d. line, it is necessary to continue at this figure to receive the support which has been accorded the line in the past.

We have been discussing the policy of granting protection to the manufacturer, the worker, and the consumer, and on that phase of the question I wish to quote the incontrovertible statement of responsible men whom I have known in connexion with my business for the last twenty-five years. After pointing out that it is necessary to continue to sell this polish as a 6d. line, in order to secure a continuation of the support that it has received, my correspondents write—

In face of the new duty, this is hardly possible, as it will enhance the distributing price to such an extent that the retailing of it will not show the grocer or boot-dealer a fair working margin, and they will naturally hesitate in laying in stocks of an unprofitable line to the detriment of both ourselves and the Australasian public. Our only way out of the difficulty—if the unfair duty is continued—will be to pack the line in a smaller can, thus giving the public a lesser quantity for the same money, and making the public the real sufferer. This we hesitate to do, but, as before mentioned, it is the only course left open.

The company that has placed this polish on the market has been doing a large business, since it has paid duty amounting to £2,000 out of a total of £12,920 collected in respect of this item. I repeat that a duty of 25 per cent., plus freightage and wharfage charges, should be sufficient to protect the local manufacturer.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [4.32].—The protectionist members of the Tariff Commission recommended a duty of 35 per cent. on polishes and blacking because of the fierce and intense competition to which the local manufacturers have been subjected, and also because of the suspected low invoice valuations, the prejudice that exists against the local article, and the cutting rates in which the importers indulge. This item does not relate to a solely Victorian industry; a start has been made in South Australia. A South Australian manufacturer complained very bitterly of the insufficiency of the duty on these goods, and asked for a duty of 50 per cent., which he said—

would tend to keep competing lines out of the market, and would greatly develop the trade. The suggested duty would, the witness thought,

lead to the establishment of similar industries in the other States, while not involving any increase in the price to the public. . . . He knew of certain lines of polish manufactured in Adelaide being labelled and sold as "American goods."

That is an evidence of the prejudice against which local manufacturers have to compete. The protectionist section of the Tariff Commission also reported that—

A Victorian manufacturer of boot and leather dressings, whose business was established under the Tariff of that State and profitably conducted up to 1903-4, complained of the impossibility of competing against imported lines. He was recently informed of a large sale of imported boot polish at 12s. per gross, a price actually less than the cost of the bottles, caps, and cork linings in which his polish was sold.

There is sworn evidence as to cutting rates and fierce competition, and there is a request for high duties. We suggested a duty of 35 per cent, because we had not the data on which to decide fixed rates of duty. I understand that a proposal has been made to substitute fixed rates for *ad valorem* duties. If the Minister is satisfied that the fixed rates suggested are substantially the same as a 35 per cent. duty, I shall have great pleasure in voting for them.

Mr. HEDGES (Fremantle) [4.36].—This is another case in which we have arguments submitted merely from the Victorian point of view. We have had the honorable members for Kooyong, Indi, Bendigo, and Yarra speaking on this item.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—But the honorable member for Indi opposed the increase of duty.

Mr. HEDGES.—It means only that if Victorians are not getting the whole of the business they continually ask for more. The honorable member for Bass pointed out that candles made in Melbourne were being dumped into Tasmania, and I can assure the Committee that the articles with which we are now dealing have been dumped into Western Australia, with the result that local factories for their manufacture have been closed. The honorable member for Yarra has complained of the dumping of English manufactures into Melbourne, but he should not make such a complaint when he finds that Victorian manufacturers are guilty of the same practice.

Mr. TUDOR.—I am opposed to it.

Mr. HEDGES.—Victorian manufacturers of candles, soap, and the goods with which we are now dealing have

dumped their goods into other States with the object of shutting up local factories, and have succeeded in many instances.

Mr. TUDOR.—What is the name of the Western Australian firm whose factory for the manufacture of blacking was closed?

Mr. HEDGES.—I do not run about with the names of firms tacked on to me.

Mr. TUDOR.—The honorable member makes general statements which he cannot prove. I gave the name of the firm that was dumping in Melbourne.

Mr. HEDGES.—I say that it is a general practice of Melbourne manufacturers to dump their goods in Queensland, Tasmania, and the other States. I have no wish that blacking should be admitted free, but I do not think duties of 50 per cent., 60 per cent., or 100 per cent. should be imposed on it. I should not object to the duties proposed by the Government in this instance, but I say the Minister should not deviate from the Tariff he has submitted in order to satisfy Melbourne manufacturers every time.

Mr. SALMON (Laanecoorie) [4.38].—The honorable member for Fremantle has made an important statement affecting Victorian manufacturers.

Mr. HEDGES.—Another Victorian.

Mr. SALMON.—Surely an honorable member representing another State is not to be allowed to slander Victorian manufacturers without a word being said in their defence. If the honorable member will supply the names of the Victorian manufacturers who are carrying on the practice to which he refers, I, for one, shall be prepared to take from them the protection they at present enjoy. I would not by my vote assist any manufacturer to take advantage of others in the Commonwealth in the way the honorable member has described.

Mr. HEDGES.—The honorable member for Bass will tell the honorable member what manufacturers have been dumping in Tasmania.

Mr. SALMON.—The honorable member for Fremantle, as a professed protectionist, should recognise that the way to prevent dumping is to induce proper competition within the Commonwealth, and that can only be secured by sufficient duties on imported goods. The honorable member should vote for the recommendations of the A section of the Tariff Commission on this occasion—I would not ask him to support a higher duty than they have recommended—and if he did so, he would very

soon find that there would be sufficient competition in the business in Western Australia to prevent dumping from within or without the Commonwealth.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [4.40].—The honorable member for Launceston, in common with all other Victorian protectionists, claims that if duties are put up high enough internal competition will do the rest. The reply is easy and not far to seek. It has not done the rest in the case of many other goods which have been made here for many years; as witness the revelations in the harvester industry. The manufacturers were getting high prices for their goods, there was plenty of internal competition, and yet they were paying their employes as low as 5s. 6d. a day.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—But they charged lower prices for their goods.

Mr. SALMON.—The question of wages was not raised by any honorable member who spoke on this item previous to me.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I know that.

Mr. SALMON.—Then why does the honorable member assume that I was arguing with respect to the wages paid?

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I assume that the honorable member takes into consideration all the conditions surrounding an industry when he refers to the effect of competition. I say that dumping has not the effect attributed to it from time to time by honorable members in discussing these duties. I wish to point out that in connexion with the blacking industry a brutal frankness was exhibited by those who appeared before the Tariff Commission. One witness wanted 50 per cent. if he could get it, and had the candour to say—

We would ask for a higher duty if we thought we would get it.

I should think he would. Who would not if he thought he had to deal with a Minister like the Treasurer, who would be prepared to give almost any duty which would prevent the importation of anything that could be made here? Who would not ask if he knew he would receive? Nothing could be more simple than to have an interested manufacturer give evidence before the Tariff Commission, and then to take his word without testing it in any way. The witness to whom I refer was asked what his object was in asking for a higher duty, and on this point I quote the following evidence given in answer to question 62070—

Do you think there ought to be a good opening in Australia for the local manufacture of these polishes?

Mr. TUDOR.—Whose evidence is the honorable member quoting?

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The evidence of Mr. Alfred Belcher, manufacturer, of Prospect. His answer to the question I have quoted was—

Yes, I am sure of it. If we only get a little higher prices on some of these things or get the others out of the market there would be a splendid trade.

There is a cool suggestion—knock everybody out of the market, and put the prices up here! Then the witness admitted that he would be doing a splendid trade. He was further examined as follows—

Have you anything else to tell us about blackings and polishes?—No; all we want is the duty increased, and that would increase slightly the price of these imported lines, and then we will have a show. We can do them at the same price. We are prepared to put our goods into the market at the same price, but people prefer the imported.

I pass by the evident contradiction. The witness first said that he wanted a higher duty, and then he only wanted the imported article shut out. I direct the attention of the Committee to the fact that this is the class of evidence given to the Tariff Commission throughout their inquiry. There evidently was a difficulty in obtaining evidence on behalf of the consumers of Australia. They did not offer evidence, and the Tariff Commission apparently did not deem it their duty to procure the evidence of consumers.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—We invited the various Chambers of Commerce to give evidence, and they refused to do so.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Yes, but the Commission had the power, and, in my judgment, should have exercised it, to get people who use the various articles dealt with to give evidence.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—The consumers?

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Yes, that is my contention. There should be some evidence from consumers to set side by side with that given by those who were interested in securing higher duties.

Mr. SAMPSON.—Would it not have taken the Commission ten years to get through their work if they had done that?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—No; about twenty years.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I do not care how long it would have taken; it should have been done if the evidence submitted by the Commission was to be of any value.

It is a question of right or wrong, and in the law courts every day it is the practice to hear both sides.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—Why did not the Chambers of Commerce come forward to represent the consumers?

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I presume they looked after their own business, as the manufacturers did. So far as I know, they do not specially represent the consumers. The honorable member is aware that they consist largely of business men.

Mr. FRAZER.—They knew that if they were called upon to pay increased duties they could pass them on to the public.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Quite so. We need not expect the manufacturers or importers to bother very much about the consumer. The importer knows that he can pass the duty on, and the manufacturer knows that he can take advantage of it for himself. I say therefore that, in my judgment, an obligation rested upon the Tariff Commission to secure evidence to show how the consumers would be affected as a result of the duties to be imposed. I am not impugning the honesty of manufacturers who gave evidence before the Tariff Commission. I say no more and no less than that human nature operates in them in the same way as in other people. The evidence submitted by the Tariff Commission is, in the circumstances, largely valueless, as being the evidence of interested persons.

Mr. COON (Batman) [4.48].—In reply to the remarks made by the honorable member for Indi, with respect to the polish to which he referred, I wish to inform the honorable member that the tin he produced was filled by a man who was asking for a higher duty. The honorable member is the representative of the foreign trader, and, speaking as such, he produced a tin of polish filled by an Australian workman. The honorable member for Parramatta has just made a speech in which he has once more shifted his ground. Honorable members of the Opposition have repeatedly referred the Committee to the evidence given before the Tariff Commission, and times out of number have quoted from it. They have asked on more than one occasion that we should quote it, but now, because a manufacturer who went before the Commission asked for an increased duty, the honorable member for Parramatta says that the evidence collected by the Commission is worthless. It is sufficient for me to know that this industry, which some time ago

employed fifty or sixty men, is only employing fourteen to-day. The honorable member for Indi knows that these goods are being dumped into Australia at a price which is less than that for which they can be bought wholesale in the Old Country. Only a short time ago 10,000 gross of "Nugget" were dumped into Sydney at 25s. a gross. The article is being sold to-day in the Commonwealth at a lower price than the local article, with the object of securing a monopoly of the trade by crushing the local manufacture out of existence. That is what the foreign trader always does when he gets the opportunity. I trust that honorable members who believe in supporting the recommendations of the protectionist section of the Tariff Commission will do so on this occasion, and give this industry a fresh start.

Mr. CROUCH.—Does the honorable member want fixed duties or not?

Mr. COON.—I want fixed duties, because with them we know exactly where we stand and what we are doing. Sometimes correct invoices are not supplied. The only way to get over that difficulty in all cases of this kind is to have fixed duties. Then those importing the articles know exactly what they have to pay, and we know where we are.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Then how did the honorable member come to support so many *ad valorem* duties?

Mr. COON.—Because I could not get fixed rates.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [4.52].—The remarks made about foreign traders and advocates for importers should cease, if it is desired to get business through. The importer is not a bit different from the manufacturer. They are practically the same individual, and a matter of chance has directed them into one occupation or the other. Each will do the best for himself, and will take all he can get. There is, therefore, no sense in constantly making statements such as I have referred to. The business of a Parliament is to see that neither of them is put in a position to take advantage of the public. The whole debate has centred round one article—the polish called "Nugget." But polishes for other purposes than dressing boots, such as polishes for harness, metals, and so on, are included in the item. If the argument with regard to "Nugget" applies in the case of boot polish, it has no reference

whatever to those other polishes. The preference for "Nugget" is as between it and other British polishes. It has been said that more than half the boot polish that comes to Australia consists of "Nugget." There is evidently something in it that makes people demand it, so that it is not a question as between an Australian and a British article, but as between British and British. The proposal is to so increase the duty as to compel people to buy another article for which they have not the same liking. Another effect will be to impose a heavier duty on all the articles included in the item, although they are not used for the same purpose. The Minister should make a statement and stop the debate.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I fear that if I make a statement, I shall keep the debate going.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The Minister knows that a proposal has been made for a fixed duty. Is he going to adopt that and abandon his own Tariff? If he is, what is the fixed duty to be?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—If I propose a fixed duty, I do not intend to make it higher than the proposed *ad valorem* rate.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—It is the introduction of alterations of that kind that causes debate.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I have not introduced the alteration on this occasion. It has been proposed by others.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—We do not know what we are doing when an alteration of that kind is sprung upon us.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I am informed that fixed rates of 1s. per dozen, and 9d. per dozen are equal to *ad valorem* rates of 40 and 35 per cent. respectively.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The honorable member for Yarra has just given the quotation of "Nugget" for export as 2s. 3d. a dozen. Therefore a fixed duty of 1s. does not represent 40 or 35 per cent., but a higher duty.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [4.56].—For packages containing under one ounce I am informed that a fixed rate of 1s. per dozen represents an *ad valorem* rate of 40 per cent., while a fixed rate of 9d. per dozen is equal to 35 per cent. In the case of packages containing over 1 oz. and under 2 oz., fixed rates of 1s. 8d. and 1s. 6d. per dozen respectively; containing over 2 oz. and up to 6 oz., fixed

rates of 3s. and 2s. 6d. per dozen respectively; and containing over 6 oz., fixed rates of 7s. and 6s. per gallon respectively, represent *ad valorem* rates of 40 and 35 per cent. respectively.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [4.57].—The Treasurer is now introducing a schedule which—

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I have not introduced it. I propose to stick to my *ad valorem* proposals.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—If the Treasurer gives us that assurance, I will say no more. Otherwise we should have to show that those fixed rates do not represent the percentages given, according to our information.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—They were given to me by the Department.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Accepting as correct the statement of the honorable member for Yarra, the figures quoted by the Treasurer do not represent the percentages proposed.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I will stick to my *ad valorem* rates.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Then I will sit down.

Mr. JOHNSON (Lang) [4.58].—I shall not press my amendment, because the words which I propose to omit would have to come under item 232.

Amendment (Mr. JOHNSON's), by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. CROUCH (Corio) [4.59].—I have a request to make to the Treasurer regarding harness dressing, which is imported in bulk in large quantities. In more than one of the States there is an industry for putting up the imported liquid harness dressing, which is brought in in bulks of from 45 to 50 gallons. That industry gives employment in Australia, and I wish to ask the Minister to consent to insert a special line with a reduced duty on harness dressing when imported in casks containing over 40 gallons.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—It will compete with the local article afterwards.

Mr. CROUCH.—That is true, but it should have some preferential treatment, because it is made up here and gives employment in tinning, printing of labels, &c. I have received the following letter on the subject—

Dear Sir,
Re Tariff Division 7, No. 230. Blacking—including dressings, pastes, and polishes for leather, &c.

The former duty was 20 per cent., and the new duty is 35 per cent. preferential, and 40 per cent. general. We import a liquid harness dressing in casks of 45 to 50 gallons, which we tin off here into pints and quarts, but principally pints. The tins for this, the printed labels to put on the tins, the wood boxes to hold one dozen tins, are all made in Melbourne, and, of course, our own employes do the work of filling, labelling, and boxing (no girls or women employed). If the duty on dressing imported in bulk were made, say, 10 per cent. less than for that imported in tins, it would give us a chance of competing with the tinned dressing—otherwise we will have to arrange to have our dressing tinned, labelled, and boxed in England, as the charges for these items will be very much less than if done here, while labour is proportionately cheaper there than here.

Yours truly,

JAMES MUNDAY & CO.

There are other firms interested. I do not ask that the article should be made free for them. I suggest that a protection of 30 per cent. should be given for those who manufacture the bulk liquid, but the honorable member for Bendigo will see that the industry has some right to a preferential treatment of, say, 5 or 10 per cent., seeing that, if that is not given, several men will be put out of employment in the case of that firm alone, and a lot of work which is now done in Australia will be sent away.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—We want something more than the tinning done here; we want the blacking made here.

Mr. CROUCH.—The question is: Which is the more important? I do not say that this will altogether stop the dressing from being imported, but it will limit it to a special line of harness dressing, which is of great importance to the farming community, and I understand that harness dressing cannot now be made in Australia of the quality required. Whatever duty is agreed to for this item, I intend to ask afterwards that the duty shall be 10 per cent. less on harness dressing imported in casks containing not less than 40 gallons.

Mr. STORRER (Bass) [5.2].—It is time that we polished this item off. I intend to support the proposal of the Government. As to all these other individuals who want special concessions, we ought to dispense with that sort of pleading for special cases. I am altogether opposed to fixed duties, because they mean a penalty which is altogether prohibitive against the cheap article. If this business cannot succeed with a protection of 40 and 35 per cent., ought to go under altogether.

Mr. JOHNSON (Lang) [5.3].—I move—

That after the words "40 per cent." the words "and on and after 3rd December, 1907, and val. (General Tariff), 25 per cent.," be inserted.

I intend afterwards to move for a United Kingdom duty of 20 per cent. I make no secret of the fact that the figures which I now propose do not represent my idea of what the Tariff should be. If I thought I had the remotest chance of carrying it, I should move for a very much greater reduction, but I have to bear in mind that our time is limited, and that if we are to get through the Tariff we must not indulge in too many useless divisions, even for the sake of showing our weakness. If I were to propose anything less than the rate in the old Tariff, several honorable members sitting on this side would not agree to it; because they are pledged not to go below the old rate. I am therefore constrained to move this amendment, which will bring the United Kingdom rate down to the rate in the old Tariff.

Mr. CROUCH (Corio) [5.4].—Do I understand that the Minister will not give any preference for harness dressing which is imported in bulk? I am told that harness dressing is not made, and cannot be made, in Australia.

Mr. WILKS (Dalley) [5.5].—I rise to emphasize the speech made by the honorable member for Lang. The honorable member has moved that the duties be 25 per cent. and 20 per cent., not because he approves of such duties, but because he cannot get enough free-traders to support him in his desire to impose the old Tariff. I do not know what the ghost of John Farrell—I do not suppose you knew Mr. Farrell, Mr. Chairman—would say if he saw his old friend, the member for Lang, an eminent free-trader, submitting such a proposal to Parliament. It would appear, however, that the honorable member for Lang slips on polishes as I have slipped on machinery; and my only desire is to show that I am not singular in slipping.

Mr. JOHNSON (Lang) [5.6].—I cannot allow the remarks of the honorable member for Dalley to pass without some reply, because they really misrepresent my position. Personally, I should have proposed a much lower duty if I were not aware of the fact that there would be no possibility of getting it carried; and I do not desire to waste time. I recognise that several honorable members on my own side have pledged themselves not to go

below the old Tariff ; but I propose a reduction which I think there is a chance of carrying.

Question—That after the words “40 per cent.,” the words “and on and after 3rd December, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 25 per cent.,” be inserted—put. The Committee divided.

Ayes	13
Noes	33
<hr/>			
Majority	20

AYES.

Archer, E. W.
Atkinson, L.
Bowden, E. K.
Brown Tilley
Cook, Joseph
Edwards, R.
Forrest, Sir John

Fysh, Sir Philip
Livingston, J.
Thomson, Dugald
Wilks, W. H.
Tellers:
Johnson, W. E.
McWilliams, W. J.

NOES.

Batchelor, E. L.
Carr, E. S.
Catts, J. H.
Chanter, J. M.
Chapman, Austin
Coon, J.
Crouch, R. A.
Deakin, A.
Ewing, T. T.
Fairbairn, G.
Fisher, A.
Groom, L. E.
Harper, R.
Hedges, W. N.
Knox, W.
Lyne, Sir William
Maloney, W. R. N.

Mauger, S.
O'Malley, King
Page, J.
Palmer, A. C.
Quick, Sir John
Salmon, C. C.
Sampson, S.
Spence, W. G.
Storrer, D.
Tudor, F. G.
Watson, J. C.
Webster, W.
Wise, G. H.
Wynne, A.
Tellers:
Cook, Hume
McDougall, J. K.

PAIRS.

Kelly, W. H.
Willis, Henry
Brown, Thomas
Smith, Bruce
Fuller, G. W.
Wilson, J. G.
Sinclair, H.
Reid, G. H.
Poynton, A.
Glynn, P. McM.
Foxton, Colonel

Kingston, C. C.
Thomson, John
Foster, F. J.
Hall, D. R.
Bamford, F. W.
Watkins, D.
Thomas, J.
Hutchison, J.
Mathews, J.
Irvine, W. H.
Irvine, Hans

Question so resolved in the negative.

Amendment negatived.

Amendment (by Mr. JOHNSON) negatived—

That after the words “40 per cent.” the words “and on and after 3rd December, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 30 per cent.,” be inserted.

Amendment (by Mr. PALMER) put—

That after the words “40 per cent.” the words “and on and after 3rd December, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 35 per cent.,” be inserted.

The Committee divided.

Ayes	17
Noes	28
<hr/>			
Majority	11

AYES.

Archer, E. W.
Atkinson, L.
Brown, Tillev
Cook, Joseph
Edwards, R.
Fairbairn, G.
Forrest, Sir John
Fysh, Sir Philip
Hedges, W. N.

Johnson, W. E.
Livingston, J.
McWilliams, W. J.
Palmer, A. C.
Thomson, Dugald
Wynne, A.
Tellers:
Bowden, E. K.
Wilks, W. H.

NOES.

Batchelor, E. L.
Carr, E. S.
Chanter, J. M.
Chapman, Austin
Coon, J.
Crouch, R. A.
Deakin, A.
Fisher, A.
Groom, L. E.
Harper, R.
Knox, W.
Lyne, Sir William
Maloney, W. R. N.
Mauger, S.
McDougall, J. K.

O'Malley, King
Page, J.
Quick, Sir John
Salmon, C. C.
Sampson, S.
Spence, W. G.
Storrer, D.
Tudor, F. G.
Watson, J. C.
Webster, W.
Wise, G. H.

Tellers:

Catts, J. H.
Cook, Hume

PAIRS.

Kelly, W. H.
Willis, Henry
Brown, Thomas
Smith, Bruce
Fuller, G. W.
Wilson, J. G.
Sinclair, H.
Reid, G. H.
Poynton, A.
Glynn, P. McM.
Fowler, J. M.
Liddell, F.

Kingston, C. C.
Thomson, John
Foster, F. J.
Hall, D. R.
Bamford, F. W.
Watkins, D.
Thomas, J.
Ewing, T. T.
Mathews, J.
Hutchison, J.
Irvine, Hans
Irvine, W. H.

Question so resolved in the negative.

Amendment negatived.

Item agreed to.

Mr. CROUCH (Corio) [5.18]. — I move—

That the following new item be added:—
“230A. Harness dressing, in casks containing over 40 gallons, on and after 3rd December, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 30 per cent.”

I propose this with the view of subsequently moving that the preferential duty be 25 per cent. A large quantity of harness dressing is imported in liquid form, and is used largely by farmers, agriculturists, and liverystable-keepers.

Mr. TUDOR.—They ought to pay the same duty as do others.

Mr. CROUCH.—Those who import the dressing in bulk have their packing and printing done in Australia; and I am assured that if the duty is not reduced, it will be necessary for them to have all this work done in the United Kingdom.

Mr. WATSON. — Why is the harness dressing not made here?

Mr. CROUCH.—The harness dressing that is required is not made here.

Mr. JOHNSON (Lang) [5.20].—I think that the honorable member for Corio might have advanced some more plausible reason for desiring to exempt particular persons from the payment of this duty. I wish to know why we should differentiate between one class of consumer and another class? Personally, I would exempt all from the payment of Customs duties, but seeing that that is impossible, I am not prepared to discriminate. It is astonishing to find that the honorable member for Corio is a free-trader in respect of this item, although in regard to every other item in the Tariff he is a protectionist.

Mr. CROUCH (Corio) [5.21].—One very good reason which might be urged in favour of my amendment is that the honorable member for Lang is opposed to it. The adoption of my proposal would mean the employment of a number of men in printing, packing, and tinning operations. That fact in itself will be a sufficient inducement to most protectionist members of the Committee to vote for it.

Amendment negatived.

Item 231. Graphite, or Plumbago, Black Lead and Foundry Black, in bulk, free.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [5.27].—A mistake has occurred in this item, upon which the A section of the Tariff Commission recommended a duty of 35 per cent. Representations were subsequently made to the Department that graphite could not be produced in Australia. Since the Tariff was introduced, however, abundant evidence has been forthcoming that it is produced in the Commonwealth, especially in South Australia.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—Where is it produced?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—In South Australia, especially. I therefore move—

That after the word "free" the words "and on and after 3rd December, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 35 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 30 per cent.," be added.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [5.28].—I should like to hear some reasons advanced as to why we should levy

such heavy duties upon articles which have hitherto been admitted free. Last year the total importations of the Commonwealth under this heading were valued at less than £5,000. Are we going to impose a duty of 30 per cent. upon plumbago for the purpose of compelling everybody in the Commonwealth to use the article which is produced somewhere in South Australia? I would further point out that graphite is the raw material of other industries.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—But it is produced here.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The item in the Tariff has reference to prepared graphite.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Abundant evidence is available that it can be prepared in the Commonwealth.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—We ought to have some assurance that it is being produced here in sufficient quantities for all commercial purposes before we consent to such heavy imposts upon it.

Mr. BATCHELOR (Boothby) [5.30].—There is no doubt that graphite is being produced in the Commonwealth. There is a mine working in Queensland, and another near Tumby Bay, in the electoral district of Grey, South Australia.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—Do these mines turn out much graphite?

Mr. BATCHELOR.—They have turned out a considerable quantity, but, as the article has hitherto been admitted free, the industry has not proved remunerative. The Ceylon mines are its chief competitors, and most of the plumbago used in the Commonwealth is imported from that island. Messrs. Burford and Company, who manufacture articles of which graphite forms the base, use a very considerable quantity of the locally-obtained ore. I have seen testimonials as to its character—testimonials which are now in the hands of the Treasurer. Samples of this ore have also been submitted to Messrs. Lewis and Whitty.

Mr. BOWDEN.—Do the honorable member's remarks apply only to graphite and plumbago?

Mr. BATCHELOR.—Yes.

Mr. MCWILLIAMS.—Is it not a fact that only a very small quantity of ore is required?

Mr. BATCHELOR.—The ore is used largely for moulding purposes, the object being to obtain a clean smooth face. For

that purpose, there is no doubt that the local ore is as good as any that can be obtained in the world. The company which has been mining for plumbago have found that, under existing conditions, the industry will not pay. I understand that they have asked for a duty of £2 per ton, which would represent a slightly less *ad valorem* rate than that proposed by the Treasurer. I think it would be equivalent to about 25 per cent. If we have suitable ore in Australia for the production of this material, we certainly ought to encourage the industry. Even if an additional £2 per ton were added to the price of the local article, its cost would be very little in excess of that of the imported article.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—£2 per ton would represent about 25 per cent.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—The local article is sold to-day for less than is the imported article.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Does the honorable member know its price?

Mr. BATCHELOR.—The figures have been supplied to the Treasurer. Plumbago is a native production, and the industry ought therefore to be encouraged.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [5.34].—I wish to point out the anomaly that we are about to create. Upon the previous item, we decided to levy a duty of 40 per cent. under the general Tariff, and of 35 per cent. under the Tariff for Great Britain. In other words, we imposed duties of 40 per cent. and 35 per cent. upon the raw materials of the leather-makers and harness-makers, who enjoy a protection of only 25 per cent. upon their finished article. Now we are asked to tax, to the tune of 30 per cent., another raw material of manufactures which are dutiable at 25 per cent. Is there any sense in taxing raw materials at a higher rate than we do the manufactured article? The position is an absurd one. We are simply multiplying Tariff anomalies. As sure as this schedule is passed in its present form, an outcry will be raised against it by reason of the many anomalies which have been created. When we come to deal with substantial industries, the Treasurer insists that there shall be a large margin between the rate levied upon the manufactured article and that imposed upon the raw material. But, in respect of small matters, he adopts the reverse attitude. I would suggest that he should withdraw his proposal, and be content to levy very much smaller duties upon this item.

Mr. WATSON (South Sydney) [5.37].—No protectionist member of the Committee will object to extending to this industry a fair measure of protection, especially as its raw material is obtainable in the Commonwealth. But it does seem to me that 35 per cent. is a very stiff charge to levy upon graphite, particularly in view of the fact that it is the raw material of other industries. If the Treasurer secured a duty of 25 per cent. under the general Tariff, and of 20 per cent. under the Tariff for the United Kingdom—seeing that the item has not previously been subjected to duty—he would be securing a very fair thing.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The Treasurer has not yet told us the value of graphite.

Mr. WATSON.—As I understand, this plumbago is simply concentrated from its crude state, and is then placed upon the market.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—It is worth about £6 per ton.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Its value is nearer £9 per ton.

Mr. WATSON.—In any case, I think that 35 per cent. is too high an impost. I do not feel disposed to vote for any rate in excess of 20 per cent.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—If that is the feeling of the Committee, the honorable member had better move in that direction. I ask leave to withdraw my amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. WATSON.—I move—

That the words "and on and after 3rd December, 1907, *ad val.* (General Tariff), 20 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 20 per cent.," be added.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I will accept a duty of 20 per cent. all round.

Mr. BOWDEN (Nepean) [5.40].—The compositions which it is proposed to make dutiable are not produced in this country to any extent, not for want of protection, but simply because the demand is so small, our annual consumption being about 600 tons only. Two or three men could produce that quantity in about a fortnight. These things are used almost wholly in connexion with some of the better castings in the manufacture of iron. The imposition of a duty will penalize certain manufactures, and will not have the effect of stimulating local production. The debate which we

have had shows how ill advised it is for the Treasurer to bring down on the spur of the moment proposals which run contrary to those originally embodied in the Tariff, and I hope that in future ample notice will be given of the intention to move such amendments as have been proposed.

Amendment agreed to.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 232. Bronzing and metal powders, ad val., 20 per cent.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [5.42].—I hope that the Treasurer will give a preference to the United Kingdom by making the importations from that country dutiable at 15 per cent.

Mr. WATSON.—Bronzing powders are made here.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Yes; but there are also importations, and we should, if we can, encourage the use of imported powders coming from the United Kingdom rather than of those coming from foreign countries.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—If the honorable member's proposals were adopted, the duty against importation from the United Kingdom would be 5 per cent. lower than under the old Tariff.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—What harm would that do? I move—

That the words "and on and after 3rd December, 1907, ad val. (United Kingdom), 15 per cent.," be added.

Mr. BOWDEN (Nepean) [5.43].—I shall support the amendment. Bronzing and metal liquids imported from the United Kingdom are dutiable at a rate 5 per cent. lower than that imposed on foreign importations, and why should not a similar arrangement be made in regard to bronzing and metal powders?

Mr. WATSON.—Nearly all the importations of bronze and metal powders come from Germany.

Amendment negatived.

Item agreed to.

Item 233 (Tallow and Greases) agreed to.

Item 234. Oils—

In vessels not exceeding one gallon, viz. :—

(A) Quarter-pints and smaller sizes per doz.

(B) Half-pints and over quarter-pints ... per doz.

(C) Pints and over a half-pint ... per doz.

(D) Quarts and over a pint ... per doz.

(E) Over a quart ... per gal.

In vessels exceeding one gallon, viz. :—

(F) Cotton Seed ... per gal.

(G) Cotton Seed when denaturated as prescribed by Departmental by-law ... per gal.

(H) Olive ... per gal.

(I) Castor; Colza; Linseed ... per gal.

(J) Lubricating (Mineral)* ... per gal.

(K) Mineral n.e.i.; Naphtha; Benzine; Benzoline; Gasoline; Pentane; Petrol; Turpentine Substitutes; and the like ... per gal.

(L) Solar Oils, and Residual Oils† ... per gal.

(M) N.E.I., including Cloth Oil ... per gal.

(N) Castor-oleine and other Saponifiable Oils ... per gal.

(O) Kerosene and other Refined Petroleum Oils, in packages less than 10 gallons in content ... per gal.

(P) Kerosene, and other Refined Petroleum Oils, n.e.i. ...

(General Tariff).

(United Kingdom).

1s. 6d.

3s.

6s.

12s.

4s.

2s.

6d.

2s.

6d.

3½d.

3d.

¾d.

¼d.

¼d.

6d.

6d.

3d.

Free.

* An admixture not exceeding 2 per cent. of any vegetable or animal oil or other foreign matter shall not be deemed to render the oil liable to any higher duty.

† When the Department is in doubt as to the exact nature of any oil so described it shall be denaturated accordance with Departmental By-laws.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [5.45].—A tremendous increase is proposed in the duty on oils imported in vessels not exceeding one gallon.

Mr. WATSON.—That is in accordance with the recommendations of the Tariff Commission.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Yes, but the rate is three times that of the old duty.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The object is to get the work of bottling done here.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Are we justified in increasing the duty so largely to obtain so small an advantage? The revenue obtained annually from the old duty, which was a heavy one, was less than £4,000, which shows how small the importation of oil in small vessels is. The proposed duty, when levied on twelve gross of bottles of sewing machine oil, gives these results: freight, £1 15s. 4d., or 18.83 per cent.; duty on the oil, £10 16s., or 146.93 per cent.; duty on the bottles, £7 16s., or 106.12 per cent.; in all, £20 7s. 4d., or 271.88 per cent.

Mr. WATSON.—Why cannot the oil be imported and bottled here?

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—What will be the worth of the industry if all the bottling is done here?

Mr. WATSON.—In the aggregate, it may come to a good deal.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—As the annual revenue under the old Tariff was only £4,000, the whole of the bottling, if done locally, would give very little employment. Are we going to compel the users of sewing machine oil, many of whom belong to the poorer classes, to pay more for it, by requiring it to be brought here in bulk, and bottled locally, than they pay now?

Mr. WATSON.—Even with the duty added, the cost will be very little. A bottle of sewing machine oil costs 6d., and one is bought perhaps once in four months.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The honorable member has used that argument before. He forgets that the total result of these small charges will be very considerable.

Mr. WATSON.—On the honorable member's own showing it would be only £8,000 spread over the consumers of all kinds of oil.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The oils on which this duty is imposed are largely sewing machine oils.

Mr. WATSON.—It is not correct to say that sewing machine oils make up the bulk

of the importations. Olive oil, bicycle oil, and other kinds of oil come within the item.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Olive, castor, and other oils come out to a certain extent, but not to a very large extent. The previous duty has evidently led to the local packing of a large quantity of the oils used here. But to impose duties which with the charges come to 271 per cent. is, I think, beyond all reason. The freight amounts to 18.83 per cent., and, of course, the freight is higher on packed oil than on bulk oils; the duty on the oil amounts to 146.93 per cent., and the duty on the bottles amounts to 106.12 per cent., making a total of nearly 272 per cent. I propose to move an amendment on the first line of the item, which, if carried, will, I presume, be an indication that that reduction shall be made throughout the item. I move—

That after the figures "1s. 6d.," paragraph A, the words "and on and after 3rd December, 1907, per doz., 6d.," be inserted.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [5.51].—The A section of the Tariff Commission recommended a graduated increase in the duty on bottled or packed oil, but no increase in the duty on bulk oil, except in the case of olive oil. The object in recommending an increased duty on bottled oil was to induce persons to import oil in bulk and bottle it here.

Mr. FRAZER (Kalgoorlie) [5.53].—The Minister might well consider whether in the interests of the community it is not advisable to refrain from imposing an additional duty on bottled oils. The honorable member for Bendigo has admitted the object which the A section of the Tariff Commission had in view in submitting their recommendation, and that was to encourage the local bottling of oils imported in bulk.

Mr. WATSON.—If we can produce the oils here, so much the better.

Mr. FRAZER.—Except in the case of olive oil, our chance of producing the raw materials is limited at the present time. The honorable member for North Sydney has submitted a reasonable amendment. The old duty was 6d. a dozen, and the employment of labour which the local bottling of the oils would create does not justify us in putting an additional impost upon the consumers. As the honorable member for Perth remarked the other night, the local bottling of somebody else's product in very likely somebody else's bottles is a parasitical industry. It has to be

spread over six States. I trust that the Minister will see his way to accept the amendment.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [5.55].—These items show the real inwardness of many of the protectionist proposals which are made here. Apparently the only idea of some protectionists is not to strive to protect our manufacturers from outside competition so far as the great staple industries are concerned, but to try in tiddlywinking ways to make work for some persons here.

Mr. WATSON.—Hear, hear; that is what we want to do.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—At the beginning of the twentieth century, the ex-Labour leader has only got to the point that he is still concentrating his energies in the direction of making work, as such. He is very much behind the economic movement of which he is supposed to be a leader. I thought that we were past that time. The inevitable result of these duties must be to encourage the importation of the articles.

Mr. WATSON.—That should satisfy the honorable member.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK. — By imposing the duties honorable members create a vested interest in the importation of the goods. Apart altogether from the absurdity of imposing high duties to secure the mere bottling of the oils, they are encouraging their importation. With our climate and with handicrafts such as we shall develop very shortly we ought to make Australia quite self-supporting in regard to all these natural products. If, with all the advantages which our isolation gives us, we cannot beat the world in the production of these articles, we shall be in a very bad way indeed. I hope that we shall not go on imposing duties which do not protect a manufacture as such, but protect only a minor process in connexion with some manufacture. The more we can tie the producing and the bottling of the things together the more efficiently we must necessarily make the production of them, and the better it will be for the consumer and all concerned.

Mr. WATSON (South Sydney) [5.57].—The honorable member for Parramatta—who by the way is more an “ex” as a Labour leader than I am—has accused me of desiring to make work as such. I have no such desire, but I think that a great deal of argument can be urged in favour of transferring work which we can accomplish from parts of the world.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—No matter what the conditions are under which we can accomplish that work?

Mr. WATSON.—Of course there are exceptions, but the general principle has, I think, a lot to recommend it to honorable members. It is much better to do our own work than to pay other persons to do it for us.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Surely in all these matters we must pay some regard to the efficiency of production?

Mr. WATSON.—I admit that the old duty was not quite high enough, but we need not go so far as the Tariff Commission has recommended. We want to be careful not to admit oils in bottles at a lower rate than that we propose to place on the oils and the bottles when brought in separately. That is one point which I think honorable members should keep in mind. The bottling of oils in Australia should be encouraged because it is a light, clean occupation for girls. There is no reason why nearly the whole of the olive, castor and linseed oils should not be bottled here instead of being bottled for us abroad. I think that the honorable member for North Sydney was mistaken in what he said as to the proportion of the imports. According to his statement, the duty paid on oils imported in small packages totalled only £4,000, and that included castor oil, which is imported very largely in small bottles.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—It is mostly bottled here.

Mr. WATSON.—Crosse and Blackwell and Morton, particularly the latter, still export to Australia a great quantity of castor oil. It is extra refined, and is claimed to be tasteless. It is imported very largely in small bottles, as well as bicycle and machine oils. The increased duty recommended by the A section of the Tariff Commission is rather high. I do not see why it should be fixed at more than 1s.

Mr. WYNNE (Balaclava) [6.1].—I, as a protectionist, have always felt that what we want to establish in Australia are large producing industries. I cannot imagine that the employment of persons to pour oil out of tins into bottles is likely to create a large industry. On the contrary, it seems to me to be a waste of valuable time that might be better employed in the carrying on of some industry which would be of benefit and use to the people as a whole.

Mr. WATSON.—Are not the making of bottles, the printing of labels, and the

manufacturing of cases things to be considered?

Mr. WYNNE.—Those are very small things. When oil is sent out in casks there is considerable waste and leakage, and the more the article is handled the greater is the cost to the consumer. It can be bottled abroad and delivered at considerably less cost to the consumer than it can be when it is sent out in bulk and put through different processes here. I remember the time in Victoria when, in order to give work, they used to employ men to dig holes in Melbourne and then fill them. That was thought to be a grand way of providing employment. The pouring of oil out of casks into bottles is very much on a par with the employment of men to dig holes only to fill them. Let us establish in this country all the industries we can. Do not let us put on duties which will increase the cost of an article without doing any good to the worker. We have agreed to give a bounty upon the production of certain oils. We have, to some extent, tried to induce persons to grow cotton and olives and other materials for the production of oil. When a duty is imposed on oil for protective purposes, it is all right. But we ought not to impose duties simply in connexion with the covering of an article. It is a poor sort of protection to charge a duty on the straw or packages in which articles are imported. Let us be fair and square; let us put a duty on the article itself and keep it there, but do not let us say that any goods shall not be packed in any country but Australia. From a protectionist standpoint, that is not an evidence of strength, but rather a petty-minded sort of taxation of the people.

Mr. STORRER (Bass) [6.4].—In my opinion, the duty proposed by the Treasurer is rather high. In my notes, I set down 1s. per dozen—that is double the old rate—as a fair duty. The honorable member for Balaclava has stated that the bottling of oils is not an industry. He should remember that bottle-making in Victoria is a very considerable industry, and one which may be increased to a very large extent. Recently I visited a local factory, where I saw bottles being made. I thought it was a very good thing to see so much bottle-making carried on in the community. If the bottling of oil is encouraged, it will lead, not only to bottle-making, but also to case-making and packing. It is all these little things which go to make up a great industry.

It is of no use to speak of one large industry. Only by having a multitude of industries can we do good to Australia; and if we can, by means of this Tariff, cause oil to be bottled here, we shall be doing good for at least one Australian industry and providing means of employment for a large number of people.

Mr. BOWDEN (Nepean) [6.6].—I wish to ask the Treasurer whether he is going to be consistent in regard to olive oil? When we were dealing with the duties affecting iron and steel, the Treasurer stated that where a bounty was granted, the duty would not operate at the same time. I remind the Treasurer that in the Bounties Bill we have provided for a bounty on olive oil. To be consistent with his former statement, he should provide that the duty on olive oil shall not operate at the same time.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [6.7].—The increase of duty proposed is based upon the analogy of the differentiation between bulk and bottled beer. On bulk beer, the duty is 1s. per gallon, and on beer in bottles, 1s. 6d. per gallon. The analogy holds good in regard to oil.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [6.8].—May I point out to the honorable member for Bendigo that the difference in duty between bulk beer and bottled beer is 50 per cent. In this case, the difference is much more than that. The duty now proposed is an increase of 300 per cent. on the old duty. It cannot be said that an increase from 6d. per gallon on cotton-seed oil and 3½d. on a lubricating oil, to 3s. per half-pint is an increase of only 50 per cent. It has been suggested to me that there ought to be a preference in favour of Great Britain in this case, and, therefore, I am willing to alter my amendment to make the duty 9d. on the general Tariff, and 6d. against the United Kingdom. May I ask, also, how far the Committee propose to go with this sort of industry? It would not involve going much further to say that we will not import refined oil, or that we will impose such a duty upon refined oil as to compel it to be refined here.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—It would be better to have a large refining industry.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—If the Committee is prepared to say, "We will make it unprofitable to import refined oil," we might by such means establish a refining industry, but we should have the most

extraordinary system of protection imposed in any part of the world.

Mr. FRAZER.—The honorable member had better stick to his proposal of 6d. per gallon.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON. — Some honorable members desire to give a preference, and, with that end in view, I desire to amend my amendment so as to make the duty 9d. per gallon in the general Tariff, with a view to inserting 6d. per gallon against imports from the United Kingdom.

Amendment amended accordingly.

Mr. MATHEWS (Melbourne Ports) [6.10].—The bottle-making industry is concerned to some extent in the item under discussion. It is useless to impose a higher duty on the imported bottles if we allow bottles to come in free when full of liquid. I do not know whether honorable members are considering what it would mean to the trade of Australia if all the bottles in which commodities are sold were made here. In three States—Victoria, New South Wales, and South Australia—about 1,800 hands are employed in the bottle industry, and some hundreds of thousands of pounds are invested in it. The most serious competitor that the industry has to face is the bottle that is imported free with a duty on the contents. Bottle making requires the service of high class mechanics. If all the bottles used in Australia were manufactured here, there would be work for thousands more artisans. In the first place, work would be provided in bottling commodities if they were imported in bulk and bottled for the market in Australia. The printing of labels and the making of cases would also involve the employment of a large amount of labour. Honorable members know that many men have been thrown out of employment in the printing trade through the introduction of the linotype. We have here an opportunity of increasing employment in the printing trade, and so absorbing the services of many of these unemployed workmen. I see no reason why the making of oils should not become an important industry in Australia. Some of the oils which honorable members opposite laughed at when we were dealing with the Bounties Bill, such as peanut oil and sunflower seed oil, are of great commercial value, and might just as well be manufactured in this country. I realize that the temper of the Committee has led to the reduction of duties, but I trust that in this

instance a truly protective duty will be imposed for the benefit of those who are manufacturing oils in Australia.

Mr. WILKS (Dalley) [6.15].—The argument of the honorable member who has just resumed his seat was that so many commodities are brought out in bottles that there is so much less work for those engaged in the bottle-making industry in this country. Why, then, does not the honorable member propose that articles which are sold in bottles shall be imported only in bulk? If his concern is simply for the use of Australian-made bottles, I make this suggestion to him—that if the bottle trade is being injured, as he makes out, the way to get over the difficulty is to insert in the Tariff a proviso that imported oils must come out in bulk. Why should I vote for a high duty which would not do what the honorable member wants? I think that the honorable member for North Sydney made out a good case, and I do not see any necessity for a high rate of duty on oil. We can consider what is necessary for the bottle industry when we deal with the item affecting bottles. I admit with the honorable member for Melbourne Ports that the trade is a very large one, and I also remember that there is a bottle factory in my own electorate. In fact, there is hardly anything worth having in Australia that is not made in my electorate. Its representative is, in himself, a very good sample of what can be produced there. However, the “bottle ho” argument has really nothing to do with the case, and I must support the honorable member for North Sydney’s amendment.

Mr. CARR (Macquarie) [6.18].—I wish to raise a protest against this new duty upon goods which we do not, and, I think, cannot, make here. There is a duty on bottles which will have to be considered hereafter, and I am prepared to protect the bottle-making industry as far as is reasonable. But we make no castor oil in Australia, nor do we make many of the other oils which are affected by this duty. I will support a duty of 2s. per gallon on olive oil. I take it that we can so devise the Tariff as to make duties apply to bottles and not to their contents. I shall not vote for a duty on goods which cannot be manufactured in Australia, unless it can be made plain to me that there is not another way of getting a duty on bottles. But I fail to see that there is no other way. I should think that the Trade and Customs Department ought to be able to conceive

of a means of imposing a duty on bottles without touching their contents. If the Minister will explain whether there is such a means, I should like to hear him.

Mr. WATSON (South Sydney) [6.20].—I think that the honorable member for Macquarie is labouring under a misapprehension. He says that he is prepared to vote for a duty on olive oil.

Mr. WYNNE.—There is not enough olive oil produced; it is difficult to get pure olive oil anywhere.

Mr. WATSON.—That is a reason why we should penalize those who sell other oil as olive oil. We have in Australia large areas capable of producing sufficient olive oil to meet the world's demand. In some parts of New South Wales, including my old electorate, olives are grown to perfection. The honorable member for Macquarie has, I think, overlooked the fact that if we abolish the duty on bottled olive oil it would be unfair to impose a duty on olive oil in bulk, because those who at present import oil in bulk and bottle it in Australia would thus be placed at a disadvantage.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—It is not proposed to abolish the duty on olive oil in bottles.

Mr. WATSON.—The honorable member for Macquarie indicated that he was in favour of its abolition.

Mr. CARR.—Not in the case of the oil. I asked the Government to distinguish, but they have bungled the whole thing.

Mr. WATSON.—I was referring, not to olive oil in bulk, but to what might be imported in bottles as olive oil. Many people in Australia are employed in bottling these oils.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—How many are employed in pouring bulk oil into bottles?

Mr. WATSON.—I cannot say; but a great many people are so employed in factories in Sydney and Melbourne that I have visited. The question is not confined, as the honorable member for Balaclava seemed to suggest, to the pouring of imported oil into imported bottles.

Mr. WYNNE.—I did not say that the bottles were imported.

Mr. WATSON.—In many cases the bottles are made in Sydney and Melbourne.

Mr. HARPER.—Then there are the labels.

Mr. WATSON.—The labels, the cases, and the cartons, which are made locally.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—And the cases are often made out of imported timber.

Mr. WATSON.—The majority of the cases used in Sydney are made from timber grown on the north coast of that State.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—And we must not forget the corks and the sealing-wax!

Mr. WATSON.—All these things combined tend to give employment to a large number of people.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—And that was done under the old Tariff.

Mr. WATSON.—I am aware of that. I think it is a mistake to assume that we have before us in this case merely a question of pouring imported oil into imported bottles. Bottles are made very largely in Australia, and if we allow these oils in bottles in at a very low duty that trade will disappear.

Mr. PAGE (Maranoa) [6.24].—It appears to me that we have in this case an instance of protection run mad. The honorable member for South Sydney seems to be particularly anxious about the bottle-making industry.

Mr. WATSON.—We shall deal later on with the item of bottles.

Mr. PAGE.—If we are going to protect the bottle industry, why these hysterics about the bottles used in the olive oil trade? The imported olive oil and castor oil in general use is bottled in the Old Country by Morton and Company. A poor man wanting a penny bottle of ink has now to pay an extra penny for it, because a duty of 1d. has been placed on the bottle.

Mr. WATSON.—That is not the question. Would it not be a good idea, Mr. Chairman, for the honorable member to confine himself to the question?

Mr. PAGE.—When the honorable member takes up the cudgels on behalf of any proposal, I am satisfied that there is something in it, but I think it would be monstrous to put an extra penny duty on every bottled package. Like the honorable member for Macquarie, I prefer that some of these oils should come in free, and I shall divide the Committee on the question. I fail to see how the bottle industry in the honorable member for South Sydney's electorate will be affected by this item.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The honorable member's eyesight is bad.

Mr. PAGE.—The honorable member does not say that when I vote with him. I am afraid that, like the Treasurer, I am getting one-eyed so far as many items are concerned. How will it be possible for the importers to put these oils on the market? If they have to import the oil in bulk, they will have to erect refineries out here. When

I ask for a bottle of olive oil or for a bottle of castor oil, I am prepared to take only that put up by Morton and Company.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The best olive oil in the world is made in South Australia.

Mr. PAGE.—But the producers will not bottle it here; they send it Home in bulk, and it is imported in bottles.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—No; olive oil bottled in South Australia can be obtained.

Mr. PAGE.—I buy olive oil chiefly to grease my buggy wheels. I fail to see how it can be said that this proposal will be an interference with the bottle-making trade, the printing industry, and the great gum and cork industries.

The CHAIRMAN. — The honorable member must not discuss the merits of other industries.

Mr. PAGE.—The honorable member for South Sydney was allowed to do so.

The CHAIRMAN.—He made merely an incidental reference to other industries.

Mr. PAGE.—I did not intend to do more, and I certainly do not wish to disobey your ruling.

Sitting suspended from 6.30 to 7.45 p.m.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [7.45].—The honorable member for South Sydney made some allusion to an industry of this kind carried on in his old electorate. I presume that the honorable member was referring to the State Agricultural Farm at Wagga Wagga. I know of no other place in the district where olives are grown. I think it may be said of that establishment, and of every place in Australia where olives are grown, that those engaged in the cultivation of the olive manufacture the oil and do their own bottling as well. These duties represent a deliberate attempt to separate the processes followed in the production of olive oil. The bottling is as much a part of the production of olive oil for commercial purposes as is the growth of the olives for the manufacture of the oil.

Mr. CARR.—It is all done in South Australia, and the duty would not affect it.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—My point is that, in order to make the production of the oil as economical as possible, the processes are not separated anywhere where olive oil is produced. Here it is proposed to separate them with the object of giving a few men work. This would necessarily make the production of the oil more expensive, and raise the cost to the consumer. The Government proposal aims at something against which those who believe that we should make all these things for our-

selves should specially set their faces. Anything which leads to expensive production cannot ultimately benefit those engaged in an industry, whether as workers or as employers. I think we should oppose this duty if for no other reason than to try to force the producers of olive oil to undertake the whole of the processes necessary to place it on the market. If the object in imposing the duties proposed is to compel people not to import oil in bottles, we might go further, and insist that oil imported in large bottles should be taken out of them and bottled again in smaller bottles. Let honorable members consider for a moment how that would encourage the bottling industry.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—If we compelled engines to be imported in the form of pig iron, that would give more work.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Quite so; and one might multiply instances of the kind indefinitely. I am not quite sure that the honorable member for Balaclava did not hit the nail on the head when he suggested that the proper analogy was the sinking of holes for the purpose of filling them up again in order to create work. If we really wished to make work for the bottle-makers of Australia, perhaps the shortest way would be to smash all the bottles we have here at present. There would be just as much sense in that as the method selected by the Government for purposes of taxation in this instance. If the bottle industry is to be encouraged by Parliament, let us encourage it in a straightforward way by imposing a duty on bottles, instead of by the intricate round-about way proposed by the Government. I should like to know whether the Minister intends to adhere to the excessive duties he has proposed. Some of the duties submitted are absurdly high, and apparently they have been submitted only on the plea that we should make work for Australians. In this young country, with its boundless resources, virgin soil, and productive capacity, we should be able to turn labour into more remunerative channels than the mere bottling of oil. I hope the Minister will consent to reduce these duties to a reasonable rate. I think it would be reasonable to put the duty in paragraph A up from 6d. to 9d., instead of to 1s. 6d., as proposed by the Minister.

Mr. CARR (Macquarie) [7.50].—I do not think there is much in the point raised by the honorable member as applied to South Australian oils, because in that State the oil produced is bottled straight away. I have no objection to the imposition

of a duty on olive oil, because we can make enough locally to supply the whole of Australia. My trouble with the Government is that I think there should be no discrimination in the duty levied as to bottles. The duty should be levied on bottles as bottles, without respect to what they contain. I am as anxious to cultivate the industry of bottle-making as is the honorable member for South Sydney, and as anxious to impose a duty on oils that can be produced here, but I am opposed to a revenue duty on mere oils. If we were given an opportunity to deal with bulk importations first, we should know where we were. I do not object to the imposition of a substantial duty on the importation in bulk of oils that we can make in Australia, or to a reasonable duty on bottles as bottles, which, of course, would affect everything imported in bottles. I ask the Government to reconsider the form in which they have submitted these duties, and give honorable members an opportunity to cast an intelligent vote.

Mr. STORRER (Bass) [7.54].—I am getting tired of this subject, but I think we might effect a compromise. There is only a difference of 3d. between the proposal made by the honorable member for North Sydney and that which I have made. I am willing that in this case the duty shall be 1s. under the general Tariff, and 9d. on imports from the United Kingdom.

Question—That after the figures "1s. 6d.," paragraph A, the words "and on and after 3rd December, 1907, per doz., 9d.," be inserted (Mr. DUGALD THOMSON'S amendment)—put. The Committee divided.

Ayes	16
Noes	19

Majority	3
----------	-----	-----	---

AYES.

Archer, E. W.
Bowden, E. K.
Carr, E. S.
Cook, Joseph
Edwards, R.
Forrest, Sir John
Fraser, C. E.
Irvine, W. H.
Knox, W.

Page, J.
Sampson, S.
Thomson, Dugald
Wilks, W. H.
Wynne, A.

Tellers:

Atkinson, L.
Johnson, W. E.

NOES.

Catts, J. H.
Chanter, J. M.
Chapman, Austin
Coon, J.
Deakin, A.
Fisher, A.
Groom, L. E.
Hedges, W. N.
Lyne, Sir William
Mauger, S.

Palmer, A. C.
Quick, Sir John
Storrer, D.
Tudor, F. G.
Watson, J. C.
Webster, W.
Wise, G. H.
Tellers:
Cook, Hume.
Crouch, R. A.

PAIRS.

Kelly, W. H.
Fysh, Sir Philip
Liddell, F.
Willis, Henry
Brown, Thomas
Smith, Bruce
Fuller, G. W.
Wilson, J. G.
Mahon, H.
Sinclair, H.
Reid, G. H.
Poynton, A.
Glynn, P. McM.
Livingston, J.
Fairbairn, G.
McWilliams, W. J.
Fowler, J. M.

Kingston, C. C.
Harper, R.
Salmon, C. C.
Thomson, John
Foster, F. J.
Hall, D. R.
Hamford, F. W.
Watkins, D.
Spence, W. G.
Thomas, J.
Ewing, T. T.
Mathews, J.
Hutchison, J.
Batchelor, E. L.
Maloney, W. R. N.
O'Malley, King
McDougall, J. K.

Question so resolved in the negative.

Amendment negatived.

Amendment (by Mr. STORRER) agreed to—

That after the figures "1s. 6d.," paragraph A, the words "and on and after 3rd December, 1907, per dozen (General Tariff), 1s.; (United Kingdom), 9d.," be inserted.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [8.2].—I will take the decision on paragraph A as the decision of the Committee with regard to paragraphs B to E, and will propose duties in proportion. I move—

That after the figures "3s.," paragraph B, the words "and on and after 3rd December, 1907, per dozen (General Tariff), 2s.; (United Kingdom), 1s. 6d.," be inserted.

Amendment agreed to.

Amendments (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That after the figures "6s.," paragraph C, the words "and on and after 3rd December, 1907, per dozen (General Tariff), 4s.; (United Kingdom), 3s.," be inserted.

That after the figures "12s.," paragraph D, the words "and on and after 3rd December, 1907, per dozen (General Tariff), 8s.; (United Kingdom), 6s.," be inserted.

That after the figures "4s.," paragraph E, the words "and on and after 3rd December, 1907, per gal. (General Tariff), 2s. 8d.; (United Kingdom), 2s.," be inserted.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [8.5].—I move—

That after the word "seed," paragraph F, the words "and China" be inserted.

Mr. PAGE.—China oil is used as a lubricant. The Minister has given us no explanation of why he has taken it out of paragraph J.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I propose to put China oil in this paragraph, because it has come into competition with olive oil for edible purposes, in the same way as has cotton seed oil.

Mr. WYNNE.—What is it made from?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I think it is made from peanuts. The importations during the years 1903 to 1905 were considerable. The following are the figures—1903—£21,869; 1904, £17,597; 1905, £21,784, so that the quantity is fairly constant.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [8.7].—China oil is used as an illuminant. This is a very heavy tax on miners and others who use it for their lamps. All the coal miners use it for that purpose.

Mr. HARPER.—They use denaturated oil, which is free.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Is that quite clear?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [8.8].—There is a footnote as follows—

When the Department is in doubt as to the exact nature of any oil so described it shall be denaturated in accordance with the departmental by-laws.

That is what is done if this oil is required for the purpose to which the honorable member for Parramatta refers. It then comes in free, and the miners pay no duty on it. But the Department has to be sure that it is going to be used for that purpose.

Mr. HARPER (Mernda) [8.9].—China oil is a highly refined oil. It is quite true that it is used by miners in their lamps. When the last Tariff was passed, it was admitted at a low rate of duty for that reason, but it was discovered immediately afterwards that that oil, which formerly was somewhat crude, was being highly refined and used for the same purposes as were olive oil and cotton-seed oil. It ought therefore to be in the same category. The denaturated oil is admitted free for use in lamps.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [8.11].—I move—

That after the figures "2s." paragraph H, the words "and on and after 3rd December, 1907, per gallon, 1s. 4d.," be inserted.

Even if this reduction be made, olive oil will get a very stiff protection, whilst, in addition, we have recently passed a very substantial bounty for its production. On the whole, the olive oil industry is doing very well without the imposition of further duties.

Mr. WATSON (South Sydney) [8.12].—The Tariff Commission's recommendation of a duty of 2s. a gallon on olive oil should be adhered to. The honorable member for Parramatta is quite mistaken

in regard to the bounty on olive oil. The Attorney-General, who was in charge of the Bounties Bill, confirms my recollection that the item was struck out of the Bill.

Mr. GROOM.—Yes; and, on the strength of that, bounties for the production of two or three other oils were also rejected.

Mr. WATSON.—It is therefore hardly fair to urge the bounty which the manufacturers did not get as a reason for reducing the duty.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—It has a very stiff protection without that.

Mr. WATSON.—I do not think so, in view of the value of olive oil, and of the fact that Australia can produce so much of it.

Mr. BOWDEN (Nepean) [8.13].—I should like to know definitely whether the bounty proposed for olive oil was struck out?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—It was struck out in this House.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. FRAZER (Kalgoorlie) [8.16].—The duty proposed on lubricating mineral oil in the general Tariff is 3½d. per gallon; and I think that the Government might very well forego the farthing. Having regard to the quantity and quality of the lubricating oil produced in Australia, 3d. per gallon represents a very substantial protection, and I ask the Minister to fix the duty at that amount. This mineral lubricating oil is quite distinct from olive oil, being extensively used wherever engines and machinery are required.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I feel very much disposed to make the duty 6d. per gallon.

Mr. WATSON.—This is a very good New South Wales industry.

Mr. FRAZER.—If it is a good New South Wales industry I suppose we may regard the matter as settled, so far as any hope of a reduction in the duty is concerned. Honorable members just now were very enthusiastic in following the recommendation of the Tariff Commission in the case of olive oil; and I may remind them that the Commission in the case of lubricating oil recommended a duty of 3d. per gallon.

Mr. LIVINGSTON.—A large quantity of olive oil is produced in Australia.

Mr. FRAZER.—Quite so; but the case of lubricating mineral oil is quite different.

Mr. CARR (Macquarie) [8.20].—I am surprised to hear the honorable member for

Kalgoorlie say that mineral lubricating oil cannot be produced in Australia.

Mr. FRAZER.—I did not say that.

Mr. CARR.—The honorable member said that he did not know of any that was produced here. However, I may inform honorable members that a considerable quantity of lubricating mineral oil is produced in Australia. One company in my electorate is producing this oil from kerosene shale, and several other companies are likely to be soon in operation. Several large leases of shale country, comprising some 20,000 acres each, have been taken up in the Blue Mountains district, and the enterprise is likely to supply all the oil required in this country. The Commonwealth Oil Company turns out black and blue oils, which are equivalent to solar, residual, and lubricating oils, to the amount of about 3,000,000 gallons per annum, and it is hoped that that output will be increased to 5,000,000 or 6,000,000 gallons at the end of this or the beginning of next year. Such enterprise is entitled to some consideration when we are dealing with the Tariff; and the present duty. I may say, is not sufficient to deter foreign manufacturers from dumping their product here. The local manufacturers are quite satisfied with the price of from 1s. 3d. to 2s. per gallon, but there is always a danger that when they come into competition, the foreign manufacturers may cut prices. Specific cases have been brought under my notice, in which local companies have lost tenders by this cutting on the part of foreign producers; and this has gone on to such an extent that the position has had to be seriously considered. The Standard Oil Company, and the companies of Sumatra and other places, are able to produce so cheaply that they can afford to cut prices. I wish to emphasize the point that prices are not cut in the ordinary way of business, but only when these foreign manufacturers are called upon to tender against local people. If these oil deposits are to be developed, our own people must be protected against unfair competition; because, if the foreign producers succeed in disabling the local industry, the people of Australia will ultimately have to pay the piper. In my opinion, nothing less than 6d. per gallon will be of any material assistance; and such a duty would not have the effect of increasing the price to the consumer. All that the local producers desire is to be assured

of the local market at present rates. I may say that the total importation into Australia is about 4,000,000 gallons of heavy oils, including lubricating, solar, and residual oils and spirit such as naphtha, benzine, and motor spirit. It will thus be seen that our output of oil is now nearly equal to Australia's requirements, and will greatly exceed that quantity a few months hence. The honorable member for Kalgoorlie seemed to think that the manufacture of lubricating mineral oils in Australia is a negligible quantity.

Mr. FRAZER.—I never said anything of the kind.

Mr. CARR.—The honorable member referred to the industry as practically non-existent; but I suppose he is making a special plea on behalf of the miners of Western Australia. I may say that the oil companies in my electorate employ some 1,300 men, and pay about £13,000 in wages every month.

Mr. HEDGES.—But these men are employed in building a railway.

Mr. CARR.—Only a small number of them are employed on the building of the railway; and a railway must be built before the shale can be got to market. This is one of the largest industries in Australia at the present time, and is well worthy of consideration; and, were it not for unfair competition, I should not be now pleading for an increase in the duty. The oil companies have undertaken additional work, with a view to protection under the Tariff; and I hope that those interested will not be disappointed.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [8.23].—I move—

That the words "including Cloth Oil," paragraph M, be left out.

I propose to put this oil under item 235, and thus make it free.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [8.25].—I move—

That after the figure "3d.," paragraph O, the words "and on and after 3rd December, 1907, free," be inserted.

I do not suppose there is much need to debate this proposal; and I, therefore, content myself by simply moving it.

Mr. CHANTER (Riverina) [8.26].—I should like to know what attitude the Government propose to take on this amendment. For my part, I am going to support the duty.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Hear, hear.

Mr. CHANTER.—I think this is a very justifiable duty, and if we strike it out we shall simply play into the hands of the great Standard Oil Trust. Much capital is already invested in Melbourne in this industry; and I, along with other honorable members, have visited the works of the British Imperial Oil Company, and seen the whole process. Employment is given to a large number of men, and the whole of the tins and cases required are manufactured on the spot. I saw the oil tested, and since then I have used it in my own home, and found it smokeless and quite equal to an incandescent gas. The British Imperial Oil Company, to which I refer, has made as good a fight as it possibly could against the largest Trust in the world; and I point out that the duty is not really on the oil, but on the tins and cases. The oil is imported by this company in bulk from Great Britain, and not from America.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Not from Great Britain.

Mr. CHANTER.—From within the Empire.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—From Borneo.

Mr. CHANTER.—The company did import some oil from Russia, but that importation is not going on now, because the quality of the oil was found to be so bad as to damage the trade.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Here is a protectionist supporting the black labour of Borneo!

Mr. CHANTER.—I am supporting the white labour of Australia. This oil is imported in bulk, and pumped from the ships into tanks of about 1,000,000 gallons capacity, at the works at Williamstown. Considerable employment is given, and the oil is sold at twopence less per gallon than the oil of the Standard Oil Trust. I understand that not only Mr. Campbell, but several others, came out from America and distributed themselves over Australia, on behalf of the Standard Oil Company, and endeavoured to bring about the defeat of the British Imperial Oil Company. That is their object, and if once they achieve it every settler in the back blocks will be compelled to pay considerably more for his kerosene than he has paid hitherto.

Mr. FRAZER.—Who is at the back of the British Imperial Oil Company? Is it not Rothschild?

Mr. CHANTER.—A great section of the Australian people are behind that company.

Mr. FRAZER.—They will help Rothschild, I suppose, in preference to Rockefeller, and feel quite interested in doing so?

Mr. CHANTER.—Is not Rothschild interested in the Standard Oil Trust? Further, that Trust has instituted a system of rebates or secret commissions, against which this Parliament has legislated. They have offered a rebate to the retailers throughout the Commonwealth to induce them to dispose of no oil other than that produced by them. The British Imperial Oil Company, on the other hand, provide employment for Australian workmen. If the present duty be removed these persons will be thrown out of employment, and only the Standard Oil Trust will be benefited.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Will not the British Imperial Company still have to compete with the Standard Oil Trust in other parts of the world?

Mr. CHANTER.—At the present time that company is chiefly interested in Australia.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—It does a far bigger business outside the Commonwealth.

Mr. CHANTER.—Surely we ought to stand by the British Imperial Oil Company, and refuse to allow it to be crushed by the greatest combine in the world?

Mr. BOWDEN.—It will not be crushed if it loses the Australian trade.

Mr. CHANTER.—May I remind the honorable member that the annual importation of kerosene into the Commonwealth amounts to over 16,000,000 gallons. That would be a very good trade for this particular company to secure.

Mr. GROOM.—But there are other companies in existence in New South Wales.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Then why not protect them by means of a duty?

Mr. CHANTER.—The duty is not upon the oil, but upon the cases, and the tins which contain it. I sincerely trust that the Committee will show that it has the welfare of Australian industries at heart, and that it will do what it can to cripple the operations in the Commonwealth of the great Standard Oil Trust.

Mr. WILKS (Dalley) [8.36].—The honorable member for Riverina grew very heated over two of the most powerful trusts in existence. They are both poor devils, and I only wish that I had half of their disease. It is true that the British Imperial Oil Company brings oil to Australia in tank steamers, but what labour does it employ? For the purpose of

discharging the cargo of one of these vessels a fair-sized pump and two Malays will suffice. But it costs the Standard Oil Trust about £800 to discharge a similar quantity of oil. The latter undoubtedly provides more employment in Australia than does the former. I have seen the British Imperial Company's tank steamers unloading in Port Jackson, and all the labour that they employed was two Malays—

Mr. CHANTER.—The honorable member has been absolutely misinformed.

Mr. WILKS.—I have seen what I describe with my own eyes.

Mr. SALMON.—The honorable member has not seen Malays pumping.

Mr. WILKS.—If they were not Malays, they were Asiatics of a low type. The labour carried by these vessels is the lowest paid in the world. I support the proposal of the honorable member for Parramatta to admit the oils specified in paragraph o free of duty.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—What I am concerned about is the company which is producing oil here.

Mr. WILKS.—A duty of 3d. per gallon will not help that company.

Mr. WATSON.—It will be of no use whatever.

Mr. WILKS.—I say that the transshipment of tinned kerosene provides more employment in the Commonwealth than does the transshipment of oil in bulk from tank steamers.

Mr. PALMER (Echuca) [8.41].—This matter has been discussed as though it affected only the interests of two companies—

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—They mesmerize the honorable member for Parramatta.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The Treasurer suggests that we are influenced by the Standard Oil Trust. That is an infamous thing to say. I ask that it be withdrawn.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I withdraw the remark if it is considered objectionable.

Mr. PALMER.—The proposed tax on kerosene, which is one of the most unpopular duties in the schedule, will bear very heavily upon the public. Kerosene is very largely used in nearly every household in the country, and oil of the best quality must be obtained. It may be very well to suggest that one oil is as good as another, but in my own household they will not use any but the best oil, because inferior oil gives off a smoke which is objectionable from a health

point of view, and blackens the ceilings. In my opinion, a duty of 3d. per gallon on oil imported in tins containing less than 10 gallons would not secure the object in view. The effect of that duty will be that the Standard Oil Trust will import its oil in bulk, with the result that there will be a diminution of the labour employed here in connexion with its landing and distribution.

Mr. BOWDEN.—There is more employment given in the handling of the cases than would be created by the tinning and the casing of the oil here.

Mr. PALMER.—Undoubtedly there is. If more oil were imported in bulk, less employment would be given locally. The importation of the oil in tins has become almost necessary, because it is so convenient, and the public are, by long usage, so accustomed to it. In the interests of the people and of the great mining community we should restore kerosene to the free list.

Mr. HEDGES (Fremantle) [8.43].—The honorable member for Riverina stated that he is in favour of a White Australia; but the company which he says should bring oil to Australia produces it by the aid of black labour, employing only ten white persons?

Mr. CHANTER.—Where?

Mr. HEDGES.—In Sumatra.

Mr. CHANTER.—How many white men are there at their works at Williamstown?

Mr. HEDGES.—Practically all the labour employed in the production of the oil is black labour. It may be all very well for places like Sydney or Melbourne to have oil brought in bulk; but in places like Fremantle and Brisbane, it is more convenient to have it brought in tins, because it enables vessels to come with a part cargo of kerosene and loaded up with other goods on which only reasonable freights are charged, because of the profit made on the carriage of the kerosene. The honorable member for Macquarie spoke about voting for the duty because oil is produced here, but his figures were somewhat confusing. He said that there are 1,300 men employed by the Commonwealth Oil Company. Assuming that they are paid 10s. a day each, the company's daily wages' sheet shows a payment of £650, or a yearly expenditure of £195,000. But their output of oil, he says, is 3,000,000 gallons per annum, so that the labour cost is about 1s. 4d. per gallon. Yet, in spite of that, he says that the company would be satisfied if it were getting about 1s. 4d. a

gallon for its oil. Figures like those are quite unconvincing. I shall vote to make kerosene duty free.

Mr. MATHEWS (Melbourne Ports) [8.46].—The party to which I belong has always voted against the imposition of duties on kerosene and tea, because those commodities are so largely used by the working classes. I am entirely opposed to increasing the taxation of those who can least afford to pay taxes. I feel convinced that the imposition of a duty of 3d. per gallon on oil imported in tins will not make that oil any dearer to the people of Australia. It will, as a matter of fact, lessen its price. Of course, some honorable members laugh at this statement, but they laugh, too, when evidence is produced showing that the effect of duties upon goods which can be manufactured here has been, by increasing the local competition, to lower prices. We, in Australia, know of the wide ramifications of the great Standard Oil Trust, which has now such a hold upon the kerosene trade of the world that it can dictate to buyers and sellers alike the conditions under which this commodity must be traded in. Until within the last seven years the Trust had no competitor in Australia. I have little sympathy with the British Imperial Oil Trust, whether it is or is not run by the Rothschilds. But if the two trusts are sharks it is better to keep them employed in Australia fighting each other than to give the whole field to one of them. No doubt I may lose votes by supporting the duty on oil imported in tins; but that consideration weighs little with me when I know my cause to be just. We have been told that less employment will be given if oil be imported in bulk than is given now, when it is brought here in tins; but it is not necessary to disprove a statement of that kind. My common sense tells me that twice, if not three times, as much employment will be given in Australia if the oil comes here in bulk, to be tinned and cased locally, than is given now, when it comes in tins. The representatives of Western Australia are opposed to this duty, but apparently they are not aware that the Standard Oil Company charges 50 per cent. more for kerosene in Western Australia than in Victoria. But if the proposed duty is imposed, and the British-Imperial Oil Company opens works at Fremantle, the price of the Standard Oil Company's oil will be reduced to meet the competition. While the Standard oil is now being sold

in Victoria at 8s. a case, it is sold in Western Australia for anything between 10s. and 12s. a case.

Mr. HEDGES.—No.

Mr. MATHEWS.—I have positive proof of it.

Mr. HEDGES.—If the honorable member's other statements are no better than that, they are worth nothing.

Mr. MATHEWS.—The honorable member for Fremantle on one occasion made a speech full of what he said were facts, though no one would accept them as such, and his statements, having been disproved, he wishes to disprove mine. Honorable members are very ready to profess themselves eager to reduce the price of kerosene in the interests of the poor worker; but I ask free-traders, who say that competition is the soul of business, whether prices will not be lower with competition in the field than if, by the taking off of the duty, it is brought to an end?

Mr. EDWARDS (Oxley) [8.53].—When the last Tariff was before the House, every member of the Labour Party tried manfully to bring about what was termed a free breakfast table, and to secure the free importation of kerosene; but on this occasion none of them has raised his voice in the interests of the working man. They appear to have lost all concern in him. The imposition of a paltry duty of 3d. per gallon has been proposed to protect a local industry, it is said. But it will have no such effect. If the local industry is to be protected, the duty must be much higher. As a matter of fact, kerosene should be admitted duty free. No class uses more kerosene than does the working class, and it will have to pay this duty, if it be imposed.

Mr. CHANTER.—If the duty be not imposed, competition will be crushed out, and the workers will have to pay more for their oil.

Mr. EDWARDS.—I regret that the Government is neglecting the interests of the working man, which they profess to study. I shall vote for free kerosene.

Mr. SALMON (Laanecoorie) [8.55].—As I have paired on this question, I wish to explain my position in regard to the proposal of the Government. I am in favour of the duty, because I wish to keep down the price of kerosene to the consumers. I have gone carefully into the whole matter, and am convinced, from inquiries I have made, and from my visits to the Williams-town works—I shall not weary honorable

members by detailing all that I have seen and heard—that the result of doing away with the small duty proposed will be to increase the price of kerosene. The statement of the honorable member for Dalley, that less employment will be given if oil be imported in bulk, is wide of the mark. He has not taken into account all the labour employed, not only in pumping the oil from the ships to the factory, and in filling the tins, but in providing and preparing the wood for the cases, and in making the cases and tins, to say nothing of carting. If the duty be not imposed, the only real competitor which the Standard Oil Trust has in Australia will be crushed out, when an increase in the price of kerosene will follow.

Mr. PALMER.—The price of oil has gone up 3d. since the duty was imposed.

Mr. SALMON.—The honorable member for Echuca said he would stand by the recommendations of the Tariff Commission, and the proposal of the Government is based on one of the Commission's recommendations. If he votes against the duty, he will do what he has professed himself anxious to avoid doing, he will make it necessary for the people in the country districts to pay more for their kerosene two years hence than they are paying now.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN (Indi) [8.57].—An attempt has been made to prove that the duty is protective in its incidence, but, in my opinion, it is not. We have been piling up duties to an enormous extent. That is proved by the returns presented to-day, which show that in five months the revenue has been increased by between £800,000 and £900,000 over the normal returns. There may be some truth in the statement that the British-Imperial Oil Company has lost a lot of money here. It has been spoken of as the Rothschild Company, while the Standard Oil Trust is known as one of Rockefeller's combinations. They are two of the wealthiest companies in the world, and we may very well let them look after themselves. But I do not wish to wreck the prosperity of this country by the imposition of duties which are too heavy. If I thought that the proposed duty would really be protective, and would give a large amount of labour, I should vote for it. But I think that it will have no protective incidence, and, in view of the state of the revenue, and the large amount of taxation which the public is now being called upon to bear, we should not continue to heap

taxes upon the people. Therefore I shall vote to make kerosene free.

Mr. CHANTER (Riverina) [9.0].—I think that before we go to a vote we should hear the views of the honorable member for Bendigo, because this duty has been recommended by the A section of the Tariff Commission, and is no doubt supported by good evidence. I feel very strongly on this item because I am quite in accord with the views of the honorable member for Laane-coorie. I challenge the honorable member for Fremantle to deny that since the British Imperial Oil Company began their operations here the price of kerosene oil has been reduced to the people of Australia.

Mr. HEDGES.—No; the price has gone up, as I shall prove to-morrow.

Mr. CHANTER.—I challenge the honorable member to prove that the price has gone up. I object to the statement that only two or three men are employed by the company at Williamstown, because, including the distributors, 400 persons are employed in connexion with those works alone. I am talking not of what I have heard, but of what I have seen.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—The honorable member seems to be excited.

Mr. CHANTER.—I am excited because I am surprised to find that when a British company—and I do not care if they have behind them all the Rothschilds—are trying to fight the biggest Trust in the world—an octopus which has its tentacles on the trade and commerce of Australia—honorable members seem inclined to brush on one side their request for a little help to sustain them in an industry which is giving employment to Australians, and to say, "Oh, only two or three wharf laborers will get more work if we remove this duty." Will the honorable member for Dalley say how many men would get employment in supplying the wood and in making tins and boxes if the whole of the 16,000,000 gallons of kerosene were imported in bulk and tinned here?

Mr. WILKS.—The honorable member forgot to include the persons who burn the oil.

Mr. CHANTER.—I have burned both kinds of kerosene oil. The oil of the British Imperial Oil Company if tested on the table to-night, would produce as brilliant a light without smoke as would the other oil.

Mr. WILKS.—No; we would go out of the chamber.

Mr. CHANTER.—The company have candidly admitted that they got from Russia one shipment which was very unsatisfactory because it smoked; but the oil which they are now importing and intend to import in the future is perfectly clear, and gives a light as bright as does an incandescent gas light, and, moreover, it is 2d. a gallon cheaper to the consumer than is the American oil. Why should we force the consumers to pay 2d. a gallon more for the oil which they use in the bush by removing this duty and so crushing out the British company? I hope that the honorable member for Bendigo will give the Committee the benefit of his knowledge.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—Have we not heard enough of these rival companies?

Mr. CHANTER.—The right honorable member used to think, as I think now, that Australia stood first and the Standard Oil Trust second.

Mr. HEDGES.—Western Australia stands first.

Mr. CHANTER.—Western Australia stands first now with the right honorable member. I am thinking not of that State alone, but of the whole continent, its people, and its industries. This is an industry which if assisted and sustained would progress and provide more and more employment for our people as time went on. This duty is imposed not on the kerosene, but on the tins and cases, which are made in America. We want the oil to be imported in bulk and the tins and cases made by our own people. I trust that the honorable member for Bendigo will tell the Committee why the A section of the Tariff Commission recommended the imposition of the duty.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [9.5].—I did not intend to speak on this matter. The honorable member for Riverina has put the case as strongly as I could do from every stand-point. I intend to support the duty, which I hope will be carried. It was recommended on the Tariff Commission by two very eminent and influential Labour members—Senator McGregor and ex-Senator Higgs—who were of opinion that if imposed it would tend not to increase the cost of kerosene to the consumer, but to maintain a healthy competition between two great companies. They considered that it was most undesirable that the Standard Oil Company should have a monopoly of the oil trade of Australia. They believed we should if possible lend a helping hand to the British Imperial Oil Company,

who have established vast works at Williamstown and helped to maintain a standard price for the article. I think that on these grounds the duty ought to be supported by those who are in favour of maintaining a healthy competition, especially by a British company as against that octopus, the world-wide Standard Oil Company. I have been given to understand that a considerable amount of British capital is invested in the British Imperial Oil Company.

Mr. WYNNE.—Where are their mines?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—Whether their mines are on British or Asiatic soil is not the chief consideration. The fact that they are operated by British capital guides me in endeavoring to give them some assistance and support. I may mention that already this proposition has had a very healthy effect on the Standard Oil Company. So far as I can gather from their correspondence they indicate an intention to tin and case their oil here. Their only complaint is that they have not had time in which to dispose of the tinned kerosene, but if that concession is made they will be able to come here, and lay down an installation for the purpose of doing their tinning and packing here. I have gathered that information from a letter which I have just read. I believe that the imposition of the duty will not result in an increased price, but will assist in maintaining healthy competition between the two companies, and causing more labour to be employed in the handling of the oil.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [9.8].—The last statement of the honorable member for Bendigo completely answers the contention of the honorable member for Riverina and the honorable member for Laanecoorie. Those two honorable members said that they want this duty to be imposed in order to save the British Imperial Oil Company from the clutches of an octopus, the Standard Oil Company. The honorable member for Bendigo, however, says that the latter company are willing to come here, so that by the imposition of the duty my honorable friends will not save the British-Imperial Oil Company from their clutches.

Mr. CHANTER.—If the duty is kept on it will.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—No, that will simply bring the two companies to closer grips, and put them on even terms. If this tremendous octopus company can beat the British-Imperial Oil Company they

will maintain their supremacy when they establish works here. The evidence, however, shows that the British-Imperial Oil Company have, so far, competed satisfactorily with the Standard Oil Company.

Mr. CHANTER.—Will not the Standard Oil Company give work for Australians if they come here?

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—My information is that the Standard Oil Company will not give more work.

Mr. CHANTER.—They must give more work if they tin the oil here.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I am told that more labour is employed in bringing the oil here in tins and cases than would be employed if it were tinned and cased here. I would point out to the honorable member for Riverina that the company on whose behalf he has spoken is not a British company, as he stated, but a Straits Settlements Company.

Mr. HARPER.—It is a London company.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I am told that all the work is done in the Straits Settlements and by black labour, too. Honorable members who have been declaiming against the Standard Oil Company to-night went beside themselves the other night in declaiming against the importation of Rangoon candles. "These candles," they said, "are made in India, and therefore we must impose prohibitive duties." Now it seems that they are quite in favour of admitting free kerosene oil produced by black labour in the Straits Settlements. Their conduct does not seem to be quite consistent. Black labour in the Straits Settlements is surely just as bad as black labour in Rangoon.

Mr. CHANTER.—What has that to do with the white kerosene industry in Australia?

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Rangoon candles had everything to do with the white candles industry in Australia. The honorable member is constantly declaiming against the black labour of the world and the products which they send here, but now he is welcoming a product of black labour, because forsooth it is handled here by a few white individuals.

Mr. CHANTER.—Do the Standard Oil Company employ white labour? Do they not employ niggers?

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I understand that for the most part the Standard Oil Company employ white labour. I know nothing about the company, and in view of the Minister's statement to-night, although

it was formally withdrawn at the direction of the Chairman, I think it is necessary to say that I have never met one of their representatives. I have no sympathy with this huge trust in any shape or form. But I have a genuine sympathy with those persons in Australia who have been paying more for their kerosene since this duty was imposed.

Mr. KNOX (Kooyong) [9.14].—Unlike the honorable member for Parramatta, I know the representatives of the British Imperial Oil Company, and have met the representative of the Standard Oil Trust. My desire has been to ascertain the exact truth in connexion with both companies. It is needless for me to assure honorable members that I have no interest in them, either directly or indirectly. I am quite satisfied that they are well able to look after their own interests. I think that the Committee should not vote on this question without definite knowledge. This morning I ascertained that the British Imperial Oil Company Limited consist of 2,000 shares, of which the Asiatic Petroleum Company Limited hold 1,993 shares.

The CHAIRMAN.—Order! If I allow the honorable member to go into details concerning one company, I must allow that privilege to other honorable members, and a debate may arise as to the status of the company.

Mr. CHANTER.—I rise to a point of order. Several honorable members have broadly stated that the British Imperial Oil Company are not a British company, but are owned and controlled by the Rothschilds and others. I submit that the honorable member for Kooyong is entitled to show that their statements are not correct.

The CHAIRMAN.—Several honorable members have mentioned the names of different companies, and said that they were not this, that, or the other, but the honorable member for Kooyong was going into the details of a company when he began to refer to their share list, and if he is allowed to make that reference the discussion may embrace a great deal more than the share list. If I allowed a discussion to follow on that, it would eventually drift into a debate on the status of the two companies.

Mr. KNOX.—I have no other object than to assure honorable members as to the exact position. It ought to be made clear that the company is, essentially, just

like any other foreign company. The statement that it is an entirely British company is not correct. I will not go into details, but may state that the matter has been dealt with by a Committee of the Chamber of Commerce, who considered that under the circumstances there is no justification or need for this duty. It is my intention to vote for free kerosene.

Amendment agreed to.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 235. Oils, in bulk or otherwise, viz.:—Birch Tar Oil; Pine; Fir Tree; Unrefined Fish Oils; China Oil when denaturated as prescribed by Departmental by-law; Seal; Whale; Penguin; Petroleum (crude); Degras; Sod; Wood Naphtha; Mirbane; and Turpentine—free.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [9.20].—I move—

That after the words "Tar Oil," line 2, the words "Cloth Oil" be inserted.

I am informed that cloth oil is used in connexion with wool scouring, and that after it has served its purpose, it evaporates, and is of no further use. For that reason, I desire to place it upon the free list.

Amendment agreed to.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [9.21].—I move—

That the words "Wood Naphtha," lines 5 and 6, be left out.

It will be found that the words "wood naphtha" are included in item 5A, and that it was determined to make the oil free. There is no necessity for having it in two places.

Mr. TUDOR.—Does pine oil mean or include resin oil?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Yes; it does.

Amendment agreed to.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 236. Paints and Colours, viz.:—

- (A) Ground in liquid, per cwt. (General Tariff), 4s. 6d.; (United Kingdom), 4s.
- (B) Prepared for use, including tattoo oil, per cwt. or ad val., whichever rate returns the higher duty (General Tariff), 6s. 9d. or 25 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 6s. or 20 per cent.
- (C) Colours, dry, n.e.i., per cwt. (General Tariff), 3s. 3d.; (United Kingdom), 3s.
- (D) Dry White Lead; Patent Dryers and the like; and Putty, per cwt. (General Tariff), 2s. 3d.; (United Kingdom), 2s.
- (E) Barytes, per cwt., 2s.
- (F) Whiting, per cwt., 6d.

Mr. JOHNSON (Lang) [9.24].—I move—

That after the figures "4s. 6d.," paragraph A, the words "and on and after 3rd December, 1907, per cwt. (General Tariff), 2s. 6d.," be inserted.

I submit this amendment with a view of moving subsequently that the duty on paints and colours from the United Kingdom be 2s. per cwt. This item includes white lead, and all those staining colours which are ground in oil, and also staining colours which are ground in water. A large number of colours used for scenic purposes are not and cannot be manufactured in Australia.

Mr. CHANTER.—Why not?

Mr. JOHNSON.—Because we have not the necessary pigments, nor is there the machinery for manufacturing from them. Coachmakers' colours are also included, and they have to be specially prepared. It would be impossible to make anything like Masury's coach colours in Australia. This is a subject about which I happen to know a good deal.

Mr. MATHEWS.—The honorable member makes similar statements about all other items.

Mr. JOHNSON.—I endeavour to inform myself by reading up about other items with which we have to deal, and with which I have no personal acquaintance. But this is a matter about which I did not need to read up. This duty is simply a tax on the raw materials of a great many trades. It is true that a description of white lead has been manufactured in Australia, but it was of poor quality and not anything like up to the accepted commercial standard. There is a quantity of sulphate of lead which is simply a cheap by-product, and has been manufactured in Australia. I have here a letter from a firm, who tell me that they themselves in years gone by, made about 300 tons of it; but they admit that it was an article that was altogether inferior to genuine white lead, and that, if supplied to the public of Great Britain as such, a breach of the law would be committed.

Mr. CHANTER.—Is that firm still in existence?

Mr. JOHNSON.—Yes.

Mr. CHANTER.—And they say that their own manufacture was bad.

Mr. JOHNSON.—I am not speaking now of colours prepared for use. They

are different altogether. They are colours mixed up with oil and turpentine, and ready for use with a brush. What I am referring to are colours ground in liquid, which have to be thinned out with turpentine or with water and size according to whether they are to be used with oil or in distemper. No attempt has been made in Australia to manufacture them. The duty is one which will fall heavily upon the users of these paints, and particularly heavily upon those small contractors who are in the habit of undertaking contracts for painting weatherboard houses and other small works. To obtain a cheap material is a matter of great concern to them. Apart from that, the duty would not help any local industry that has been established, nor would it encourage any industry that is likely to be established.

Mr. CARR.—There are paint mills in my electorate.

Mr. JOHNSON. — But they do not manufacture these particular goods.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—Does the honorable member mean to say that Vosz and Company do not?

Mr. JOHNSON.—White lead of an inferior quality is made here.

Mr. TUDOR.—Some of the best.

Mr. JOHNSON.—It is impossible for the honorable member to tell me that. I do not think that he will find any architect of standing in Australia who would specify that Australian white lead should be used on any building for which he was responsible. No responsible architect would risk his reputation by specifying that Australian white lead should be used in the painting of any premises where first-class work was required.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—The honorable member's experience is confined to Sydney.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Only two or three standard makers are recognised in the whole world. Indeed, practically there is only one maker, whose white lead is specified for good work. This is well known to every one in the trade—to every architect, to every painter, and to every artist. This tax applies not only to white lead, but equally to other colours ground in water, which are largely used for scenic purposes in Australia. They are scarcely used in any other way, except perhaps for very fine decorative purposes. If my amendment be carried, the item will be brought more into line with the old Tariff, under which a duty of 2s. per cwt. was imposed.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [9.31].—This scheme of duties has been very carefully considered, and since it hangs together, I hope that it will not be substantially disturbed.

Mr. JOHNSON.—These duties have been increased by about 125 per cent.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—The duties on paint, ground in liquid, and prepared for use, have been increased for good and sufficient reasons. In the first place, the raw materials of prepared paints—the linseed oil, white lead, and colours—are dutiable.

Mr. JOHNSON.—My amendment refers to paragraph A.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—We cannot interfere with paragraph A without prejudicing the raw materials of the paints dealt with in the item. I am sure that every protectionist desires the production of linseed in Australia to be promoted, and the white-lead industry to be developed. It is well said that those are the basic elements of paint, and very heavy duties have been imposed upon them. Consequently we must have a heavier duty on the prepared article.

Mr. JOHNSON.—A lot of these paints are ground in water, and there is no duty on water.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—I am referring to the duties on oil and white lead. Paint cannot be built up without those elements. The paint manufacturers who came before the Tariff Commission in the various States said in effect, "If you give us our raw materials free, we shall not ask for a duty; but since there are very heavy duties on our raw materials"—and it is most desirable that there should be duties on them in order that their production may be encouraged—"we must have a heavier duty on the finished article, and more particularly upon the superior paints." Some of them said that they did not desire as heavy a duty on the common grades as they sought on the superior grades, having zinc as a base. This Tariff does not discriminate between the two classes; it merely imposes duties upon paints ground in oil, and paints completely prepared. If we wish to promote the production of linseed oil and to develop the white lead industry, as well as the production of various colours, we must have these duties. If we break down the first paragraph, the whole scheme will collapse. It is most desirable that linseed oil—and the beginning of its production in

Australia is not far distant—should not be free; if it is we shall not be able to enter upon its production in commercial quantities. I recognise that a duty on it imposes a burden on the painting trade; but it may be only a temporary one; and when we have established the industry of producing linseed oil in Australia we shall be able to make a *pro rata* reduction in the duty on the complete article. The production of white lead in Australia is progressing, but local prejudice has to be combated.

Mr. JOHNSON.—I should not like to use any Australian white lead.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—I do not know whether the honorable member is an expert; but I base my remarks on expert evidence given before the Commission.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—The honorable member for Lang understands painting.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—He seems to be a walking encyclopædia.

Mr. MATHEWS.—He wants nothing Australian.

Mr. BOWDEN.—That is unfair.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—Very good white lead has been made in Australia, and, since a preference has been given to it by some of the States Governments, it ought surely to be good enough for private contractors.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Not necessarily.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—Some very valuable colours are produced in South Australia. I would refer honorable members to the evidence given by John O'Connell, which appears at page 66 of the *Minutes of Evidence*. This witness, who asked for a duty of 40 per cent., was asked—

With what sort of colours would you undertake to provide the Commonwealth, suppose you had your 40 per cent. duty. Name the principal?

He replied—

Raw sienna, burnt sienna, raw umber, burnt umber, purple brown (which is red oxide of iron); raw oxide, quaker green (three shades), bronze green, hematite, Oxford ochre, yellow ochre and others.

He produced some of his colours to the Commission, and we were satisfied that large and valuable deposits existed, not only in South Australia, but in other parts of the Commonwealth. We have drawn up a scheme providing for a duty on those colours, and placing on the free list colours produced in Australia, such as Van-
dike's, manganese, Letharge blacks, Paris
blue and vermillions. If we desire to

protect the raw materials of the industry, we must retain, at a high standard, the duty on the finished article.

Mr. WILKS (Dalley) [9.37].—I was under the impression that Victoria, in pre-Federation days, was a pronounced protectionist State, and as such, one would have expected to find that under its Tariff paints were heavily protected. I learn, however, that under that Tariff, they were dutiable at 40s. per ton., or 2s. per cwt.

Mr. MATHEWS.—At that time, we had not tried to make it.

Mr. WILKS.—The honorable member has a ready excuse. Victoria did not awaken to the importance of the paint manufacturing industry when it was at the height of its protectionist boom. Prior to Federation, New South Wales was accustomed to have these, and cognate items, on the free list; whilst Queensland had a duty of 3s. per cwt.; South Australia a duty of 2s. per cwt., and of 4s. per cwt. in the case of the made-up articles; Tasmania, a duty of ½d. per lb.; and Western Australia a duty of 10 per cent. Under the first Federal Tariff, the duty under this item was 2s. per cwt., and the Government now propose to raise it to 4s. 6d. on foreign imports, and to 4s. per cwt. on imports from Great Britain. Having enjoyed for five years an increase of 200 per cent. on the old Victorian Tariff, paint manufacturers here, instead of being able to show that their industry is a flourishing one, are asking for more protection, and the Treasurer offers them a still further increase of 250 per cent. The honorable member for Bendigo says that these proposals have been very carefully considered, and I must certainly admit that the paint manufacturers have been most carefully considered. But what about those who use paint? To my mind, the honorable member for Bendigo gave away his case when he said that the excessive duties upon the raw materials of the paint-making industry, made it necessary to impose a high duty on the finished article. That being so, this cannot be called a scientific Tariff.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—We have not yet dealt with the duty on white lead.

Mr. WILKS.—No; and that is one of the basic elements of paint. The honorable member for Lang has touched the real point at issue. If we impose this heavy duty upon the finished article, we shall severely tax the coachpainter and others who use paints of this kind. In the report of the protectionist section of the

Tariff Commission, appears the following startling statement in regard to the local manufacture of white lead, which the honorable member for Bendigo says we ought to encourage—

The manager of a paint and oil company in Sydney had seen samples of white lead that were said to have been manufactured in Sydney. They could not compare with the imported article so far as colour was concerned. Locally produced white lead turned yellow after standing a given time, while the imported article keeps its colour much longer. The defect did not lie in the local lead or zinc, but in manufacture, which, in his opinion, experience would tend to remedy.

The Committee are asked to place a heavy duty on prepared paints, so that in the days to come, an improved white lead may be produced in Australia. I believe that the proper way to encourage the manufacture of paint would be to place linseed oil, white lead, and the other raw materials of the industry, either on the free list or under as low a duty as possible. I have many sides to my character as a politician, and I happen to have in my electorate the largest paint manufactory in the Commonwealth. Nevertheless, I do not ask for a duty upon prepared paint, but I would assist the industry in the way I have indicated. The honorable member for Lang very reasonably asks the Treasurer to revert to the duty imposed under the 1902 Tariff. Surely the Prime Minister could not have agreed to an increase of 250 per cent. on that duty, when he knows that in protectionist Victoria, in the palmiest days of protection, no more than 2s. was asked. The honorable member for Lang proposes a duty of 25 per cent. in excess of that duty, and I must say that it is rather rash of the honorable member as a free-trader to make such a proposal.

Mr. JOHNSON.—I make it only because I do not think I could carry a lower duty.

Mr. WILKS.—I intend to support the honorable member. If we wish to give assistance to manufacturers of paint, we should do so by reducing the duties on white lead and linseed oil. The Tariff Commission reported—

The manager of a white-lead company, which manufactured direct from the raw sulphide which was obtained from Tasmania, New South Wales, and South Australia, asked the Commission "to inquire into certain statements so that a new industry in the Commonwealth might not be closed by the wealthy companies of Europe."

The honorable member for Bendigo, apparently, is prepared to upset the whole

scheme of the Tariff on behalf of this Tasmanian company.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—It was not a Tasmanian company. The company only imported materials from Tasmania.

Mr. WILKS.—I am going by the Tariff Commission's report.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Let us get on or we shall have to sit late.

Mr. WILKS.—What does that matter, if we are fighting in the interests of the public? If I were fighting for the little paint manufacturing industry in my electorate the Treasurer would be cheering me. He objects when I am fighting in the interests of the users of the article.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The honorable member is only talking against time.

Mr. WILKS.—That is not fair, in view of the fact that the Treasurer, after fighting for three hours over the duty on kerosene, was afraid to go to a division on the item and have a vote against the Government recorded, and for that reason asked leave to withdraw the call for a division. Although paint is being manufactured in my electorate I am prepared to vote for the lowest duty.

Mr. JOHNSON (Lang) [9.48].—The honorable member for Bendigo no doubt inadvertently forgot, whilst quoting from the evidence given by Mr. Clarkson, to point out that as a manufacturer that gentleman stated that the local demand for paint was too small to warrant the employment of the skilled labour necessary in the production of locally-manufactured white lead, if there was to be any hope that an article would be produced which would approach in quality the standard of the imported article.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—That reference was to the South Australian demand.

Mr. JOHNSON.—That might be so, but if the manufacturer in question had command of the whole of the Australian market it must not be forgotten that the manufacturers of the imported article have the whole world for a market, and are therefore much better able to employ the highest skill and the best machinery in the manufacture of the article.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—The reference was to oxide colours and not to white lead, so that the honorable member is misquoting Mr. Clarkson.

Mr. JOHNSON.—The honorable member is not correct. Mr. Clarkson refers to an insufficient margin in regard to white lead. I point out, further, that those engaged in the manufacture of paint

follow a very unhealthy occupation, and require to have special provision made for them with respect to ventilation, exercise, food, and also special baths.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—It is not an industry we need seek to encourage.

Mr. JOHNSON.—That is so. It is further said that one reason why they have failed to produce this to any extent in Australia is, that the plant to treat it properly is too expensive, in view of the limited local demand. A Mr. Borthwick, another manufacturer, contradicts the statement made by the honorable member for Bendigo concerning siennas and umbers, at page 78 of the evidence. He says that siennas and umbers, as well as other colours, have not yet been found in Australia. In addition to the high duty, the Victorian Government gave a subsidy to Messrs. Patterson Brothers, I think of this city, who claimed to have discovered suitable pigments for making colours on their property. This attempt to foster the industry collapsed, and the Government foreclosed on the machinery mortgaged to it to cover the subsidy. The honorable member for Bendigo referred chiefly to colours ground in oil. I do not think the honorable member made any reference to the numerous colours ground in water. As water is free, the honorable member could not claim that those colours, in a manufactured condition, should be subject to a duty because the ingredients used in mixing them are subject to duty. Here are a few of these colours which occur to my mind at the present time: ultramarine, cobalt, Prussian blue, carnation paste, emerald green, Brunswick green, brown lake, carmine, chrome yellows, chrome green, Dutch pink, celestial blue, azure blue, flake white, sienna umber, Vandyke brown, and vermilion. I think with a little consideration, I could name half a hundred different colours, none of which are manufactured, or likely to be manufactured, in Australia, because the pigments from which they are manufactured are not obtained here.

Mr. MATHEWS.—We could import the pigments.

Mr. JOHNSON.—These pigments are ground, on the spot where they are found, in water, and the preparation is hermetically sealed in bottles or tins for export to various parts of the world. There would be the local demand for these colours

in Australia to warrant their manufacture here, even though the pigments were imported in bulk.

Mr. BATCHELOR (Boothby) [9.55].—I wish to correct a misquotation by the honorable member for Lang. Of course, the honorable member was not aware that he was misquoting Mr. Clarkson's evidence; but if he will look at the evidence again, he will find that he represented that gentleman as saying precisely the opposite of what he did say. The honorable member attributed to Mr. Clarkson the statement that the demand for white lead in Australia is insufficient to make it worth while to manufacture the article here. Mr. Clarkson did not say anything of the kind. What he said was that the only pigments being produced in South Australia were iron oxides.

Mr. JOHNSON.—What is the honorable member quoting from?

Mr. BATCHELOR.—Question 53421, page 72 of the evidence. Mr. Clarkson there said—

There is only a limited use for the oxide colours.

The reference was not to white lead, and, speaking of the oxide colours, Mr. Clarkson said he did not think the output would warrant the expenditure that would be involved in getting the necessary men. He went on to say that he could obtain some good colours, that he did not desire a duty on dry colours, but would not object if any one else proposed such a duty, and would be inclined to support it. It will be found that Mr. Clarkson referred to white lead in the evidence reported at question 53430, and honorable members will see that he suggested that the duty should be 25 per cent. instead of 2s. per cwt. He went on to say that he had seen good white lead made in Australia. In a circular, which no doubt honorable members have received, speaking of Vosz and Company, of which he is manager, he says—

We have during the last twelve months spent £15,000 in land, buildings, and plant at Port Adelaide, and have now an up-to-date plant for the manufacture of all classes of paint and white lead, and the duties as fixed in the last Tariff give us more encouragement for manufacture than the previous Tariff.

He goes on to say—

Our industry promises to be a most important one, and we are gradually increasing our output. We find the prejudice against the Colonial article gradually disappearing as the public discover they can get an article equal to imported at lower rates. . . . We believe that

we are at present the only white lead corrodors in Australia, and are now turning out a product in every way equal to the imported article, and during the next month or so we will be able to place on the market quantities. There is fierce competition in this line, and there should be a big industry open for Australia.

In view of these facts I am warranted in believing that the honorable member for Lang will take the first opportunity to apologize to Mr. Clarkson for having attributed to him the statement that the demand in Australia was so small as not to warrant the employment of skilled men in the industry. Mr. Clarkson, in his circular, goes on to say—

We purchase our raw material from Broken Hill, and the duty, as now fixed, gives us a margin in which to meet foreign competition.

We put a duty on linseed oil, one of the raw materials of this industry, and we should now complete the scheme proposed by the Tariff Commission, and enable white lead to be successfully manufactured in the Commonwealth. As to other colours, a variety is produced at the Blumberg mine, South Australia, and in various parts of the Commonwealth. The secretary to the Blumberg mine, Mr. O'Connell, gave pretty lengthy evidence before the Commission as to the necessity for a duty to enable the company to compete against wealthy British companies. The industry is well worth establishing, and will undoubtedly be established in every State in the Commonwealth. There is therefore no likelihood of a monopoly in the manufacture of paints. There will be pretty fierce local competition, and instead of prices being increased for more than a very temporary period, it is almost certain that as the result of the building up of the industry here, prices will be kept very much lower than they would be likely to be should the industry be crushed out, as it would be if these duties are not imposed.

Mr. PALMER (Echuca) [10.0].—In view of the large increase of duty proposed over the rate in the former Tariff on this item, and the important part that paints play in matters concerning the welfare of the people, I desire to bring under notice two letters which I have received. The first is from the firm of Wm. Young and Company, Melbourne, who state—

In spite of some hysterical articles in our local press, we can confidently assert that genuine white lead as recognised in Great Britain is not yet an article of manufacture here. A quantity of sulphate of lead, which is a cheap by-product, has been manufactured here—we ourselves in years gone by have utilized about 300 tons of the same. It is an article altogether

inferior in covering power to genuine white lead, and, if offered to the public in Great Britain as such, would be a breach of the law.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—That is a slander on the Australian product. The honorable member ought not to read such slanders.

Mr. PALMER.—The letter was sent to me, and I quote it in good faith. It is a matter of the utmost importance, in the case of an expensive item so widely used, that we should have an article of good quality. The other letter comes from the Melbourne Steamship Company and the Duke's Dock and Engineering Company, and deals with ships' paints.

Mr. WILKS.—That question comes under paragraph B.

Mr. PALMER.—Then I will read the letter later. I do not say that the Australian paint is inferior, but I know that it makes a great deal of difference to people who go to large expense in renovating buildings or putting up new structures if they use a paint that will stand the weather. An inferior paint is absolutely worse than useless. It has a bad effect upon the property, it is a disappointment all round, and we should not by any legislative means seek to force its use upon the people of this country.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [10.3].—I cannot allow this attack on the Australian production to pass without giving it a flat contradiction. It has originated from a person, evidently an importer, who is interested in damaging the reputation of Australian white lead. I have here, not the statement of an interested individual, but a certificate given by Mr. Henry C. Jenkins, the Government Metallurgist of Victoria, as follows—

Sir,

I have now to report that the sample of lead for a white paint, left after an interview, on your instructions, by the Australian White Lead Company, was analyzed and proved to contain within 0.3 of being pure. The sulphate of lead, that is the result of their process, is a very suitable substance for a paint, and is produced under conditions favouring a fine state of division, and that quite forbid the presence of free sulphuric acid. Tests were made to discover its covering power, as compared with that of the best white lead obtainable in Melbourne; it was tested for any foreign material, such as baryta, and was found to be pure. Two sets of comparative tests were made, and measured quantities of the oils, &c., employed in the paints, were taken in each test. The paint was employed upon wooden surfaces and upon glass, in order to see the actual body of the coating when dry. One set was with boiled linseed oil, and the other with raw linseed oil, all

other things being equal, and that the covering power of the resulting paint was nearly equal in the two cases for whiteness and body, the balance being still rather in favour of the sulphate of lead, as against the white lead of commerce, which is, as is well known, a basic carbonate.

I quote that as a refutation of the slanders which have been circulated.

Mr. MATHEWS (Melbourne Ports) [10.5].—All the manufacturers like to get their raw material free, but unfortunately in practically every instance the raw material of one industry is the finished article of another. The question of paints and their constituent parts is so complicated that it is hard to discover what is really the basic raw material. The worst of it is that each manufacturer concerned wants his raw material free, and each condemns the Australian-made raw material, saying, "I have to compete with the rest of the world in the Australian market, and must get the best material to use in producing my manufactured article. Therefore, I must import it." The manufacturer of white lead in Australia assures us, and backs up his assurance with a certificate, quoted by the honorable member for Bendigo, from a gentleman duly qualified to express an opinion, that the article which he is producing is as good as, if not superior to, the imported white lead. Unfortunately, the man who uses white lead in making paint, being interested, condemns the Australian white lead. He says, "I want imported colouring material if I am to give my customers the paints which they demand. I must also have imported white lead." The manufacturer of colours in Australia shows us that he is quite competent to produce the best colours, having men here who are qualified through experience in other parts of the world. The honorable member for Lang stated that it was impossible to make these colours in Australia. He enumerated all the colours of the rainbow, from elephant's breath to boiled mutton, and told us that they could not be made here. But first-class pigments are produced in South Australia. I am not surprised at the honorable member for Lang making that statement, because he is a free-trader—a foreign representative.

Mr. JOHNSON.—I have protested several times against the application to me of the epithet of "foreign representative." It is offensive, and I ask that it be withdrawn. I do not apply offensive epithets of that character to honorable members opposite.

I am just as much an Australian representative as is the honorable member—perhaps a little more.

The CHAIRMAN.—I ask the honorable member for Melbourne Ports to withdraw the remark which the honorable member for Lang regards as offensive.

Mr. MATHEWS.—If the remark is offensive to the honorable member for Lang, I withdraw it without qualification. I was not speaking in a personal but merely in a political sense. In spite of what the honorable member for Lang says, there is an establishment in my electorate which is producing first-class colours. I am sure to be asked whether there are any of these works in my electorate. That is getting rather a by-word now, but I have voted for the protection of industries that are not in my electorate, and I shall certainly support those that are. That firm have imported a man who has had twenty-five years' experience in England. They can produce any of the colours which the honorable member for Lang says are not made here. They turn out good commercial commodities, which are on the market at the present day. But it is essential, in order that they may keep them upon the market, that they should have some protection. There are certain portions of their raw material which they have to import, and, seeing that there is a duty on that, it is necessary that they should get a duty on their manufactured article, which, in its turn, is the raw material of another industry, so that they may compete with imported articles. Then the house or coach painter, who uses paints, wants his raw material as cheaply as possible. The coachbuilder is strongly protected—I have many in my electorate—and yet he will send us documents to show that we must not ask him to use the Australian article. But the very argument that we have to adduce to get him to use it, is the one which we have to urge in order to get the Australian public to use the finished article which he produces. So that we find the same difficulty all along the line. It matters little to me what the commodity is so long as we can bring the industry in Australia up to a proper standard. There is no process in the manufacture of white lead, or the making of pigments, or the mixing of paints, that cannot be undertaken here. In the newspapers honorable members will see an advertisement to the following effect:—"Mixed paint, 3d. per tin. Don't be prejudiced. Buy it and give it a trial."

That is an imported article. How is it possible to expect our producers of paint to compete with an article of that sort, which we know does not contain an atom of white lead or of linseed oil?

Mr. McDUGALL.—What is the condition of the white-lead workers of England?

Mr. MATHEWS.—It is lamentable in the extreme. One of the arguments used by the producer of white lead in Australia is that the article which he produces is not poisonous.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Is not lead, which is the basis of the article, the same in its properties everywhere?

Mr. MATHEWS.—The honorable member may know how to use paints when they are mixed, but is he scientist enough to know that lead can be treated in such a way as not to be poisonous? I am assured by those who run this business in Footscray that their treatment of the lead makes it non-poisonous, and that it has no bad effect upon those who handle it. But the individual who uses the paint says, "That is the very reason why the Australian article is of no use to us." They practically say that it is no good because it does not kill those who produce it. On the one hand, we are asked, "What is the condition of those who manufacture the white lead in England?" and we answer, "It is lamentable; they die at ages when they have no right to die." Then when we say, "Here is a commodity that will not poison the workers," we are told, "It is useless for our purposes." We do not expect any assistance from free-traders in this instance, but we desire, and should be able to demand, the votes of all those who came into this House as protectionists.

Mr. JOHNSON (Lang) [10.15].—The honorable member for Boothby accused me of having misrepresented or misquoted the evidence of Mr. Clarkson.

Mr. CHANTER.—Withdraw the statement, and apologize.

Mr. JOHNSON.—I have nothing to withdraw. The honorable member for Boothby should withdraw his statement, because I did nothing of the kind. I propose to read that evidence a little more fully. I think I fairly gave the sense of what Mr. Clarkson said, as the following quotations from his evidence will show—

What increase of duty do you want on white lead?—I suggested 25 per cent. It is at present 2s. per cwt.

What increase would that be?—About 100 per cent.

Why do you want such a high increase on lead?—The reason I suggested it was that it would certainly cost a great deal to go in for the manufacture of it, and the necessary experiments, and the margin is not large enough.

Would not the same argument apply to dry colours, seeing that we have the materials?—Yes. But you have all the materials for lead here. You have not all the materials for dry colours.

What material is lacking?—There are many colours we have not so far got the natural earths for. Then you have your colours here, but you have not the output.

I think that bears out exactly what I said about Mr. Clarkson's evidence, though I did give a summary in order to save time.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [10.17].—The honorable member for Bendigo has made what I regard as an unjustifiable attack on the honorable member for Echuca.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—I was not attacking the honorable member, but the circular he read.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The circular said just what the honorable member for Bendigo himself said. Something beyond what the circular said might be inferred, but the fact stated was that the white lead produced here is made from sulphate of lead, and that it cannot be of as good quality as white lead made from carbonate of lead. In that there is no comparison between Australian and British white lead, because the same statement would apply to the two processes in Great Britain. White lead produced from sulphate of lead is, in the opinion of scientific men, and of users, inferior to white lead produced from carbonate of lead, wherever it may be produced. That was all that was stated in the circular, and it was the statement repeated by the honorable member for Bendigo later. Every statement of the kind made from this side seems to be twisted into a reflection on Australian production. There is much tenderness shown in this relation, although, as I have pointed out, the same comparison could be shown between the two products in Great Britain. I do not think that there ought to be such sensitiveness, or such a disposition to turn all criticism into an attack upon Australian productions. The question whether sulphate of lead or carbonate of lead makes the best white lead is not one involving any reflection on the Australian product.

Mr. CHANTER.—That was not the statement.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—That was the statement—that the white lead made in Australia was from sulphate of lead.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—The circular says that Australian white lead is bad, irrespective of its origin.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—What the circular says is that Australian white lead is produced from sulphate of lead, and is not equal to lead produced from carbonate of lead. The honorable member for Bendigo confirmed that statement, namely, that the Australian was made from sulphate of lead, and white lead made from sulphate of lead is inferior, in the opinion of most authorities, to white lead made from carbonate of lead, wherever the manufacture may be carried on.

Mr. CROUCH.—That is not the interpretation which the honorable member for Echuca put on the letter.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I did not observe that the honorable member for Echuca said anything beyond what was stated in the circular; in fact I heard the honorable member say that he did not know that the white lead produced here was inferior. Whether the opinion expressed, and confirmed by the honorable member for Bendigo, be right or wrong, it is the opinion held by those who ought to know best.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Divide!

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—If honorable members opposite make attacks, they must expect some reply.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—There have been some attacks from the other side.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I have not heard any attack made by this side on individuals; although there have been attacks made by the other side on individuals on several occasions. I do not mind debate being created in this way so long as we have the opportunity to reply; but such debate will not attain what we all desire, namely, an expeditious settlement of the Tariff. The duty recently imposed in New Zealand, under a protective Tariff, is only 2s. 6d., and that is the duty now suggested by the honorable member for Lang.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [10.23].—The question is not whether Australian white lead is made from carbonate of lead or sulphate of lead; the question is as to the quality of the lead and its covering power. The certificate I read showed that, although the Australian white lead is made from sulphate of lead, and not from carbonate of lead, its covering power, as tested by the Government Metallurgist, is equal to the best white lead obtainable in Melbourne. The question is not the metallic contents, but the covering power.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The honorable member for Echuca said nothing to the contrary.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—The circular that was read said that Australian white lead is of inferior quality, and had not the same covering power as imported white lead. I have here another certificate from the Storekeeper of the Newport Railway Workshops, Melbourne, in which he says—

The sample of white lead submitted by you for trial at the Newport workshops has been reported on as follows, viz.:—It is soft and fine, and requires little or no grinding, and, weight for weight, will cover a larger surface than the ordinary dry white lead.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [10.25].—The honorable member for Bendigo is, in my opinion, trying to prove too much.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—I should not have risen but for the reading of the circular.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I have yet to learn that a chemist is necessarily an expert painter.

Mr. CHANTER.—The report just read was not that of a chemist, but that of the Chief Storekeeper at Newport Workshops.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I do not regard those individual statements as conclusive. First of all, I decline to believe that a metallurgist has necessarily an expert knowledge of the covering qualities of white lead; when he begins to talk about the covering qualities of lead he steps outside his function altogether. The question is one for a practical painter; and experience must be the great teacher. I fancy that covering qualities ultimately depend on the wearing qualities of the lead; that must be the test. So far from the honorable member for Echuca being singular in the quotation he made to-night, and in the views to which he gave utterance, I have to say that a practical ironmonger, a friend of mine in Sydney—a man of the highest integrity, who has been selling white lead all his life—expressed the same opinion.

Mr. SALMON.—According to the honorable member's own showing, that man cannot know anything about the covering qualities of white lead.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I suppose the evidence of this man is worth just as much as that of any other man connected with the business. Is it suggested that these statements are made out of sheer wantonness? Honorable members ought not to attack people for making statements in all good faith. We are here to discuss these matters, and not to abuse one another. I

have never witnessed a more savage attack than that made on the honorable member for Echuca; but I fancy he will be able to live through it all, and, perhaps, ultimately benefit.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [10.28].—Mr. McDonald—

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Honorable members opposite are talking like a lot of children!

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I would not describe the action of the Treasurer in such favorable terms as those in which he has described ours. The honorable member for Bendigo questions what was stated in the circular quoted by the honorable member for Echuca, and I now desire to read the following sentences—

In spite of some hysterical articles in our local press, we can confidently assert that genuine white lead, as recognised in Great Britain, is not yet an article of manufacture here. A quantity of sulphate of lead, which is a cheap by-product, has been manufactured here—we, ourselves, in years gone by have made about 300 tons of the same. It is an article altogether inferior in covering power to genuine white lead and if offered to the public in Great Britain as such, would be a breach of the law.

That is all the circular says.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—It does not happen to be true.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—What is not true?

Mr. BATCHELOR.—The statement that good white lead is not made in Australia.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I am not raising that question; I am only pointing out that the letter states that white lead made from sulphate of lead is inferior to white lead made from carbonate of lead, and that that is an opinion confirmed by the highest authorities.

Mr. CROUCH (Corio) [10.30].—The honorable member for North Sydney has stated that he does not know that Australian white lead is used for painting purposes. In my opinion the honorable member has not distinguished between metallic lead and white lead. I would point out to him that in the report of the A section of the Tariff Commission the following statement is made—

In November, 1904, the Victorian Public Works Department specified that Australian-made white lead could be used in their contracts. At that time metallic lead was £13 rs. 3d. per ton, and instead of a percentage rise in the price of white lead, owing to the increased cost of the raw material there was a reduction of over £3 per ton.

I challenge honorable members opposite to refute that statement. I should like to hear what the honorable member for Echuca has to say concerning it. He seems to think that nothing made in Australia can possibly be equal in quality to what is made elsewhere.

Mr. PALMER.—I rise to a point of order. I have never made any such statement as that attributed to me, and I ask that it be withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN.—As the honorable member regards the remark as offensive, probably the honorable member for Corio will withdraw it.

Mr. CROUCH.—I should like to know what is regarded as offensive.

Mr. PALMER.—The statement that I have an objection to everything that is Australian.

Mr. CROUCH.—I do not regard that statement as an offensive one. It is a fair deduction to make from the honorable member's attitude in this chamber.

The CHAIRMAN.—If the honorable member for Corio insists upon the statement, it is not possible for me to compel him to withdraw it. But when an honorable member takes exception to a statement made by another honorable member it has been customary for the author of the statement, as a matter of courtesy, to withdraw it.

Mr. CROUCH.—Then it is a custom which I do not intend to observe on this occasion. I am sorry that the honorable member for Echuca does not like it, and I ask him not to regard my statement as offensive.

The CHAIRMAN.—Will the honorable member proceed?

Mr. PALMER.—It is a case of non-surrender, sir.

Mr. CROUCH.—The honorable member for North Sydney has declared that it is not white lead, but metallic lead, which is used in Australia. I hope that he is not super-sensitive, like the honorable member for Echuca—

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I shall not regard anything which the honorable member may say as offensive.

The CHAIRMAN.—Will the honorable member proceed?

Mr. CROUCH.—If I am to be badgered in this way, not only by the Opposition, but by the Chair, I cannot continue my argument.

The CHAIRMAN.—I have no desire to badger the honorable member, but I would point out that he is holding a conversation

with the honorable member for North Sydney.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [10.35].—I propose to read some statements in regard to this item which are contained in the report of the protectionist section of the Tariff Commission, and which eclipse anything that has been said to-night by the honorable member for Echuca. That section of the Commission summarizes the evidence of a gentleman named Finlayson.

Mr. WILKS.—I quoted that summary this evening.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Then there is no need for me to refer to it again. A few minutes ago the honorable member for Bendigo rose to repel a slander. Why, then, did he incorporate the slander in his own report?

Mr. BATCHELOR.—He referred only to the white lead which is made in Sydney.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Of course there is a difference between the white lead which is made in Sydney and that which is made in Victoria? It is a slander to reflect upon anything made in Victoria, but quite proper to do so in respect of anything made in Sydney. Have we reached that point? The whole thing is absurd.

Amendment negatived.

Amendment (by Mr. JOHNSON) put—

That after the figures "4s. 6d." paragraph A, the words "and on and after 3rd December, 1907, per cwt. (General Tariff), 3s.," be inserted.

The Committee divided.

Ayes	13
Noes	25
Majority	12

AYES.

Archer, E. W.	McWilliams, W. J.
Brown, Tilley	Thomson, Dugald
Cook, Joseph	Wilks, W. H.
Edwards, R.	Wynne, A.
Forrest, Sir John	<i>Tellers:</i>
Johnson, W. E.	Atkinson, L.
Livingston, J.	Bowden, E. K.

NOES.

Batchelor, E. L.	O'Malley, King
Carr, E. S.	Page, J.
Catts, J. H.	Palmer, A. C.
Chapman, Austin	Quick, Sir John
Coon, J.	Sampson, S.
Ewing, T. T.	Storror, D.
Fisher, A.	Tudor, F. G.
Frazer, C. E.	Watson, I. C.
Groom, L. E.	Webster, W.
Lync, Sir William	Wise, G. H.
Maloney, W. R. N.	<i>Tellers:</i>
Mer, S.	Chanter, J. M.
Mugall, J. K.	Cook, Hume

PAIRS.

Kelly, W. H.	Kingston, C. C.
Fysh, Sir Philip	Harper, R.
Liddell, F.	Salmon, C. C.
Willis, Henry	Thomson, John
Brown, Thomas	Foster, F. J.
Smith, Bruce	Hall, D. R.
Fuller, G. W.	Bamford, F. W.
Wilson, J. G.	Watkins, D.
Sinclair, H.	Thomas, J.
Reid, G. H.	Spence, W. G.
Poynton, A.	Mathews, J.
Glynn, P. McM.	Hutchison, J.
Irvine, W. H.	Deakin, A.
Mahon, H.	Knox, W.
Hedges, W. N.	Crouch, R. A.
Fowler, J. M.	Foxton, Colonel

Question so resolved in the negative.

Amendment negatived.

Amendments (by Sir JOHN QUICK) agreed to—

That after the figures "4s. 6d." paragraph A, the words "and on and after 3rd December, 1907, per cwt. (General Tariff), 4s.," and that after the figures "4s." the words "and on and after 3rd December, 1907, per cwt. (United Kingdom), 3s. 6d.," be inserted.

Mr. WILKS (Dalley) [10.46].—The proposed rates of 6s. 9d. and 6s., or 25 and 20 per cent. *ad valorem*, whichever returns the higher duty, on paints and colours prepared for use, will be a very severe impost upon an anti-corrosive paint which is used for ships' bottoms. It is a patented article, prepared by a secret process, and has to be imported, its value being about £150 a ton, whereas ordinary paint costs from £20 to £30 per ton. When the last Tariff was under discussion, on my motion the Government agreed to substitute for an alternative rate the fixed rate of 4s. per cwt. The Government has, by departmental regulation, exempted deep-sea ships on which this paint is used from the payment of duty, and I wish to secure the same exemption for Inter-State vessels.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I am willing to make the duty on such paint 4s. 6d. and 4s.

Mr. WILKS.—In that case, I give notice of my intention to move the insertion of a new paragraph, imposing duties of 4s. 6d. and 4s. on ships' anti-fouling composition.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [10.50].—I move—

That after the figures "6s. 9d." paragraph B, the words "and on and after 3rd December, 1907, per cwt. (General Tariff), 6s.," be inserted; and that after the figures "6s." the words "and on and after 3rd December, 1907, per cwt. (United Kingdom), 5s. 3d.," be inserted.

I move this amendment to bring the rates in paragraph B in conformity with those in paragraph A. I intend subsequently to move an alternative *ad valorem* rate of 20 per cent., which is what was suggested by the Tariff Commission, to cover high grades of paint.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The proposed rate against British importations is 20 per cent.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—I should not object to a 20 per cent. rate all round.

Mr. WYNNE (Balaclava) [10.52].—No doubt other honorable members have, like myself, received statements from the master coachbuilders and wheelwrights of New South Wales and Victoria, in which they say that last year the imports of foreign-made vehicles were valued at only £9,500, and that the estimated value of vehicles of all classes made in Australia is £2,000,000 per annum. They are satisfied with the present rates of duty, under which they have, as a matter of fact, been able to establish an export trade, but they object to the increasing of duties on their raw materials.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—Is the honorable member's information from Victorian manufacturers?

Mr. WYNNE.—It is signed by F. Skinner, W. H. Stevens, Dan White, F. C. Wilmot, and J. W. Waring, on behalf of the Master Coachbuilders' and Wheelwrights' Association of Victoria, and on behalf of a special meeting of Bendigo master coachbuilders, held on the 9th September, 1907; while it is signed by G. H. Olding, on behalf of a special meeting of the Sydney master coachbuilders, held at Sydney on the 23rd August last, and on behalf of eighteen leading New South Wales coachbuilders.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—They ask for protection for their finished products; but they wish to get their raw material free.

Mr. SAMPSON.—Most of them are only assemblers of parts. They are not manufacturers in the true sense.

Mr. WYNNE.—They use what wood they can get.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—No; they do not. Some of them came to me, and I told them that I would not do what they asked.

Mr. WYNNE.—They use a great deal of Queensland and other Australian woods, the only timber imported by them being hickory for shafts and spokes. I have seen dozens of vehicles made in Ballarat and Melbourne very largely from Australian timbers. There is practically no

paint ground in liquid, or paint prepared for use, made in this country, although the honorable member for Bendigo says that in time it will be manufactured here. I was concerned in a white lead making company which was started at Footscray, but, although it spent a great deal of money, it could not get on, not for want of a duty, because the price was good enough, but because it could not make a proper article. If we are going to tax the raw material of the coachbuilders—

Sir JOHN QUICK.—We have increased the duties on vehicles.

Mr. WYNNE.—They have not asked for higher duties on vehicles. Australia can hold its own in that matter.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—Has the honorable member read the Tariff Commission's evidence on the subject?

Mr. WYNNE.—I know as much about the matter as did the witnesses who came before the Tariff Commission. Years ago the Americans used to send vehicles here, but within the last decade, hardly one has been imported, and I do not think that there are ten imported buggies in Victoria at the present day. Furthermore, the Railway Workshops make the carriages and waggon required for the railways, the wood used in each case being nearly all Australian.

Mr. MATHEWS.—This has been done under protection.

Mr. WYNNE.—Certainly; and I am in favour of protection; but I do not desire to hamper our manufacturers by taxing their raw material. We cannot produce prepared oils and paints in this country.

Mr. EDWARDS (Oxley) [10.56].—I am opposed to these high rates of duties, and the Minister has given no reason for increasing the duty from 4s. to 6s. 9d., or *ad valorem* rates of 25 and 20 per cent., whichever may be the higher. To show how this double-barrelled duty works out on paints prepared for use, let me quote the following letter—

Invoice for coach paints just to hand, contents of which are 168 lbs. at the 6s. 9d. per cwt. rate will make the duty 10s. 2d., while under the 25 per cent. rate, it brings the duty up to 38s. 5d., and another lot, weighing 98 lbs., at the specific rate the duty would come to something like 6s., while under the *ad valorem* duty, the duty comes to 60s. 6d. The figures speak for themselves.

The duty on a certain high-class and high-priced paint imported from England, has been increased, with the result that, instead of having to pay 4s. per cwt., which equals

8d. per gallon, it has to pay 20 per cent., plus 10 per cent., which equals 4s. 1d. per gallon. Under the old Tariff, this paint was so expensive that it could be used only in good work, such as railway cars, hospitals, ships, &c., and the new duty practically prohibits its use. I hope that the Minister will consent to a large reduction. I shall support the proposed amendment of the honorable member for Dalley.

Mr. CROUCH (Corio) [10.59].—When the honorable member for Balaclava said that the coachbuilders ask that the duties on their raw materials shall not be increased, it was objected that they asked for higher duties on their finished products; but that is not so, because they are satisfied with the old rates in regard to both their vehicles and their raw materials.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—Only some of them.

Mr. CROUCH. — I am sorry that the Minister of Trade and Customs is not at the table. He received a deputation, introduced by me, consisting of representatives of the Master Coachbuilders' Association of Victoria. It presented telegrams from Bendigo, Ballarat, and Geelong, and was accompanied by a representative of the Coachbuilders' Association, of Adelaide, and the President of the New South Wales Coachbuilders' Society. It was distinctly stated by the speakers that they did not want an increased duty on the finished article, and were quite satisfied with the protection they had against outside competition. They asked the Minister that the duties in the old Tariff should be allowed to stand. I know nothing about the views of the trade beyond the statements which were made by that representative deputation.

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—I suppose the honorable member recollects that there was a little difference of opinion?

Mr. CROUCH.—There was one man who had not been asked to attend, and I understand that he made some representations to the Minister subsequently. But so far as the deputation could be representative, it was.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [11.2].—I point out that in this case we are asked to agree to alternative duties—to duties of 6s. and 5s. 3d. respectively, or if those are not high enough to duties of 25 and 20 per cent. respectively.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—That is on the higher grade of paints.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Yes; but 2 per centage on the cheaper paints is very

much higher than the percentage on the dearer paints. I do not like these alternative duties, because attempts will be made to evade them. In the case of paints it will be quite impossible in many cases to distinguish them. Where there are great variations in value, as there are in many cases, the Customs officers will have great difficulty in distinguishing them. I would far rather see a fixed duty, even at the higher amount proposed by the honorable member for Bendigo, than the duty previously proposed. I shall not raise any objection to the amendment of the honorable member for Bendigo, but I propose to move the omission of the duties of 25 and 20 per cent.

Amendments agreed to.

Amendment (by Mr. DUGALD THOMSON) proposed—

That the words "ad val. (General Tariff), 25 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 20 per cent., whichever rate returns the higher duty," paragraph B, be left out.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—If the Minister sees no objection to that amendment, I shall not oppose it.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [11.4].—I prefer to see the words retained, because the duties are intended to affect, not the cheaper grades of paints, but the higher grades. It was recommended by the A section of the Tariff Commission that the duty on British imports should be 6s. per cwt., or 20 per cent.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—But the honorable member for Bendigo now says that if the Minister does not object to my amendment he will not.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not mind the duty being fixed at 20 per cent. in each column.

Mr. WEBSTER (Gwydir) [11.5].—I think that the Treasurer should reduce the *ad valorem* rates to 20 and 15 per cent. respectively. If he will agree to that reduction it will cover the cases which he has in his mind.

Mr. WYNNE (Balaclava) [11.6].—As the old duty of 4s. has been increased to 6s., it means a duty of £6 a ton. That, I think, ought to be sufficient protection on any class of paint. To my mind, it is a very big charge. I do not know what paint is worth, but I should think that £20 would be a very good price. On that value a duty of £6 a ton would be equal to 20 per cent. It is a most difficult thing for any person to assess the value of these articles. Preferably I would support a fixed duty on all things, because it does away

with any inducement to commit a fraud. If we impose an *ad valorem* duty and a fixed duty, it will only encourage persons to undervalue their goods, whereas if we impose a fixed duty only they will know exactly what they have to pay, and there will be no inducement to commit a fraud.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [11.8].—I would point out to the honorable member for North Sydney that if his amendment be negatived, the duty of 25 per cent. will stand, although the Treasurer has offered to reduce it to 20 per cent.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—If honorable members are agreeable, I am prepared to accept duties of 20 and 15 per cent.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [11.9].—I propose to test the point on an amendment to omit the words "or ad val." In any case if the Minister does not want the duty fixed in that form, it can be dealt with afterwards in a separate paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN.—I point out to the honorable member for North Sydney that if his amendment is lost, the honorable member for Gwydir will not be able to move an amendment to reduce the rates, because the question put to the Committee will have been that the words proposed to be left out stand part of the item.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment (by Mr. DUGALD THOMSON) proposed—

That the words "or ad val.," paragraph B, be left out.

Question—That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the item—put. The Committee divided.

Ayes	25
Noes	16
			—
Majority	9

AYES.

Hatchelor, E. L.	McDougall, J. K.
Carr, E. S.	O'Malley, King
Catts, J. H.	Quick, Sir John
Chapman, Austin	Salmon, C. C.
Coon, J.	Sampson, S.
Ewing, T. T.	Storrer, D.
Fisher, A.	Tudor, F. G.
Frazer, C. E.	Watson, J. C.
Groom, L. E.	Webster, W.
Lyne, Sir William	Wise, G. H.
Maloney, W. R. N.	<i>Tellers:</i>
Mathews, J.	Cook, Hume
Mauger, S.	Crouch, R. A.

NOES.

Archer, E. W.	Page, J.
Atkinson, L.	Palmer, A. C.
Cook, Joseph	Thomson, Dugald
Edwards, R.	Wilks, W. H.
Forrest, Sir John	Wynne, A.
Hedges, W. N.	
Liddell, F.	<i>Tellers:</i>
Livingston, J.	Bowden, E. K.
McWilliams, W. J.	Johnson, W. E.

PAIRS.

Kingston, C. C.	Kelly, W. H.
Harper, R.	Fysh, Sir Philip
Thomson, John	Willis, Henry
Foster, F. J.	Brown, Thomas
Chanter, J. M.	Brown, Tilley
Hall, D. R.	Smith, Bruce
Bamford, F. W.	Fuller, G. W.
Watkins, D.	Wilson, J. G.
Deakin, A.	Irvine, W. H.
Thomas, J.	Sinclair, H.
Spence, W. G.	Reid, G. H.
Mathews, J.	Poynton, A.
Hutchison, J.	Glynn, P. McM.
Knox, W.	Mahon, H.
Foxton, Colonel	Fowler, J. M.
Irvine, Hans	Hughes, W. M.

Question so resolved in the affirmative.

Amendment negatived.

Amendments (by Mr. WEBSTER) agreed to—

That after the words "25 per cent.," paragraph B, the words "and on and after 3rd December, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 20 per cent.;" and that after the words "20 per cent.," the words "and on and after 3rd December, 1907, ad val. (United Kingdom), 15 per cent.," be inserted.

Mr. WILKS (Dalley) [11.12]. — I move—

That the following new paragraph be inserted:—

"BB. Ships' anti-fouling composition, per cwt. (General Tariff), 4s. 6d.; (United Kingdom), 4s."

The object of this new paragraph is to afford facilities for Inter-State vessels to be docked in Australia. If provision be not made in this direction, it simply means that ships will be docked in eastern ports. Other countries, like New Zealand, admit these paints practically free, and it would be advisable for Australia to do the same.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [11.19].—Paragraph c, "Colours, dry, n.e.i.," is an item as to which we have proposed a little increase of 225 per cent. in the duty. It is desirable to emphasize that fact. Such an increase may not sound very much if one says it quickly. I do not profess to know much about colours, but

I must protest against an absurd increase of this kind. I move—

That after the figures “3s. 3d.,” paragraph c, the words “and on and after 3rd December, 1907, per cwt. (General Tariff), 2s.,” be inserted.

Amendment negatived.

Amendments (by Mr. WEBSTER) agreed to—

That after the figures “3s. 3d.,” paragraph c, the words “and on and after 3rd December, 1907, per cwt. (General Tariff), 2s. 6d.,”; and that after the figures “3s.,” the words “and on and after 3rd December, 1907, per cwt. (United Kingdom), 2s.,” be inserted.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [11.22].—I should be glad if the honorable member for Gwydir would move a reduction on my behalf, in respect of paragraph d. I am prepared to agree to a proposal that the duty on foreign imports be reduced from 2s. 3d. to 1s. 6d. per cwt.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I shall not accept such an amendment.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I move—

That after the figures “2s. 3d.,” paragraph d, the words “and on and after 3rd December, 1907, per cwt. (General Tariff), 1s. 6d.,” be inserted.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. WEBSTER (Gwydir) [11.24].—I intend to move—

That after the figures “2s. 3d.,” paragraph d, the words “and on and after 3rd December, 1907, per cwt. (General Tariff), 2s.,”; and that after the figures “2s.” the words “and on and after 3rd December, 1907, per cwt. (United Kingdom), 1s. 9d.,” be inserted.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [11.26].—I should like the Treasurer to agree to progress being reported.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The honorable member may try to count-out the House if he likes to do so, but I shall not agree to an adjournment until we have dealt with this division.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Why not finish the whole Tariff before we adjourn? I think that it is time that progress was reported. The Committee seems to be in a mood to vote for whatever the Treasurer desires.

Mr. WATSON.—We are all reasonable men.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Yes; when the duties have been increased by 200 per cent. and 300 per cent. The Treasurer is in a very unreasonable mood. He has told me across the table that he will do nothing for me, and I do not see why I should do anything for him.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I did not say that.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The reduction proposed by the honorable member for Gwydir is a paltry, contemptible one, and I would sooner vote for the original duty. It is an abuse of terms to speak of these duties as reasonable. So far as I can learn, there is very little of this material imported. The Treasurer will agree to nothing, but now and again he puts up an honorable member on his own side to make a slight reduction.

Mr. WEBSTER.—He does not do anything of the kind.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—When the honorable member for Gwydir begins to move reductions, we may be quite sure that he has had the “office.”

Mr. WEBSTER.—I know something about these items.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The honorable member for Lang is the authority on white lead, and he declares that these duties are extremely high. I appeal to the Treasurer to agree to duties of 1s. 9d. and 1s. 6d.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—No. I will agree to 2s. and 1s. 9d.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Then I move—

That after the figures “2s. 3d.,” paragraph d, the words “and on and after 3rd December, 1907, per cwt. (General Tariff), 1s. 9d.,” be inserted.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [11.34].—I think the Treasurer should be more reasonable. Items have been passed to-day with a rapidity I did not expect. We might reasonably have expected that the discussion of the kerosene duty would have occupied a whole day. There is one item in this division on which it is necessary that something should be said, because the increase proposed in the duty is enormous. I refer to item 237—varnishes. I suggest that the Minister should postpone the consideration of that item.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—No. We have reached a stage at which it is necessary that we should make up our minds to get to a certain place in the Tariff each day.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The Minister cannot expect that honorable members on this side will give up the views they hold because he insists that a certain duty should be imposed. There must be some consideration for honorable members on this side, or there must be debate.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Let us go on with the debate. I intend to finish this division to-night.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—There is the answer to the suggestion that the Treasurer should agree to the postponement of the one item of varnishes. This is what we get in return for checking debate on the kerosene duty. It should not be forgotten that even if the Minister applied the closure to the debate, and merely took a division on each item, it would be impossible for him to get the Tariff through before Christmas without the co-operation of the Opposition.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—We are so near the end of this division that I think we might finish it to-night.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—If the Treasurer would meet the Opposition in connexion with varnishes, there should be no difficulty about that.

Mr. WATSON (South Sydney) [11.36].—Every one must recognise that the honorable member for North Sydney is right when he says that unless there is co-operation amongst members on all sides we cannot expect to finish the consideration of the Tariff in this Chamber before Christmas. Still, I suggest that this division might be put through to-night. I must say that the Opposition have treated honorable members on this side fairly to-night. I point out with regard to varnishes that the proposed increase is not such an enormous one as has been suggested, and I think it will be found when we reach the item that there is a fair prospect of an agreement upon it.

Question.—That the words proposed to be inserted (Mr. JOSEPH COOK's amendment) be so inserted—put. The Committee divided.

Ayes	10
Noes	24

Majority	14
----------	-----	-----	-----	----

Archer, E. W.	AYES.	Page, J.
Bowden, E. K.		Thomson, Dugald
Cook, Joseph		
Forrest, Sir John		Tellers:
Liddell, F.		Atkinson, L.
McWilliams, W. J.		Johnson, W. E.

Batchelor, E. L.	NOES.	Quick, Sir John
Carr, E. S.		Salmon, C. C.
Catts, J. H.		Sampson, S.
Chapman, Austin		Storror, D.
Coon, J.		Tudor, F. G.
Fwing, T. T.		Watson, J. C.
Fisher, A.		Webster, W.
Frazer, C. E.		Wise, G. H.
Groom, L. E.		Wynne, A.
Lyne, Sir William		
Maloney, W. R. N.		Tellers:
O'Malley, King		Cook, Hume
Palmer, A. C.		McDougall, J. K.

PAIRS.

Kelly, W. H.	Kingston, C. C.
Fysh, Sir Philip	Harper, R.
Willis, Henry	Thomson, John
Brown, Thomas	Foster, F. J.
Brown, Tilley	Chanter, J. M.
Smith, Bruce	Hall, D. R.
Fuller, G. W.	Bamford, F. W.
Wilson, J. G.	Watkins, D.
Irvine, W. H.	Deakin, A.
Sinclair, H.	Thomas, J.
Reid, G. H.	Spence, W. G.
Poynton, A.	Mathews, J.
Glynn, P. McM.	Hutchison, J.
Fowler, J. M.	Foxton, Colonel
Hughes, W. M.	Irvine, Hans
Wilks, W. H.	Mauger, S.
Hedges, W. N.	Crouch, R. A.
Livingston, J.	Knox, W.

Question so resolved in the negative.

Amendment negatived.

Amendments (by Mr. WEBSTER) proposed—

That after the figures "2s. 3d.," paragraph D, the words "and on and after 3rd December, 1907, per cwt. (General Tariff), 2s.," and that after the figures "2s.," the words "and on and after 3rd December, 1907, per cwt. (United Kingdom), 1s. 9d.," be inserted.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [11.43].—I should like to know whether the Minister can give any information on the item of white lead. I admit that it is very rare for him to give information. Will he tell us where white lead is produced in Australia, under what conditions, what wages are paid in the industry, if it is an industry worth cultivating in Australia, and what justification he has for this huge increase in the duty? White lead is one of the raw materials for the manufacture of paint. The number of men interested in getting it in at a moderate rate of duty far outweighs the number of men who will be employed in any industry of the kind which is likely to be developed in Australia for some time to come. Why we should be constantly taxing the raw materials of certain industries, I am at a loss to understand. But apparently the Treasurer has only to sit tight and he gets everything through without a word of explanation. Scarcely one honorable member knows where, in Australia, this white lead is produced.

Mr. COON.—It is produced at Yarraville, near Footscray.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Then will the honorable member for Batman tell us all about the industry? How many hands are employed? We must know something about the item before we pass it. We cannot vote in the dark. We are voting 100 and

200 per cent. increases of duty in the most absolute ignorance of what we are doing.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—The honorable member has had two divisions on it in the dark.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—As the Committee is determined not to reduce the duty, the next best thing is to justify it. Will any more labour be employed if the duties are increased? Is the new protection to apply to the industry if established under these inordinate rates? I will not vote a 100 per cent. increase in any duty unless I know that the workman is to benefit, and that the best labour conditions are to apply. Why tax the raw material of the painters of the Commonwealth, who are making a bare living as it is? I like a fair thing, but I do not think this is a fair thing. We are told that this white lead—I hope that I shall not be accused of slandering Australian industries—

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—The honorable member is doing very well.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I cannot even get a reduction of 3d. If I could get the ear of the honorable member for Gwydir, he might persuade the Government to be reasonable even yet.

Mr. STORRER.—He has proposed duties of 2s. and 1s. 6d.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Is that a reasonable proposal? A duty of 1s. 6d. is an increase of 75 per cent. I wished to find out how much of this article was imported, but the figures are not at all clear. I am referred "over the leaf," but that tells us nothing, because there I find "colours, dry, n.e.i." I should like to know where white lead is produced in Australia, how many men are employed, what wages are paid, and the area of the works? I should like to know, further, from the Minister of Trade and Customs, in the absence of the Treasurer, whether he feels justified in agreeing to the reasonable proposition that the duties should be 2s. and 1s. 6d.?

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—I accept the suggestion.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendments (by Mr. JOSEPH COOK) agreed to—

That after the figures "2s. 3d.," paragraph D, the words "and on and after 3rd December, 1907, per cwt. (General Tariff), 2s.," and after the figures "2s.," the words "and on and after 3rd December, 1907, per cwt. (United Kingdom), 1s. 6d.," be inserted.

Mr. TUDOR (Yarra) [11.55].—I should like to suggest to the Minister of Trade

and Customs that barytes should be placed under item 239, and thus be made subject to a general Tariff of 5 per cent., with free imports from the United Kingdom.

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—The Government will accept that suggestion—let us do some business.

Amendment (by Mr. TUDOR) agreed to—

That the words "(E) Barytes, per cwt., 2s.," be left out.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 237. Varnishes; Varnish and Oil Stains; Lacquers; Enamels; Enamel Paints and Glosses; Japans; Berlin and Brunswick Blacks; Liquid Sizes; Patent Knotting; Oil and Wood Finishes; Petrifying Liquids; Damp-wall Compositions; Lithographic Varnish; Printers' Ink Reducer; Terebine; Liquid Dryers; and Gold Size, per gal., 2s., or ad val., 30 per cent., whichever rate returns the higher duty.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [12.0].—This is a debatable item which might well occupy the Committee profitably for at least half a sitting; and yet we are asked to deal with it at midnight. I decidedly object to any "double banking." Let people know what they have to pay one way or the other. If the Minister of Trade and Customs will agree to leave out the *ad valorem* duty I shall have no more to say.

Mr. MATHEWS.—Why should the *ad valorem* duty be left out.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Because the duty is a high one, even when the *ad valorem* rate is omitted.

Mr. STORRER.—The best article will then be admitted at the lower rate of duty.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I am assured by the best authorities upon varnishes, that it is impossible to check their values—that one cannot tell the difference between a varnish which is worth 5s. per gallon and one which is worth 6s. and 7s. per gallon. Their relative values can be determined only by their wear.

Mr. MATHEWS.—They must be funny practical men who cannot tell the difference between the values of varnishes.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The honorable member for Lang is an expert upon varnishes—he has been working amongst them all his life—and he cannot tell the difference between their values. I should like to know whether the Treasurer will agree to substitute a fixed rate for an *ad valorem*?

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [12.2 a.m.].—The *ad valorem* rate proposed is

30 per cent. Personally, I should be willing to agree to a reduced rate as a compromise.

Mr. BOWDEN.—The protectionist section of the Tariff Commission recommended only 1s. 9d. per gallon.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—That is a mistake. We recommended a duty of 2s. per gallon.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Let us say 2s. 6d. per gallon under the general Tariff, and 2s. per gallon under that for the United Kingdom.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—I have no objection. I suggest to the Treasurer that we should omit the *ad valorem* rate, and substitute in lieu thereof 2s. 6d. per gallon under the general Tariff, and 2s. per gallon under the Tariff for the United Kingdom.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [12.4 a.m.].—In the first place, it is undeniable that a difficulty is experienced in checking the values of varnishes. That fact would enable dishonest firms to obtain a trade advantage. In the second place, a good deal of this work has to be done in competition with other places. A considerable portion of it has to be done upon vessels, and upon articles which go out of Australia. Seeing that New Zealand levies a duty of only 2s. per gallon upon varnishes, the imposition of the rate proposed would offer a premium to all vessels which touch at the Dominion and Australia to get their work done there. For these reasons the Treasurer might well agree to the suggestion which has been made.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [12.5 a.m.].—Several persons have contended that under the operation of the duty proposed, ships would visit New Zealand in order to get their varnishing work done there. I do not believe that many vessels would go there specially for that purpose. But I confess that I do not like a double duty. At the same time, I do not wish to allow the higher class importations to escape taxation. I move—

That after the word "Berlin" the word "and" be left out, with a view to insert in lieu thereof a comma.

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That after the word "Brunswick" the words "and stoving" be inserted.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [12.7 a.m.].—In deference to the de-

sire which has been expressed, and emphatically to facilitate the transaction of business, I move—

That after the figure "2s." the words "and on and after 3rd December, 1907, per gallon (General Tariff), 2s. 6d.; (United Kingdom), 2s.," be inserted.

I shall afterwards move the omission of the words "or ad. val. 30 per cent., whichever rate returns the higher duty."

Mr. MATHEWS (Melbourne Ports) [12.8 a.m.].—I am rather surprised that the old argument that we cannot produce varnish in Australia has not been advanced. The former rate of duty was 1s. 9d. per gallon. Yet coachbuilders tell us that Australian varnish is useless.

Mr. JOHNSON.—A lot of it is.

Mr. MATHEWS.—The whole of the varnish used on the Victorian railways is manufactured in this State.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Some Australian varnish is good, the bulk of it is bad.

Mr. MATHEWS.—Under the existing system the higher grades of varnish will be admitted at a cheap rate. Unfortunately, while the Treasurer is frequently derided by the Opposition for refusing to give way upon Tariff matters, he yields more to the members of that body than he does to his own supporters. The varnish made here is good enough for the varnishing of the railway carriages of Victoria, and therefore I think that the least the Minister could have done was to insist upon his original proposal. Now that he has agreed to a reduction, it is hopeless for me to try to move him.

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That the words "or ad val., 30 per cent., whichever rate returns the higher duty," be left out.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 238. Liquid removers of Paint and Varnish, ad val. 15 per cent.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I hope that the Committee will negative this item.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [12.13 a.m.].—I am informed that liquid removers of paints and varnish generally consist of mixtures of turpentine and spirits, or similar substances, their manufacture being a very simple process. Under the old Tariff they were free as unspecified articles, there being no dutiable heading under which they could be placed. This was considered anomalous, and therefore the previous proposal was made.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—No one asked for a duty on these things.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I object to the departmental officers proposing duties of this kind. It is not their function to do so.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE. — A Minister cannot carry on his Department without listening to the recommendation of officers who have grown up in the service, and know more about these matters than does any one else.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Why not negative the item, and bring liquid removers of paint and varnish into item 239?

Mr. SALMON.—This arrangement was proposed for the protection of the revenue.

Mr. LIDDELL.—We ought to shift all these officers. The country is being ridden by Victorian officials.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not think that we could get better officials anywhere. I wish the honorable member had half the brains of any one of them.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [12.15 a.m.].—I wish to say, as emphatically as I can—and I have been saying it ever since I came to this Parliament—

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Without any effect.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Nothing reasonable can have effect while the honorable member is in power. Every one knows that he is entirely in the grip of his secretary, because he has not the ability requisite to do his own work.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The honorable member should not be insulting.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I suppose the Treasurer is never insulting. I object to Tariffs being made by officials who should be tax-gatherers and not tax-framers. It is their duty to protect the revenue, and to make suggestions to that end; but they step beyond their functions when they make proposals for the protection of Australian industries. That is the business of this Parliament. The officials have no right to interfere in it.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—And they have not done so.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The Treasurer said that they suggested this item.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—They suggested a re-arrangement, because the former Tariff was anomalous. The item was embodied in the Tariff for the sake of clearness.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Although their reason, according to the Treasurer, was simply to obtain clearness, the effect of the item is to make dutiable at 15 per cent. a composition which under the old

Tariff was admitted duty free. I enter my emphatic protest against the proposing of duties by officers in the Department.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I am prepared to bring liquid removers into item 239, which will make them dutiable at 5 per cent., or, if imported from the United Kingdom, free.

Mr. STORRER (Bass) [12.19 a.m.].—I move—

That the words "and on and after 3rd December, 1907, ad val., 10 per cent.," be added.

This is a matter I know something about, and, in my opinion, the departmental officers did quite right in suggesting the insertion of the item. They were actuated by the desire to protect the revenue of the Commonwealth, and it is a pity that reflections have been cast on men who know more about the working of the Department than we do. It is their duty to point out anything that they think to be wrong, while it is our duty to judge the wisdom of their suggestions. I think that in this case they have done quite right.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [12.20 a.m.].—By way of personal explanation I desire to say that my remarks were addressed not to the Under-Secretary but to the Minister, who encourages that sort of thing on the part of the officers.

Mr. WATSON (South Sydney) [12.21 a.m.].—The honorable member for Bass has told the Committee that he is an expert on this matter, but he has given us no indication that he possesses special knowledge.

Mr. STORRER.—I did not want to make a speech at this hour.

Mr. WATSON.—I appreciate that. From the statement of the Minister I understand that liquid removers are composed of spirits of turpentine and similar things. If that is so, I do not see that any great trouble will ensue if we do what has been suggested.

Mr. STORRER.—They can make the article and bottle it here.

Mr. WATSON.—Yes. When they put spirits of turpentine and something else together they have a liquid remover. From what I can hear, it is an extremely simple thing to make. The Tariff Commission made no recommendation on this head. No one has asked for a duty to be imposed, and at the most the Minister has said that it is a Ministerial recommendation. In those circumstances I do not think that we need worry very much about the matter, but I

suggest to the honorable member for Parramatta that he might accept the Minister's proposal to make the duty 5 per cent. in the general Tariff, and to admit British imports free, as it approximates to his own idea.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I have no objection.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [12.23 a.m.].—I do not think that there is any ground for reflecting upon the officers of the Department. I have always found them very fair and impartial and anxious to place information from every point of view in the hands of honorable members. I hope that the honorable member for Parramatta did not mean to reflect on them.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I explained that I did not.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—The officers of the Department have a duty to perform, and if they see an ambiguity in the Tariff, and that no provision is made as to the head under which a duty is to fall, it is their business to direct the attention of the Minister to the matter, with a view to its being put right.

Mr. SALMON (Laanecoorie) [12.24 a.m.].—I think that the honorable member for Parramatta scarcely did justice to himself when he described the officers of the Department as mere tax-gatherers, as they have very important and intricate duties to discharge.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—That is all I said.

Mr. SALMON.—The honorable member described them as mere tax-gatherers.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—And something besides.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. BATCHELOR).—Order! I think it is unnecessary to discuss the officers of the Department on this item.

Mr. SALMON.—I hope that I may be pardoned for saying a few more words, as the remarks have reflected on the State which I represent. It has been stated that the officers are Victorians. The Comptroller-General does happen to be a Victorian. No one can question his ability, capacity and integrity. He is second to no officer in the Public Service. The next officer who administers the Department happens to come from New South Wales, and he also is a very competent officer.

Mr. WEBSTER (Gwydir) [12.26 a.m.].—I propose to move that item 238 be eliminated, with a view to its being brought under another head.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN.—There is an amendment before the Committee.

Mr. BOWDEN.—I call attention to the state of the Committee. [*Quorum formed.*]

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) proposed—

That the words "and on and after 3rd December, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 5 per cent.; (United Kingdom), free," be added.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [12.28 a.m.].—I desire to say a few more words about the officers of the Department. This, I repeat, is not the first time I have referred to this matter here. I have no complaint to make against the officers. My complaint is made against the Minister for permitting them to control and make the fiscal policy of Australia. Their function is to protect the revenue, and not to suggest or to control our fiscal policy. The latter function appertains to the Minister and to this Parliament.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—I think that their suggestions might receive consideration.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE. — They might be considered.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I have already said that any suggestion for a re-arrangement or a better arrangement of the items might be considered, but no suggestion for the imposition of new duties should be entertained, because that involves a question of policy.

Mr. SAMPSON.—Are not the officers there to assist the Minister?

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Yes; they are there to assist the Ministry in carrying out the policy laid down by this Parliament. They are not there to impose new duties.

Mr. WISE.—I rise to order. What have the honorable member's observations to do with the item?

The CHAIRMAN.—Order! The honorable member for Gippsland will resume his seat. The honorable member for Parramatta is quite in order.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The moment I rise to my feet that jack-in-the-box over there gets up. I am getting about tired of it.

Mr. WISE.—We are all tired of the honorable member.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Then the honorable member can go outside. I subscribe to all that has been said as to the ability and integrity of the officers of the Department. I have never doubted them. I do not believe that we could have more capable

men at the head of the Department of Trade and Customs than are there to-day. My point is clear—that they are there to assist the Minister in administering the Tariff, not to make suggestions for new and high duties.

Amendment agreed to.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 239. Blacks . . . Vermilions, Crayons, ad val. (General Tariff), 5 per cent.; (United Kingdom), free.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That the words "barytes" be inserted after the word "Crayons."

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Progress reported.

SPECIAL ADJOURNMENT.

Motion (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That the House, at its rising, adjourn until 11 a.m. this day.

House adjourned at 12.35 a.m. (Tuesday).

House of Representatives.

Tuesday, 3 December, 1907.

Mr. SPEAKER took the chair at 11 a.m., and read prayers.

PETITION.

Mr. GLYNN presented a petition from the Adelaide Chamber of Commerce praying that the Australian Industries Preservation Bill be laid aside.

Petition received and read.

MELBOURNE AND SYDNEY TELEPHONE LINE.

Mr. McDOUGALL asked the Postmaster-General, *upon notice*—

1. What was the total cost of the telephone line erected between Melbourne and Sydney?

2. How much has it cost the Department to maintain and operate the said line to date; and what is the average weekly revenue earned by it?

3. Were the prospective subscribers in the cities mentioned asked for a guarantee before the work was undertaken?

Mr. MAUGER.—The answers to the honorable member's questions are as follow—

1. The total cost of the telegraph and telephone line (the line is used for both purposes between Melbourne and Sydney), was £46,686. maintenance, £97 5s. 2d.; for operation, 19s. 5d. The average weekly revenue been £67 3s. 8d.

"BROKEN SHIFTS": SYDNEY GENERAL POST OFFICE.

Mr. JOHNSON asked the Postmaster-General, *upon notice*—

1. Whether he issued instructions that the practice of working "broken shifts" in the Mail Branch of the G.P.O. was to be discontinued?

2. Is he aware that the practice of working "broken shifts" still continues and is a source of much dissatisfaction to the officers affected thereby?

3. Will extra pay be allowed to officers of the G.P.O., Sydney, for overtime worked to keep pace with the extra rush and volume of business during the Christmas and New Year season?

Mr. MAUGER.—The answers to the honorable member's questions are as follow—

1. When in Sydney I received a deputation of officers on the subject of "broken shifts," and instructed the Deputy Postmaster-General that the practice was to be discontinued as far as possible.

I may add that that officer pointed out that in no post office was it possible, in connexion with the mail branch, to so arrange work that there would be no broken time.

2. Yes, to a certain extent; but it is reported to be impracticable in view of the very irregular character of the work in the Mail Branch to altogether do away with broken time.

3. Extra pay for overtime in accordance with the provisions of the Public Service Act and Regulations will be allowed.

TARIFF.

In Committee of Ways and Means
(Consideration resumed from 2nd December, *vide* page 6896):

Division VIII.—Earthenware, Cement, China, Glass and Stone.

Item 240. Portland Cement, Plaster of Paris, and other like preparations having Magnesite or Sulphate of Lime as a basis; also Gypsum, per cwt. (General Tariff), 1s.; (United Kingdom), 9d.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [11.8].—Before we proceed to deal with this item, I wish to make a short statement in regard to item 252, concerning which I know there is some feeling that the duties proposed are not exactly what is desirable. Very strong representations having been made to me on the subject, I desire to inform honorable members that when the item is reached, I shall propose that it be negatived so that the goods covered by it will fall into item 253, and be subjected to a lower duty. The specific duty was imposed on the recommendation of the protectionist section of

the Tariff Commission, but I find that, as it stands, it represents a very high percentage. I thought it well to give the Committee notice of what I intend to do.

Item agreed to.

Item 241. China, parian, and porcelain ware and mosaic flooring, ad. val. (General Tariff), 35 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 25 per cent.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [11.9].—No china has yet been made in Australia, notwithstanding that there has been in operation for the last five or six years a duty of 20 per cent. Why then should the duties have been increased? Has the Treasurer proof that chinaware is being made in Australia?

Mr. COON.—It can be made.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Anything can be made in Australia at a figure. So far no one in Australia has entered upon the manufacture of china, although a 20 per cent. duty, with an importing cost equal to at least another 25 per cent., should be a fair temptation to begin it. Until some effort is made to manufacture china in Australia we are, by the imposition of these duties, unnecessarily taxing those who wish to buy china. In the circumstances I am prepared to move that the duty should be 20 per cent., as under the old Tariff.

Mr. TUDOR.—Twenty per cent. all round?

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Yes; because this is purely a revenue duty. If there is anything in the suggestion that there might be a preference in this case, the duties might be 20 per cent. and 15 per cent.

Mr. FAIRBAIRN (Fawkner) [11.12].—I think the duty proposed by the Government is a little high. China is not made here at all. I hope that some day clay suitable for its manufacture will be discovered in Australia; but, so far as I know, no clay has been found here from which china could be made.

Mr. LIVINGSTON.—We can get all kinds of clay in Australia.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—We have suitable clay, but the manufacture of china has not yet been begun.

Mr. FAIRBAIRN.—In deciding what the duties on these articles should be it should not be forgotten that the cost of freight, including breakages, amounts to anything from 50 to 100 per cent. Another point of importance is that even the experts have great difficulty in discriminating between china and earthenware. Under the old Victorian Tariff they were dutiable at different rates, but that was found to be

unworkable, and they had to be classed together. As honorable members are, no doubt, aware, we can command the earthenware trade with local manufactures. In all the circumstances I think that duties of 25 and 20 per cent. would meet the case.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [11.15].—I admit that the duties proposed on this item seem somewhat high. The one intention, of course, is to encourage the manufacture of china in Australia, and, in my opinion, it is scandalous that it has not yet been made here. The officers of the Department are very anxious that the duties on items 241 and 243 should be the same; but in connexion with some of the articles included in item 243 I do not care to reduce the items to as low a rate as the honorable member for Fawkner suggests.

Mr. TUDOR.—We might separate earthenware and stoneware from the other items, and impose a higher duty on them.

Mr. WATSON.—Make the duties 25 and 20 per cent. all round.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—Once the Minister makes concessions the whole thing will tumble down.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—We cannot discuss item 243 at present; but it includes some items on which the duties suggested would not be sufficiently high. It may be necessary to take some articles out of that item and deal with them separately. On this particular item I accept the suggestion that the duties should be 25 and 20 per cent.

Mr. KNOX (Kooyong) [11.17].—China, parian, and porcelain ware are not made in Australia, and it is not likely that they ever will be made here. But I wish to point out that mosaic flooring must be regarded as in quite a different category. With the approval of the Minister I should like to see mosaic flooring removed to item 244.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I have no objection; I was going to propose that myself.

Mr. PAGE (Maranoa) [11.18].—The Treasurer has not given what I regard as a sound reason for agreeing to the proposed reduction of these duties. I have before me a circular from a firm dealing in chinaware, in which the statement is made that not a single piece of chinaware is made in Australia. I claim the vote of the honorable member for South Sydney on this item, because the honorable member has time and again assured the Committee that

he is opposed to revenue duties, and this is neither more nor less than a revenue duty. I shall not detain the Committee. I move—

That after the words "35 per cent." and "25 per cent." the words "and on and after 4th December, 1907, free" be inserted.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [11.19].—I am inclined to think that it would be well to reduce the duties on this item to 25 per cent. and 20 per cent., but I should not like honorable members to run away with the impression that it is not likely that china will never be produced in Australia. To suggest such a thing would be to do an injustice to a budding industry in South Australia, which, I hope and believe, has a very good future before it, although its present prospects are not very bright. Mr. Joseph Provis, mining engineer and chemist, and general manager of the Kangaroo Island Chinastone and Clay Company, informed the Tariff Commission that they had discovered vast deposits of china clay, composed of the finest felspar and silica, and offering reasonable conditions of manufacture. Mr. Provis was asked with reference to this item, "China, parian and porcelain ware, and mosaic flooring, *ad valorem* 20 per cent.," and gave the following evidence—

56299. What have you to say about that?—I would like to see an increased duty of 10 per cent. on that.

56300. Raising it to 30 per cent.?—Yes, that would make it 30.

56301. What articles would be included in that?—That would include the whole of the porcelain ware, and the whole of the mosaic flooring. A large quantity of that is introduced into this country, and we can manufacture here. Samples which I have seen manufactured in the State are equally as good as the imported article. We have the materials here and the ability for doing it; and the work, as far as I have seen it, and as far as I am a judge of these things, is equally as good as the best imported article.

56302. What does china include?—That would be china cups and saucers, dinner sets, and tea set ware, and vases, and so on.

While my colleagues and myself were convinced that these fine deposits existed there, we recognised that they were in a crude state of development, and that it would take a large amount of capital and skilled labour to bring them up to working pitch. In the meantime we do not feel justified in recommending a high duty, which might for years operate as a revenue duty, but we think that in time those important deposits will come into prominence. I mention them now to bring them under the atten-

tion of the House, and of the country, in the hope that capitalists and others will give a little attention to them. Probably in a few years it will be quite justifiable to impose the duty now proposed by the Minister, but at present I see no reason for imposing a duty which will operate only as a revenue duty.

Mr. BOWDEN (Nepean) [11.22].—The transport expenses are very heavy in the case of these articles, owing to the great bulk of the packages, the care necessary to be taken in the packing, and the breakages that are constantly taking place. All those considerations pile up the cost tremendously, especially of the finer class of china and porcelain. At the very lowest, the freight and breakage expenses must be put at from 33½ to 50 per cent. 33½ per cent. is the allowance made for freight and breakage in the Doulton warehouse. That is for good quality material, which, of course would be very liable to fracture. The cheaper and heavier stuff is not so liable to be broken. That cost of 33½ per cent is in itself a very heavy protection for the local manufacture, if it can be undertaken, but there is practically nothing being made here at present of the higher class of these articles, although a little of the delf ware is being made. This is, therefore, a purely revenue duty, and rates of 15 and 20 per cent. are quite sufficient. We do not want to keep the higher class of china and porcelain out of the homes of the poorer people. If the honorable member for Parramatta persists in his amendment, I will support him.

Mr. COON (Batman) [11.25].—Honorable members have said that cups such as the one which I hold in my hand are not made here. They are not likely to be made here when a cup like this, made of chinaware, can be bought to-day retail at 1s. 6d. per doz. in Melbourne.

Mr. FAIRBAIRN.—It is earthenware.

Mr. COON.—It is chinaware, and costs only 1½d. per cup retail.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—It is earthenware, and not china.

Mr. COON.—The honorable member is wrong for the second time. It is china, and was sold to me as such. It is marked china. How is it possible to establish an industry here when the imported article is sold at so low a price? I do not know why the Minister has agreed to reduce the duty so much. If that is done it will be impossible to establish the industry. The honorable member for Nepean spoke of the

cost of the freight, but the freight from Germany to Australia is only 5s. for 36 cubic feet.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Not so.

Mr. COON.—Then I will refer the honorable member to the *Blue Book* containing a report presented to the House of Commons on the decline of trade between Great Britain and Australia. The reason given to the Commission who investigated that question was that goods were being shipped from Germany to Sydney at that low freightage.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—That statement is not more ridiculous than many of the statements made here every day.

Mr. COON.—It is a statement made to a Commission of the House of Commons of the Mother Country that the honorable member talks so much about.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—It is only a statement.

Mr. COON.—It is also true. The Minister has announced his intention to accept duties of 25 and 20 per cent.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I am proposing those rates because I am informed that the article is not made here.

Mr. COON.—It is impossible to make it here without a protective duty. The cup which I exhibited was not made here. I never said that it was. It is an imported cup, but I bought it in Melbourne. They cannot be made here when they are sent out at a wholesale price of 1s. 4d. per dozen. They could be made in Sydney and at Brunswick, but it is necessary first to impose a protective duty.

Mr. LIVINGSTON (Barker) [11.28].—If any business can stand a little taxation, this one might, as it is well known that in Australia we can obtain any kind of clay that is to be found on the face of the earth. It is only a question of getting the experts to deal with it. If we give the industry a little protection, we shall get the experts. The other day when I went into a shop to buy a small article, I said "This is not up to the proper standard. It is imported." The man replied "If you want anything good you have to import it. You have not got in Australia the experts to deal with this class of work." I asked, "Do you mean that we have nothing good in Australia?" And he replied, "You cannot make anything good in Australia except the people, and they are all good." I urge the Committee to give this little protection, because it will not hurt the poor people. The duty proposed would not

prejudicially affect poor or working people, who use very little china, and, in fact, do not want it. The sample cup produced by the honorable member for Batman is quite good enough for all practical purposes; and I am just reminded by the honorable member for Fremantle that there was a time when most of us were glad to get a pannikin. A duty on china will be borne by the rich; and I hope that the Minister will not back down, but will afford proper protection.

Mr. STORRER (Bass) [11.31].—When speaking in the general discussion on the Tariff, I referred to the difficulty there is in distinguishing between china and earthenware, and the events of this morning have shown that the statements I made on that occasion were perfectly correct. Several honorable members have asserted that the cup produced by the honorable member for Batman is not china, but it has been pronounced by an expert in the House to be china. This only shows how the public may be imposed on, and how extremely difficult it must be for the Customs officers to distinguish.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—What expert says that this cup is china?

Mr. WATSON.—A gentleman in the Speaker's gallery.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Then that gentleman, if he be an expert, knows better.

Mr. WATSON.—No doubt the gentleman knows better than does the honorable member.

Mr. STORRER.—I will take the word of the expert before that of any honorable member in the House. I myself thought the cup was not china, until it was pronounced to be so. We ought to impose a duty on those commodities we desire to have produced here; and there is nothing to prevent china being made in Australia in the future. I hope that the compromise accepted by the Treasurer will be indorsed by the Committee.

Mr. WEBSTER (Gwydir) [11.33].—I cannot understand the frame of mind of honorable members this morning. The Treasurer has indicated that he is prepared to accept the suggested compromise; and yet honorable members continue the discussion on the item. I suggest that we get on as quickly as possible with the business, instead of "flogging a dead horse." Legitimate discussion on some items is absolutely necessary, but the present waste of time is unjustifiable.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [11.34].—Notwithstanding the opinion of the expert in the gallery, who ought to know better if he does not, the cup produced is no more china than I am a Dutchman. I happen to know a little of this subject, seeing that I spent my early days in the "potteries" of the Old Country.

Mr. SALMON.—The honorable member expressed the opinion before he had seen the cup.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Quite so; I know perfectly well that a china cup, from any part of the world, cannot be bought for 1½d. I suppose, however, that honorable members opposite will say that this is a case of dumping. I desire to emphasize my determination not to vote for any revenue duty of 25 per cent. Let those who believe they can make china in Australia get to work. Personally I see no reason why china should not be made here, but the fact remains that the industry has never been begun. In the meantime, there is a duty of 20 per cent., plus a natural protection, consisting of the charges of importation, of at least 50 per cent. If 70 per cent. is not sufficient inducement to people to undertake the manufacture, there must be some other reason why the industry has never been started.

Amendment negatived.

Amendment (by Mr. JOSEPH COOK) negatived—

That after the words "35 per cent.," the words "and on and after 3rd December, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 20 per cent.," be inserted.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [11.39].—I move—

That the words "and mosaic flooring" be left out.

My intention is to move that these words be inserted in item 244.

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That after the words "35 per cent." the words "and on and after 3rd December, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 25 per cent.," and after the words "25 per cent." the words "and on and after 3rd December, 1907, ad val. (United Kingdom), 20 per cent.," be inserted.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 242. Scientific apparatus, porcelain, viz.:—Crucibles, tubes, pressure filters, and evaporating dishes for laboratory use, free.

Mr. FRAZER (Kalgoorlie) [11.42].—I trust that the Treasurer will consent to the insertion after the word "crucibles" words "scorifiers and muffles," view to eliminating them from the

next item. These articles were previously upon the free list, and the roasting dishes, assay furnaces, and cupels which are used in association with them are at present included in that category under item 248. Those who have any knowledge of assaying work know that the heat which has to be generated in assaying furnaces, and to which these crucibles are subjected, is terrific. As a matter of fact, the best crucibles cannot be used often, and many of them not more than once. In laboratory work it is of the highest importance that the assayer shall have absolute confidence in his materials, because, in the event of his crucible giving way in the furnace, the whole of the assay is lost. It has been stated that in South Australia three men are employed in making these crucibles. I gather from the evidence tendered to the Tariff Commission that the industry has not been started in any other State.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—The best crucibles in the world are made in Victoria.

Mr. FRAZER.—I will read for the honorable member's information his own report upon this matter. He says—

In Adelaide the manager of the local pottery company asked for a duty of 25 per cent. on crucibles, muffles, scorifiers, &c., imported from England, and a higher duty when imported from foreign countries, particularly Japan, where labour is so cheap. These articles are at present free of duty. The company has been carrying on business for six years, merely struggling to live. Unless the industry receives some protection, they were much afraid that they would have to give in to the competition of imported goods. His company has been benefiting the mining companies, which were the chief customers, as the prices of imported crucibles would have been higher but for local competition. . . . The company would employ from twelve to fifteen hands if they had the duty asked for, but at present (November, 1905), employed only three. The business had been started prior to Federation without a duty, but had never prospered. Plumbago crucibles were preferred to those made from fire clay, but they were very much more expensive.

If the crucible of local production were equally suitable for the purpose for which such articles are used, is it likely that assayers would prefer to use a very much more expensive crucible? In this connexion, I desire to quote the opinion of a mining man who says—

On account of crucibles being of bulky nature, and freight charged by measurement, they cost from 30 per cent. to 40 per cent. to import, which in itself is a substantial protection. Local crucibles vary in quality on account of the clay being unsuitable, and being unreliable they are little used. Battersea. (Morgan's) crucibles are

imported and used almost exclusively by the mines, the Government laboratories, mints, universities, schools of mines, chief mines, and assayers throughout the Commonwealth and New Zealand; and in Western Australia crucibles of German manufacture are largely used. These crucibles are also in general use throughout India, China, America, Germany, France, &c. The Broken Hill Proprietary Company and other leading mines specify in their tender sheets "Battersea crucibles."

As there are only three men engaged in the production of these crucibles, I contend that we are not justified in penalizing scientific research by imposing a duty of 35 per cent. upon them.

Mr. GYLNN (Angas) [11.50].—I agree with the honorable member for Kalgoorlie that there ought to be a considerable reduction in the duty on articles to which he has referred. According to the information which I have obtained their local manufacture gives very little employment. Some clay crucibles have been manufactured in South Australia, but there are, it is said, only a few men employed at the works. It is estimated that the increased employment which the duty would give at the Stafford manufactory—at Alberton, I think—would range from a few hands to about twelve. The quality of the crucibles is a most important matter in mining, because experts state that they must be so made as to withstand extreme changes of temperature. It is most inexpedient, merely with a view to providing a little more employment, to impose a severe tax on one of the scientific necessities of a mining company. I have very apt information on the subject. It is stated that the cost of importing clay crucibles and scorifiers is 40 per cent. Therefore, there is a natural protection of 40 per cent. for the local product before a single penny of duty is imposed. For thirty or forty years the best classes of English crucibles have been imported, and have been used not only by mining companies, but also by State Governments for their testing work. In the circumstances I hope that the Minister will consent to a substantial reduction in the duty upon them. My idea is that the duty in the general Tariff should be reduced from 35 to 15 per cent., and that British imports should be made free.

Mr. FRAZER.—Why not free altogether?

Mr. GLYNN.—I do not think that there is any justification for imposing a severe duty. If a suggestion is made to divide up the articles embraced in the item, with a view to making some of them free and others subject to a duty of 15 per cent.,

as recommended by the B section of the Tariff Commission, I will support it. I do not like to attempt to make a classification, but if a proposal of that kind is made by the Minister, or by any honorable member who has looked into the matter more closely than I have done, it will receive my support.

Mr. COON (Batman) [11.54].—I hope that the Minister will not consent to take crucibles out of the next item, because they are being made here.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I have not said that I would.

Mr. COON.—If they are taken out of the item who will be penalized? It will penalize, not the wealthy companies which have been spoken of, but the poor miners who have small plants.

Mr. WATSON.—What are crucibles made of?

Mr. COON.—They are made of clay. I have smelted gold in them, so that I know what I am talking about. The local manufacturers want the duty retained, so as to keep their men employed. Their product has given satisfaction.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Under the old Tariff there was no duty on crucibles.

Mr. COON.—Because there was no duty on the article previously, that is no reason why there should not be a duty imposed to-day. Because Japan is not exporting to Australia a number of things this year, that is no reason for believing that she will not export them to us next year. In framing this Tariff we are making provision not only for to-day, but also for the future.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—But the honorable member said that the local manufacturers wanted the old duty retained.

Mr. COON.—I meant that they wanted the duty retained, as proposed by the Minister.

Mr. FOWLER (Perth) [11.55].—There is no doubt that in Australia a crucible is made in which probably the honorable member for Batman has smelted gold, but the difficulty arises in connexion with the refractory ores, which require a very great amount of heat. There are practically only a few places in the world that supply the materials necessary to make crucibles which will withstand the intense heat to which they are subjected under certain processes. The ordinary crucible spoken of by the honorable member for Batman will always find a local market for the simpler and more easily smelted metals.

The price of the others is so prohibitive that they are not used unless absolutely required. I trust that the Minister who has hit pretty hard industries belonging to other States will for once be generous in this small matter, and concede to those who require to use imported crucibles the opportunity of obtaining them at the lowest possible rates.

Mr. KNOX (Kooyong) [11.57].—The honorable member for Perth has stated the facts. For highly scientific work it is absolutely necessary to have these particular crucibles, which, so far as I am aware, are not made in Australia. I understand that the item before the Committee is item 242, but the discussion is really on the next item. I suggest to the Minister that crucibles, tubes, pressure filters, and evaporating dishes for laboratory use, should be made free, and that crucibles, scorifiers, and muffles, which are used for a reduction which does not require very great heat, should be dealt with separately in item 242. Certainly they should not be retained in item 243, which includes "earthenware, brownware, and stoneware, n.e.i." on which, of course, a high duty will have to be imposed.

Mr. FRAZER.—Let us put those articles under item 248 instead of under item 242.

Mr. KNOX.—I do not care what item the Minister puts the articles under, but they certainly should be taken out of item 243. If my suggestion is not adopted our discussion of that item must be confused. Unquestionably the articles embraced in item 242 ought to be free.

Mr. HUME COOK.—They are free now.

Mr. KNOX.—Then what has all the talk been about?

Mr. HUTCHISON (Hindmarsh) [11.59].—I believe that the item before the Committee includes skittle pots. This description of crucible is used in glass-bottle factories. I hold in my hand some invoices which have been given to me by a sound protectionist manufacturer, who believes in getting everything he possibly can in Australia, but who cannot get here crucibles, which will do his work.

Mr. STORRER.—All the articles mentioned in item 242 are free.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—I want to get these particular crucibles made free. This manufacturer imported six skittle pots, measuring 36 inches by 16 inches, and which cost 14s. each, or in all, four guineas. By the time they had reached Port Adelaide, with the importing charges

added, the cost had run up to £16 7s. 2d., without the duty of 30 per cent. This manufacturer, whose word can be relied on absolutely, has stated that he was not likely to pay £16 7s. 2d. for six pots, which cost abroad only four guineas, if he could have obtained them in Australia. They are very unwieldy and awkward things to carry, and therefore the freight is very high. Again, he imported four skittle pots, which cost 11s. each, or in all 44s. With the importing charges added that cost was brought up to £5 10s. 10d., without the landing charges, agency, and the duty at 30 per cent. These crucibles are as much tools of trade which cannot be made here as are bottle moulds which can be made in Australia. But, strange to say, bottle moulds are allowed in free as tools of trade, whilst crucibles are taxed. I would rather see a duty placed on bottle moulds than on crucibles. I think it is clear that these goods would be made in Australia if practicable.

Mr. KING O'MALLEY (Darwin) [12.1].—I hope that the Treasurer will not surrender on the question. If we shut up the local factories the result will simply be that the importers will put up their prices. I ask the Treasurer not to give way to the supporters of foreign institutions at the expense of the institutions of their own country. It is strange to me how eagerly honorable members opposite will fight for the interests of the big men. They seem to believe in the survival of the fattest, not in the survival of the fittest. Crucibles better than any that can be made elsewhere are made in Australia.

Mr. FOWLER.—Cannot they be made better in America?

Mr. KING O'MALLEY.—I am fighting for Australia just now. When I have occasion to fight for America, I will do so just as strongly as I now fight in the interests of this country. At present the small tributaries throughout Australia cannot get crucibles at reasonable prices. I again ask the Treasurer to stand firm, and help the local manufacturer to prevent the importers from raising their prices.

Item agreed to.

Item 243. Earthenware, Brownware, and Stoneware, n.e.i., including Crucibles, Scorifiers, and Muffles, ad val. (General Tariff), 35 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 30 per cent.

Mr. FRAZER (Kalgoorlie) [12.6].—I move—

That the words "including Crucibles, Scorifiers, and Muffles" be left out.

My object is to have the articles enumerated in the amendment included with kindred articles in item 248, where they will be free. The placing of these goods on the free list will not make one iota of difference to local manufacturers, but it will save those who want to get high-class articles from penalization.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [12.7].—I have no doubt it is true, as the honorable member for Kalgoorlie says, that most mines in Australia require high-class crucibles. But I am informed that they can be made just as well in Australia as elsewhere. That statement has been made by the honorable member for Bendigo. I am also informed that crucibles are being made in Sydney and Melbourne which are better than those imported to Western Australia.

Mr. GLYNN.—Plumbago crucibles are not made here.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Why is there such a desire to have goods that can be made in Australia imported from abroad? There appears to be a wish to deprive Australian manufacturers of the opportunity of competing in these directions. I can quite understand large companies in Western Australia, having business connexions entirely outside Australia—owned largely in Germany and France—fighting to be enabled to import their supplies from abroad. But I cannot understand an Australian assisting them.

Mr. HEDGES.—Name one mine of that kind.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I know of one mine that was owned absolutely in France and it is one of the biggest mines in the West.

Mr. HEDGES.—Name it.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The Golden Horseshoe.

Mr. HEDGES.—Not at all.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I know that it was owned by French people.

Mr. FOWLER.—I suppose that it is worked by Australians.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not say that it is not.

Mr. FOWLER.—Will not the Minister think of the men who are working on the field?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I am thinking of the men; but the honorable member is thinking of the wealthy owners.

Mr. FOWLER.—The Minister would make Western Australia a desert by means of these duties if he could.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I would make it a pleasant country to live in—a better country than it is now—and not allow it to remain as it is, under the domination of outside influences which are to a large extent anti-Australian.

Mr. FOWLER.—There are better Australians in Western Australia than some of those whom the Minister has round about him.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not find them returned here. I am informed that these goods are made in Australia as good as it is possible to make them.

Mr. GLYNN.—They are not.

Mr. HEDGES.—Not plumbago crucibles.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—My desire is to help the industries concerned as much as I can. The goods mentioned by the honorable member for Kalgoorlie have been included in this item for a special purpose. They were formerly included in another item, but representations have been made from very large centres in the eastern parts of Australia that the goods are being made here. Furthermore, the Tariff Commission has recommended a duty as high as 30 per cent. That recommendation was made after evidence had been taken and weighed. I have been guided in most of these cases largely by the report of the A division of the Tariff Commission. But I am blamed for taking it as a guide.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The Minister does not allow himself to be guided by it always.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—With very few exceptions, I do.

Mr. FOWLER.—They frequently made recommendations irrespective of the evidence.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I am not going to accuse them of doing such a thing. I dare say that the free-trade section of the Commission made just as many recommendations in favour of goods being placed on the free list in the absence of evidence to support such a proposal. If one section resorted to such tactics, no doubt the other section did so. Even if honorable members do not agree to the duty proposed, I think that a substantial duty should be carried. Surely we are not to put aside evidence that crucibles can be made in Australia. I have given way on a good many small items, but I hope that in this case honorable members will be prepared to give Australia a show.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—There are three men involved in this industry.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I know of a place in New South Wales where far more men are employed. I have had a personal report in reference to it, and although I have not seen the works, I am told that they turn out a good article, which is used in many of the mines in the eastern States. If the Committee decides against me, I cannot help it, but I shall certainly have a division.

Mr. GLYNN (Angas) [12.12].—I am sorry to have to speak a second time, but since the Treasurer has asked why crucibles should be free, I think it necessary to mention that plumbago crucibles are not made in the Commonwealth. The necessary plumbago is not to be obtained here.

Mr. WATSON.—It is found in South Australia.

Mr. GLYNN.—Then why do they not make plumbago crucibles there? The manufacture of clay crucibles has been carried on on Kargaroo Island for the last five years, but the industry does not appear to increase very rapidly.

Mr. BOWDEN.—Are those the works at which only three men are employed?

Mr. GLYNN.—No, according to a statement I have seen they are employed at the Alberton works. I believe that there is a plant at Kangaroo Island. Clay crucibles may be used four or five times, but those made of plumbago can be used from thirty to fifty, and in some cases a hundred times. The English crucibles that we import are used there in public departments like the Mint, and also in many of the States of Europe. In the circumstances, while wishing the local industry success, I feel that there is ample justification for the request that these articles should be on the free list.

Mr. FRAZER (Kalgoorlie) [12.14].—I resent the attitude adopted by the Treasurer, who nearly always insinuates that the stand taken up by an honorable member in regard to any item is due either to his having a personal interest in it, or to the influence of some one who is affected by it.

Mr. GLYNN.—It is not to my interest to advocate the placing of crucibles on the free list; it is rather to the contrary.

Mr. FRAZER.—I daresay that that is the position of honorable members in many cases; but the Treasurer insists upon making such assertions in matters relating to Western Australia.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—And I am justified in making them.

Mr. FRAZER.—That is an insult to honorable members, and, so far as I am concerned, it is a deliberate untruth.

The CHAIRMAN.—The honorable member must withdraw that remark.

Mr. FRAZER.—I withdraw it, sir, and will say that the attitude of the Minister is a most disgusting one. He has been hurling insinuations all round the chamber.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I have not.

Mr. FOWLER.—He has said that representatives of Western Australia are anti-Australian.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—That is not an insinuation; it is a fact.

Mr. FRAZER.—It appears to me that the Treasurer is incapable of giving impartial consideration to arguments that are advanced in reference to any of these items. As a matter of fact, although he has said that Australian-made crucibles are used in the eastern States, and that Western Australia alone asks for the imported article, I have just had handed to me a letter from the Victorian Chamber of Mines—

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not pay much attention to its representations.

Mr. FRAZER.—If a deputation from the Victorian Chamber of Manufactures waited on the Treasurer, he would take it into the Ministerial room so that he might obtain a full and clear explanation of what was wanted, and then, like a gramophone, would repeat in the House what was said. The Victorian Chamber of Mines ought to be just as competent to express an opinion on a question of this description as is any institution. It knows more about mining and the points at issue in connexion with this matter than does any other institution. Its members find it to their interests to secure the best appliances. In a letter from the Chamber, it is stated that—

On account of crucibles being of bulky nature and freight charged by measurement, they cost from 30 to 40 per cent. to import, which in itself is a substantial protection.

They also state that—

Local crucibles vary in quality on account of the clay being unsuitable, and, being unreliable, they are little used.

Mr. WATSON.—We have many tons of good clay in Australia.

Mr. FRAZER.—The Chamber of Mines states that Morgan's Battersea crucibles are imported, and used almost exclusively on the mines.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—No one takes any notice of them.

Mr. FRAZER.—I admit that the honorable member takes no notice of opinions with which he disagrees.

Mr. KNOX.—That is due to his ignorance.

Mr. FRAZER.—The fact that he is incapable of giving proper consideration to the arguments of others does not say much for his intellectual capacity. It is stated in this letter that—

Battersea (Morgan's) crucibles are imported and used almost exclusively by the mines, the Government laboratories, mints, universities, schools of mines, chief mines, and assayers throughout the Commonwealth and New Zealand.

If that be so, how shall we benefit Australia by imposing this duty? Will the desire to give employment to three men in the making of an inferior class of crucible be sufficient to justify us in placing a heavy impost on scientific institutions that are doing much to encourage research, and to improve mining propositions that may be of immense benefit to the people of Australia?

Mr. HEDGES (Fremantle) [12.19].—It was not my intention to speak to this question until the Treasurer urged that we ought, in this case, to give Australia a show. If we desire to do so we certainly ought not to include in this item crucibles made of plumbago, or partly of plumbago, and high-grade assay crucibles. If we do, instead of helping Australia, we shall blight it. As to the remarks made by the Treasurer regarding the Golden Horseshoe mine, I point out that he visited Western Australia during certain festivities, and he had to listen to practically everything that was said.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I received my information from the manager.

Mr. HEDGES.—The honorable member was told a lot of things that disagreed with what many of us knew.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I received my information from the manager, Mr. Sutherland, who had just returned from a visit to France to meet the directors.

Mr. HEDGES.—The Golden Horseshoe mine is owned by a company having its head office in England, and is managed by an Australian, who was educated at the Ballarat School of Mines. As to the statement that some of the shares in the company are held in France—

The CHAIRMAN. — The honorable member must not make more than an incidental reference to that phase of the question.

[244]

Mr. HEDGES.—The broad statement made by the Treasurer that French-owned mines are being run in Western Australia is incorrect, and that remark will apply also to the statement that crucibles can be, and are being, made in the Commonwealth.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—What nonsense.

Mr. HEDGES.—Common crucibles for ordinary work are made here, and we should be prepared to grant them the protection of a reasonable duty, but high-grade crucibles, and those made of plumbago, or partly of plumbago, are not made in Australia. I hope that the Treasurer will be reasonable and include in item 248 the articles to which I have referred.

Question—That the words "including crucible, scorifiers, and muffles," proposed to be left out, stand part of the item (Mr. FRAZER's amendment)—put. The Committee divided.

Ayes	20
Noes	24
Majority				4

AYES.

Cafts, J. H.	Mauger, S.
Chanter, J. M.	McDougall, J. K.
Chapman, Austin	O'Malley, King
Coon, J.	Salmon, C. C.
Crouch, R. A.	Storror, D.
Deakin, A.	Watson, J. C.
Ewing, T. T.	Wise, G. H.
Groom, L. E.	
Hutchison, J.	
Lyne, Sir William	
Maloney, W. R. N.	

Tellers:

Cook, Hume
Webster, W.

NOES.

Atkinson, L.	Knox, W.
Brown, Tilley	McWilliams, W. J.
Carr, E. S.	Page, J.
Cook, Joseph	Palmer, A. C.
Edwards, R.	Sampson, S.
Fairbairn, G.	Spence, W. G.
Forrest, Sir John	Thomas, J.
Frazer, C. E.	Thomson, Dugald
Fysh, Sir Philip	Wynne, A.
Glynn, P. McM.	
Hedges, W. N.	
Irvine, Hans	
Irvine, W. H.	

Tellers:

Bowden, E. K.
Johnson, W. E.

PAIRS.

Kingston, C. C.	Kelly, W. H.
Bamford, F. W.	Fuller, G. W.
Hall, D. R.	Smith, Bruce
Watkins, D.	Wilson, J. G.
Thomson, John	Willis, Henry
Batchelor, E. L.	Archer, E. W.
Mathews, J.	Poynton, A.
Foster, F. J.	Brown, Thomas
Quick, Sir John	Fowler, J. M.
Harper, R.	Reid, G. H.
Tudor, F. G.	Mahon, H.

Question so resolved in the negative.
Amendment agreed to.

Amendments (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That after the words "35 per cent." the words "and on and after 3rd December, 1907, ad. val. (General Tariff) 25 per cent." be inserted.

That after the words "30 per cent." the words "and on and after 3rd December, 1907, ad. val. (United Kingdom), 20 per cent.," be added.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 244. Roofing Tiles, Flooring Tiles, and Tiles n.e.i., of all materials, ad val., 30 per cent.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [12.31].—We agreed to omit the words "and mosaic flooring" from item 241 with a view to transfer them to this item. I therefore move—

That after the word "materials" the words "and mosaic flooring" be inserted.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [12.32].—I intended to propose that there should be a lower duty imposed on opal and glass tiles, which, I understand, are not made here, but if the Treasurer is willing to accept on this item duties of 25 and 20 per cent. I shall not move any amendment.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I intend to propose duties of 30 and 25 per cent.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I think that duties of 25 and 20 per cent. would represent a fair compromise on this item. If the Minister will not agree to those duties I think the Committee should be prepared to accept a lower duty on opal and glass tiles, which are not made here.

Mr. TUDOR.—They come into competition with glazed tiles, which are made here.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [12.35].—With a view to proposing subsequently a duty of 20 per cent. on imports from the United Kingdom, I move—

That the words "and on and after 3rd December, 1907, ad val. (United Kingdom), 25 per cent." be added.

Duties of 25 per cent. on this item would represent a considerable increase on the duties imposed under the old Tariff, which were 15 per cent. on roof tiles and 20 per cent. on other tiles.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—There would practically be no increase on other tiles, as almost the whole of the imports are from Great Britain.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—No, a quantity is imported from the Continent, and chiefly from Marseilles. I re-

mind the Committee that in New South Wales the manufacture of tiles was undertaken without the advantage of any duty at all, and the manufacturers were able to compete with the imported article. I understand from makers of tiles in that State that there is no necessity for an increase of duty. The article is a cheap one, and the importing charges represent a very high percentage of its value. The duties I suggest would really mean an increase of 10 per cent. on the old Tariff, since the bulk of the roofing tiles are imported from Marseilles, and we should not add more than that to the cost of building.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The increased duty will not add to the cost of building. It does not do so in the honorable member's own electorate, where I know that one or two houses have been covered with imported tiles for which the same price was paid as is charged for local tiles.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—That may be so. The manufacturers of local tiles would keep their prices up to the prices charged for imported tiles, even though the duty should be increased. By my amendment I offer a 10 per cent. increase of duty on roofing tiles, most of which are imported from France.

Mr. SAMPSON.—The honorable gentleman proposes practically no increase in the protection on flooring and other tiles.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—That is so; the figures show that the bulk of those tiles are imported from Great Britain.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I do not say that a large quantity is not imported from Great Britain, but I do say that some of these tiles are imported from the Continent. There is really no occasion for an increase of this duty, because the local manufacturers have sufficient protection already. The competition exists, and the local manufacture has been undertaken, even in New South Wales, where there was no duty at all. I do not think that we ought to increase these building charges more than we have done already. There are comparatively few makers of tiles in any one State, and it would be easy for them to arrange for their price to come up to the duty.

Mr. SAMPSON (Wimmera) [12.41].—I hope the Government will not reduce these rates below 30 per cent. and 25 per cent. We reduced the rates in the last item by 5 per cent. too much. According to the schedule supplied to honorable members,

£15,000 worth of these tiles were imported last year. *Knibbs* states that £27,000 worth of tiles, n.e.i., and tiles for roofing are imported per annum. The whole of those should be manufactured in Australia, especially in view of the clays we have.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The asphalt and roofing tiles are practically all imported from foreign countries.

Mr. SAMPSON.—Most of the roofing tiles come from France, but about £15,000 worth of flooring and other tiles were imported, mostly from Great Britain. Therefore, the proposed duties of 25 per cent. and 20 per cent. would give no increased protection. We should especially encourage the primary industries, and this is distinctly a primary industry. There are earthenware and tiling factories scattered throughout the country districts of Australia. We should make the whole of our roofing tiles. I shall be prepared to move for a duty of 25 per cent., as against the United Kingdom, retaining a duty of 30 per cent. in the General Tariff.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [12.43].—I hope that the duty will not be reduced. I may inform those honorable members who represent Western Australia that the principal evidence with reference to this item was received in Perth from a local manufacturer, Mr. Richard Gervase Kirton, managing director of the Kirton Patent Pottery Company Limited, Belmont. He said they were engaged in the production of fine roofing tiles out of local clay, with local labour.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—He was only getting a duty of 15 per cent.

Sir JOHN QUICK. — He asked the Tariff Commission for increased protection. How in face of that can the honorable member for Fremantle say that no one asked for an increase of duty on this item? That witness stated that the local industry was in a state of collapse on account of the cheap importation of French tiles. This is a passage from his evidence—

I think that when a product is manufactured in a foreign country where the conditions are much less expensive, then the competition of that country is not an equitable competition. Touching the matter of these Marseilles tiles, we know that they are manufactured in Marseilles, where the wages range from 15 to 25 francs a week. Here we have to pay double, or a little more than double.

I cannot find his exact statement as to the amount of increased duty which he required, but I know that he wanted it effective

to enable him to compete on equal terms with the imported article.

Mr. WATSON.—The imported tiles can be brought out very cheaply, as they are very heavy, and can be packed close in the bottom of a ship.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—I should like the Western Australian members to take notice of the Western Australian suggestion which I have cited, and to recognise that this is not one of the much-abused Victorian manufactures.

Mr. KNOX (Kooyong) [12.44].—I hope that the rates of 30 per cent. and 25 per cent., proposed by the Government, will be agreed to, and that the amendment of the honorable member for North Sydney, for a general Tariff rate of 25 per cent. will be negated. This industry is very much affected by the importation of the surplus stocks of the United States of America manufacturers. Here is a letter from America, dated 10th June, 1907, which shows what the local manufacturer has to contend with. It is from a large tile manufacturing company in Kansas City—

We take the liberty of sending you, by parcels post, sample of special ceramic mosaic tile, which we will sell you at \$3.50 per barrel, containing about 100 square feet—1s. 4d. yard.

The usual trade price of that article is actually 9s. 10d. per square yard.

We are also sending you a sample of a special white glazed wall tile, measuring 6 inches long by 1½ inches wide, which we will sell you at 8c. net per square foot—3s. square yard.

The usual trade price of that article is 8s. 1d. per square yard. Whether those prices are for delivery in America or for delivery in this port, the difference between them and the local prices is enormous.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Wages are as high in America as they are here, and those quotations show that the manufacturers with high protective duties must be making gigantic profits.

Mr. KNOX.—No one knows better than the honorable member for North Sydney does how the American manufacturers charge their own people high prices, and sell their surplus stocks in other countries at lower prices. The Australian tile manufacturing industry is in an exceptional position in consequence of the difficulty which I have pointed out.

Mr. SALMON.—Are those particular tiles made here?

Mr. KNOX.—Yes. When the first Tariff was under consideration I exhibited

samples in this chamber, made at Mitcham, which is now in the constituency of the honorable member for Flinders.

Mr. HEDGES (Fremantle) [12.50].—The tile-making industry in Western Australia was started before Federation, and prospered without the assistance of Victoria.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—It was shut up for want of increased protection at the time we visited Western Australia.

Mr. HEDGES.—I know the place well. The train passes within half-a-chain of it, and I have seen it grow from a little place to a big one without asking Victoria for help. The honorable member for Bendigo made a dead set at me, and mentioned me in this matter. I have no desire to injure any Australian industry. I wish to assist to establish every industry possible, but where I see one already established, and doing well, I shall be no party to spoon-feeding it. It is rather a disgrace to Victoria that tile-making should have been undertaken in Western Australia before it was begun in Victoria.

Mr. STORRER.—They had good protection in Western Australia then.

Mr. HEDGES.—I am in favour of a reasonable duty.

Mr. SAMPSON.—Does the honorable member consider 15 per cent. reasonable?

Mr. HEDGES.—An honorable member who wishes to speak about anything which is not Victorian is scarcely allowed to be heard in this Chamber. It would be a good thing if we could move this Parliament somewhere into the bush. I am sure that members from other parts of Australia will never get a fair deal until we get away from Melbourne. The tiles made in Western Australia are of a very good quality, and I see no reason why Victorians should not be able to make a tile of equal quality, if they have the energy and pluck to undertake the industry without the assistance of Western Australia and Queensland.

Question.—That the words "and on and after 3rd December, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff) 25 per cent." be added (Mr. DUGALD THOMSON'S amendment)—put. The Committee divided.

Ayes	11
Noes	33
Majority	22

Atkinson, L.
Brown, Tilley
Cook, Joseph
Forrest, Sir John
Fysh, Sir Philip
Glynn, P. McM.

Carr, E. S.
Catts, J. H.
Chapman, Austin
Coon, J.
Deakin, A.
Ewing, T. T.
Fairbairn, G.
Fisher, A.
Frazer, C. E.
Groom, L. E.
Hedges, W. N.
Irvine, Hans
Irvine, W. H.
Knox, W.
Lyne, Sir William
Maloney, W. R. N.
Mathews, J.

Kelly, W. H.
Fuller, G. W.
Poynton, A.
Brown, Thomas
Reid, G. H.
Smith, Bruce
Mahon, H.
Archer, E. W.
Willis, Henry
Wilson, J. G.
Fowler, J. M.

AYES.

Johnson, W. E.
Page, J.
Thomson, Dugald
Tellers:
Bowden, E. K.
McWilliams, W. J.

NOES.

McDougall, J. K.
O'Malley, King
Palmer, A. C.
Quick, Sir John
Salmon, C. C.
Sampson, S.
Spence, W. G.
Storrer, D.
Thomas, J.
Tudor, F. G.
Watson, J. C.
Webster, W.
Wise, G. H.
Wynne, A.
Tellers:
Chanter, J. M.
Cook, Hume

PAIRS.

Kingston, C. C.
Bamford, F. W.
Batchelor, E. L.
Foster, F. J.
Hall, D. R.
Harper, R.
Hutchison, J.
Mauger, S.
Thomson, John
Watkins, D.
Crouch, R. A.

Question so resolved in the negative.

Amendment negatived.

Amendment (by Mr. SAMPSON) proposed—

That the words "and on and after 3rd December, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 25 per cent." be added.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [12.56].—I draw attention to the fact that objections raised to the withdrawal of calls for divisions are likely to waste a great deal of time. Such objections are not fair to the Committee. Already we have allowed one or two calls for divisions to be withdrawn by the Treasurer, simply because we desired to expedite matters. Are we to be compelled to go to the honorable member for Riverina and ask him whether we may move an amendment? Is he to be an autocrat, and say, "If you move an amendment I shall force the question to a division"? Surely an honorable member has a right to move an amendment in order to see whether he can get support; and it is only reasonable on his part, if the support be not forthcoming to ask that the call for a division be withdrawn.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [12.58].—My desire has always been not to place any obstacle in the way of a call for a division being withdrawn. I may, say, however, that I have heard the honorable member for Riverina express his disapproval at repeated attempts to alter duties by means of one amendment after another and this may have influenced him in the course he took.

Mr. CHANTER (Riverina) [12.59].—I am just as anxious as any honorable member to see the business expedited. It is the right of every honorable member to move amendments; and I objected to the withdrawal of the call for a division—

Sir JOHN FORREST.—The honorable member has done so twice.

Mr. CHANTER.—And I may do so again.

Mr. WATSON.—Then we shall never get on!

Mr. CHANTER.—Will the honorable member permit me to state my case?

Sitting suspended from 1 to 2.15 p.m.

Mr. CHANTER.—When the sitting was suspended, I was making a personal explanation concerning statements made by the honorable member for North Sydney and the honorable member for Parramatta, who appear to entertain a decided objection to the exercise by me of the privilege of objecting to the withdrawal of the call for a division when once it has been made. It has been said that I desire to prevent honorable members from moving amendments. I have no such desire. Any honorable member is at liberty to submit whatever proposal he may deem fit. I merely object to the action of some honorable members opposite who, after having disputed the decision of the Chair in regard to the voices, are in the habit of calling for a division, allowing the bells to be rung, practically occupying the whole of the time that would be absorbed in taking a division, and then asking leave to withdraw their call.

Mr. JOHNSON.—We have merely asked leave to withdraw our calls when we have been requested to do so by the Minister. Upon nearly every occasion the request for a withdrawal of the call has been made at the instance of the Minister.

Mr. CHANTER.—I take up this position—

The CHAIRMAN.—The honorable member will not be in order in debating the question.

Mr. CHANTER.—I do not propose to do so.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—Better leave well alone.

Mr. CHANTER.—My action was prompted by the conduct of the Opposition in permitting the bells to be rung for a division, and after having wasted the time of the Committee, in asking for leave to withdraw the call.

Mr. BOWDEN.—Is the honorable member in order in accusing the Opposition of wasting time?

Mr. CHANTER.—Having explained the motive which induced me to object to the withdrawal of the call for a division, I wish only to add that my future course of action will depend entirely upon what I think of the action of the Opposition.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [2.19].—I am afraid that the time has not yet arrived when the Opposition must consult the honorable member for Riverina in regard to how, when, and where its members shall vote.

Amendment (Mr. SAMPSON'S) agreed to—

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 245. Asphalt, mastic, ad val., 15 per cent.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [2.20].—Asphalt mastic is manufactured from crude bitumen and limestone. The imported article is the manufactured production which is melted and mixed with bitumen. The duty proposed is that which has been recommended by both sections of the Tariff Commission.

Mr. JOHNSON (Lang) [2.21].—I would point out that this article was on the free list under the old Tariff, and that no reason has been advanced why it should be made dutiable. I therefore move—

That the words "and on and after 4th December, 1907 (General Tariff), free" be added.

Amendment negatived.

Item agreed to.

Item 246 (Earthenware) agreed to.

Item 247. Fire and glazed bricks; fire lumps; fibro cement; fire clay manufactures, n.e.i.; and asphalt tiles, ad val., 15 per cent.

Mr. POYNTON (Grey) [2.24].—Under the old Tariff fire bricks for reverberatory furnaces were admitted free. I have been assured by certain mine managers that it is impossible to obtain in Australia a fire brick which is capable of withstanding the great heat to which such bricks must be

subjected. The manager of the Moonta mines gave me that information only a little while ago. I therefore move—

That the words “and on and after 4th December, 1907, fire bricks for reverberatory furnaces, free” be added.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—Do they not make fire bricks here? They do in Western Australia.

Mr. POYNTON.—Fire bricks are not made in the Commonwealth which will withstand the test to which they must be subjected as well as will the imported article.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [2.27].—This is another item in respect of which an application was made to the Tariff Commission by a South Australian industry for consideration. Mr. Frederick Meakin, of Royal Park, Alberton, near Adelaide, brought under the attention of that body the question of the duty upon fire bricks. He was examined by Senator McGregor as follows—

53266. Have you never had any idea of going in for the manufacture of fire bricks?—We have got the idea at the present time of going in for fire bricks. We feel convinced it can be done.

53267. If you had a larger market for your present wares, would that assist you in going in for the manufacture of fire bricks?—Yes.

53268. Is there anything else besides these crucibles and fire bricks that the clay is suitable for?—Well, there is the manufacture of other common goods.

53269. If you were thoroughly satisfied in the manufacture of these wares you are doing now, and also of fire bricks, would you go in for the manufacture of other ware?—Probably; but we would direct our attention to the manufacture of those lines principally.

It was upon these representations that the Commission recommended that fire bricks for reverberatory furnaces should be removed from the free list.

Mr. POYNTON.—It is upon the representations of South Australian mining managers that I ask that they shall be restored to the free list.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—Fire bricks are also manufactured in Victoria and can be made in various parts of Australia. I fail to see why fire bricks for reverberatory furnaces should be admitted free whilst other fire bricks should be dutiable. How is it possible to distinguish between fire bricks which are intended for reverberatory furnaces and fire bricks which are intended to be used for other purposes? If these bricks for reverberatory furnaces are to be exempted from duty let us make them free all round. At the present time they are

being imported under the pretence that they are to be used for high-class purposes when as a matter of fact they are intended to be used for all sorts of purposes. I think that reason has been shown for extending some slight protection to the industry. Certainly fire bricks ought not to be placed upon the free list. If we can manufacture earthenware for ordinary pottery purposes, surely we ought to be able to manufacture firebricks. I, therefore, ask the Committee not to omit the item, but, if they think fit, to fix a more moderate duty.

Mr. MATHEWS (Melbourne Ports) [2.30].—Firebricks are not manufactured in my electorate, but are used there more than, I suppose, in any other electorate. I have been assured by users that the Australian firebrick is the best. I venture to say that, after the next few years, there will be no more necessity to have the firebrick on the Tariff than there is now to have the ordinary brick. At the present time, however, it is essential that the item should be dutiable, so that we may get all the large ironworks to use Australian firebricks. In the Newport workshops only Australian firebricks are used, and they give great satisfaction. Last week I was in a steel crucible factory in South Melbourne, and five or six persons told me that the Australian firebrick was positively the best, having a longer life and being cheaper. Therefore, I hope that the Minister will retain the duty at 15 per cent. on firebricks. I believe that if any honorable member were to inquire outside, he would find that the price of the article has gone down considerably.

Mr. KNOX (Kooyong) [2.32].—I am aware that a large number of Australian-made firebricks are used in the furnaces at Broken Hill and elsewhere. A special firebrick, which is made in Glasgow, is also used; but any one who says that Australian-made bricks are not used, is not speaking in accordance with facts.

Amendment negatived.

Amendment (by Mr. BOWDEN) negatived—

That the words “and on and after 4th December, 1907, ad val., 10 per cent.” be added.

Item agreed to.

Item 248. Roasting Dishes, Assay Furnaces, and Cupels, free.

Mr. FRAZER (Kalgoorlie) [2.34].—In accordance with a decision of the Committee, I move—

That after the word “cupels” the words “crucibles, scorifiers, and muffles” be inserted.

Mr. SALMON (Laanecoorie) [2.35].—Before the amendment is put, I wish to point out that cupels, which are made in Australia, ought to be taken out of this item with a view to their being brought under a duty. If the honorable member for Kalgoorlie will afford me an opportunity, I propose to move the omission of the word.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—Mr. Chairman, as the effect of omitting the word "cupels" will be to increase taxation ought not an amendment for that purpose to be moved by a Minister of the Crown instead of by a private member?

The CHAIRMAN.—Yes.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) proposed—

That the word "cupels" be left out.

Mr. GLYNN (Angas) [2.36].—I have some information with regard to cupels and scorifiers. It is stated that after the process in which the scorifier is used is finished—

a small button of lead still remains, but much reduced in size, and still containing all the precious metals. This button is then cupelled. A cupel is a small dish made of bone ash, magnesia, or other special material. The cupel is placed in a muffle, and the small button obtained by scorification placed in the cupel. The cupel, being absorbent, soon absorbs all the lead, and a button of gold and silver is then obtained without any lead at all. A scorifier and a cupel are used once only.

Mr. LIDDELL (Hunter) [2.38].—It is very strange indeed that information of that sort should have to come from a private member instead of from the Treasurer. I submit that the latter ought to be in a position to furnish honorable members with all necessary information.

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment (by Mr. FRAZER) agreed to—

That after the word "and" the words "crucibles, scorifiers, and muffles" be inserted.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 249. Glass, viz. :—

Bent, Bevelled, Heraldic, Sand-blasted, Enamelled, Embossed, Etched, Silvered, and Cut; Corners Cut, Bevelled, or Engraved; Panes, Prisms, and all Glass framed with metal, ad val., 30 per cent.

Mr. GLYNN (Angas) [2.39].—I hope that the Treasurer will consent to omit from this item, with a view to making them free, ornamental windows for churches.

Mr. HUME COOK.—They are all made here.

Mr. GLYNN.—No.

Mr. MAUGER.—Yes, beautiful ornamental windows are made here.

Mr. GLYNN.—At all events, as classes vary, people want them made duty free. Within the last few months an ornamental church window was imported for the Church of England, in Adelaide, at a cost of £260, and the duty thereon amounted to no less than £90. Surely, in the interests of art, the Minister is not going to impose a tax on an ornamental church window, which really contributes to the beautifying of a city, to the tune of £90? That, in my opinion, is merely protection run mad. Anything which improves public edifices, apart from the fact that they are churches, is a matter in which the community is largely interested. We ought to encourage the use of the highest forms of art, and the only way in which to achieve that object is by having a moderate duty, or no duty. I think that if we omit the word "heraldic" it will cover the case of ornamental church windows. It may also be necessary to strike out the words "or engraved," and to insert the word "plain" before the words "panes, prisms, and all glass framed with metal," because, otherwise, ornamental church windows might fall under the latter words. I believe it is the custom of the Department, whenever doubtful construction gives them a chance, to put a tax on any article, however beautiful it may be.

Mr. MAUGER.—As the churches look to the people here for their money they ought to have their work done here.

Mr. GLYNN.—The honorable gentleman ought to remember that the churches here are maintained voluntarily.

Mr. MAUGER.—Yes; but it is the workers who support the churches.

Mr. GLYNN.—By taxing the windows of churches we impose a drain upon those persons who voluntarily support them. At the present time the churches have great trouble to get necessary subscriptions.

Mr. MAUGER.—They will experience a good deal more trouble if they do not support the workers.

Mr. GLYNN.—The churches are not conducted by amateur preachers and philanthropists. Subject to any amendment which the Minister may suggest, I intend to move the omission of the word "heraldic" from this item, and afterwards

to move its insertion in item 254, under which ornamental church windows, as glass, will be free. I move—

That the word "Heraldic" be left out.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [2.40].—I hope that the amendment will not be carried. Throughout Australia great complaints were made to the Tariff Commission about ornamental church windows being free. Not only workers, but also manufacturers, asked: Why should ornamental glass for churches be free any more than glass for mansions? The churches ought to be able and willing to support Australian manufactures. I see no reason why they, any more than private individuals, should claim exemption from this duty. We all appreciate the beautification of our places of worship, but we need not thereby sacrifice our system of encouraging native industry. I protest against the omission of the word.

Mr. EDWARDS (Oxley) [2.43].—Under item 299, "mirrors framed, or not, n.e.i." are subjected to duties of 40 and 30 per cent., and it will be desirable, I think, to make it quite clear whether mirrors are included in the item before the Committee. It would be just as well that these articles should appear at one place only in the Tariff.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—They would not be dutiable under both 299 and 249.

Mr. EDWARDS.—That is what I understood. I cannot say that I know very much about the articles included in this item, but I have received a communication from a gentleman in Brisbane who is particularly familiar with such goods. I think that the best thing I can do is to read his letter. This gentleman represents the firm of James Campbell and Sons Limited, Brisbane. He says—

A deputation of Melbourne glass silverers and bevellers recently waited upon the Comptroller of Customs to enlist his sympathy in the direction of abolishing the duty on plain polished plate glass under 25 ft. super., which is used in Australia for making mirrors, or as an alternative to increase the duty on bevelled and silvered plate glass from the proposed new duty of 30 per cent. to at least 45 per cent., and to make all bevelled glass in imported furniture pay an excess duty of 2d. per lineal foot.

We, in common with Messrs. R. S. Exton and Co., of this city, the only other firm having a silvering and bevelling plant in the State, are entirely in accord with the objects of the deputation, and have already wired our sympathy with the movement. Our object in addressing you is to solicit your support of the proposal when this particular line is brought

up for consideration, and we sincerely hope you will see your way to assist in making this industry, which has for years been struggling to exist, a profitable one for those engaged in it, and the means of affording employment to an additional number of hands.

We attach hereto for your information the chief points of the evidence placed before the Tariff Commission, which will enable you to grasp the situation as it exists in the Commonwealth.

Then follow some particulars which I think it is desirable to communicate to the Committee, as to the chief points of evidence placed before the Tariff Commission—

RAW MATERIAL.

Fixed, 5s. per 100 feet super. in plates under 7 feet super.

Fixed, 7s. 6d. per 100 feet super. in plates from 7.12 feet super.

Fixed, 10s. per 100 feet super. in plates from 12.100 feet super.

The bulk of our raw material is up to 25 ft. super., which we desire to be free, which, according to the Customs returns, would be a loss to the revenue. Which loss would be practically recovered by increasing the duty to 12s. 6d. per 100 feet super. in plates from 25.100 feet super.

Reasons why the duty should be remitted on our raw material up to 25 ft. super:—

- 1st. Foreign manufacturers do not pay duty on raw material in our trade, it is free.
- 2nd. Freight. We pay more freight on the raw material than on the finished article.
- 3rd. Cullett—which we sell to the bottle works at per ton, for which we pay market price, and on which we have paid duty as well as freight, and which alone is equal to 10 per cent., that is, 10 ft. waste in every 100 ft. of the finished article.

If the foregoing cannot be done then—

Increase proposed as ad val. duty, 30 per cent. to 45 per cent.

From 30 per cent. to 45 per cent., ad val., on silvered plate and sheet glass, bevelled plate and sheet glass.

Reason—Conditions of labour in Great Britain and the Continent.

- 1st. There are no restrictions to girl and boy labour.
- 2nd. No minimum wage.

FURNITURE.

The imports under this head amounted to £67,878, which contains bevelled and silvered plate—we request that a duty of 2d. per ft. lineal be placed on all bevelled glass in furniture imported into the Commonwealth, plus the present duty.

Take an ordinary case for example:—

Bedroom Suites.

48 x 12,	10 ft. bevel at 2d.,	1s. 8d.
24 x 15,	7 ft. bevel at 2d.,	1s. 2d.
12 x 6,	3 ft. bevel at 2d.,	6d.
6 x 6,	4 ft. bevel at 2d.,	8d.

What we request, viz., plain polished plate glass up to 25 ft. super.

1st. That our raw material be free, or that the proposed duty on bevelled and silvered glass be raised from 30 per cent. to 45 per cent.

2nd. That all bevelled glass in imported furniture pay an excess duty of 2d. per foot lineal.

I hope that the Treasurer will pay attention to these particulars.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE. — It is difficult to listen when four or five other honorable members are round about me endeavouring to explain various matters to me.

Mr. EDWARDS. — I have the utmost sympathy with the Treasurer, and think he has done remarkably well in conducting the business of the Government in connexion with the Tariff. No other member of this House, in my opinion, would have maintained such good temper as he has done during the whole time. We must admire the way in which he has kept control over himself. I do not know whether I should be in order in moving an amendment with the object of increasing the duty.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE. — That could not be done.

Mr. EDWARDS. — Failing that I ask the Treasurer to take the matter into his consideration. There is no doubt that there is already a very large industry in the Commonwealth in connexion with silvering and bevelling glass, and it is bound to grow into a very much larger industry well deserving of our full consideration.

Mr. MATHEWS (Melbourne Ports) [2.50]. — I wish to join with the honorable member for Oxley in asking the Treasurer to give special consideration to this item. Items 249 and 250 are really bound up with each other. One is concerned with the raw material of the other. It goes without saying that the bevelled-glass industry is a very large one. Fair wages are paid in some places, and good wages in others. Our desire should be to keep out the cheap stuff made by people working long hours, and for low wages. What I think should be done is to increase the duty under paragraph A of the next item, and to make a reduction under paragraphs C and D.

Mr. LIDDELL (Hunter) [2.53]. — I feel inclined to support the amendment of the honorable member for Angas, because, after all is said and done, we must admit that church stained-glass windows are works of art. I am surprised at the heat

thrown into the discussion by the honorable member for Bendigo, and regret that he has seen fit to introduce the sectarian issue.

HONORABLE MEMBERS. — No, no.

Mr. LIDDELL. — It appears to me that the honorable member was holding a brief against the ornamentation of our churches. Further on in the Tariff works of art are exempt.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE. — I am going to ask the Committee to leave this matter over until we deal with the exemptions.

Mr. LIDDELL. — I am pleased to hear that, and am surprised to find the Treasurer exhibiting so much reasonableness. I think more of him now than I did previously. He himself sees the advisableness of exempting works of art intended for public institutions. Our churches are really in the same position as other public institutions.

Sir JOHN QUICK. — Statuary and oil paintings are exempt.

Mr. LIDDELL. — Church windows are practically in the same category as statuary and oil paintings. They are a most valuable means of education, especially for those who cannot afford to travel and admire works of art in foreign countries. I understand that the words "panes, prisms, and all glass framed with metal" in this item refer to cellar lights which are used in pavements, and which, I am informed, are not made in Australia. That being so, I think that the duty upon them is excessive. With the exception of those lights the item relates to glass worked up. I admit that such work is carried on in the Commonwealth, but whilst the silverers and bevellers may ask for a high protective duty, those engaged in all branches of the industry do not. To illustrate the fallacy of high protective duties, I would point out that under free-trade in New South Wales, in 1900 no less than 183 hands were employed in this industry, whilst in Victoria, notwithstanding its thirty years of protection, only eighty-seven hands were so engaged.

Mr. CHANTER. — What is the honorable member's authority for that statement?

Mr. LIDDELL. — It was obtained from the return secured by the honorable member for Kooyong. I do not know why we should tax the users of cellar lights, which, I am informed on the best authority, are not—and are not likely to be for some time—made in Australia.

Mr. TUDOR (Yarra) [3.3].—We find ourselves confronted with a difficulty in dealing with the finished article before we have disposed of an item covering the raw materials used in its production. The next item comprises the raw material of the beveller and the silverer, who are engaged in the manufacture of mirrors for furniture and decorative purposes. I do not ask the Treasurer to postpone this item, but I think that if he would agree to exempt up to certain sizes the glass included in the next item, the Committee would be prepared to vote for a higher duty on glass exceeding in size 25 superficial feet.

Mr. WATSON.—Why?

Mr. TUDOR.—Because smaller sizes are used for silvering and bevelling purposes. The bevelling and silvering industries are carried on all over the Commonwealth, and this request is indorsed by manufacturers in all the States.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—Is plate glass manufactured in Australia?

Mr. TUDOR.—I do not think that polished plate glass has yet been manufactured here, and I, for one, would be prepared to reduce the duty upon it. I ask that glass in sizes of less than 25 superficial feet shall be allowed to come in free. No doubt the time will come when we shall be producing polished plate glass in the Commonwealth, but in this, as in other cases, I think that we ought not to tax the raw material of an industry, especially when that raw material is not locally produced.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—What is it that the honorable member desires?

Mr. TUDOR.—I desire that the duty on this item shall remain, and that the Treasurer will give us an undertaking that when we reach the next item he will be prepared to place on the free list glass of less than a certain superficial area.

Mr. KNOX (Kooyong) [3.7].—I agree that we need to consider this item in connexion with the next. If there be anything in the representations constantly made in this Chamber as to what constitutes the raw material of an industry, then unquestionably glass of certain sizes is the raw material of the silverer and the beveller. I would urge the Treasurer to agree to the suggestion that that phase of the question should be reconsidered by him at a later stage. I wish now to refer more particularly to the duty on stained-glass windows.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The honorable member for Angas is going to withdraw

his amendment in reference to stained-glass windows, and they will be dealt with under the exemptions.

Mr. KNOX.—I propose to make a short extract from a communication that I have received on this subject, in which it is stated that the anomaly is—

That stained glass windows for churches and public institutions are under departmental by-laws admitted free of duty, while the material of which the windows are almost entirely composed, antique and cathedral glass, is charged a duty of 15 per cent. This glass, the raw material of the glass painter, is not made here in Australia, nor is it likely to be for many years, as the demand is very small.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—If the honorable member raises a debate on that point we shall be here all night.

Mr. KNOX.—I wish the Minister to understand the application of the Tariff by the Department. I merely desire to obtain from him an assurance that this matter will receive his attention, and that a reasonable adjustment will be made.

Mr. McDUGALL.—Is there any reason why this glass cannot be made in Australia?

Mr. KNOX.—I am assured by experts that the quality of glass used for these purposes cannot be made here. As for glass painting for church and domestic purposes I claim that, with the exception of the work of some men of world-wide reputation, our productions cannot be beaten. I recognise, of course, that the highest class of church windows come only from one centre, but artistic work, such as that of the writer who has addressed me on this subject, and who is known in all the States as one of the most artistic stained-glass workers in the Commonwealth, ought to be encouraged. This gentleman complains, with justice, that the departmental arrangement is anomalous. I submit that the matter deserves the attention of the Minister, and whilst I certainly shall not favour the high duty proposed. I do not think we should be justified in allowing this glass to come in free, seeing that we have an opportunity to encourage the artistic work now being carried on in our midst.

Mr. GLYNN (Angas) [3.11].—My desire is to assist the Treasurer in this matter, and before speaking I consulted the head of the Department of Trade and Customs as to the best way to accomplish my object. The Treasurer has suggested that if I do not press my amendment at this stage,

he will favorably consider an exemption such as is included—

Mr. WATSON.—I hope not.

Mr. GLYNN.—I wish honorable members would not be so hasty. The Treasurer has suggested that we might afterwards exempt windows for churches and public institutions, as being works of art, imported under departmental by-laws. In the Tariff of 1902, there is a line which supplies an answer to the heated remarks of the Chairman of the Tariff Commission. I refer to the special exemption—

Works of art being statuary, and paintings framed or unframed, also windows for churches or public institutions under departmental by-laws.

In view of that provision, can it be said that there is anything extreme in my suggestion?

Mr. WATSON.—There is a great deal of complaint.

Mr. GLYNN.—But there is nothing to justify the extraordinary protest made by the honorable member for Bendigo. Ornamental glasses for church purposes vary greatly in quality. They are works of art, and vary quite as much as pictures. If my amendment be not adopted, then the glass of which Shelley speaks—

Life, like a dome of many coloured glass
Stains the white radiance of eternity—

will be excluded.

Mr. WATSON (South Sydney) [3.13].—I think that the Committee has been allowed to stray. For some time honorable members have been discussing a later item in the Tariff.

Mr. JOHNSON.—The two are interrelated.

Mr. WATSON.—They are, but a discussion dealing with two distinct items is confusing. I have no objection to a reduction of the duty on plate and polished glass, but so far as the item immediately under consideration is concerned, I hope that no exemption will be made. I should like to suggest to the Treasurer that the word "or" should be substituted for the word "and" in the line "silvered and cut." Should not it read "silvered or cut"?

Sir JOHN FORREST.—It might be both.

Mr. WATSON.—If so, the word "or" should appear somewhere else in the sentence.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I think the item as it stands would cover glass "silvered and cut" or "silvered and uncut." I propose after the word "and" to insert the words "or brilliant."

Mr. WATSON.—The matter is one on which the officers of the Department can advise the honorable gentleman; but I still think that the word "or" is necessary. I rose principally to object to the proposal to put heraldic glass and stained glass for windows on the free list. There are men engaged in the industry in Sydney and Melbourne, and, I think, also in the capitals of the other States, and it would be most unfair to call upon them to pay duty on the paints and pigments and other materials they use without giving them protection to at least the same extent in respect of the finished article. I suppose that we all desire to see our churches beautified, but a slight increase in the cost of stained-glass windows, due to a duty for the protection of the local industry, would not prevent people interested in church decoration from purchasing beautiful windows.

Mr. GLYNN (Angas) [3.18].—I wish to withdraw the amendment, but I wish it to be understood that I do so because of a promise given by the Treasurer that, without binding himself in any way, he would favorably consider the inclusion of these articles in a list similar to the exemption list in the Tariff of 1902.

Mr. WATSON (South Sydney) [3.19].—I should like the Treasurer to declare what his policy is going to be on this item. If he is prepared to exempt the article referred to by the honorable member for Angas, it would be better that the whole of the articles included in this item should be admitted free. The honorable gentleman's decision on the question may affect my vote upon the whole item.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [3.20].—The matter is one for the Committee to deal with; but, personally, I may say at once that I believe that works of art should be admitted free. I do not care for what purpose they are imported, if they are real works of art, and not simply replicas, I do not see why they should not be admitted free, as they have been heretofore. What I told the honorable member for Angas was that I did not think this was the place in which to deal with the question. Previously these articles have been included amongst those exempt under departmental by-laws, and I think that is the proper place for them. I have not said that they will be included amongst those exemptions, but I admit that my feeling is in that direction.

Mr. JOHNSON (Lang) [3.21].—I wish to point out that if the honorable member for Angas withdraws his amendment he will not accomplish the purpose he desires. The best way would be to take these articles out of this item and subsequently include them in the list of exemptions. It is quite true, as the honorable member for South Sydney has said, that there are a number of people engaged in the stained-glass industry in the Commonwealth; but I never yet heard of any artist in Australia asking for protective duties with the object of keeping out works of art.

Mr. WATSON.—Those engaged in the stained-glass window industry are asking for a duty. I had a protest only a short time ago from a manufacturer in Sydney against their free admission.

Mr. JOHNSON.—There is a difference between a manufacturer and an artist. If the person referred to was an artist, he must be an exception to the general rule. Artists the world over are only too glad to add to their knowledge by the study of works of art produced in all parts of the world.

Mr. WATSON.—Can the honorable member define what a work of art is?

Mr. JOHNSON.—To do that might take me the whole afternoon; but I have no doubt that the works of art mentioned in this item should be included in the free list.

Mr. HUTCHISON (Hindmarsh) [3.23].—I remind the Committee that stained-glass windows must be considered as in a different category from paintings or sculpture. A great painting, or a fine piece of sculpture, imported, cannot be produced in Australia; but I will undertake to find in Victoria, New South Wales, or South Australia, artists who will produce any kind of stained-glass window honorable members are willing to pay for.

Mr. WILSON.—Bunkum!

Mr. HUTCHISON.—I challenge the honorable member to point to any stained-glass window in Australia at the present time a replica of which cannot be made in the Commonwealth. It must not be forgotten that in the stained-glass window industry the artists are not the only persons employed. The industry gives a great deal of employment to ordinary workmen. I am astonished at the Treasurer giving in this matter a promise which would have the effect of destroying a flourishing industry giving considerable employment,

and which would also prevent the development in the Commonwealth of the higher class of art in this line.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH (Parkes) [3.25].—I hope the honorable member for Hindmarsh will permit me to tell him that he is entirely wrong when he speaks in the way he has done about stained-glass windows. Some of the greatest artists in England are employed to-day upon ecclesiastical glass work for which we have no parallel in this country.

Mr. WATSON.—There is very fine work in this line done here.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—That may be so. Very fine oil and water-colour painting and very fine sculptors' work are done here. There is also very fine literature produced in Australia. I saw a magazine the other day, in which it was roundly asserted that no magazines from abroad should be allowed into Australia, because all the magazine work required in the Commonwealth could be produced here.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—I do not think so.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—I am aware that the honorable member does not think so, but the statement, appearing in the magazine to which I have referred, discloses the same spirit as that just displayed by the honorable member, and which is very often found in people who are not sufficiently informed artistically to discriminate in these matters. I can inform the honorable member that the best stained glass ecclesiastical window work is looked upon in Great Britain, and on the Continent, as involving as high a knowledge of art as does oil or water-colour painting.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—The honorable member cannot point to a stained glass window in Australia which could not be duplicated here.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—The honorable member is talking about replicas, but he must know that we could get a first-rate Australian artist to make a replica of the "The Bent Tree" to-morrow, and while "The Bent Tree" cost about £5,600, the copy of the picture would not be worth £5. To make a replica of any man's painting and consider that a work of art is very much like a man transcribing another man's book and then claiming to have produced literature.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—I claim that those engaged in the local industry of stained glass window making can produce windows of original design equal to any at present in Australia.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—Then I join issue with the honorable member. Any one who knows much about the subject will indorse what I say, when I tell the honorable member that he makes a very great mistake if he supposes that we have artists in this country at the present time who can turn out the ecclesiastical or heraldic glass work which is at present being produced in the Old Country. The heraldic glass work might not be so difficult, since it is generally designed from coats-of-arms, and is more in the nature of a copy, but there is no doubt that the highest class of ecclesiastical glass work could not be produced here.

Mr. WATSON.—Some of the men engaged in the work in the Old Country come out here.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—The best men engaged in the work would not come here, because it would not pay them to do so.

Mr. WATSON.—I suppose that the younger and aspiring artists might be induced to come here.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—Young artists in oil and water-colour painting come here from the Old Country in the same way, but we could not get a Leighton, a Millais, or an Alma Tadema, or men of that rank to come out to Australia, because they can secure prices for their work in Great Britain which Australian people would not dream of giving. It is very difficult for an artist in Australia to obtain £50 for a painting. Yet we find that a man like Corot for his "Bent Tree," of which there is a copy in Europe, gets £5,600.

Mr. WATSON.—Corot did not get the £5,600.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. BATCHELOR).—The honorable member is getting away from the question.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—I submit, sir, that there is a very close analogy from the artistic point of view between literature, sculpture, painting, and stained-glass work of the kind with which we are dealing. I invite the honorable member for Hindmarsh to inquire into the matter. He will find literature on the subject in our Library to convince him of the truth of what I have said. Some of the greatest artists engaged in this work in England obtain hundreds of guineas for a set of glass windows. To say that we could do such work here is to claim that we have a Millais, an Alma Tadema, or a Leighton amongst Australian artists.

Amendment (Mr. GLYNN's), by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That after the word "silvered" the word "and" be left out, with a view to insert in lieu thereof the words "or brilliant."

Mr. WATSON (South Sydney) [3.29].—I should like to suggest to the Treasurer that if we are to give special consideration to stained glass windows for churches instead of putting them on the free list, it would be better to include them in a special line at a lower rate of duty. What I want to urge is that our local artists who are ambitious to do good work of this kind should at least be given a protection equivalent to the extra price they are called upon to pay on the materials they use as a result of the duties imposed on those materials. The matter should be dealt with in a way which would not prejudice local artists in this line.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—What does the honorable member suggest?

Mr. WATSON.—At least 15 per cent.

Mr. TUDOR.—The duty on the raw material—glass, n.e.i.—is 15 per cent.

Mr. WATSON.—That is true.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—It would not be necessary to put a duty of 15 per cent. on the window. It should be only on the proportion of the window that represents the raw material.

Mr. WATSON.—That is so, but the paint and other materials used must be considered.

Mr. FOWLER (Perth) [3.31].—I agree in a large measure with the honorable member for South Sydney, that if there is any virtue in a protective policy the artists engaged on this kind of work are entitled to some benefit from it, but I would urge very strongly that as the disadvantages of the protective policy undoubtedly apply to them to a certain degree steps should be taken to insure that they are not penalized. There is no doubt that they have to pay to some extent on their raw material. It may be a comparatively small amount, but still the fact remains, and I take it that even free-traders would be willing to level up that difference. The object of the free-trade section of the Tariff Commission has always been to level up any disadvantages that may exist in connexion with an industry in this country carried on by importations of materials from abroad.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The free-trade section of the Tariff Commission recommend 15 per cent.

Mr. FOWLER.—I was going to suggest that 15 per cent. would be a fair thing. The honorable member for Parkes was a little too dogmatic in saying that there were no artists in Australia capable of turning out the high quality of work of this kind that is produced in other parts of the world. I know one artist in stained glass work who had to come to Australia for the benefit of his health. He previously occupied a very high position in a firm that has a world-wide reputation for this work. That is only one instance. I am sure that there are a good many other artists who are prepared to turn out good work if they are only given the opportunity. The Minister would be well advised to adopt 15 per cent. as a fair compromise in existing circumstances.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [3.34].—The honorable member for Perth, rather than the honorable member for Parkes, has stretched matters. He cites the case of a sick artist who has come out here and who once was employed in producing these windows at Home. But does the honorable member base any serious argument on an incident of that kind? The fact remains that we have not the same high quality of skill—I am speaking only of the highest and best work—as can be found in the rest of the world. I do not think that any Australian, unless a very presumptuous one, would claim that we have. We may hope in the course of time to acquire it.

Mr. THOMAS.—We have given protection to the engineer. Why should not the artist be protected as well?

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Does the honorable member suggest that we should protect our artist because he is paid higher rates for his work than are the pauper artists of the Old Country? I am afraid the parallel does not apply. The value of these works of art is the value of the skill and ability which the artist puts into them. Therefore the cost of the raw material would not come to even a quarter or a half per cent. The value of works of art of this kind is what is known economically as the value arising from the cost of production. The duty on the raw material is not worth considering, and it is absurd to urge it as a reason for imposing a duty of 15 per cent. on works of art of this kind.

Mr. WATSON.—A stained glass window may be a work of art, but it also contains a lot of mechanical work.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—And the mechanical skill does not necessarily cost much, so far as the raw material is concerned.

Mr. HUME COOK.—At least 10 per cent. of the raw material is cut to waste.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Not at all. I am willing to vote any reasonable countervailing duty which will cover the duty on the raw material, but at the outside 5 per cent. would be a very handsome allowance to make for any raw material used in these very costly works of skill and art.

Mr. STORRER (Bass) [3.38].—I thought that when the honorable member for Angas withdrew his amendment, the discussion on stained glass windows would end, and that we should deal with bevelled glass and other articles included in this item. I hope that the Minister will not reduce any proposed duty with reference to glass. We want protection for all industries. We hear the argument time after time that certain things are not being produced in Australia. Anything can be produced in Australia that is produced in any other part of the world if we only hold out inducements for those skilled in particular industries to come here and establish them. That is how America has made herself great in a short time. Surely we in Australia have confidence enough in our country to believe that the same thing can be done here. I hope the Minister will stand firm on this question, and that there will not be this paring away of proposed duties in order to satisfy a few individuals who badger honorable members about their own particular industries, and do not look at the good of the whole country. That is one of the evils in connexion with people coming here, and canvassing for particular industries. Some people want protection for cordials, and free-trade in bottles and corks. If we in this Parliament are to do justice to the interests of the Commonwealth, we must look to the good of the whole of Australia, and not of particular industries only. That is the way in which I regard the question of the duties on glass. As good church windows can be made in Australia as any that we have here at present. Of course, there may be better ones in other parts of the world, but I have not been there to see them. So far as concerns works of art, it might be a good thing

for Australia if such productions as "The Bent Tree," for which over £5,000 was paid, were shut out altogether.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [3.41].—I rise, not to extend, but to curtail the debate, by asking whether the Minister is going to allow this question to stand over in order that it may be dealt with under the exemptions, or whether he intends to propose the duty of 15 per cent. suggested? If the question of stained glass windows is to be postponed, it is not necessary to debate it further now.

Mr. CROUCH.—I am going to debate it until we get a duty of 30 per cent.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—This is not a vitally important item, however we view it, but considerable time has been spent in debating it, and we on the Opposition side are expected to curtail our speeches on really important items.

Mr. SALMON.—The reason why it has been debated is the uncertainty which exists. We do not know what is going to be done.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I want the Treasurer to say whether he will adhere to his promise given to the honorable member for Angas.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I did not exactly make a promise. I did not say that it would be done. I said that I was not certain whether it could be done, but I gave the honorable member my opinion.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The Minister made a suggestion to the honorable member for Angas, who thereupon withdrew his amendment and went away satisfied with the Minister's assurance that the item would be postponed until the Committee reached the exemptions. If the Minister will state that he intends to adhere to that promise or suggestion, the debate need not continue.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [3.43].—I feel that this matter is causing two debates instead of one. It was the amendment of the honorable member for Angas that began the debate. If the article is to be made free it should be included in the list of exemptions, as it was in the last Tariff. I do not feel at all disposed to propose a duty of 15 per cent. The article should either be free or be dutiable at 30 per cent.

Mr. WATSON.—What about the men who are doing the work here? Does the Treasurer propose to make them pay the duty on the raw material?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—If the Committee says that the duty is to be 30 per

cent., well and good. I am quite prepared to take the responsibility of testing the feeling of the Committee. I was astonished that debate should arise at this stage.

Mr. WATSON.—It is the honorable member's fault that it did arise.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I did not start the debate.

Mr. WATSON.—The honorable member gave a promise to exempt an article which is made in Australia.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—There is a strong feeling throughout the Commonwealth that works of art which cannot be produced here should be admitted duty free.

Mr. WATSON.—These works of art are produced here.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—A number of these windows are not works of art.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—If they are not works of art they should not be admitted free. I will not support a proposal to admit free anything but works of art. I shall move nothing in regard to this particular class of work, but will give the Committee an opportunity to decide regarding it in considering the exemptions. That seems to me to be the best course to take.

Mr. CROUCH (Corio) [3.45].—The Committee looks for guidance to the Treasurer, but fails to get it. He does not know whether the duty is to be 15 per cent., or the 30 per cent. proposed by himself, or whether the article is to be free. My desire is to have a duty of 30 per cent., because I think these ecclesiastical windows can be made in Australia, and made well. At Melton, in Victoria, there is a little church, the erection of which has been largely assisted by the Staughton family, and where only Australian stained glass is used in the windows. The honorable member for Laanecoorie will bear me out when I say that the windows in that church are really artistic, and a credit to the country. Australian men are being trained in this art, and they make studies of the great paintings of the Old World. Although we may not have an Alma Tadema or a Millais amongst us, we have some very thoughtful and gifted students. The work of such men as Alma Tadema and Millais never reaches Australia; but is devoted to the cathedrals of the Old Country which are supported largely by a wealthy leisured class. There is not the slightest doubt, however, that Australian art in ecclesiastical windows can hold its place, and I am pleased to say that the artists are

beginning to study Australian flora and fauna as a means of decoration. We have all heard of Corot's "Bent Tree"; but that is a French tree. What would Corot have done with an Australian gumtree? The great majority of our people are not so fortunate as the honorable member for North Sydney, who may take a trip to the Old Country occasionally—they have to study their art in the Australian fields and the bush. What is the good of a picture of a bent tree from France? It is our duty to encourage our own artists to paint works from Australian nature, so that people can compare the artist's genius with their knowledge of the living tree. As to ecclesiastical windows, we are producing no saints in Australia, although I am reminded we have amongst us a "Holy Joe," and though not our own St. George and the Dragon, we have Johnson and the Alligator.

Amendment (by Mr. JOHNSON) put—

That the words "and on and after 4th December, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 25 per cent.," be added.

The Committee divided.

Ayes	22
Noes	37
Majority	15

AYES.

Archer, E. W.
Atkinson, L.
Bowden, E. K.
Brown, Thomas
Cook, Joseph
Forrest, Sir John
Fowler, J. M.
Glynn, P. McM.
Hedges, W. N.
Irvine, Hans
Johnson, W. E.
Livingston, J.

McWilliams, W. J.
Poynton, A.
Smith, Bruce
Thomson, Dugald
Wilks, W. H.
Willis, Henry
Wilson, J. G.
Wynne, A.

Tellers:

Fuller, G. W.
Liddell, F.

NOES.

Bamford, F. W.
Carr, E. S.
Catts, J. H.
Chapman, Austin
Coon, J.
Crouch, R. A.
Deakin, A.
Edwards, R.
Ewing, T. T.
Fairbairn, G.
Fisher, A.
Foster, F. J.
Groom, L. E.
Hughes, W. M.
Irvine, W. H.
Knox, W.
Lyne, Sir William
Maloney, W. R. N.
Mathews, J.

Mauger, S.
McDougall, J. K.
O'Malley, King
Page, J.
Palmer, A. C.
Quick, Sir John
Salmon, C. C.
Sampson, S.
Spence, W. G.
Storror, D.
Thomas, J.
Thomson, John
Tudor, F. G.
Watkins, D.
Watson, J. C.
Wise, G. H.

Tellers:

Cook, Hume
Webster, W.

PAIRS.

Kelly, W. H.
Reid, G. H.
Mahon, H.
Brown, Tilley
Fysh, Sir Philip

Kingston, C. C.
Hall, D. R.
Hutchison, J.
Chanter, J. M.
Harper, R.

Question so resolved in the negative.

Amendment negatived.

Amendment (by Mr. JOHNSON) put—

That the words "and on and after 4th December, 1907, ad val. (United Kingdom), 25 per cent.," be added.

The Committee divided.

Ayes	30
Noes	29
Majority	1

AYES.

Archer, E. W.
Atkinson, L.
Bowden, E. K.
Brown, Thomas
Edwards, R.
Fairbairn, G.
Forrest, Sir John
Fowler, J. M.
Fuller, G. W.
Glynn, P. McM.
Hedges, W. N.
Hughes, W. M.
Irvine, Hans
Irvine, W. H.
Johnson, W. E.
Knox, W.

Liddell, F.
Livingston, J.
McWilliams, W. J.
Palmer, A. C.
Poynton, A.
Sampson, S.
Smith, Bruce
Thomas, J.
Thomson, Dugald
Wilks, W. H.
Willis, Henry
Wynne, A.

Tellers:

Cook, Joseph
Wilson, J. G.

NOES.

Bamford, F. W.
Carr, E. S.
Catts, J. H.
Chapman, Austin
Coon, J.
Crouch, R. A.
Deakin, A.
Ewing, T. T.
Fisher, A.
Foster, F. J.
Groom, L. E.
Lyne, Sir William
Maloney, W. R. N.
Mathews, J.
Mauger, S.

McDougall, J. K.
O'Malley, King
Page, J.
Quick, Sir John
Salmon, C. C.
Spence, W. G.
Storror, D.
Thomson, John
Watkins, D.
Watson, J. C.
Webster, W.
Wise, G. H.

Tellers:

Cook, Hume
Tudor, F. G.

PAIRS.

Kelly, W. H.
Reid, G. H.
Mahon, H.
Brown, Tilley
Fysh, Sir Philip

Kingston, C. C.
Hall, D. R.
Hutchison, J.
Chanter, J. M.
Harper, R.

Question so resolved in the affirmative.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. WATSON (South Sydney) [4.0].—
I move—

That the words:—"and on and after 4th December, 1907—

(A) Stained glass windows for churches or public institutions under departmental by-laws, ad val., 15 per cent." be added.

I submit this proposal because I fear that if the Treasurer, at a later stage, moves to exempt stained glass windows, they may be placed upon the free list from which both sections of the Tariff Commission have recommended their removal.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—I thought the honorable member held that 15 per cent. was a revenue duty?

Mr. WATSON.—I am merely endeavouring to make the best of a very bad job, because the alternative seems to be that these articles will be free. In that case our local artists, who are engaged in this class of work, will be called upon to pay duty upon their raw materials, and to compete with windows which are imported free.

Mr. GLYNN (Angas) [4.5].—The Treasurer will understand that if the amendment be carried the promise which he made to me yesterday will remain unaffected by it.

Mr. WATSON.—Oh, no.

Mr. GLYNN.—I am sure that the Treasurer is not the class of man who will go back upon a promise which he has made.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [4.6].—I should like to hear the Treasurer's view of the proposal of the honorable member for South Sydney. Does he mean to accept it, and, if so, what are his intentions in regard to the promise which he made to the honorable member for Angas?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [4.7].—I have already stated my intentions in this connexion. I ask the honorable member for South Sydney to withdraw his amendment, and I will give him an opportunity of testing the feeling of the Committee upon this question at a later stage. Personally, I am in favour of these windows being admitted free, and I feel that I am bound by my promise. I think that it is very unfair for the honorable member to place me in the position which I now occupy. I was asked to move this amendment, and I declined to do so. I do not think that this is the proper place to insert it. If the Committee decide that stained windows shall be free, well and good; but if they decide otherwise we ought to retain the duty at 30 per cent. I am quite prepared to do either, but I am not willing to go half-way.

Mr. THOMAS.—Why should not an artist as well as an engineer be protected?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I thought that the honorable member was a free-trader. Under the old Tariff, stained glass windows for churches or public institutions were admitted free, under departmental by-law. If the honorable member for South Sydney persists in his amendment, of course a vote must be taken upon it, but I would regard it as a great favour if he would withdraw his proposal, and allow the matter to remain in abeyance till we come to deal with the question of exemptions. Then, if it is necessary to go back to this item and to take a vote upon the question of the imposition of a lower duty, I will give him the opportunity to do so.

Mr. WATSON.—Under the circumstances, I ask leave to withdraw the amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [4.9].—I did intend to object to the withdrawal of the amendment. After the long debate which has taken place, it seems most undesirable to revive the matter when we come to deal with the question of exemptions. The fact that both sections of the Tariff Commission have recommended the removal of stained glass windows from the free list is a strong reason why they should be eliminated from that category.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 250. Glass, viz. :—

- (A) Polished and Patent Plate, n.e.i., per 100 superficial feet (General Tariff), 11s.; (United Kingdom), 10s.
- (B) Sheet, per 100 superficial feet (General Tariff), 2s. 3d.; (United Kingdom), 2s.
- (C) Polished and Patent Plate, each plate not exceeding 7 superficial feet, per 100 superficial feet (General Tariff), 5s. 6d.; (United Kingdom), 5s.
- (D) Polished and Patent Plate, each plate exceeding 7 superficial feet and not exceeding 12 superficial feet, per 100 superficial feet (General Tariff), 8s. 3d.; (United Kingdom), 7s. 6d.

Amendment (by Mr. TUDOR) proposed—

That paragraphs c and d be left out, with a view to insert in lieu thereof the following paragraph :—"c. Polished and Patent Plate not exceeding 25 superficial feet, free."

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [4.11].—I do not suggest that there is no foundation for the complaints made by the workers in this trade. I admit that they appear to be unduly penalized in regard to their raw material. We must recollect that they chiefly use the smaller sizes of glass, the freight upon which is as high as if not higher than

the freight charged upon the larger sizes. They have also to cut away portions of the glass, and to sell those portions at a ridiculously small price. There is some reason therefore why their raw material should be admitted free. But the proposal of the honorable member for Yarra appears to go beyond what is asked by the Victorian bevellers and glass-workers. They say that they desire polished and patent plate up to 12 superficial feet to be admitted free. They further request that a duty shall be levied upon all glass in furniture. Whilst I am prepared to exempt their raw material from duty up to a reasonable size, I think that their other request is not a desirable one to grant. If the Customs authorities have to open up all furniture imported, and to measure the area of glass which it contains, the task will be a constant source of trouble alike to the officials and importers. Moreover, it will frequently cause injury to the articles imported.

Mr. BAMFORD.—If the duties on furniture are retained, there will not be much of it imported.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I believe that the more expensive descriptions of furniture will continue to be imported although the volume will be reduced considerably if the high duties are carried. So far the request of the glass-cutters seems to be reasonable, but to accede to the whole of their request is, I think, quite out of the question.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The request I have seen is to admit free glass up to 25 superficial feet.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I am not absolutely sure that this communication commits the glass-cutters to the exemption of glass beyond 12 superficial feet. What they spoke of was the omission of the items under 12 superficial feet, and I concluded that it was their raw material up to that measurement which they wanted made free. If the honorable member for Yarra can say that it is up to 25 superficial feet that they want their raw material made free, I shall accept his statement.

Mr. TUDOR (Yarra) [4.17].—In the typewritten document which has been distributed amongst honorable members, the glass-cutters distinctly request that the duty on glass up to 25 superficial feet be removed. I have also a letter from the secretary to the union, in which he informs me that the members of the union

representing the workers in the trade ask for practically the same thing as I have proposed. He says—

What we desire is that our raw material should be admitted free.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I am willing to accept the amendment.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [4.18].—I see no objection to the amendment. I am very glad that it has been moved, because it will be a concession to the bevellers and silverers, and will not involve any very serious loss of revenue. I do not believe that at the outside it will mean a loss of more than £1,000.

Amendment agreed to.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 251 (Glass, n.e.i., &c.) agreed to.

Item 252. Glassware, including packing; measuring outside the package as imported, viz. :—

Globes for Lights, Chimneys for Lights, Fish Globes, Confectionery Glasses, Cake Glasses, Bird-seed Boxes and Cups, Fly Traps, Telegraph Glassware—When cut, embossed, engraved, etched, frosted, ground, or sand-blasted, per cubic foot (General Tariff), 2s. 6d.; when not cut, embossed, engraved, etched, frosted, ground, or sand-blasted, per cubic foot (General Tariff), 1s. 6d.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [4.19].—I propose to ask the Committee to negative this item, so that the articles which it embraces may fall under item 253, and be subject to a very much lower duty. I am informed that the fixed duty proposed in this item averages from 100 to 125 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Mr. GLYNN.—I have estimates showing that in some cases the duty runs up to 325 per cent.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—According to the estimates with which I have been supplied, the fixed duty does not run so high as the honorable member has stated, but I recognise that it is very high. When the articles are placed under the next item they will be subject to duties of 35 and 25 per cent. respectively. The A section of the Tariff Commission recommended a duty of 25 per cent. and the B section a duty of 15 per cent., while under the old Tariff the duty was 20 per cent.

Item negatived.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That the following new item be inserted :—

Item 252. Glass Cells for Primary and Secondary Electric Batteries, *ad val.* (General Tariff), 5 per cent.; (United Kingdom), free.

Item 253. Glassware, n.e.i., including Smelling and Perfume Bottles, Glass Stoppers and Fruit-jar Caps of any material; also Glass Bottle Marbles, ad val. (General Tariff), 35 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 25 per cent.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That the words "of any material" be left out.

Mr. POYNTON (Grey) [4.23].—I appeal to the Committee to reduce the duty in the general Tariff to 25 per cent., and the duty in the preferential Tariff to 20 per cent. In the first instance, I move—

That after the words "35 per cent." the words "and on and after 4th December, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 25 per cent.," be inserted.

Question put. The Committee divided.

Ayes	30
Noes	28

Majority	2
----------	-----	-----	---

AYES

Archer, E. W.	Livingston, J.
Atkinson, L.	McWilliams, W. J.
Brown, Thomas	Page, J.
Cook, Joseph	Poynton, A.
Edwards, R.	Storror, D.
Fairbairn, G.	Thomas, J.
Forrest, Sir John	Thomson, Dugald
Fowler, J. M.	Thomson, John
Frazer, C. E.	Wilks, W. H.
Fuller, G. W.	Willis, Henry
Glynn, P. McM.	Wilson, J. G.
Hedges, W. N.	Wynne, A.
Hughes, W. M.	
Irvine, Hans	
Irvine, W. H.	
Knox, W.	

Tellers:

Bowden, E. K.
Johnson, W. E.

NOES.

Bamford, F. W.	O'Malley, King
Batchelor, E. L.	Palmer, A. C.
Carr, E. S.	Quick, Sir John
Catts, J. H.	Salmon, C. C.
Chapman, Austin	Sampson, S.
Coon, J.	Spence, W. G.
Crouch, R. A.	Tudor, F. G.
Deakin, A.	Watkins, D.
Fisher, A.	Watson, J. C.
Foster, F. J.	Webster, W.
Groom, L. E.	Wise, G. H.
Lyne, Sir William	
Maloney, W. R. N.	
Mathews, J.	
Mauger, S.	

Tellers:

Cook, Hume.
McDougall, J. K.

PAIRS.

Kelly, W. H.	Kingston, C. C.
Reid, G. H.	Hall, D. R.
Mahon, H.	Hutchison, J.
Liddell, F.	Ewing, T. T.
Brown, Tilley	Chanter, J. M.
Smith, Bruce	Harper, R.

Question so resolved in the affirmative.
Amendment agreed to.

Amendment (by Mr. POYNTON) proposed—

That after the words "25 per cent." the words "and on and after 4th December, 1907, ad val. (United Kingdom), 20 per cent.," be added.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [4.30].—If this amendment be carried there will be practically no increased protection for glassware.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Hear, hear. The Committee has given an extraordinary vote.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—The efforts made by the A section of the Tariff Commission to secure assistance for this industry will have been made in vain.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Hear, hear.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—First the Minister abandoned the scheme of the Tariff in regard to flint glass. That was the beginning of the downfall. Immediately the Minister made that concession, the whole recommendations of the A section of the Commission tumbled down. Now, I am not going to allow these duties to be reduced in this manner without making an effort to assist the industry.

Mr. PAGE.—The majority of the Committee are against the honorable member.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—Because a large number of honorable members returned as protectionists are voting as free-traders.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Hear, hear; they got in under false pretences.

Mr. PAGE.—Does not the honorable member for Bendigo know that a large number returned as free-traders have pulled the Government out of messes?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—New South Wales industries will suffer by this reduction even more than those in Victoria. The chief appeal under this heading was not made to the Commission by Victorian, but by New South Wales, manufacturers.

Mr. GROOM.—The appeal came from Queensland, too.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—Mr. R. J. Connolly, a Sydney manufacturer, made a special appeal for increased duties on flint glassware, such as lamp chimneys, confectioners' show cases, and railway glassware as used in carriage lamps and telegraph glassware as used for electrical cells. He claimed just those concessions which the Minister abandoned under this heading. Now, however, the *ad valorem* duty has also been reduced from 35 to 25 per cent. Not content with that, the free-trade party, assisted by a few so-called

protectionists, are endeavouring to reduce the duty to a still lower standard on goods imported from Great Britain.

Mr. ATKINSON.—Twenty-five per cent. is the recommendation of the honorable member's section of the Commission.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—But what is proposed now is a duty of 20 per cent. The whole scheme, in fact, has been smashed up. I strongly object to any further reduction, even in favour of British goods. I should have been prepared to agree to a concession, provided flint glassware had been maintained upon the higher standard, with fixed measurement duties. But as all the duties are absorbed under this heading now, I think it would be a great mistake to make a further reduction.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [4.35].—I do not know what this splenetic outburst from the honorable member for Bendigo means. We have been voting for the honorable member's recommendation. Why is he bolting away from his own recommendation in this fashion? Why must the protectionists be designated "so-called protectionists"—a most insulting term to apply to any man, I think.

Mr. STORRER.—It does not apply to the honorable member, anyhow.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—But it does apply to the honorable member who made use of the phrase just now, as much as to any member of this Committee, because he has departed frequently from his own recommendations, and has repeatedly ignored them.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—No.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I say yes, and the honorable member will find out that what I say is true if he looks through the record of his own votes. The honorable member overlooks the fact that four-fifths of these goods come from foreign countries.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—My section of the Commission recommended a duty of 25 per cent., and the honorable member's party now propose to reduce it to 20 per cent.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—But it has been pointed out that four-fifths of the importations would come in under the 25 per cent. vote, and that only a very small proportion would come in under the 20 per cent. duty—which, by the way, is not carried yet.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—This item covers all flint glassware now.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I should hope so. Again the reply is that the bulk of these goods come from foreign countries—I mean the cheaper sorts.

Mr. SALMON.—The honorable member says that the A section of the Tariff Commission recommended 25 per cent. They did not. They recommended a measurement duty, as the honorable member will see if he turns to their report.

Mr. WILKS.—Then the honorable member for Bendigo is to blame for allowing the item to be altered.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I see on turning to the report, that the honorable member for Laanecoorie is quite right. I want to add that any man or set of men who would deliberately propose duties on glassware amounting to over 200 per cent. must have been beside themselves. Such recommendations are only worthy to be scouted, not to be followed.

Mr. FOWLER (Perth) [4.40].—The honorable member for Bendigo has referred to the elaborate report of the A section of the Tariff Commission on glassware. The B section on account of lack of time did not furnish anything in the nature of a report. Nevertheless, our recommendations are based on a fair analysis of the evidence. I make bold to say that the recommendations of the A section are not based on the evidence as a whole. Emphasis has been laid on a certain portion of it, and other phases of the evidence, equally important in my opinion, have been altogether ignored. There is no doubt about the high duties proposed by the A section in this respect. Added to the high cost of importing these goods into Australia, those duties would, in my opinion, exceed even the necessities of prohibition. I hold in my hand documents which show that in the case of typical instances in glassware the cost of importation is as high as 165 per cent. With the duties as proposed the total would be 355 per cent. Surely that is protection absolutely run mad. If the honorable member for Bendigo is not a prohibitionist, I take it that he must come down very considerably from those high duties in order to reach that level of moderation which he claims he always had before him in framing his recommendations. I have before me the cost book of an importing firm. I have been sufficiently in touch with evidence on fiscal matters to be very incredulous unless I have absolute proof,

and when statements with regard to the cost of importing glassware were put before me, I wanted proof. The firm in question has supplied me with its cost book. I have taken the trouble to verify the facts contained in the papers that have been supplied to honorable members by entries in the cost book. I find that the facts are identical in every respect. There can be no question that a gross and unnecessary duty is being added to the high charges of importation, which will make the carrying on of this industry only possible at enormous disadvantage. If there is any vitality in the Australian glassware industry at all, it ought to be able to carry on without any duty, the cost of importation being so high. There is another cost which has not been included in these amounts. I allude to breakages, which, I believe, run up to about 10 per cent. That percentage has to be added on to the 355 per cent. to find the total charges under the existing scheme of the Government. I am satisfied that these duties are so unnecessarily high that reasonable protectionists cannot indorse them. I feel sure that they can be reduced with considerable advantage to the community as a whole, and without any disadvantage to the glassware industry in Australia if it is being conducted on anything like a commercial basis.

Mr. WILKS (Dalley) [4.45].—The trouble that has occurred over this matter has arisen from the transfer of the articles formerly under item 252—which provided for a measurement duty—to item 253, which provides for an *ad valorem* duty. The honorable member for Bendigo did not object to the transfer, though he was in the Chamber at the time.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The honorable member thought that the Committee would be reasonable, and not reduce the duty. That was my opinion also, or I should have objected to the transfer.

Mr. WILKS.—As a matter of fact, the honorable member for Bendigo did not object. Now, he tells us that he himself would have objected to the transfer except that he thought that the proposed duty of 35 per cent. was going to be carried. The Treasurer's real reason for the transfer of the articles from one item to another was that he was absolutely ashamed of the item as it stood. The measurement duty was at an exorbitant rate. Neither the honorable member for Bendigo nor the Treasurer could have defended it. The heaviest

impost was placed upon the cheapest class of articles.

Mr. SALMON.—As item 252 has been negatived, surely the honorable member is not in order in discussing it.

The CHAIRMAN.—The honorable member must not discuss it; but he may make an incidental reference to it.

Mr. WILKS.—The honorable member for Bendigo informed the Committee that the biggest glassworks in the Commonwealth are those at Leichhardt, which is in my electorate; but I regard the local manufacturers of glassware as so heavily protected by their natural advantages that I intend to vote for the lowest rate of duty. As the honorable member for Perth has shown, the charges connected with the importation of glassware are peculiarly heavy, giving the local manufacturers a protection of 165 per cent.

Mr. FOWLER.—That estimate is correct. I obtained it from official documents.

Mr. WILKS.—Assuming the natural protection to be only 80 per cent., or half of what it really is, the additional 25 per cent. which the Committee has allowed gives the local manufacturer a very fair protection. I intend to vote for a duty of 20 per cent. against British importations, because I do not think that the Treasurer should go back on his avowed policy of preference to Great Britain. So far as the honorable member for Bendigo is concerned, as he did not object to the removal of the measurement duties, he has only got himself to blame for the position in which he finds himself. The Committee has voted the 25 per cent. *ad valorem* duty recommended by the protectionist section of the Tariff Commission.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I blame protectionists for having thrown over this industry.

Mr. WILKS.—I am answerable only for myself, and while I desire that the glass-making industry shall flourish here, I think that, in addition to the natural protection, a rate of 25 per cent. on foreign importations and 20 per cent. on British importations will be sufficient.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The past has shown that those rates will not be sufficient.

Mr. WILKS.—If heavier rates were imposed, what would be the position of the users of glassware? That is a subject which concerns me as a free-trader. The Treasurer considers that he has been sold by his protectionist friends.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I have.

Mr. WILKS.—Apart from his fiscal views, I have more than ordinarily kindly feelings for the Treasurer, and if he thinks that he has been sold by his friends, the proper thing for him to do is not to utter complaints, but to make a crisis.

Mr. POYNTON (Grey) [4.50].—I wish to point out to the Committee that, while we have negatived item 252, the glassware therein specified is now dutiable as "glassware, n.e.i.," under item 253. The honorable member for Bendigo has spoken about the need for high protection, but, as a matter of fact, the natural protection to the local makers is very heavy. The cost of importing ruby and coloured lamp globes, which are not made here, comes to 107 per cent. The cost of importing lamp chimneys is 165 per cent. The cost of importing the clear crimped-top lamp chimney is 204 per cent., and the cost of importing frosted crimped-top lamp chimneys 170 per cent. These are the charges in addition to the duty.

Mr. FOWLER.—And the loss by breakages is not taken into account.

Mr. POYNTON.—No. As I pointed out earlier in the debate, it is shown by invoices that the average loss on glassware landed at Port Adelaide is about 10 per cent. In addition to a natural protection, which ranges from 107 per cent. to 204 per cent., the Committee has imposed a duty of 25 per cent. on foreign importations, and it is now proposed to make the duty on British importations 20 per cent. The honorable member for Bendigo must think that he is talking to children when he says that this protection is not sufficient. How much does he want? The measurement duties which were knocked out were equivalent to over 500 per cent. The local manufacturers of glassware are being treated very liberally.

Mr. COON (Batman) [4.55].—Honorable members have a lot to say about the natural protection enjoyed by the local manufacturers of glassware, but it does not prevent imported tumblers from being retailed in Victoria at 1½d. each, or 1s. 4d. a dozen. These goods are being dumped here, notwithstanding the supposed protection of 165 per cent. Their original cost cannot be more than 5d. or 6d. a dozen. They are made by work-people who are employed for twelve hours a day during all the seven days of the week. I bought for 1½d. the tumbler which I hold in my hand.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Did the honorable member wish to pay 6d. for it?

Mr. COON.—I mention the fact to show that the protection about which honorable members have said so much does not prevent dumping. How can our work-people, who are employed only eight hours a day, for a week of forty-eight hours, compete with work-people who are employed for a week of eighty-four hours, and many of whom are women and girls? There are no women or girls employed in the glass-making industry in Australia, where all the operatives are paid Wages Board rates, and work under proper conditions.

Mr. JOHNSON.—How much did the other tumbler, which the honorable member has, cost?

Mr. COON.—Threepence.

Mr. JOHNSON.—The other is very much the better article.

Mr. COON.—Of course, the honorable member prefers the imported article. The cost of sending a ton of glassware from Germany to New South Wales is only 5s. a ton of 36 cubic feet measurement.

Mr. HANS IRVINE.—Can the honorable member produce a bill of lading to prove that statement?

Mr. COON.—I can support it with sworn evidence. The talk about the so-called natural protection is all humbug, and I hope that the Minister will not allow the duty to be further reduced.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS (Robertson) [4.58].—No doubt the Tariff Commissioners took into consideration the enormous charges incidental to the importation of glassware, and, having done so, one section recommended a duty of 15 per cent., and the other duties ranging from 20 per cent. to 300 per cent. The complaint of the honorable member for Bendigo comes rather late, and, as we have dealt with item 252, we might very well agree to the proposed rate of 20 per cent. on British importations, so that we can make progress.

Question—That after the words "25 per cent." the words "and on and after 4th December, 1907, ad val., (United Kingdom), 20 per cent." be added (Mr. Poynton's amendment)—put. The Committee divided.

Ayes	28
Noes	26

Majority 2

AYES.

Archer, E. W.
Atkinson, L.
Brown, Thomas
Cook, Joseph
Edwards, R.
Fairbairn, G.
Forrest, Sir John
Fowler, J. M.
Frazer, C. E.
Fuller, G. W.
Glynn, P. McM.
Hedges, W. N.
Irvine, Hans
Irvine, W. H.
Johnson, W. E.

Knox, W.
Liddell, F.
Livingston, J.
McWilliams, W. J.
Page, J.
Palmer, A. C.
Poynton, A.
Thomson, Dugald
Willis, Henry
Wilson, J. G.
Wynne, A.

Tellers:

Bowden, E. K.
Wilks, W. H.

NOES.

Batchelor, E. L.
Carr, E. S.
Catts, J. H.
Chapman, Austin
Coon, J.
Crouch, R. A.
Deakin, A.
Fwing, T. T.
Fisher, A.
Groom, L. E.
Lyne, Sir William
Maloney, W. R. N.
Mathews, J.
Mauger, S.

O'Malley, King
Quick, Sir John
Salmon, C. C.
Sampson, S.
Storror, D.
Thomson, John
Watkins, D.
Watson, J. C.
Webster, W.
Wise, G. H.

Tellers:

Cook, Hume
McDougall, J. K.

PAIRS.

Kelly, W. H.
Smith, Bruce
Reid, G. H.
Mahon, H.
Brown, Tilley
Fysh, Sir Philip
Hughes, W. M.
Thomas, J.
Foxton, Colonel

Kingston, C. C.
Hall, D. R.
Harper, R.
Hutchison, J.
Chanter, J. M.
Bamford, F. W.
Foster, F. J.
Tudor, F. G.
Spence, W. G.

Question so resolved in the affirmative.

Amendment agreed to.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 254 (Glass; lenses, &c.) agreed to.

Item 255. Glass, viz.:—Gas analysis apparatus, arsenic testing apparatus and tubes, evaporating basins, free.

Mr. EDWARDS (Oxley) [5-7].—This item relates to scientific glassware, on which a moderate protection is sought by firms in Brisbane who are engaged in the industry. We have already established in that city two factories.

Mr. CHANTER.—What does the Minister say to this?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Having regard to the vote to destroy the glass industry just given by the honorable member, I shall not give what he asks if I can help it.

Mr. EDWARDS.—The honorable member knows perfectly well that I made no attempt to destroy the glassware industry.

I shall put the facts of this case before the Committee, leaving honorable members to decide as they think fit. I have no interest in the matter.

Mr. WATSON.—We shall do just as the honorable member has been doing. He has been voting against everything that is not "Queensland."

Mr. EDWARDS.—I have been voting against proposals of which I disapprove, and shall continue to vote against every proposition that I think is not in the interests of the people. I have certain facts relating to the scientific glassware industry to put before the Committee, and appeal to the better nature of the Treasurer to do justice to it. How have the Victorian industries been treated? The hat manufacturers of Victoria have been granted the assistance of protective duties amounting to nearly 200 per cent., and the clothing manufacturers have also received substantial protection. Does not the Treasurer think that every industry deserves some encouragement at the hands of the Government? If the news goes forth that because I voted against the Government on two or three items of which I did not approve, an important industry in Queensland is to be penalized, what opinion will the people form of the Treasurer's attitude?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—They will form a very bad opinion of the honorable member.

Mr. EDWARDS.—What will the people think of the vote given a few minutes ago by the Treasurer, who professes a desire to grant a preference to the Old Country?

Mr. McDUGALL.—What will the people of Japan think?

Mr. EDWARDS.—They are well able to look after themselves, and seek no assistance from us. The Treasurer says he will grant no consideration to the scientific glassware industry, because on the last item I voted against the Government. That is a contemptible stand to take up.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—The Treasurer in this case has turned free-trader.

Mr. EDWARDS.—He is a free-trader when it suits him, or, to use one of his own elegant phrases, "a shandygaff protectionist." I do not pretend to be an expert in the matter of scientific glassware, but I have here a catalogue of various instruments that are being manufactured in the factories to which I have referred.

Mr. PAGE.—And the Treasurer ought to be prepared to protect them.

Mr. EDWARDS.—He should be, if he desires to establish the industry on a sound basis. Messrs. J. and W. Wilson Limited, of Brisbane, under date 14th October, 1907, wrote to me as follows—

Dear Sir,

Following our letter of 5th inst., *re* scientific glassware, we beg to state that the circular sent you was printed prior to the declaration of the new Tariff. We mentioned incandescent electric lamps as being admitted free, but under the new Tariff they carry 25 per cent. and 15 per cent. (*vide* item 144). This is the only article in our line of business that has received any adequate protection. Items 255, 256, and 442 include most of the articles important to those in our line of business, and are admitted free. On pages 7, 8, and 9 of our illustrated catalogue are some testimonials which prove our ability to turn out scientific glassware. At present we are manufacturing for the Commonwealth, New Zealand, Singapore, Honolulu, &c. We would draw your attention to what we consider an anomaly in the present Tariff relating to glassware. While fine, expensive, artistic, and ornamental glassware, which is not made in the Commonwealth nor likely to be for many years to come, carries a duty of 35 per cent., scientific glassware, which can be and is being made here, is admitted duty free.

The Treasurer does not listen; he does not want to learn the truth regarding this industry—

We fail to see the justice of this, presuming that the Tariff is intended to assist and protect Australian industries.

The general belief is that the object of the Tariff is to assist industries generally, and not to penalize any one industry because the honorable member who advocates its protection has voted against the Government—

We know of many glass-workers throughout the States, comprising the Commonwealth and New Zealand, who cannot obtain work at their trade on account of the free importation from the Continent; and who are obliged to be engaged in such work as railway carriage cleaners, labourers in connexion with the metal trades, tramway employes, storemen, packers, bailiffs, &c., or any employment offering. We would respectfully suggest that the list of articles contained in our circular as scientific glassware be included in the Tariff as glassware, item 253, carrying duty to the extent of 35 per cent. in the general Tariff and 25 per cent. in the preferential Tariff. We trust that when these matters come up for debate, our Queensland representatives will see the necessity for giving our industry protection, and give our views their very earnest support.

I have done my part.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The honorable member has dealt with their interests!

Mr. EDWARDS.—I venture to say that every newspaper in the Commonwealth will expose the Treasurer.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I shall expose the honorable member before I have done with him.

Mr. EDWARDS.—There is nothing concerning me that the Minister can expose; I am utterly independent of him.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I rise to a point of order. Is the Treasurer in order in describing the honorable member for Oxley—as he did across the table—as an old fraud? I think that it is disgraceful.

The CHAIRMAN.—The honorable member for Parramatta is in order in calling my attention to such a statement, but he is not in order in commenting upon it. There was so much noise that I did not hear the statement attributed to the Treasurer, but if he did make it I must ask him to withdraw it.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I withdraw anything that the honorable member for Oxley thinks is offensive to him. I shall reply to him.

Mr. EDWARDS.—Had I heard the remark myself I should have asked that the Treasurer be called upon to withdraw it. Anything that he may say, however, will not affect me; we all know how offensive he can be. The letter which I have just read was accompanied by a number of testimonials which, but for the consideration that I have for other honorable members, I might read for the benefit of the Treasurer. I was prepared to show some consideration for the Treasurer until I heard the contemptible way in which he said that he would not agree to protection for this industry, because I had recorded a certain vote. One of the testimonials to which I refer is from "R. L. J. Ellery, F.R.S., Government Astronomer, Melbourne," and is as follows—

This is to certify that I know Mr. W. Wilson as a skilled thermometer and barometer maker and worker in all kinds of glass meteorological instruments, he having made and repaired many instruments, &c., for the Observatory to my entire satisfaction.

I read these testimonials to show that the men who have established this industry in Brisbane are competent men.

Mr. PAGE.—If they were established in Victoria, they would get protection all right.

Mr. EDWARDS.—They would. I was going to remind the Minister that this industry is established in Brisbane and not in Melbourne. It is just as well that honorable members should understand that.

I propose only to read another testimonial from Messrs. Humble and Nicholson, of Vulcan Foundry, Geelong—

The CHAIRMAN.—Order! I cannot allow the honorable member to read the whole of these testimonials. He will see that if I did so, and the practice were followed by other honorable members, there would be no finality to the discussions upon the Tariff.

Mr. EDWARDS.—May I remind you, sir, that during the discussions on the Tariff testimonials have been read repeatedly. I had marked only two concerning the business to which I am referring, and had no intention to read any more. I hope I shall be allowed to read the second testimonial which I intended to bring under the notice of the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN.—Order!

Mr. EDWARDS.—Very well, I will not read it. These men are very well known, and I have no doubt the day will come when the Treasurer will regret what he said this afternoon.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Indeed, I will not.

Mr. EDWARDS.—I hope the Committee will have some regard for an industry to which the Treasurer is not prepared to give any consideration.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [5.18].—The honorable member for Oxley has said that I will not do what he desired because he has been trying to destroy the glass industry this afternoon.

Mr. EDWARDS.—The honorable gentleman said so himself.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The honorable member has given votes to-day—

Mr. WATSON.—And every day.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—And every day, which were absolutely destructive of industries.

Mr. PAGE.—I rise to a point of order. Has the Treasurer any right to reflect upon a vote of any member of the Committee?

The CHAIRMAN.—No. The honorable gentleman would not be in order in reflecting upon the vote of any member of the Committee, but I did not understand him to do so.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I am not reflecting upon the honorable member, who, of course, is at liberty to do as he likes. But when the honorable member for Oxley has voted, as he has done in almost every instance, to reduce the duty proposed in connexion with the very industry to which he is now referring to rates which would render it impossible to carry on the

industry, of what use is it for him to ask me to put certain manufacturers in Brisbane in a position which I say is not a good position for them or for any one else—and solely because of the way in which the honorable member has voted. I am not going to do it.

Mr. EDWARDS.—I am glad that the honorable member has told us that.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not wish to reflect upon the last vote, but it was the most serious vote given in this chamber.

The CHAIRMAN.—Order!

Mr. EDWARDS.—I resent such a statement.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I am exceedingly sorry that such a vote should have been given. I marvel that the honorable member and other representatives of Queensland on the Opposition side get anything through this House, because other honorable members have become tired of the practice they have followed, of voting to suit their own purposes, instead of in the interests of the other States.

The CHAIRMAN.—Order!

Mr. WATSON (South Sydney) [5.21].—The attitude assumed by the honorable member for Oxley in making this request borders on the humorous. For weeks past the honorable member has consistently voted for the lowest possible duty, except where the interests of a Queensland industry have been at stake. He now asks, again in respect of a Queensland industry, that it should be given every consideration in this Tariff. Whenever a Queensland industry is in question, the honorable member desires that something should be done for it, and every other part of Australia, so far as he is concerned, can go hang. I say that, so far as my knowledge of the people of Queensland goes, they do not desire any such discrimination in their favour. They are content that duties should be so imposed as to benefit industries in all the States alike.

Mr. EDWARDS.—That is so.

Mr. WATSON.—I am sure that they would repudiate the selfish attitude the honorable member has consistently adopted in this Chamber.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—What discrimination has been suggested by the honorable member for Oxley?

Mr. WATSON.—The honorable member for Oxley has consistently voted for the lowest rate of duty he could get on every item in which Queensland was not concerned.

Mr. EDWARDS.—I rise to a point of order. I wish to know whether the honorable member is in order in reflecting upon any votes recorded by members of the Committee?

The CHAIRMAN.—The honorable member would not be in order in reflecting upon any vote given by any honorable member. I did not understand the honorable member to do so, but if he did, I am sure he will withdraw.

Mr. WATSON.—I would not think of reflecting upon the honorable member for Oxley. I merely direct attention to some little inconsistencies on the part of the honorable member, which are probably quite accidental. There is, however, a peculiarity about them, as they always seem to be in the one direction. Where a Queensland industry is involved, the honorable member suddenly becomes a protectionist, and on everything else he is a free-trader.

The CHAIRMAN.—The honorable member must not pursue that line of argument.

Mr. WATSON.—Despite the attitude adopted by the honorable member for Oxley, I do not think that we should ignore a Queensland industry. I am quite prepared to give every consideration to industries established in Queensland, even though representatives of that State should be so selfish as to refuse to give consideration to industries established in the other States. I trust that the Treasurer will look into the matter referred to, and see whether anything has been overlooked. I am glad to be able to say that at the Women's Work Exhibition recently held here I saw some Queensland glass products from Rockhampton that were equal to anything I have seen imported from the Old Country, or anything of the kind that has ever been placed on the market in Australia. I regret that owing to the last vote, carried with the assistance of the honorable member for Oxley and other honorable members opposite, such productions are likely to receive so small a measure of protection in the future that it is doubtful whether the industry for their manufacture can continue to be carried on.

The CHAIRMAN.—Order!

Mr. WATSON.—I think the Treasurer should look into this matter, in which the Brisbane industry referred to is concerned, and endeavour to make good any deficiency in the Tariff.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—It is not worth while.

Mr. PAGE (Maranoa) [5.26].—From the debate which has taken place since the honorable member for Oxley brought this matter before the Committee, and from general remarks on the Tariff to which I have listened, I am disposed to think that the honorable member made the greatest possible mistake in not first consulting the Treasurer's understudy, the honorable member for Batman. If he had only told that honorable member that he wanted a duty for the benefit of this Brisbane industry, I am satisfied that the Treasurer would have acceded at once to his request. This is the Lyne-Coon Tariff. There is no doubt at all about that. As soon as any article is mentioned, the honorable member for Batman gets up, and says, "The thing can be made in Australia. I have it here in my pocket." The honorable member went so far the other night as to say that he had a sheep-shearing machine and a wool-scouring machine in his pocket. He may know something about a good many things, but the honorable member does not know much about wool, or he would not have brought forward the sample he exhibited in this Chamber. The trouble is that this is a Queensland industry, and so did not happen to have the ear of the Treasurer, the Minister of Trade and Customs, or the honorable member for Batman. The honorable member for Oxley was returned as an independent member of this Parliament, and is free to vote as he likes. We all claim to do that. If one or two, or the whole of the representatives of Queensland, happen to be opposed to the policy of the Government, that is no reason why the industries of that State should not be given a square deal.

Mr. WATSON.—The honorable member wants a square deal for Queensland industries, but will not concede the same to the industries of the other States.

Mr. PAGE.—With all respect to the honorable member for South Sydney, I claim to have helped industries in Victoria and New South Wales, as well as Queensland industries.

Mr. WATSON.—I was not referring to the honorable member.

Mr. PAGE.—Then I beg the honorable member's pardon. I do not wish to do any man or woman in the Commonwealth out of a day's work, and from what I know of him the honorable member for Oxley would not do so either.

Mr. MATHEWS.—The honorable member's votes do not show that.

Mr. PAGE.—The honorable member for Oxley, as well as the honorable member for Melbourne Ports, has his own opinions. The honorable member for Melbourne Ports is a one-eyed protectionist, and cannot cavil if the honorable member for Oxley is the same. I ask the Treasurer to leave the honorable members for Oxley and Maranoa out of this question altogether, and, if it is the policy of the Government to protect established industries, to do something for this industry in Queensland.

Mr. SALMON (Laanecoorie) [5.28].—I was somewhat astonished to hear the honorable member for Oxley making a proposition—

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Why cannot honorable members let the honorable member for Oxley alone? They are pecking at him like a lot of political crows.

Mr. SALMON.—Surely it is not befitting a deliberate assembly that when one rises to throw some light on a discussion—

Mr. JOSEPH COOK. — The honorable member is doing nothing of the kind. He is rising for the purpose of savagely attacking another honorable member.

The CHAIRMAN.—Order!

Mr. SALMON.—The honorable member ought to know that I never savagely attack any one. No member of the Committee is more meek and mild in his criticism of others than I am. I express my surprise that, when the Committee has declined to place any duty upon scientific appliances, the honorable member for Oxley should have asked us to go out of our way in order to assist an industry in the State from which he comes. The honorable member did not indicate the articles which he desired to have protected, or the duty he wished to have placed upon them. Am I to understand that he wishes the Government to take into serious consideration the desirability of taxing scientific glassware?

Mr. EDWARDS. — Yes. Just because these articles are manufactured here, in the same way as are clothing and hats.

Mr. SALMON.—A number of scientific appliances which are manufactured here have already been placed on the free list by the Committee. The Government have studiously avoided the imposition of duties upon material used for scientific purposes. The honorable member must be aware that

gas analysis apparatus is not very largely used, and I feel sure that he would not desire that an impost should be placed upon instruments used to prevent disaster to the community. Arsenic testing apparatus and tubes should be treated in the same way.

Mr. MCWILLIAMS. — The honorable member should not decry an Australian industry.

Mr. SALMON.—I have no wish to do so, but I say that purely scientific instruments should be admitted under the freest possible conditions.

Mr. PAGE.—If they are made in Australia, what does it matter whether they are made in Queensland or in Victoria?

Mr. SALMON.—I do not care where they are made.

Mr. PAGE.—Be fair.

Mr. SALMON.—Does the honorable member accuse me of unfairness for saving a word for the freedom of scientific apparatus which we have already admitted free of duty under different parts of the Tariff? If the honorable member for Oxley desires a duty, I hope that the Treasurer will give his request the consideration it deserves. But I feel that the Treasurer will be consistent. He has been consistent throughout the consideration of the Tariff. We should not place an impost upon articles required for scientific work. Even if a duty were placed upon evaporating basins, I do not think that it would make any difference in the number manufactured here. The honorable member for Oxley has gone out of his way to ask the Committee to do something which they have never done before, in placing a duty upon apparatus used solely for scientific work, and for making scientific observations.

Mr. EDWARDS.—And which are manufactured in Australia. That is the crux of the whole thing.

Mr. SALMON.—The honorable member astonishes me by the fluency of his protectionist protestations. He would go to the extent of those who in France some years ago proposed that the air also should be taxed, because it was produced in France.

Mr. PAGE.—Mr. Kingston proposed a duty of 15 per cent. in 1902.

Mr. SALMON.—Was it carried?

Mr. PAGE.—It was knocked out. If these articles were made in Maryborough, Victoria, the honorable member would bar-rack for a duty on them.

Mr. SALMON.—The honorable member is not treating me fairly. I know of

several items under the heading of scientific apparatus which are made in Melbourne, but which, if they were dutiable, I would strongly urge should be placed upon the free list. I am glad to say that they are already on the free list. I can only express my regret that the new-born zeal of the honorable member for Oxley for protectionist principles had not been exhibited in a worthier cause.

Mr. EDWARDS (Oxley) [5.34]. — I much regret that the Minister should have lost his temper this afternoon.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I never lose my temper.

Mr. EDWARDS.—I spoke this morning in admiration of the way in which the Minister has controlled himself during the whole Tariff discussion. I was honest and sincere in what I said then; but I am afraid that it had a bad effect upon him. Apparently he likes to be scolded better than to be praised. I ask him to take this matter into consideration with the view of giving some measure of protection to the industry which I have mentioned. I do not care whether it is established in Brisbane or in any other part of the Commonwealth. I take it that the industry is established to some extent in other parts of the Commonwealth. I know that I cannot move for an increase of duty, but the particular articles which Messrs. J. and W. Wilson manufacture are to be found in items 255, 256, and 442.

Mr. SALMON. — Which of the articles enumerated in item 255 do they manufacture?

Mr. EDWARDS.—The honorable member can read, I presume. He has the Tariff in front of him. I gave him the numbers of the items. Surely he does not want any more?

Mr. SALMON.—The honorable member is misleading the Committee, because they do not make all the articles included in item 255.

Mr. EDWARDS.—The honorable member is very troublesome. He takes up a good deal of time himself. He should know that we want to get the Tariff through before Christmas. I ask the Minister to take the matter into his serious consideration, with a view to giving protection not only to this firm, but to others throughout the Commonwealth. The honorable member for Laanecoorie knows that I am not speaking only on behalf of the people of my own State. It has been alleged that I vote only for those things which will

benefit Queensland, but I can say that Queensland has nothing to thank the Federal Parliament for. It is always thrown in our faces that we do nothing except for the benefit of Queensland. I deny and resent the imputation. I hope the Treasurer will see his way clear to impose a duty of 15 or 20 per cent. I think I am moderate in my request. I term myself a moderate protectionist. I am not an extremist. I regard high duties as being just as bad as are too low duties. The self-reliance of men and masters is weakened when they have to depend on duties, and on such assistance as they may be able to get from a Government.

Mr. PAGE (Maranoa) [5.37].—I hope the Minister will take the request of the honorable member for Oxley into serious consideration. We want only a square deal. The honorable member for Oxley does not ask the Treasurer to impose a duty on the whole of the item.

Mr. SALMON.—Yes, he does.

Mr. PAGE.—That is not so. The honorable member for Oxley has furnished the Minister with a catalogue of the surgical instruments that are made by the firm in Brisbane.

Mr. SALMON.—Those are not included in this item.

Mr. PAGE.—The Minister sits in his chair like a Sphinx, and will not say what he will do or not do. Instead of the honorable member for Laanecoorie helping the honorable member for Oxley, knowing full well, as a professional man, the names of these scientific instruments, he tried to cloud the issue by saying that they are not included in this item. If the honorable member for Laanecoorie were fair to the honorable member for Oxley, to the Committee, and to Queensland, he would say whether these articles can be made in Australia or not. Will he say, as a professional man, whether this is a fair industry to be protected? If it were carried on in Victoria, I am satisfied that every Victorian in the House, including the honorable member for Melbourne Ports, would be barracking hard for it. The honorable member for Melbourne Ports interjected something about free-traders being strong on protection. I may tell the honorable member that I was not returned at the last election as a free-trader. I announced on the platform what I intended to do with regard to protection. I said that if the Government introduced scientific protection, and would protect the workers, I

would give them the help that they needed. I hope the honorable member for Melbourne Ports will not throw that taunt at me again. I am as good a man as he is, in any way he likes to take me. No good end is served by saying that honorable members are agents for this or that man. Each of us has a constituency to represent, and is amenable to his electors. Let them deal with us, instead of our attempting to judge one another on the floor of this chamber. The honorable member for Oxley has only asked for a fair thing for our State. He wants the same fair and square treatment for Queensland as I and other Queensland members have given to the other States in regard to their manufacturing industries. I ask the Treasurer, in all seriousness, to see if something cannot be done to protect this industry. Messrs. J. and W. Wilson claim to be the sole Australian manufacturers of accurate scientific glassware. Their factory and warehouse is situated in Wharf-street, Brisbane. I do not know them, but as the instruments which they advertise are made in Brisbane, which after all is in the Commonwealth, those honorable members who are so strong on protection for industries in other States which have more numerous representation than Queensland has should accord this industry the same fair, square treatment as other States are getting. I ask the Treasurer to give this matter consideration, not on account of the honorable member for Oxley, who does not care a snap of the fingers personally, but in the interests of Queensland and of the Commonwealth.

Mr. SALMON (Laanecoorie) [5.42].—The honorable member for Oxley has been good enough to suggest that I have chattered a good deal on this Tariff. I have spoken very little upon it. My constituency is vitally interested in it in many ways, but in the interests of the despatch of business I have kept silent on many occasions in the face of great provocation. When I asked the honorable member for Oxley a civil question as to what articles included in item 255 were made by the Brisbane firm mentioned, he replied in a fashion which I am sorry to say he has apparently acquired from those with whom he is sitting.

Mr. EDWARDS.—I gave the honorable member the number of the item.

Mr. SALMON.—I asked the honorable member a question with regard to the

articles in the item, but he resented it, and was somewhat rude. At any rate, he was querulous.

Mr. EDWARDS.—I replied in the same tone as the honorable member used in asking the question.

Mr. SALMON.—I was anxious for information, but I did not get it. I have now been handed a copy of the catalogue issued by this firm. From a cursory glance, I should say that the manufactures of this firm do not come under the item we are discussing at all. The honorable member for Oxley has anticipated the discussion on a subsequent item.

Mr. EDWARDS.—They come partly under this item and partly under the next.

Mr. SALMON.—I cannot find in the catalogue any article that is included in item 255. There are only three articles included in that item, one of which I know from personal knowledge is not manufactured in the Commonwealth. When the honorable member asserted that all the articles in item 255 were manufactured in the Commonwealth, he made an assertion that is not borne out by the catalogue itself. I hope the Treasurer will decide not to place a duty on apparatus used purely for scientific purposes. If the Minister refuses to impose a duty he will be doing only what has been the consistent policy of the protectionist party for many years past. Of course, we desire to see these articles manufactured here, if possible; but if they are not manufactured here—and even if they are—we decline to make them subject to taxation.

Mr. KING O'MALLEY (Darwin) [5.46].—I plead with the Treasurer to do justice to Queensland, irrespective of any feeling he may have in regard to the honorable member for Oxley. In a great fiscal battle of this kind, we ought not to feel sore if we do not get all the assistance we think we ought to have.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Then by this time I ought to feel a little sore.

Mr. KING O'MALLEY.—Quite so; I feel sore myself. At the same time, I urge the Treasurer in this instance to be a Christian to Queensland.

Mr. HUGHES (West Sydney) [5.47].—I hope the Treasurer will not differentiate between glassware in this item and glassware as treated under item 256. We have agreed that glassware under item 253 shall be admitted on duties of 25 per cent. and 20 per cent.; and now it is proposed

that, instead of admitting free glassware which we cannot make in this country successfully, a duty should be imposed because there is a factory or factories in Queensland. I do not believe that there is a glass factory in my electorate, but I feel sure, seeing that the electorate is within a stone's throw of some of the largest factories in Australia, that some of those engaged in the industry are amongst my constituents. I was perfectly content with a duty of 25 per cent., which the honorable member for Parramatta has informed us really means protection up to 130 per cent. That duty, however, is for the *bona fide* protection of an industry already in existence, employing a considerable number of people, whereas the proposal now is to impose a duty to protect an industry in which only one or two persons are employed in some factory in Queensland. The proposal exhibits a provincial and narrow view; and I hope that, in the interests of scientific research and knowledge, the honorable member for Oxley will not persist in his amendment. I am sure that the honorable member's contention will not be corroborated, namely, that glassware for scientific instruments can be produced in Australia to compete with European instruments.

Mr. ARCHER (Capricornia) [5.50].—It is generally known that I was returned to this Parliament pledged not to interfere with the old Tariff. At the same time, I cannot help feeling that attention may very well be drawn to the attitude of protectionists like the honorable member for Laanecoorie and others. All through the Tariff discussion we have seen high duties imposed in order to protect industries, some of which are only one-man industries, or employing very few people.

Mr. CHANTER.—How many men are employed in this glassware industry in Queensland?

Mr. ARCHER.—I do not know.

Mr. CHANTER.—The honorable member will not answer the question.

Mr. ARCHER.—It has taken very little inducement in other cases to cause protectionists to impose duties even as high as 40 per cent. and 50 per cent.

Mr. MATHEWS.—The honorable member has voted free-trade in everything but sugar.

Mr. ARCHER.—I have voted consistently all through for the old Tariff, and I intend to do so in regard to the present item. At the same time, I desire to point out the inconsistency of the extreme

protectionist members, who are now attacking the honorable member for Oxley, seeing that time after time they have imposed high duties in the case of industries which give no more employment than does the industry under discussion.

Mr. MATHEWS.—Those protectionists have been consistent right through, whereas the honorable member has not.

Mr. ARCHER.—That does not affect the position taken up by protectionist members opposite. The honorable member for Oxley has never advocated prohibitive duties. It has been pointed out that he has voted against the Government on many occasions, but that is simply because he is a moderate protectionist; and now he asks for a moderate protective duty.

Mr. MATHEWS.—“Moderate protectionist” is only another name for free-trader!

Mr. ARCHER.—That is a matter of opinion. The honorable member for Oxley is quite consistent in proposing a duty of 15 per cent. or 20 per cent. Honorable members opposite, as I have already said, have supported duties as high as 35 per cent. and 40 per cent.

Mr. SALMON.—Not on scientific instruments.

Mr. ARCHER.—The fact that these people in Queensland manufacture scientific instruments has very little to do with the matter from a Tariff point of view. We must not forget the taxation, equal to 15 per cent. or 20 per cent., which has been imposed on the farmer. What difference would it make to scientific research if particular instruments cost 2d. or 3d. more by reason of the proposed duty? It is ridiculous to say that scientific research will be stopped at once if a duty of 15 per cent. be placed on this glassware.

Mr. HUGHES.—The honorable member did not speak like that when the duty on wire netting was under discussion!

Mr. ARCHER.—I opposed the duty on wire netting, just as I shall oppose the proposed duty on this glassware, which was free under the old Tariff. I am merely pointing out the inconsistency of those who have attacked the honorable member for Oxley on the ground of his inconsistency.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [5.54].—The honorable member for Oxley is asking me to do that which is quite impossible at the present stage. If honorable members turn to items 255, 256, and 442, they will see that the system fol-

lowed now, as in the past, is to make scientific instruments free; and I cannot think of reversing, at a moment's notice, the policy which has been followed for so long. On several occasions, when scientific instruments have been involved, I have eliminated them from dutiable items in order that they might be made free. But the honorable member for Oxley now asks me at a moment's notice to upset the whole scheme of the Tariff, simply because he has discovered that there is a glassware industry in Queensland.

MR. EDWARDS.—Has the Treasurer not altered other items over and over again?

SIR WILLIAM LYNE.—Not in relation to scientific instruments. This is a scientific matter altogether.

MR. ARCHER.—What is a scientific matter? The manufacture of glassware?

SIR WILLIAM LYNE.—I am referring to scientific instruments. The honorable member holds that whether scientific instruments or other goods are made here or not, they ought to be obtained from Great Britain.

MR. ARCHER.—I do not say that.

SIR WILLIAM LYNE.—The honorable member has said so in every case.

MR. ARCHER.—When?

SIR WILLIAM LYNE.—However, at the present time I am not prepared to take any action in the direction proposed by the honorable member for Oxley.

Question—That the item be agreed to—put. The Committee divided.

Ayes	45
Noes	8

Majority	37
----------	-----	-----	----

AYES.

Archer, E. W.
Atkinson, L.
Bamford, F. W.
Batchelor, E. L.
Bowden, E. K.
Brown, Thomas
Carr, E. S.
Catts, J. H.
Chanter, J. M.
Chapman, Austin
Cook, Joseph
Deakin, A.
Ewing, T. T.
Fairbairn, G.
Forrest, Sir John
Frazer, C. E.
Glynn, P. McM.
Groom, L. E.
Harper, R.
Hedges, W. N.
Hughes, W. M.
Hutchison, J.
Irvine, Hans

Irvine, W. H.
Livingston, J.
Lyne, Sir William
Maloney, W. R. N.
Mathews, J.
Mauger, S.
Palmer, A. C.
Poynton, A.
Salmon, C. C.
Sampson, S.
Spence, W. G.
Thomas, J.
Thomson, Dugald
Thomson, John
Watkins, D.
Watson, J. C.
Webster, W.
Willis, Henry
Wilson, J. G.
Wise, G. H.
Tellers:
Cook, Hume
Johnson, W. E.

NOES.

Coon, J.	Tudor, F. G.
Crouch, R. A.	
Fysh, Sir Philip	<i>Tellers:</i>
McWilliams, W. J.	Edwards, R.
Storror, D.	Page, J.

Question so resolved in the affirmative.

Item agreed to.

Item 256. Scientific Apparatus (glass), viz.:—Beakers; Flasks; Test Tubes; Vacuum Tubes; Burettes; Weighing Bottles and Tubes; Eudiometers; Nitrometers; Radiometers; Fat Extraction Tubes; Filter Pumps; Gas Washing Reduction Absorption and Drying Bulbs Towers and Tubes; Glassware graduated in centimetres grains minims ounces and grammes; also Carbonic Acid, Sulphuretted Hydrogen, Decomposing Water, and Bacteriological Apparatus of Glass. Free.

MR. PAGE (Maranoa) [6.3].—Before this item is passed, I appeal to the Prime Minister, who is now in the chamber, to see that justice is done to the people of Queensland. I am satisfied that there is some justification for the articles which have appeared in the public press of that State, and which declare that its wants are ignored by this Parliament. The Government is supposed to be a protectionist Government, and I ask the Prime Minister to see that the same modicum of protection is extended to Queensland industries that has been extended to the industries of other States.

Item agreed to.

Item 257 (Screens, Process Engravers') agreed to.

Item 258. Bottle Stoppers, n.e.i., of all kinds and materials, free.

SIR WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [6.5].—I move—

That the words "of all kinds and materials" be left out.

MR. BOWDEN.—I should like to know from the Treasurer what will be the effect of his amendment?

SIR WILLIAM LYNE.—I am informed that the retention of the words would give to the item an operation outside of the divisional heading.

MR. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [6.7].—I am not aware that stoppers are specified in any other portion of the Tariff.

MR. JOHN THOMSON.—They are included in item 253.

MR. DUGALD THOMSON.—Only glass stoppers. But there are stoppers other than those made of glass. For instance, there are rubber stoppers. Would they come under the heading of rubber?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—If stoppers are made of wood they will come under the heading of wood, if they are made of rubber they will come under the heading of rubber, and if they are made of metal they will come under the heading of metal.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—If the Government desire to make it clear that it is not corks to which reference is made in this item, why not insert the words "except corks"? In the absence of some such words, the importers of materials other than glass will not know whether the stoppers are dutiable or not.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [6.11].—I would point out to the honorable member that bottle stoppers come under different designations, and are subjected to different duties. The Customs Department does not consider that it would be easy to include all stoppers under one heading. Consequently it desires that they shall be grouped.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—May I point out to the Treasurer that glass stoppers are specifically named, and consequently if other stoppers are not elsewhere included they will be admitted free.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—They will be free, unless they are specified as bottle stoppers.

Amendment agreed to.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 259. Bottles, n.e.i., Flasks, and Jars, empty, including packing; measuring outside the package as imported:—

- (A) From one dram up to and including 10 ozs. of fluid capacity, per cubic foot (General Tariff), 2s.; (United Kingdom), 1s. 9d.
- (B) Over 10 ozs. of fluid capacity, per cubic foot (General Tariff), 1s. 1d.; (United Kingdom), 1s.
- (C) Wine, Beer, Spirit, and Aerated Water Bottles, per cubic foot (General Tariff), 10d.; (United Kingdom), 9d.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [6.14].—In respect of this item we have one of the most severe increases of duty that has been levied under this Tariff. The impost upon bottles of more than 10 ozs. of fluid capacity, has been raised from 20 per cent. under the old Tariff, and from 10 per cent. in the case of wine and beer bottles, to at least 100 and 150 per cent. in certain instances. These are most extraordinary increases. Yet we know that under the operation of the old Tariff the bottle-making industry was flourishing and expanding. The rate which formerly obtained, added to freight

and other charges, represented a natural protection to the industry of from 60 to 80 per cent. Let me point out to the Committee the effect of freight and charges. The New South Wales Wine and Spirit Association has furnished some figures showing that the Home cost of black wine bottles is 10s. per gross, and that, under the present duty, the landed cost with all charges in Sydney is 35s. per gross, being an increase of 250 per cent. on the Home cost. The landed cost of the same description of bottles at Fremantle is 38s. per gross, being an increase of 280 per cent. on the Home cost; while at Hobart it is 40s. per gross, being an increase of 300 per cent. on the Home cost.

Mr. WATSON.—In Sydney persons can get bottles made for ever so much less than 35s. per gross.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The figures I have given illustrate the effect of the new duty, which duty, I may say, works out at about 100 per cent. on the value of the bottles.

Mr. WATSON.—What is the landed cost of the bottles independent of the duty?

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I have not worked that out.

Mr. WATSON.—It is most important to know that.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The honorable member can easily calculate that for himself, as the fixed duty on the bottles is equivalent to about 100 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Mr. HANS IRVINE.—About 110 per cent. is the cost of bringing the bottles to Australia.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—As the duty on the bottles is 10d. per cubic foot, and the Home price of them is 10d. per dozen, a dozen bottles go to the cubic foot.

Mr. WATSON.—I think that the landed cost runs from 18s. to £1 per gross.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The honorable member for Grampians has interjected that 110 per cent. is the cost of bringing out the bottles, and if we take the Home cost at 10s. per gross, the landed cost will be about 21s. Under the old Tariff, including all charges, a protection including charges of from 60 to 100 per cent., according to the class of the bottle, was given to the bottlemakers. But under the new Tariff the protection is increased by three times on some items, and by more than three times on some items. Surely that is not a reasonable duty! No one else has ever

claimed such gigantic protection. No one has ever claimed a duty of 100 per cent. on the Home cost, when the article was a small one which would not occupy much space. In the case of bulky goods like bottles it costs an enormous amount in proportion to cost to protect them from breakage and to import them. Is it right to levy an enormous tax on an article of that sort?

Mr. WATSON.—Hitherto an enormous proportion of the bottles have been brought out full.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The honorable member is raising another question, with which we shall have to deal afterwards. I do not think that there is very much in his observation.

Mr. WATSON.—It is a very large item. Under the old Tariff bottles came in free.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—In some cases that assisted other manufacturers.

Mr. WATSON.—But that did not do much for the bottle-makers.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The bottle-makers are doing very well for themselves.

Mr. WATSON.—No; some of them are doing no good at all.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—As in every other calling, there will be differences in the results, but the more important bottle works are doing very well.

Mr. WATSON.—In both Sydney and Melbourne a number of persons have gone down in the bottle-making industry.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Yes, and in every other industry, but surely it is not proposed to levy enormous duties merely to prevent some persons from being unsuccessful in a calling in which others are successful. What we have to consider is not so much the firms who are engaged in the trade as whether the proposed duty is reasonable and for the good of the people. I cannot see how enormous duties can be for their good. I also have some figures relating to some shipments of bottles which, under the old Tariff, came in at a total duty of £16 10s., but which, under the new Tariff, would come in at a total duty of £165. Of course, those figures refer to only special cases. The other figures I quoted related to a large import of the ordinary black wine bottles and bottles of a similar size, such as beer bottles. In addition to that, we have to remember that this item covers not only bottles, but also flasks and jars. On pre-

serving jars, which are largely used here, the duty amounts to from 60 to 80 per cent.

Mr. WATSON.—Jars are made in Australia, too.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—If preserving jars were made largely under the old Tariff, as I believe they were, there seems to be no occasion for the enormous increase of duty which is proposed. Then let us take small jars, such as meat extract jars. On an invoice value of £103 8s. 3d., the old duty of 20 per cent. amounted to £20 16s. 1d., and on an invoice value of £115 4s. 4d., the new duty has amounted to £56 10s. 4d., showing an increase of over 200 per cent. Again, take an invoice of ginger-beer bottles. Under the old Tariff the duty was £49 10s., but under the new Tariff it is £180. What a gigantic increase that is! I ask the Treasurer if he is wedded to these enormous duties. Surely such duties, which have not been asked for on any other items, are not intended to be maintained? A protection of from 250 to 300 per cent. on bottles—which are subject to a duty equal to 100 per cent.—is surely too gigantic a tax to levy on articles which are used largely in a great many of our industries.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—But the honorable member must not forget the bottle-makers.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I am not forgetting the bottle-makers. I have pointed out that under the old duty the larger bottle-works were exceedingly active and increasing their trade. I do not say that every bottle-maker was doing well, but the trade itself was growing, and the annual reduction in the number of imported bottles was affording an opportunity for a considerable increase in local business. I cannot see from that aspect that there was any necessity to increase the old duty. If we retain this enormous duty on jars, it will handicap our meat extract makers in the markets of the world.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Why do we not make the jars here?

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—There is no doubt that if the importer whose invoice I quoted just now could get the jars cheaper locally, he would do so. No man imports an article for mere amusement.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—A great many of them do.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—A manufacturer must procure as cheaply as possible the bottles and jars in which he wants

to pack his goods; he will not give any preference in price unless there is a superiority in quality. I do not know that any one has ever attempted to make meat extract jars here, or that it would pay any one to do so. But the effect of this enormous duty is to handicap the exporter of meat extract in competition with other countries. I hope that the Minister will reconsider the duties embraced in this item. At the present moment, I shall not move a reduction in the duty, on bottles, but personally I should prefer to retain the old duty of 20 per cent.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—No.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I do not know that any reason has been given for increasing the old duty. I point out to the honorable gentleman that measurement duties are very objectionable. Under the old Victorian Tariff, they were found objectionable, and I think abandoned. Under this system it is all a question of what space articles can be packed into. In many instances, it compels persons to adopt a certain shape of article, when they would rather use another shape. They have to adopt a shape which will allow the article to be packed closely. Measurement duties are absolutely objectionable, especially on lines like bottles, and whatever duty we may decide upon I urge the Treasurer to abandon them.

Sitting suspended from 6.30 to 7.45 p.m.

Mr. POYNTON (Grey) [7.45].—I desire to test the feeling of the Committee on the question of whether the duty should be calculated on an *ad valorem* basis or at so much per cubic foot. I shall do that by moving to strike out the words "per cubic foot." The Committee can afterwards determine upon the rate of duty if the amendment be agreed to. I may mention, however, that I am inclined to support duties of 25 per cent. and 20 per cent., though I believe there is a consensus of opinion in favour of 30 per cent. and 35 per cent. I intend to move—

That the words "per cubic foot," paragraph A, be left out.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [7.47].—I had intended to move an amendment on the same lines as that of the honorable member for Grey. I admit that the proposed duty is high, and so far as I can judge, it is not likely to be passed by the Committee in its present form. But I think that duties of 30 per cent. and 25

per cent. would be rather low. I had intended to propose that the duties should be 40 per cent. and 35 per cent.

Mr. HANS IRVINE.—I think that 30 per cent. and 25 per cent. would be reasonable.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—My information is that those duties would provoke great complaints from those in the bottle trade. But the honorable member for Grampians knows a good deal about the subject, and I should like to hear his opinion. I know that he imports and exports bottles, and I shall not move an amendment until I have heard what he has to say.

Mr. HANS IRVINE.—If the Minister moves that the duty be 30 per cent. and 25 per cent. we will support him.

Mr. MATHEWS.—I hope that the Minister will not agree to duties so low as that. They would be useless.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I had intended to move the item in the form of two paragraphs—paragraph A relating to bottles *n.e.i.*, flasks, and jars, empty, *ad valorem*, 40 per cent. and 35 per cent.; paragraph B, wine, beer, spirit, and aerated water bottles, empty, 30 per cent. and 25 per cent. As I gather, it is desirable that there should be a little differentiation.

Mr. MATHEWS.—Those duties would wipe out the beer bottle trade.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—In the meantime, I ask the honorable member for Grampians, who knows all about this subject, to tell us what he thinks.

Mr. HANS IRVINE (Grampians) [7.51].—I may be supposed to speak more or less as one who is interested in this matter, though my interests will not be allowed to influence my vote in this House. I shall deal with the subject on general lines, from the point of view of what I consider to be the interests of Australia and Australian industries. I think that a heavy tax upon bottles is oppressive both to the primary producer and the consumer. The old duties of 10 and 20 per cent., when freight and charges were taken into consideration, amounted to a protection of 110 per cent. I have documentary evidence in my possession which I am prepared to submit to the Treasurer for his perusal, and which will show that my statement is correct.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Has the honorable member original invoices with him?

Mr. HANS IRVINE.—Yes. I think that duties of 30 per cent. and 25 per cent. would afford a large measure of protection to the bottle trade.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—All round?

Mr. HANS IRVINE.—Yes; I think that those duties should be applied all round. Quantities of goods which are put into small phials are sold at 3d., 4d., and 6d. per bottle retail. Those who use them are largely country people, who ought not to be taxed excessively for the benefit of industries in the large capitals, and to the detriment of the primary producer and consumer all over Australia.

Mr. WATSON.—Would the honorable member allow full bottles to come in free?

Mr. HANS IRVINE.—Certainly, considering that the products which they contain are heavily taxed. I have before me invoices which I think should be sufficient to convince the late leader of the Labour Party that my contention is correct.

The CHAIRMAN.—I remind the honorable member that the question of dealing with full bottles will be dealt with under the next item.

Mr. HANS IRVINE.—A case in point came under my notice within the last two or three weeks. I will quote the figures. Fifteen cases of Burke's stout, pints, each case containing 8 dozen, were imported. Stout, as honorable members know, is only made in qualities which are in great repute at one place, namely, Dublin. The duty and charges paid under the old Tariff would have been £8 7s. The extra duty collected under the new Tariff was £4 10s. That is to say, £12 17s. was paid on fifteen cases of pints. The Treasurer knows as well as I do that stout is especially recommended by the medical faculty for the use of sick people, and it is a necessary article of consumption in many such cases. He will surely recognise that an extra charge of £4 10s. on fifteen cases of pints is not fair.

Mr. WATSON.—The bottles are quite good for use after they are washed out.

Mr. HANS IRVINE.—And they should be used. I have here an invoice from one of the largest firms in Great Britain, Jorgensen and Jorgensen Limited. It is a Swedish firm, having establishments in several places; its London headquarters are situated in St. Mary's Axe, London, E.C. I have another statement before me for 578 gross and 3 dozen bottles, including pints and quarts, clarets and black wines. The cost f.o.b. London was £299 19s. 8d. The old duty at 10 per cent. being £40 18s. 10d., the freight and other charges would bring the total cost up to £364 9s. 1d. Surely

to goodness those figures indicate a sufficiently heavy protection. Under the proposed duty the same shipment, 5,796 cubic feet, at 10d. per cubic foot, would cost £241 10s. On the top of that have to be added freight and other charges, bringing the total cost up to £565 os. 3d., which is 215 per cent. I do not think that any one wants the people of this country to pay 215 per cent. on bottles. I want as much as any one can do to secure effective protection, because I believe in the establishment of Australian industries throughout the length and breadth of Australia. But I do not wish to penalize the primary producer or consumer to such an extent as is now proposed. Our policy should be rather to induce people to settle in the country instead of attracting them into the large centres.

Mr. MATHEWS.—People cannot get on to the land if they want to.

Mr. HANS IRVINE.—The honorable member talks without sufficient information. He can get land anywhere if he is prepared to pay for it. I am prepared to indicate where land is to be obtained if people want it, but not if they want it for nothing. Some people want to get land but do not want to work for it. I am quite willing to submit the documents from which I have quoted to the Treasurer, in order that he may see for himself that what I have stated is reasonable. I consider that duties of 30 per cent. and 25 per cent. *ad valorem* all round ought to be quite sufficient. No one can challenge the figures which I have quoted, and which show a protection of 215 per cent. on a shipment of bottles landed here. I believe in the Australians making their own bottles, but a protection of 215 per cent. is altogether too high. If we impose duties of 30 and 25 per cent., giving the British manufacturers a preference of 5 per cent., we shall deal very liberally with the local industry.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Would the honorable member impose those rates of duty on both full and empty bottles?

Mr. HANS IRVINE.—I think that full bottles should be admitted free, because, although it is said that our manufacturers can make any kind of bottle, it is not so. On the Continent of Europe, and in the United Kingdom, large factories confine themselves to the making of special bottles. One factory will make flagons, another black wine or black beer bottles, another

amber glass bottles, another medicine bottles, another patent bottles, and so on. We have a great deal to learn in connexion with bottle making. There are secrets which have been handed down from generation to generation of makers in Germany, France, and England. France is the only country in the world where they can make a first-class champagne bottle, capable of standing high pressure. They make a good bottle in Germany, but the German bottle will not compare with the French bottle. Neither will the English bottle. The French champagne pint bottle will stand a pressure of from 160 to 170 lbs. to the square inch. The art of making such bottles is not to be learned in a year or two. Only years of experimenting will produce bottles like those. The best French champagne quart bottles will stand a pressure of from 120 to 130 lbs. to the square inch, whilst most other bottles will not stand a pressure of more than about 40 lbs. to the square inch. While I would give encouragement to the local bottle-making industry, I shall not vote for the prohibition of importations, which is practically what the Government proposal means, the duties proposed being in some instances equivalent to *ad valorem* rates of nearly 400 per cent. on some kinds of bottles. I could deal with this matter at greater length, but I shall not do so, unless I find it to be necessary to make a second speech, because we all want to make progress with the Tariff.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [8.5].—We all wish to get on, but it will not be well to progress at the expense of efficiency, or by slurring over our work. I am sorry that the glass-bottle industry has not more friends and sympathizers in this Chamber. I wish that some of the local manufacturers and workers who gave evidence before the Tariff Commission could speak on their own behalf, as the honorable member for Grampians has spoken, so that we might hear both sides.

Mr. GLYNN.—The honorable member for Grampians was not speaking only on his own behalf.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—He admitted that he is interested in this matter. If both sides were heard, honorable members would take a broader and more sympathetic view of the industry. Probably they have not found time to read the evidence taken by the Commission, because it is very voluminous, and the work of going through it is very tedious. Had they read it, they

would not deal with these proposals in a cavalier spirit, and, to save time, agree to wholesale reductions of duties. Something like £150,000 is invested in bottle works in Australia, upwards of £60,000 being sunk in the Melbourne bottle works, while £25,000 is sunk in bottle works in New South Wales, and there are other bottle works in South Australia. It was from South Australia that the request for a substantial increase of the duty on bottles came. Mr. Hughes, the pioneer bottle manufacturer of that State, pointed out that, under the old Tariff, his output was reduced, and he was not able to keep his hands fully employed, so that some of his men were without work for a considerable part of the year. He and other manufacturers strongly advocated fixed rates; first, because these had operated very successfully in Victoria, and, secondly, because they make it impossible for importers to deceive the Customs authorities by presenting incorrect invoices. We were informed that the Customs authorities prefer the measurement system to a duty of so much for a certain number of bottles. Notwithstanding the up-to-date equipment of the Melbourne Bottle Works, the proprietors cannot compete against many of the imported bottles. Their present machinery has enabled them to reduce prices; but now further reductions are impossible, and Mr. McNeilage informed the Tariff Commission that, even if the higher rates of duty which he suggested were agreed to it would take some years for the company to get back its outlay. In New South Wales we learned of the market being swamped by the importation of cheap bottles made in China, Japan, and Germany. I would like honorable members—particularly those belonging to the Labour Party—to listen to this pathetic story of a Sydney glassblower. It is given on page 559 of the reports and recommendations of the protectionist section. Mr. Scott, the glassblower in question, told us—

The reason I have been sent before you is to explain what effect the foreign competition has had upon us. For instance, the factories have had to close down for want of work some two and three and a half months at a time, and we have had first-class tradesmen nearly starving for the want of employment. They have not been able to get work two months out of the twelve. In July, 1903, we made an agreement with the manufacturers to have a certain price for making bottles, and had it filed under the Arbitration Act and made a common rule. It was just on twelve months

after that the manufacturers asked us to accept 15 per cent. reduction in wages, or they would have to close their factories down. The reason for asking for this reduction was that they could not compete with the foreign trade. Twelve months after accepting the 15 per cent. reduction, men were out of work from twelve to fourteen weeks. Before the Japanese and Germans interfered with the trade here we could earn between 14s. to 17s. a day.

That was prior to the reduction of wages. This appeal is indorsed by the manufacturers, who have a large amount of capital invested, and by their employes, who have consented even to the reduction of wages to enable the manufacturers to continue their competition with foreign importations, in the hope that relief would be granted by the amendment of the Commonwealth Tariff. This scheme of fixed duties is based on suggestions made in South Australia, Victoria, and New South Wales. The rates recommended are lower than were asked for by the men concerned. The Minister suggests that *ad valorem* rates should be substituted for them.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—That was suggested before I said anything about the matter.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—I have nothing to gain by pleading the cause of this industry; but I desire to put honorable members on the track of information. The fixed duties proposed are equivalent in some cases to an *ad valorem* rate of 50 or 60 per cent.; but the Tariff Commission was told that high rates are absolutely necessary to enable the local bottle manufacturers to compete against foreign importations. If honorable members prefer *ad valorem* to fixed rates, by all means let them adopt them; but whatever rates are agreed upon should give effective protection to the local industry. A mere nominal increase of the present duties would be useless. If we are to have *ad valorem* rates, they should not be lower than 40 and 35 per cent. I hope that the Minister will stand by his proposition.

Mr. MATHEWS (Melbourne Ports) [8.14].—The manufacture of bottles should give work to thousands of men in Australia. Since the Tariff Commission made its inquiries, the amount of capital invested in bottle works has been considerably increased.

Mr. WILKS.—About £100,000 is invested in the industry.

Mr. MATHEWS.—More than that. The Brisbane Bottle Works, which have been constructed because of the prospect of higher duties, have cost £20,000. In

New South Wales there are seven bottle making factories—those of Messrs. Ross and Vance, J. Maddern, Ross Brothers, Z. Smart, the Co-operative Glass Works, the Federal Glass Works, and the Sydney Glass Bottle Works. In Victoria, there are the Austral Bottle Works, Sanderson Brothers' factory, Carr and Company's factory, Knott Brothers' factory, the Melbourne Glass Bottle Company's works, and their branch at Fort Melbourne. In South Australia we have the Adelaide Glass Bottle Works, and the works of Messrs. F. B. Hughes and Messrs. Johnstone and Lange; in Queensland we have the newly established Brisbane Bottle Works; whilst in Western Australia we have Messrs. Curtis and Croft, carrying on business in Perth. At the present time, there are about 2,500 hands engaged in the industry, which, if reasonably encouraged, would give employment to three or four times that number and provide a sound investment for Australian capital. I am not deeply concerned about the investment of capital; but I sympathize with the men engaged in this industry, which I think is necessary to the Commonwealth. Surely it should be our desire that the workers engaged in it shall be well paid. They carry on their labours under peculiarly trying conditions, sitting by a fire all day long and exposed to greater heat than are the men employed in iron works.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Surely a duty of 35 per cent. should allow a margin wide enough to enable them to receive a fair wage.

Mr. MATHEWS.—In respect of some manufactures a duty of 300 per cent. would not be sufficient to enable us to cope with the poorly-paid labour of other countries. The honorable member for Grampians has dealt with the f.o.b. price of certain imported bottles.

Mr. HANS IRVINE.—The honorable member knows that my statement is correct.

Mr. MATHEWS.—I admit its correctness. The f.o.b. price of imported beer bottles is less than the cost of the labour of those engaged in producing them in Australia, yet it cannot be said that the wages paid here are very high.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Are not the consumers to be considered?

Mr. MATHEWS.—A circular, issued on behalf of the liquor trade, contains a statement that local bottle manufacturers will raise their prices to exorbitant rates if the Government proposal be adopted. In reply to that statement, I would point out

that the Melbourne Bottle Works has entered into a contract with the Association of Bottlers in South Australia for the supply of their requirements for five years at the present ruling rate.

Mr. JOHNSON.—The intentions of the manufacturers are always good, but their performances are not always up to them.

Mr. MATHEWS.—A firm like this has interests in all parts of the Commonwealth, and when it enters into a contract we may rest assured that it will carry it out. I do not expect to be able to make any impression upon the honorable member for Lang, who consistently adheres to his election pledges, for I know that if he yielded to my appeal he would break faith with his constituents. I am directing my appeal more particularly to those protectionists who may be inclined to think that this industry is not likely to expand, and is so small as to be unworthy of consideration. It may be said that it cannot be compared with any of the great manufacturing industries of Australia; but I think we should all recognise that it is very necessary that we should have bottle works, and that those engaged in them should receive reasonable remuneration. Surely when I, as a Labour man, am prepared to concede that every investor has a right to secure a fair return on his capital, the representatives of the wealthier classes will be ready to admit the reasonableness of my claim that we should so protect the industry as to enable fair wages to be paid. I do not ask that the manufacturers should be assisted to amass large fortunes. I merely say that they should be so protected that they will be able to compete to some extent against foreign bottle-makers. It is true that the manufacture of some classes of bottles is scarcely worth protecting; but we ought to be prepared to assist those engaged in making bottles that are in general use. The honorable member for Grampians, who has dealt with this question from the stand-point of the users of bottles, was quite justified in the position that he took up, and although he is an interested party, I am sure he would honestly state what he believed to be a fair duty. But we have no more right to doubt the evidence of the manufacturer than we have to disbelieve his statements; and I appeal to the Committee to grant to the industry the fair protection of more than 30 per cent. and 25 per cent. duties.

Mr. HANS IRVINE.—On top of a natural protection of 110 per cent.?

Mr. MATHEWS.—We are constantly being told of the natural protection which some of our industries enjoy, but investigation shows that it does not count for much. Unfortunately, many people in Australia are ever ready to belittle our own productions. I do not believe that this practice obtains so largely in Victoria as in some of the other States; but it is a remarkable thing that even the merits of our great artists are not recognised until they leave Australia. And so with many of our manufactures; if the people would give them a fair deal high duties would not be necessary. It is true, as has been said, that certain counties in England, as well as some continental countries, confine their attention to the production of a particular class of bottle, and since they thus specialize they will always be able to land their manufactures here at a price considerably below the cost of the labour involved in producing them in Australia. I appeal to protectionists not to be led away by the statements of opponents of this proposal, but to grant substantial protection to this industry.

Mr. GLYNN (Angas) [8.25].—If this industry needs encouragement, surely a moderate duty ought to be sufficient. Copies of invoices placed in my hands show that it enjoys a natural protection of 123 per cent., which ought to be sufficient to keep employed the 2,500 hands who, according to the honorable member for Melbourne Ports, are now engaged in it. I think that the duty proposed in the first Federal Tariff was only 20 per cent., and that in anticipation of its imposition there was a bit of a flush in the bottle-making industry prior to Federation. I was asked at the time, in Adelaide, to become a shareholder in a company which it was said would carry on operations in New South Wales, and make large profits under a duty of 20 per cent. or 25 per cent. Some capital was invested in the enterprise, and if it is thriving I fail to see why we should increase the duty. On the other hand, if it is not, it is about time—seeing that it has enjoyed the protection of a duty of 20 per cent., in addition to the natural protection of 123 per cent.—that we stopped listening to the appeals of mendicant industries. I merely mention this matter because the honorable member for Bendigo assumed that the Committee knew absolutely nothing about this question, and that the possibilities of the industry were being ignored by those who appealed for

moderate duties. Various industries will be affected by these duties. The chemists complain of them, and the licensed victuallers have brought forward a joint remonstrance with an elaboration and conclusiveness that is almost exceptional.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—So that there is a regular combination against the bottle-making industry.

Mr. GLYNN.—We are constantly hearing invidious arguments of that description. Even the honorable member, fair as he is, when he rose to deal with this question, could not rid himself of the atmosphere in which he seems to have moved as a member of the Tariff Commission. Although the honorable member for Grampians rose in response to an appeal by the Committee, that as an expert he should offer some explanation of the effect of these duties, the honorable member for Bendigo could not rid himself of the trammels of his associations, and immediately imputed to him a personal motive. I should be very sorry to have these issues decided by appeals to a matter of prejudice, but I wish to place before the Committee an illustration of the operation of this duty which has been brought under my notice. I have here an invoice of 100 gross of bottles valued at £95, on which the old duty would have amounted to £20 18s.; whereas the new duty was £68 10s. Surely we are not going to stimulate an existing industry to that extent at the cost of the aerated water manufacturer who has to import his bottles. I have many other instances of the unequal operation of these duties. It has been pointed out to me that while the duty amounts to 5d. per case in respect of magnums of champagne, it amounts to 3s. 4d. per case of half-pint bottles of champagne used chiefly by invalids. It has also been pointed out to me that it amounts to 5s. per case of imported bottled spirits. I could, if I wished, give other instances from a synopsis of invoices, and I should like to remind the Victorian protectionists to whom the honorable member for Melbourne Ports has appealed, that even the Victorian Commission in 1894 condemned a tax upon bottles.

Mr. SAMPSON.—Those were antediluvian days.

Mr. GLYNN.—Then it is the honorable member who wishes to go back to the antediluvian days, when he desires that we should revert to the 40 per cent. duties imposed before 1894.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—The Victorian Commission recommended a duty of 1s. per cubic foot.

Mr. GLYNN.—Referring to the duty on bottles, which was a duty at per cubic foot, the Commission said—

This duty, of course, is exactly equal to an addition to a duty on the goods contained in the bottles. It is paid by the consumer of the goods, and is really a second duty on the contents.

I do not need to read the whole of the report, but they wound up by saying—

We are not in a position to make a recommendation in regard to all bottles, but we regard the duties on bottles containing liquids as a troublesome tax which falls on the various contents in an irregular manner, and we recommend their total abolition.

That ought to be good enough, although it is described as antediluvian by some Victorian extreme protectionists. To show how the present duty operates, I can give instances from specific imports. I have had my attention called to this fact, that while the f.o.b. cost of bottles for wine packed in mats and straw envelopes amounts to 10s., when they are cleared here after payment of the duty and charges, the total has gone up to £1 5s., a pretty stiff protection, representing from 125 to 130 per cent. Take other instances. Black wines, pints, packed in mats and straw envelopes f.o.b., cost per gross, 8s. 3d.; cost when cleared, 25s. In the case of Apollinaris, half-pints, f.o.b., costs 7s.; the cost after clearance is 18s. 3d. I do not wish to labour this matter; but these are facts which do not require an appeal to prejudice in support of the proposal made for a reduction of the duty.

Mr. POYNTON (Grey) [8.32].—I notice that honorable members, in trying to induce the Committee to carry a particular duty, make a practice of over-stating their case in regard to importations. The honorable member for Bendigo drew a graphic picture from the evidence submitted to the Tariff Commission of the importation of Japanese bottles, and the ridiculous rates of wages paid to bottle-makers in Japan. The inference sought to be drawn was that, as a result of the importation of these Japanese bottles, the local industry was being ruined. It is just as well to get down to the actual facts, and in the statistics prepared by the Government Statistician, I find that of small bottles of not more than 5 drams capacity the imports from Japan for last year represented the enormous

value of £28. The imports of bottles of over 5, and not exceeding 9 drams' capacity, were valued at £34.

Mr. BOWDEN.—The honorable member will find that the latter figure represents dozens, not pounds.

Mr. POYNTON.—It is evident that the importations from Japan are nothing like what they were represented to be to the Tariff Commission.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—I do not think that we had those figures before us.

Mr. POYNTON.—I am giving the figures for 1906, and stating the actual facts up to date.

Mr. CROUCH.—What wages do bottle-makers get in Japan?

Mr. POYNTON.—I am not raising the question of wages, and if that question is raised, surely a duty of from 100 to 120 per cent., which is what my proposal would amount to, should be sufficient for the local industry? Under the old Tariff, bottles up to 5 drams capacity were free. The duty on wine and beer bottles was only 10 per cent., and on all other bottles, 20 per cent. I have proposed duties of 30 and 25 per cent., and when it is remembered that that would mean an increase to the full extent of the duty in the case of bottles up to 5 drams capacity, an increase of 20 and 15 per cent. on wine and beer bottles, and an increase of 10 and 5 per cent. on all other bottles, I feel justified in considering that I am making an extravagantly liberal proposal. But, with a view to avoiding the monstrous proposition of fixed duties on these articles, I am prepared to adhere to it. I understand that the Government have agreed to adopt measurement duties. With the object of moving subsequently that the duty on imports from Great Britain should be 25 per cent., I move—

That after the figure "2s.," paragraph A, the words "and on and after 4th December, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 30 per cent.," be inserted.

I think there is something in the contention that there should be some small duty on bottles imported containing liquids; but that is a question which might be dealt with when we are discussing the duty to be imposed on the contents. The total amount paid in duty on bottles last year was £1,086, and the total importations, 329,000 dozen. I trust the Committee will agree to duties of 30 and 25 per cent. on this line, plus the natural protection of from 80 to 120 per cent., which can be

proved beyond doubt from actual invoices.

Mr. CROUCH.—Add the natural protection to the duty.

Mr. POYNTON.—That would bring the duty up to 150 per cent. on some of these lines. Honorable members talk of starving this industry with the fact staring them in the face that the protection on some lines amounts to 150 per cent. I shall occupy no more of the time of the Committee in dealing with the matter. I trust that the common sense of honorable members will prevent them from imposing any higher duties than those I have mentioned.

Mr. BOWDEN (Nepean) [8.40].—I notice from the reports of the Tariff Commission that this plea that Japan is a serious competitor in this industry was raised by very many of the witnesses. The figures quoted by the honorable member for Grey are sufficient to show that the plea was not raised *bonâ fide*. There are one or two columns from which the honorable member did not quote, and in order to put the facts completely before honorable members, I should like to refer to them. The figures will be found in the Trade and Customs returns for 1906, at pages 54 and 55. These returns show that of wine and beer bottles, out of a total importation amounting in value to £10,321, all we got from Japan was £14 worth. As the honorable member for Grey has already shown, of small bottles of not more than 5 drams capacity, £3,812 worth were imported altogether, and of that amount only £28 worth came from Japan; whilst of bottles of from 5 to 9 drams capacity, in connexion with which the figures are given in dozens, out of a total importation of 352,000, only 34 dozen came from Japan. In the circumstances, I say that Mr. McNeilage, Mr. Thompson, and Mr. Bishop, who gave this evidence about the warehouses being filled with Japanese bottles, must have been misinformed, or they wilfully misled the Commission. Mr. McNeilage also gave evidence about the effect of the duty upon the Victorian industry from the time Federation was established up to 1906. His evidence on the subject will be found in answer to questions 76998-9. He told the Commission that the Caledonian Bottle Works, and several smaller works in Victoria, had ceased to exist since the Federal Tariff had been inaugurated. I find, as a matter of fact from the reports of the Chief Inspector of Factories in Victoria,

that in 1900, before Federation, there were 391 males employed in this industry, at an average wage of 27s. 10d. per week; whilst in 1906, after six years of Federation, there were 533 males employed with an average wage of 30s. 8d.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—Were they employed all the year round?

Mr. BOWDEN.—The report does not say so. The honorable member can check the figures for himself, but the basis of the comparison is the same. There are other points connected with the industry to which I should like to refer.

Mr. CROUCH.—What about the importation of vinegar bottles from Japan? If the honorable member will look at page 69 of the Trade and Customs returns, he will find that £319 worth were imported.

Mr. BOWDEN.—Another noteworthy fact is that the New Zealand Government have, after deliberation, withdrawn the proposed duty upon bottles. The honorable member for Grampians emphasised the fact that the best quality of bottles are not made here. There is only one company, with factories in Sydney and Melbourne, who make the black bottles used for beer, wine, and spirits. Under the proposed duty that company would be so strengthened that it would practically have a monopoly of the trade. They are unable now to fulfil the orders that are placed with them.

Mr. COON (Batman) [8.46].—We must first consider the conditions under which bottles are made here and in other countries. Witnesses who went before the Tariff Commission appointed by Mr. Chamberlain in Great Britain asked for 25 per cent. protection against the foreigner, particularly the German. If so, what protection do we, with the wages that we have to pay, require here? As for natural protection, a ton of bottles, representing seven gross, can be landed in Victoria to-day for 22s. 6d.! We shall have bottles from Japan very shortly, and also from Germany. Great Britain is losing her trade with us because, as she says, Germany is dumping her bottles into the Commonwealth. Duties of 30, 40, 50, or even 60 per cent. are not high enough. Japan has a protective Tariff of 60 per cent. The United States of America has a Tariff of 80 per cent. Germany has a Tariff of 45 per cent. We need a Tariff of at least from 40 to 60

per cent. in order to compete with the long hours and sweated labour of other parts of the world.

Mr. WYNNE (Balaclava) [8.48].—There is a feeling in the Committee that this question might be compromised. I suggest that the Government make the duties 35 per cent. in the general Tariff and 25 per cent. against the United Kingdom on empty bottles, and adopt in the case of full bottles the schedule as drawn up by the honorable member for South Sydney, which I hope the honorable member will read to the Committee.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [8.49].—I wish to say something in reply to the return read by the honorable member for Grey about importations from Japan. According to the figures read by him, the importations for 1906 were very small. I have not had the returns for that year brought under my notice, but Mr. Cornelius Bishop laid before the Tariff Commission figures showing the importations from Japan in the years 1903 and 1904. They are given on page 252 of the *Minutes of Evidence*, vol. 5, question 88279, as follows—

88279. In 1903, 4,568 dozen empty wine and beer bottles were imported from Japan. Does that cover the importation to which you refer? —At page 49 of the records which you have handed to me—*General Imports*—£1,451 is set down as the value of the glassware imported from Japan, and 160,000 dozen as the importation of empty wine and beer bottles.

Mr. POYNTON.—I suppose that is the evidence of an interested party. My figures are from the official records of the Statistician.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—In that evidence the quotation is given from *General Imports*, and the page is mentioned.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Cannot the honorable member accept Mr. Knibbs' latest figures, issued since the Commission sat?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—The figures I quote were given in sworn evidence.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—That evidence is evidently valueless.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—The imports may have fallen off in 1906, but I do not think that there is any inaccuracy in Mr. Bishop's evidence as to the imports in 1903 and 1904.

Mr. WATSON (South Sydney) [8.52].—The suggestion of the honorable member for Balaclava might be adopted. The schedule which he mentioned as having been drawn up by me has reference to the next item. I think the two items are very

closely related, because the effectiveness of the duty on empty bottles would depend very largely on what is charged on full bottles. The schedule which I suggest with regard to full bottles is as follows:—Bottles up to 5 drams capacity, whether empty or full, free.

Mr. PAGE.—How much would they contain?

Mr. WATSON.—About half an ounce. Bottles of over 5 drams, and not exceeding 10 ozs., fluid capacity, per dozen (general Tariff), 1½d.; (United Kingdom), 1d.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—That is lower than the old Tariff.

Mr. WATSON.—They were free previously, if full. Bottles of over 10 ozs., and not exceeding 20 ozs., fluid capacity, per dozen (general Tariff), 2d.; (United Kingdom), 1½d.; bottles of over 20 ozs., fluid capacity (general Tariff), 2½d.; (United Kingdom), 2d. per dozen. That would reduce the number of items very materially.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Make the duties on empty bottles 30 per cent. and 25 per cent. respectively, and we will agree.

Mr. WATSON.—Thirty per cent. is rather low as against the foreigner.

Mr. WILKS (Dalley) [8.54].—After listening to both sides, and the reports that have been quoted, I have concluded that this industry is like many others—if the makers have good management they do not ask for a large increase of duty. When I find an industry, according to its own reports, doing well in some parts of Australia, and badly in others, with the same standard of duty, I am forced to the conclusion that the fault lies in the latter case in the absence of good administration. In a large measure the argument urged to-night is an admission that those who have charge of this industry have in many cases failed in their administrative power. A sum of £100,000 is invested in the bottle-making industry of Australia, of which £60,000 is invested in Victoria. The Melbourne bottle industry has a branch in New South Wales. That shows that they are energetic and look after their business well. If we could get behind all the evidence quoted, and into which the Tariff Commission did not inquire, it would be found, not only in the bottle industry, but in many other industries, that want of proper business management had caused the failure. We are asked to vote duties to make up for mistakes of management. I refuse to

do so. The reason the industries do well in the Old Country is that they have the best business ability at the head of affairs, and run them well. I really think that the weak spot in many of our industries is that they do not pay enough money, and so do not secure the best ability at the top. I am glad that the specific duty has been knocked on the head. The duty according to measurement was tried in Victoria a few years ago, and proved a failure. The first Barton Administration introduced it and then dropped it. The Treasurer apparently is going to do the same. I am prepared to vote for duties of 30 and 25 per cent., unless the Treasurer can show that 5 per cent. is not enough difference between the German or Japan-made bottles, as against the British article.

Mr. HUTCHISON (Hindmarsh) [8.56].—If there is one industry that wants protection it is the bottle industry. Honorable members say that it is established. It is established in different States, but an industry that has to close down a good part of its business for half the year cannot be said to be doing well. We should encourage it so that it may have work enough to keep it going the whole year round. The honorable member for Nepean mentioned the wages that were being paid, but it does not matter what wages are paid if men are only drawing them for half the year, because they have to keep their wives and families for the whole year. It has been proved that it was not possible under the old duties for a number of the bottle factories to keep going except for a portion of the year. Only the other day I met a young man who originally came from the Old Country, and who was engaged in the bottle industry. As soon as the first Tariff was adopted he found himself out of employment, and had to work at a different trade, but since the new duties in this Tariff were imposed he and a good many others have found employment. That shows that these new duties have already been effective. I am going to vote for the highest duty that I can get. Every bottle manufacturer in Australia tells us that the business has not been a success of late years under the old Tariff in competition with Germany and Japan. I do not see why honorable members should be so anxious to encourage the manufacture of German bottles for use in Australia. One honorable member said that we cannot make bottles here to bear the pressure. I maintain that there is not a bottle that may

be required in Australia that cannot be made here, if encouragement is given to make it.

Mr. WILSON.—That shows that the honorable member does not understand the business of making champagne bottles.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—I have a good deal of information from those who do understand the business. The honorable member can get his champagne bottles from Japan if he wants to. Comparatively few people can afford to drink champagne, and whatever price they have to pay for the bottles will not interfere with them. The industry has gone back since the uniform Commonwealth Tariff was inaugurated, although it is capable of enormous expansion, and we ought to do all that we can to encourage it. I shall support the Treasurer in imposing the highest duty possible. I am doubtful whether the proposal of the honorable member for South Sydney is high enough; and in many cases I do not think the duty will amount to 25 per cent. When we contrast the wages paid in Australia with those paid in Germany and Japan, it is only fair to prevent the importation of bottles from the latter countries. I have no objection to a higher preference being given to Great Britain, provided the German and Japanese bottles are shut out. Japan has only lately entered upon the bottle export trade, but we may be sure that if her exports represent £1,000 to-day, it will not be long before they represent £100,000 worth. It has been said that Japan cannot produce a first-class bottle; but I can say that some time ago I saw some Japanese medical instruments which would compare with instruments made in any part of the world, and they were sold at half the ordinary prices.

Mr. PAGE.—Why did not the honorable member give us his vote this afternoon?

Mr. HUTCHISON.—Surely the honorable member does not desire me to crush an industry in order that Japanese industries may be encouraged.

Mr. PAGE.—This is rich!

Mr. HUTCHISON.—I have been voting on one side all the time, whereas the honorable member for Maranoa has been on all sides. This industry is practically in the hands of Germany, and any duties which will transfer it to Australia shall have my support.

Amendment (Mr. POYNTON's), by leave, withdrawn.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [9.2].—The debate has lasted for some considerable time, and I propose to adopt the suggestion made by the honorable member for Balaclava. I move—

That the following words be added:—"and on and after 4th December, 1907 (A) Bottles, n.e.i., flasks and jars empty, ad val. (General Tariff), 35 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 25 per cent."

I should have much preferred the higher duty, but I have ascertained that such is not possible; and I do not want to unduly delay the completion of the consideration of the Tariff. The duty I now propose is much lower than that recommended by the A division of the Tariff Commission, after much evidence had been heard.

Mr. POYNTON.—The Treasurer is accepting my proposal in the one column, and proposing 5 per cent. more in the other column.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Yes.

Mr. POYNTON.—I agree to that.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [9.6].—I should have much preferred to see a duty of 30 per cent. in the general Tariff, as I understood was the original intention. However, I think that we have arrived at a fairly satisfactory compromise; at any rate, it is certainly a better arrangement than that which provided for huge duties without any reason whatever.

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) proposed—

That the following words be added to the item as amended:—" (B). Bottles, up to and including 5 drams of fluid capacity, free."

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [9.7].—I object to these small bottles being made free, because they are the class on which boys and youths are said to work. On this point, Mr. Hughes, a South Australian manufacturer gave evidence. He said that small bottles, of two, four, and six drams fluid capacity ought not, in his opinion, to be admitted free. He went on to say—

The reason I ask for a duty on the small bottles is because they are a class of bottles that boys begin on in the older countries. They learn on these bottles, and, if you notice, especially the 2-dram bottle, you can see it is very badly finished. You can see it is learners' work.

The manufacturers do not desire that these small bottles should be made free; and I shall vote against the proposal.

Mr. GLYNN (Angas) [9.8].—I hope that the proposal of the Treasurer will

be supported, because the incidence of the taxation on these small bottles is exceedingly heavy.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—It amounts to thousands per cent.

Mr. GLYNN.—I have several proofs of that. In one case, where the price of bottles is 3s. 6d. per dozen, the duty is 1s., and on the ordinary bottles used in schools the duty amounts to 1d. each.

Mr. HUTCHISON (Hindmarsh) [9.9].—I support the honorable member for Bendigo. Every penny bottle of ink used in the schools of Australia is made in Australia—both bottle and ink. No one, therefore, need pay a single fraction more for these bottles of ink than they are paying at the present time, if a duty be imposed.

Mr. ATKINSON.—If all these bottles are made here now, the duty is not required.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—But if there is not a duty we shall have bottles imported which have been made by sweated labour. As the honorable member for Bendigo said, these are the bottles on which boys and youths learn the business of bottle-making; and I myself have seen boys employed in glasswork in this way during slack times of the year, when otherwise they would have been dismissed.

Mr. GLYNN.—The honorable member is fighting for his own district!

Mr. HUTCHISON.—I am fighting for the whole of Australia. There are firms in Adelaide, Melbourne, and Sydney who are quite prepared to supply all the bottles of ink required in all the schools of the Commonwealth. There is no reason why these bottles should be admitted free, seeing that the process of manufacture is as simple as could well be imagined.

Mr. WATSON (South Sydney) [9.11].—The reason I favour following the example set in the old Tariff, and making bottles under five drams capacity free, is that if they be made dutiable, and full bottles of similar capacity are exempted, outside manufacturers will have a considerable advantage, in the importation of essences, perfumes and so forth, over local manufacturers. The duty charged on essences and perfumes is on the spirituous contents of the bottles and not *ad valorem*, and, therefore, Messrs. Crosse and Blackwell, and similar firms, would send in these bottles free, while local manufacturers, who desired to fill the bottles here, would have to pay duty on the empty bottles. I do not see that we can

do much harm by allowing the exemption to continue as proposed by the Treasurer. It is true that some small bottles are made in Australia, but not many classes of them. The trouble is that in flint glass small bottles there is such a variety of patterns required that it does not pay local men to enter upon their manufacture. Local manufacturers can certainly make ink bottles, but it is not worth while their entering upon the manufacture of perfume bottles and so forth, of small capacity.

Amendment agreed to.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 260. Bottles, n.e.i., Flasks, and Jars, filled; irrespective of whether the contents are liable to duty or not—

- (A) Up to and including 2 ozs. of fluid capacity, per dozen (General Tariff), 1s. 1d.; (United Kingdom), 1s.
- (B) Over 2 ozs. of fluid capacity, per dozen (General Tariff), 10d.; (United Kingdom), 9d.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That the following words be added, “and on and after 4th December, 1907:—

Bottles, n.e.i., Flasks, and Jars, filled—

- (A) Up to and including capacity of 5 fluid drams, free.
- (B) Over 5 drams and not exceeding 10 ozs. fluid capacity, per dozen (General Tariff), 1½d.; (United Kingdom), 1d.
- (C) Over 10 ozs. and not exceeding 20 ozs. fluid capacity, per dozen (General Tariff), 2d.; (United Kingdom), 1½d.
- (D) Over 20 ozs. fluid capacity, per dozen (General Tariff), 2½d.; (United Kingdom), 2d.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 261. Glue; gelatine of all kinds; and cements, n.e.i., including mucilage and belting compounds, ad val. (General Tariff), 40 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 30 per cent.

Mr. JOHNSON (Lang) [9.15].—I would point out that glue is the raw material of cardboard box makers, bookbinders, and furniture manufacturers, and that the heavy increase proposed in the old rate of duty would severely handicap those industries into which the consumption of glue enters so largely. The cost of importation amounts to 20 per cent., which, added to the duty, is equivalent to a total protection of 60 per cent. The inevitable result of an increase in the duty will be an increase in the price of glue. This is abundantly demonstrated by what happened in 1901. In that year, when a duty of 2d. per lb. was levied upon this article, its price rose from £32 to £45 per ton—an increase of £13 per ton. But when ultimately the duty was reduced to 20 per cent., its price fell from £45 to £34 per

ton—a decrease of £11 per ton. I would also point out that the manufacture of glue was established, both in New South Wales and South Australia, without any protective duty whatever. Before Federation was accomplished, the price of this article in Victoria ranged from £40 to £50 per ton, whilst its price in New South Wales was only £34 per ton. Mr. John Robert Firth, a cardboard box manufacturer, of Sydney, in giving evidence before the Tariff Commission, read the following statement—

Glue is manufactured in South Australia, Victoria, and New South Wales, from raw materials obtainable entirely in the Commonwealth. Glue making is generally only adopted in larger works, tanneries, &c., and, although such work employed large numbers of hands, yet in glue making alone there cannot be from more than fifteen to twenty hands employed throughout the Commonwealth. Glue making was firmly established in South Australia and New South Wales before the imposition of any Tariff. Cost of importing is high, owing to bulk, and the "natural protection," therefore, amounts to about 20 per cent. Duty handicaps the following trades:—Cardboard box makers, bookbinders, and furniture manufacturers, glue being one of their raw materials. The Barton Government imposed a duty of 2d. per lb., equal to 60 per cent., whereupon prices rose enormously; but when the House of Representatives reduced the duty to 20 per cent., the price of Colonial glue fell from £45 to £34, and of imported glue to £58 to £38 per ton. When the duty of 2d. per lb. was imposed a combine was formed, and the price fixed at £45, about £13 per ton advance on previous Sydney price. The House of Representatives reduced the duty from the 20th February, 1901. Next day the combine collapsed, and the price fell as above-mentioned. However, the combine might be revived. Glue should, therefore, be placed on the free list.

I should be glad indeed to move that it be placed upon the free list, but I know that in a Committee composed as this is of a strong protectionist majority, I would have no chance of carrying such a proposal. With regard to the Glue Combine, it is only fair to add that another witness, Mr. Markwald, denied its existence. In cross-examination, however, he admitted that he was not in Australia at the period referred to, and had no personal knowledge of the matter. This will be seen by reference to the answers to questions 95694 and 95697. It was also shown by evidence that there is no particular prejudice against the Australian glue, and that the imported article is of a very much higher quality. A large firm of printers and paper-box makers write—

Glue—Another line now increased from 20 to 40 per cent. We use about half a ton

monthly, and have bought it from a Victorian glue maker for many years, and it has been mutually satisfactory, but we have little doubt that if the duty is retained that the price will be raised—though there is no necessity for it, as the raw material is here, no duty to pay, and the price charged well pays the manufacturer. Any increase on the 20 per cent. is not needed.

Gelatine—Duty formerly 2d. lb., equal to about 10 per cent., and now proposed to increase to 40 per cent. Coignet's Gold Medal quality worked out under the old Tariff at 18s. 8d. cwt. duty, while under the proposed Tariff the duty will be 88s. 8d. cwt. This line is only used for manufacturing purposes, and it should be free.

It will thus be seen that although glue forms but a small portion of the manufactures connected with our tanneries, it is a minor article which is used in very many established industries, and consequently any increase in its price must handicap those industries. I therefore suggest that the duty should be reduced to 25 per cent. under the General Tariff and 20 per cent. under the Tariff for the United Kingdom.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [9.26].—I move—

That the following words be added:—"and on and after 4th December, 1907—

- (A) Glue and Gelatine, per lb. (General Tariff), 2d.; (United Kingdom), 1½d.
- (B) Cements, n.e.i., including mucilage and belting compounds, ad val. (General Tariff), 30 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 25 per cent."

These rates represent a reduction upon the proposals contained in the Tariff schedule.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—By how much?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The proposed duty of 2d. per lb. upon glue represents a material reduction. At the same time, it will confer a fair measure of protection upon that article.

Mr. STORRER (Bass) [9.28].—I am opposed to the imposition of fixed duties upon items of this description because they will mean the collection of a higher rate upon the cheap article and of a lower rate upon the better class of article.

Mr. HARPER.—The cheap article should not be imported.

Mr. STORRER.—It is sometimes necessary to import it. I prefer an *ad valorem* rate to a fixed duty. I am satisfied that the result of levying specific duties will be to increase Tariff anomalies.

Mr. TUDOR (Yarra) [9.29].—I would point out to the honorable member for Bass that 2d. per lb. was the duty imposed upon gelatine under the old Tariff. The manufacturers of photographic dry plates complain that if gelatine be taxed at 20

per cent. they will have to pay duty upon their raw material, whilst the finished article will be admitted duty free. I need scarcely remind the Committee that the gelatine which is used by them costs up to 3s. 6d. per lb., and that it is not manufactured in the Commonwealth, though I will not say that it could not be manufactured here. I think that in proposing a fixed duty upon this article the Treasurer is acting wisely, and I hope it will be carried.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [9.30].—I remind the Treasurer that glue and gelatine are articles of very different values.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—It is very hard to distinguish between them.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—No. I have here a quotation for glue at 38s. per cwt., that is £38 per ton.

Mr. HARPER.—The price of gelatine, or so-called gelatine, comes down very nearly to that.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON. — Some gelatine is much dearer than glue, being worth over 1s. per lb.

Mr. HARPER. — Yes; but it is not possible to distinguish between the two.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I admit that there is a difficulty in distinguishing between different kinds of gelatine, but not between glue and gelatine. The duty on a ton of glue at 2d. per lb. would be over £18 per ton. But I understood the Minister to say that that duty is equal to 20 per cent.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—No; I am advised by the officers that the duty on glue runs from 35 to 40 per cent., and that the duty on gelatine is equal to 20 per cent.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I have a quotation showing glue quoted at 38s. per cwt. Glue is made from local products, and a duty of 20 per cent. gives absolute protection.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Under the old Tariff the duty on glue and gelatine n.e.i. was 20 per cent., and on gelatine sheet 2d. per lb.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The honorable gentleman is proposing to make the duty on all gelatine 2d. per lb. on the ground that there is some difficulty in distinguishing between the different descriptions of that article. To that proposal I do not object, but I do object to the imposition of a duty of 2d. per lb. on an article like glue, which is used in various industries, and the price of which was

raised on one occasion by a combine when they got an opportunity to take that step under the cover of a Customs duty. It is equal to a duty of between 40 and 50 per cent. *ad valorem*. What were the imports under the old duty of 20 per cent., which in my opinion was too high?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—From the United Kingdom £13,400 worth, and from other countries £15,400 worth.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Those figures represent importations of gelatine principally. I thought that perhaps the honorable gentleman had the figures for glue and gelatine separately. I am prepared to believe that the importation of glue is very small indeed. We can export glue, and a high duty on an article which is worth only £38 per ton is altogether out of the question. The Minister is seeking to impose the same duty on an article worth from £112 to £140 a ton. The Minister has got an increased duty on gelatine, and I urge him to impose the old duty on glue, or, if he likes, to fix the rate in the general Tariff at 25 per cent. That will give ample protection, and I am quite sure that there will not be an importation of ordinary glue.

Mr. HARPER (Mernda) [9.35].—I point out to the honorable member for North Sydney that the difficulty in dealing with this matter arises from the fact that glue and gelatine, although different products, approach each other so closely that there is a point at which one cannot be distinguished from the other. Large quantities of gelatine are used for making edible jellies, and only the best class of gelatine ought to be used for that purpose. Large quantities of a highly-refined glue, which costs perhaps £2 a ton more than ordinary glue for industrial purposes, have been imported and used for edible purposes. If the honorable member's suggestion were adopted that description of glue would be imported, and used as gelatine.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Surely that could be stopped.

Mr. HARPER.—No, because it is impossible to tell where glue ends and gelatine begins. If it were possible to separate them there would be great force in what the honorable member has said about the difference in the price of the articles, but, as a matter of fact, low-class gelatine is very little dearer than high-class glue. That is the practical difficulty, and I think that the proposal of the Minister is reasonable, and ought to be accepted.

PH COOK (Parramatta) opinion the Department of customs ought to be able to between glue and gelatine.

D THOMSON.—On inquiry I informed that they can do any great difficulty.

PH COOK.—If the Department to do it readily there is prevent them fixing an arbitrary gelatine.

ONEY.—The difference in cost two articles is very great.

SEPH COOK.—Yes, but the member for Mernda has pointed there is a superior kind of glue point of quality nearly ap- gelatine. Even if that be so, the at have the power to fix their dards, and therefore they could distinguish between the two articles le purposes. If it is true that rior quality of glue is being used purpose of making lollies, the hat practice is stopped the better. ought not to tax to the extent per cent. one of the raw materials industries. That does not seem to be the right alternative. The alter- should be rather more vigorous and nt inspection of glue, and the fixing definite standard for gelatine.

DUGALD THOMSON.—Or imposing ty of 20 per cent. on all.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Exactly, but Minister will not consent to do that. the contrary, he is seeking to inflict ery high duty on the strawboard and ilar industries which use glue largely.

Mr. HUME COOK.—They use dextrine.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—No, they use ue, because dextrine is far too expensive them.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I intend to make xtrine free.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Yes, but even then it would be too expensive to them. What they use is ordinary glue. Either the honorable gentleman should distinguish between glue and gelatine, or he should impose an *ad valorem* duty on each article, or a duty of 1d. per lb. all round.

Mr. HUME COOK.—On gelatine that would be too little.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The Treasurer must see as well as we do that it is not fair to impose the same duty on an article worth £38 a ton as on an article worth from £100 to £120 a ton. There is no rea- in a proposal of that kind.

Mr. JOHNSON.—I intend to propose a duty of 20 per cent.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The honorable member had better submit his proposal, as I can get no consideration from the Minister.

Mr. CARR (Macquarie) [9.42].—The honorable member for Parramatta has used a very good revenue-raising argument, but not a very good protectionist one. It is not a question of taxing an article according to its quality, but a question of imposing a duty on articles which can be made here, and allowing others to come in free, if possible. The highest class of gelatine cannot be made here, and therefore it ought to be free. Glue is made all over Australia, and in such quantities that no duty is likely to affect the price of it. If it were possible, I should like a duty of 2d. per lb. to be imposed on the cheaper class of glue, and the higher class of glue to be admitted free, but as the honorable member for Parramatta has pointed out, in some cases it is very difficult to distinguish between superior glue and gelatine. In view of that fact, the only logical course for me to pursue is to support a duty of 2d. per lb. all round. Although it means a low rate on the high-priced goods, still it is quite in consonance with my attitude throughout, and that has been to admit free any goods which cannot be made here.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [9.45].—As the raw material of glue and gelatine exists in Australia, this may be regarded as a true native industry, and ought to have substantial protection. That is why the A section of the Tariff Commission recommended a duty of 20 per cent. We had a considerable amount of difficulty in deciding the question. We were informed by a Sydney manufacturer that glue ranges in price from £28 to £60 per ton. We considered that it would be very unfair to impose a fixed duty on an article having such a wide range of values. Accordingly we suggested an *ad valorem* duty of 30 per cent., so that there might be no inequality in the incidence of the duty. We also considered that glue and gelatine should be treated alike, and charged duty at the same rate, because we were informed by another Sydney witness that an analyst could not say at what point glue becomes gelatine, or *vice versa*. One witness said that he had sometimes imported gelatine as glue.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Who was that?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—Mr. Markwald said that glue and gelatine were so much alike that he could not sometimes distinguish them, and consequently there should not be two classes of duties on them. That also was the opinion of the Customs expert.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Does he sell both at the same price?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—There are different values. I think that a mistake has been made in resorting to a fixed duty of 2d. per lb. Mr. Long told us that a fixed duty of 2d. per lb. would be equivalent to 100 per cent. on glue sold in Italy at £19 per ton. I think that an *ad valorem* duty of 35 and 30 per cent. on glue and gelatine would be sufficient.

Mr. MALONEY (Melbourne) [9.47].—If the Committee decides upon a duty of 2d. per lb., an alteration should be made in the duty on printers' roller composition, because gelatine is the raw material from which that composition is made. The old duty on printers' roller composition was 20 per cent. Even an expert cannot determine the quality of roller composition without an actual trial. It is impossible to look at that material and say forthwith whether it is of good or inferior quality. It has to be used, perhaps, for a period extending over some weeks to test its value. If the Minister agrees to accept a fixed duty at so much per lb., I will ask him to make the duty on roller composition, in accord with it, 4d. per pound.

Mr. SALMON (Laanecoorie) [9.49].—The honorable member for Bendigo is quite right in the description which he gives of the products under discussion. Glue and gelatine are derived from the same substances, and they represent simply different stages of one manufacture. But I feel in a difficulty about this matter, because there is one sort of gelatine that is imported and used very largely, and which cannot be made in this country. I have reason to believe that it will be used more largely in the future than it is now. I allude to that which is imported for photographic purposes, to form the emulsion placed upon photographic plates and films. That material is made by only one manufacturer in Great Britain, and his product is not the best. The best quality is made on the Continent of Europe, and it is only made there in the depth of winter. In fact, the temperature has to be below freezing point before the manufac-

ture can be carried on. Would the Minister prefer that this gelatine should be placed on the exemption list or be dealt with now?

Mr. CARR.—How can it be distinguished?

Mr. SALMON.—It is possible to differentiate between the higher class of gelatine and medium classes. Indeed, the medium class of gelatine is used for domestic purposes, whilst the higher class is only used in the circumstances which I have described. If the Minister would prefer that the matter should be dealt with when we are considering the exemptions, I will bring it up later on.

Mr. JOHNSON (Lang) [9.50].—It is unfortunate that the Minister will not accept a fair and reasonable compromise when it is suggested to him. The proposal of the honorable member for Bendigo is far preferable to that of the Minister, and I should be prepared to support it as against the Treasurer's proposal. There ought to be a differentiation, because, notwithstanding what has been said to the contrary, glue and gelatine are different compounds altogether, although they are both made from the same basic materials. The labour cost in a ton of gelatine of £80 value would be from £15 to £18, according to the evidence of Mr. Meister, question 94592. The gelatine imported in 1903 was of an invoice value of £151 per ton. In 1904 the value was £108 per ton—see Mr. Meister's evidence, question 94610. There is consequently an immense difference between the value of this article and that of common glue. Gelatine can be manufactured locally for from £75 to £90 per ton; and from £125 to £130 for thick and thin sheets respectively—see question 94613. Taking these values, it appears that the proposed duty of 40 per cent. is equal to from £43 4s. to £52 per ton, and that no duty is required to enable this article to be manufactured at much lower rates in Australia than in Europe. The former duty of 2d. per lb., or £18 13s. 4d. per ton, was equal to only 14 to 17 per cent. I shall not propose an amendment, but will support the duties suggested by the honorable member for Bendigo, namely, 30 and 25 per cent.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [9.55].—I will ask the Treasurer to agree to duties of 30 and 25 per cent., which will meet all the requirements. At the same time, I must say that I could not agree to the sug-

gestion that gelatine should be free. There is a strong request that it should be made dutiable.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Does the honorable member suggest 30 and 25 per cent.?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—Yes.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Very well.

Mr. HARPER (Mernda) [9.56].—I do not object to duties of 30 and 25 per cent. on glue. That may be a fair proposal. But it is not fair to impose such duties on an article which costs £150 per ton, and cannot be made here.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The moment I agree to something there is always opposition.

Mr. HARPER.—If the Minister would either agree to a duty of 2d per lb. on gelatine or make it free—whichever he chooses—so as to differentiate it from glue I should be satisfied. The duties of 35 and 30 per cent. on glue would be satisfactory.

The CHAIRMAN.—In order to enable the proposal for duties of 30 and 25 per cent. to be moved, it will be necessary for the Minister to withdraw the amendment at present before the Chair.

Mr. CROUCH (Corio) [9.58].—As I understand, the proposal that we have been discussing is that the duties should be 2d. and 1½d. per lb. No explanation has been made as to why a reduction of the duty should be agreed to. Are we to allow the Opposition to construct this Tariff? Every time a member of the Opposition submits an amendment and says that he will sit down if it is accepted, the Treasurer accepts it.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—This suggestion has come from the honorable member for Bendigo.

Mr. CROUCH.—It was not accepted by the Treasurer until the honorable member for Lang said that he approved if it. Then the Treasurer accepted it. The original purpose in accepting duties of 2d. and 1½d. per lb. instead of 40 and 30 per cent. was that the Treasurer considered that the former were more advisable duties. Yet after a long argument he has abandoned the position altogether, and says that he will agree to duties of 30 and 25 per cent. instead of 40 and 30 per cent., as originally proposed. I take it that the Treasurer knows something about his own Tariff.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—What is the use of the honorable member talking like that? He knows that I could not carry the original duties.

Mr. CROUCH.—Then I understand that the Treasurer is abandoning the proposed duties of 40 and 30 per cent., because he thinks that he cannot carry them. If we are going to have a Tariff made by leading members of the Opposition, let us understand that. But if we are going to have what is supposed to be a protectionist Tariff, the Treasurer should not so readily abandon his proposals. The honorable member for Mernda said that there was not sufficient distinction between glue and gelatine for the ordinary importer or for the Customs officers to be able to differentiate. Yet now he is urging the Treasurer to allow gelatine to be imported free. Speaking as an expert, he told the Committee that it is almost impossible to distinguish between the better kinds of glue and the inferior kinds of gelatine.

Mr. HARPER.—So it is. I said that they might both be free, or both be made dutiable at the same rates.

Mr. CROUCH.—The last suggestion made by the honorable member was that the rates for glue should be 35 and 30 per cent. and that gelatine should be free.

Mr. HARPER.—I said that there would then be no attempt to substitute glue for gelatine.

Mr. CROUCH.—The honorable member so confuses the Treasurer that the latter is willing to take anything that the Opposition will give him.

Mr. HARPER.—That is not saying much for the Treasurer.

Mr. CROUCH.—No; but it is most objectionable that the Treasurer should give up principles.

Mr. HARPER.—It is useless to try to protect the manufacturers of gelatine in Australia, because it cannot be made here.

Mr. CROUCH.—The honorable member's statements seem to be contradictory. The Treasurer should stick to something.

Mr. GLYNN (Angas) [10.2].—I have received a letter from the firm of Wimble and Company, in which they say—

We would much prefer to keep the price of our roller composition at the old figure, but unless the duty on gelatine is reduced as we ask, we will have to increase the selling price of the composition. If duty on gelatine is reduced to 2d., our price remains as formerly.

This would not interfere with the glue industry, as refined gelatine, such as we use in making roller composition, is not made in the Commonwealth.

That is a letter from what I believe to be a protectionist firm. Surely, therefore, the Minister is not inconsistent.

Mr. SALMON (Laanecoorie) [10.4].—I asked the Minister if he would deal specially with the higher kinds of gelatine, such as are used for photographic purposes, which cannot be made in Australia.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—It is news to hear that there is anything which cannot be made in Victoria.

Mr. SALMON.—To make it, the temperature of the building in which it was being made would have to be reduced below freezing point. The Minister was prepared to impose an all-round duty of 2d., and I was ready to accept that rather than have time occupied unduly. Now, however, the Minister seems desirous of imposing a duty of 30 per cent., which would be equivalent to a duty of 6d. per lb. I cannot assent to that, and I am surprised that the members of the Opposition urged the imposition of such a duty.

Mr. JOHNSON.—We have not urged it. What we desire is that gelatine shall be separated from glue.

Mr. SALMON.—I understand that the honorable member wishes the Minister to adopt an *ad valorem* duty.

Mr. JOHNSON.—On glue; not on gelatine.

Mr. CARR (Macquarie) [10.6].—Shall I be in order in moving the imposition of a duty of 2d. per lb., which is a lower rate than that the Minister proposes?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—No, it is not.

Mr. CARR.—Thirty per cent. on gelatine costing 1s. 6d. a lb. would be equivalent to a fixed rate of about 6d. a lb. A fixed rate of 2d. a lb. would prohibit the importation of glue, while it would not materially affect the price of gelatine, which cannot be made here, or the prices of materials made from it, such as printers' roller composition.

The CHAIRMAN.—The Minister already has an amendment before the Committee.

Mr. JOHNSON (Lang) [10.7].—I wish to move a prior amendment—the omission of the words “gelatine of all kinds,” with a view to imposing a lower rate on gelatine.

The CHAIRMAN.—Is it the pleasure of the Committee that the Minister's amendment be withdrawn?

Mr. CARR.—I object to its withdrawal.

Mr. FISHER (Wide Bay) [10.8].—I hope that the honorable member for Macquarie will not insist on his objection. If members generally were to exercise their right to object to the withdrawal of amendments, the first man who rose to speak would have the Committee at his mercy, because he could move such an amendment as would preclude others from putting propositions before it, and we should cease to be a deliberative assembly. If the objection is persisted in, I shall advise my friends to vote against the amendment.

Mr. CARR.—That is vindictive.

Mr. FISHER.—I shall do so, not out of vindictiveness, but to enable the Committee to come to a proper conclusion.

Mr. CARR (Macquarie) [10.9].—In my opinion, 2d. per lb. would be a suitable rate to agree to. Such a rate would prohibit the importation of glue, which can be made here, and would not materially increase the price of gelatine, which cannot. Those interested in the manufacture of roller composition for printers' work have informed me that the proposed duty of 2d. per lb.—the old rate—will not affect its price. If we allow the Minister's amendment to be withdrawn, we run the risk of a higher rate being proposed. If I am assured that the duty will not be increased, I shall withdraw my objection.

Mr. SALMON.—Will the honorable member withdraw his objection if the Minister agrees to re-move his amendment?

Mr. CARR.—Certainly.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [10.11].—I do not quite know what is required of me. The honorable member for Macquarie says that he objects to the withdrawal of my amendment because he fears that the duty may be raised. I think that it would be unfair to prevent the feeling of the Committee on this subject being ascertained. But I should like to know what rate it is intended to propose in connexion with gelatine if the words “gelatine of all kinds” are left out of the item.

Mr. JOHNSON.—I propose to move a special item, making gelatine dutiable at 2d. a lb.

Mr. POYNTON.—It would simplify matters to deal with these things in separate paragraphs.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I have moved to do that, though I have put only cement in paragraph B. The honorable member for Bendigo, who heard all the evidence given on the subject, was strongly in favour of an *ad valorem* duty.

Mr. CARR.—The *ad valorem* rate proposed would make the duty on gelatine too high.

Mr. TUDOR.—Let us deal with glue first, and with gelatine afterwards.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I am prepared to do that.

The CHAIRMAN.—Is it the pleasure of the Committee that the amendment be withdrawn?

Mr. CROUCH.—I object.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS (Robertson) [10.13].—There seems to me no need for separating gelatine from glue. It is quite as easy to make the one as to make the other.

Mr. JOHNSON.—They cannot make gelatine in this country.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—I know that they can. In places where they make neatsfoot oil—which is extracted from bullocks' feet—they melt down the feet of calves and yearlings to make gelatine.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The price of gelatine runs up to £120 and £150 a ton. That is why it is desirable to separate it from glue.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—That is purified gelatine, made up into tablets for jelly. Any person who likes to boil down calves' feet can make gelatine.

Mr. CROUCH (Corio) [10.14].—If the Minister will give me his assurance that he will afterwards move to make the rates 2d. and 1½d., I shall withdraw my objection to the withdrawal of the amendment. He has refused to give that assurance to the honorable member for Macquarie. Probably what he will move will be *ad valorem* rates of 25 and 30 per cent. That sort of thing has been done before.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I shall not give that assurance. The honorable member is insulting.

The CHAIRMAN.—Is it the pleasure of the Committee that the Treasurer have leave to withdraw his amendment?

Mr. CROUCH.—I object.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Could not the honorable member for Lang accomplish his object by moving an amendment of the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN.—Yes.

Amendment (by Mr. JOHNSON) proposed—

That the amendment be amended by leaving out the words "and gelatine," paragraph A.

Mr. J. H. CATTS (Cook) [10.18].—I propose to read from the evidence taken by the Tariff Commission a short paragraph

which shows that honorable members are apparently in entire ignorance of the facts relating to this question.

Mr. HEDGES.—Do not say that.

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—Since it has been said that gelatine cannot be made in Australia, and I am able to prove that it can, I fail to see why objection should be taken to my statement. At page 273 of Vol. 5 of the *Minutes of Evidence* given before the Tariff Commission will be found a statement by Henry Meister, manufacturer, of Gardiner's-road, North Botany.

Mr. JOHNSON.—I have already made a quotation from his evidence.

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—Mr. W. G. Long, glue manufacturer, of O'Riordan-street, Alexandria, also gave evidence on this question, and I have in my possession a letter from the Australian glue and gelatine manufacturers carrying on business in the same suburb of Sydney. Mr. Meister said—

With regard to gelatine, it may be stated that at the present time very little is made in the Commonwealth. There is made a small quantity in South Australia, and even that little is hard to sell at a reasonable price, because it is Colonial made, and cannot compete with the imported as long as gelatine can be imported so cheaply. Any quantity of raw material is to be had, but it is exported, because under the present Tariff it would be madness to touch this line of manufacturing, which could give a lasting occupation to a good number of hands; but no man of business would put in about £8,000 or £10,000 when he can foresee that every penny of it must be lost. The whole quantity of gelatine consumed in the Commonwealth could easily be manufactured here, but nothing can be done without raising the duty to 4d. per lb.

Mr. Meister also said—

I know for a certainty that any amount of capital is available for starting the manufacture of gelatine as soon as the proper protection is granted, but without that protection no man will ever put a single penny in a concern of that description. I do not think that a higher duty would affect the sale price of gelatine much more than three farthings or one penny per lb.

Mr. HARPER.—They cannot make it in England.

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—I do not know whether it can or cannot be made in England, but I do know that it can be made in Australia. The proprietors of the Australian Glue and Gelatine Works at Alexandria, in answer to a number of questions which I put to them, stated that they were manufacturing glue and gelatine, and that the imports amounted to

£17,000 per annum. The question of whether we should have a high or a low Tariff is not of vital importance to me as a policy. I have voted a good many times with the Government, when I might have voted just as readily against them; but I absolutely object to the moulding of the Tariff being placed in the hands of the Opposition. Whilst I am prepared to assist in passing it with reasonable despatch, I hold that for the sake of saving a little time we ought not to be deterred from doing the work effectively.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Then we shall have to stay here until after Christmas.

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—I am prepared to stay here until we are able to do properly the work that we are called upon to carry out. I certainly do not wish the framing of the Tariff to be slumped at the instigation of those whose prime object it is to destroy the work of the Government. Why should not the glue and gelatine industry have extended to it the consideration that other industries have received? Why should it be neglected, whilst others that chanced to be affected by items appearing earlier in the Tariff have received the fullest consideration?

Mr. JOHNSON.—The honorable member should ask the cardboard manufacturers in his electorate what they think of this duty?

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—I have not to consider them only; they did not consider me.

Mr. JOHNSON.—That is a very nice reason to give.

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—The attitude which I take up is not due to that reason; but the cardboard-box manufacturers in Australia have not to compete—

The CHAIRMAN.—The honorable member must not discuss that matter.

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—This item has an important bearing on the manufacture of cardboard boxes. The maker of cardboard boxes, has little or no competition from abroad to contend with, seeing that the importation of cardboard boxes is not considerable.

The CHAIRMAN.—The honorable member will not be in order in referring to imports of cardboard boxes.

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—I was only making a passing reference, because glue is one of the raw materials of the cardboard box manufacturer.

The CHAIRMAN.—The honorable member will see that if I permit him to refer to the imports of cardboard boxes, some

other member of the Committee may wish to question his figures, and we should get into a general discussion about cardboard boxes.

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—I shall not pursue the matter further than to point out that the honorable member for Lang has already referred at considerable length to the statements made by cardboard box manufacturers with respect to the duty on glue. The Government have claimed that the Tariff as submitted is uniform and symmetrical. They should therefore stand by their proposal to give a substantial protection to encourage the manufacture of gelatine and glue. The new protection proposals will conserve the interests of the consumers and the workers in the industry, and on that understanding I am prepared to vote for reasonable duties on gelatine and glue.

Mr. FISHER (Wide Bay) [10.27].—I have no wish to prolong the discussion, but I think an arrangement might easily be come to if, as I understand is the case, the Treasurer has no objection to deal with these articles separately.

Amendment of the amendment agreed to.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That the amendment be amended by leaving out the words "per lb., 2d.," and "per lb., 1½d.," paragraph A, and inserting in lieu thereof the words "ad val., 30 per cent." and "ad val., 25 per cent."

Amendment, as amended, agreed to.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That the following words be added to the item as amended:—

"c. Gelatine of all kinds, per lb. (General Tariff), 2d.; (United Kingdom), 1½d."

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 262. Printing Roller Composition, ad val., 35 per cent.

Amendment (by Mr. JOHNSON) proposed—

That the words "and on and after 4th December, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 25 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 20 per cent.," be added.

Mr. CARR (Macquarie) [10.33].—I hope the Committee will not agree to any reduction in the duty proposed by the Government. Printing roller composition can be and is being made here in any quantity, and of better quality, than very much of what is imported. I happen to know from experience that locally-made roller composition is equal to and cheaper than the best that is imported, whilst those who are

engaged in the manufacture of the article are quite prepared to adhere to present prices.

Mr. WILKS.—Then they should be satisfied with the existing duty.

Mr. CARR.—They have the usual difficulties raised by the import trade to contend with. I have said that the manufacturers are content with present prices, and the duties proposed by the Government would at once invite opposition should those at present in the trade attempt to take advantage of their position.

Amendment negatived.

Item agreed to.

Item 263. Dry Gums, Shellac, Sandarac, and Mastic, free.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That after the word "Sandarac" the word "Dextrine" be inserted.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 264 (Slate slabs, split, and with rough edges) agreed to.

Item 265. Slate slabs, sawn or chiselled on one or more faces, or on one or more edges, ad val., 20 per cent.

Mr. WILSON (Corangamite) [10.37].—This item raises the whole question of stone, marble, and slabs. The principle is involved in the word "sawn." Under the old Tariff sawn slabs were dutiable at 15 per cent., and chiselled at 20 per cent. All these articles must be sawn before they can be transported. The real work done is the chiselling. I move—

That the words "sawn or" be left out.

That will leave chiselled slabs dutiable at 20 per cent., while sawn slabs, not chiselled, will fall automatically under item 264.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—Does the honorable member propose to add the sawn slabs to the item dealing with split slabs?

Mr. WILSON.—Yes.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—I see no objection.

Mr. WILSON.—It is a reasonable thing to do. The Minister could move to include sawn slabs in item 264.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I will not move anything of the kind.

Mr. WILSON.—If that cannot be done on account of item 264 having been passed, a new paragraph could be added to this item making sawn slate slabs dutiable at 15 per cent.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [10.40].—The previous item deals with slate slabs, split, with rough edges. That is the raw material. The slate in

this item is partially manufactured, and in most cases practically wholly manufactured. When I was Minister of Trade and Customs I had a great deal of trouble over this question, and fought the people interested in this article and in marble. Under the previous classification they practically brought in their mantelpieces and tables with nothing more to be done to them except to smooth the edges and polish them. I must oppose the amendment. This classification has been prepared with a full knowledge of what has previously happened, and of what the effect will be. They are allowed to bring in the split blocks with rough edges, but surely we can do the rest of the work here.

Amendment negatived.

Item agreed to.

Item 266 (Wrought slate, n.e.i.) agreed to.

Item 267. Roofing Slates, ad val., 25 per cent.

Mr. JOHNSON (Lang) [10.42].—I intended to propose a preferential rate on the previous item, but it was put too quickly.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The duty in this item is recommended by the Commission.

Mr. JOHNSON.—By one section of the Commission. The old duty was 15 per cent. I move—

That the words "and on and after 4th December, 1907, ad val. (United Kingdom), 15 per cent.," be added.

Amendment negatived.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That the words "and on and after 4th December, 1907, ad val. (United Kingdom), 20 per cent.," be added.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 268. Stone and Marble—

- (A) Unwrought, including rough or scabbled from the pick, ad val., 10 per cent.
- (B) Slabs or scantlings, sawn on one or two faces, ad val., 15 per cent.
- (C) Slabs or scantlings, sawn on one or more faces, and one or more edges, ad val., 20 per cent.
- (D) Wrought, n.e.i., ad val., 30 per cent.
- (E) Wrought ornamental, ad val., 35 per cent.
- (F) Dust and Chips, ad val., 20 per cent.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) proposed—

That before the word "Unwrought," paragraph A, the word "Marble" be inserted.

Mr. CARR (Macquarie) [10.46].—I desire to point out that, although in Australia there are unlimited quantities of

coloured marble—some of the best in the world—there is no white marble. This has been searched for all over the Commonwealth, and I have it on the highest authority that pure white marble comes from Carrara, in Italy, only.

Mr. HUME COOK.—There is pure white marble in both New South Wales and Victoria.

Mr. CARR.—If the statement of the honorable member for Bourke is correct, I shall support the duty as proposed; but I have yet to be convinced that white marble has been found in Australia. The proposed duty on other classes of marble is desirable, because, as a matter of fact, it is so plentiful in my electorate that some of the streets of the country towns are metalled with it.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [10.48].—I have taken great interest in this question for a very long time. I asked Mr. Summers, the well-known sculptor, to investigate the matter, and I have a report from him showing that there are quarries in the neighbourhood of Bathurst, Molong, and Orange where white marble is to be obtained. For the first twelve feet, however, when the ground was opened, the marble was not pure white, being stained with iron or some other colouring matter; but as the work has proceeded it has been found that magnificent marble is obtainable. As a matter of fact, I have some photographs and samples of the marble in my office at the present moment, and there are deposits of white as well as of coloured marble awaiting development here.

Mr. FISHER (Wide Bay) [10.50].—I think that marble in the rough ought to be free. To me it appears a quixotic idea to impose a duty on rough marble.

Mr. MAUGER.—There is splendid marble to be obtained in Australia.

Mr. FISHER.—Does the Postmaster-General not know that there is twenty times the work provided on the marble after it is quarried than is provided in the quarrying of it? In big centres like Melbourne and Sydney it is easy to obtain marble from the quarries, but in the more distant parts of the Commonwealth the cost of conveyance would be greater than that of the marble itself. No one can say that a duty of 10 per cent. can have any protective incidence, and it should be our desire to afford our sculptors an opportunity to obtain their raw material at as reasonable a rate as possible.

Mr. JOHNSON (Lang) [10.53].—What the honorable member for Wide Bay has said is perfectly true, and this marble ought to be on the free list. There is a local white marble, which is useful for a number of purposes; but local sculptors of undoubted standing themselves say that it is altogether useless for the finer work of statuary. The local marble is not nearly so white as the imported marble, and, not being of so fine a grain, has a dark, rough appearance when finished. It is, moreover, full of small flint-like particles, which interfere considerably with its working. It is, however, quite possible that at a lower depth a better marble may be found.

Mr. CARR.—I was quoting the local sculptors, and I think the honorable member must have seen the wrong people.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Those who use the marble ought to be the best judges of whether it is good, bad, or indifferent; and my information is that the local stone is not to be compared with the imported white marble at present.

Mr. SALMON (Laanecoorie) [10.54].—The honorable member for Macquarie suggested that the honorable member for Lang had been unfortunate in the sculptors with whom he had come in contact. We must not forget, however, that Mr. Summers, who has been referred to by the Treasurer, is, I suppose, one of the foremost sculptors in Australia. Mr. Summers spent over twenty-five years in Rome, and was President of the Art Society there.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—That is a beautiful statue by Mr. Summers at Ballarat.

Mr. SALMON.—It is.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—It was made in Rome.

Mr. SALMON.—Mr. Summers, with all his years of experience, and knowing as he does every marble quarry of any size in the whole of Europe, declares that in the southern part of New South Wales and the north-eastern portion of Victoria, marble is to be found equal in quality to any obtained in the world. The honorable member for Lang has said that, on account of its colour, sculptors cannot use Australian marble. But I repeat that Mr. Summers has done work with it.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—With white marble?

Mr. SALMON.—Yes. It would give me very great pleasure to take the honorable member to his studio. Here we are again discussing the merits of an Australian production. I am sorry that the honorable member for Lang did not tell us the names

of the sculptors whom he had in his mind, and who he declared could not work Australian marble.

Mr. JOHNSON.—I said that they could not turn out such excellent work with the local marble as they could with the imported.

Mr. SALMON.—The honorable member said that they could not work it for the purposes of statuary.

Mr. JOHNSON.—I absolutely deny having made that statement.

Mr. SALMON.—I am quite content to accept the honorable member's assurance. We have in Australia an artist who has a world-wide reputation—

Mr. HANS IRVINE.—One mason says that there is no white marble in Australia.

Mr. SALMON.—I suppose that he is an importer of marble. Mr. Summers is prepared to stake his reputation upon the statement that we have in Australia enormous deposits of white marble, which are equal in quality to that of any other deposits in the world. He has proved his contention by producing works which are on view at his studio in East Melbourne.

Mr. TUDOR (Yarra) [11.0].—If the Treasurer will move in the direction of imposing a duty of 10 per cent. upon colored marble, I shall be prepared to support him. I unhesitatingly say that there is no white marble in the world except that which is found at Carrara. I know that some honorable members declare that white marble can be obtained at a dozen places in the Commonwealth. But in reality it is not a white but a creamy marble. Directly it is manufactured into statuary it does not retain its colour as does white imported marble.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—Nonsense.

Mr. TUDOR.—I know that a petition has been circulated amongst honorable members setting out that "the undersigned marble and granite masons, manufacturers, and merchants, ask that there should be no alteration in the old duty."

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The petition bears three hundred signatures.

Mr. TUDOR.—Most of the signatures are those of workmen. In other words, the petition is a "faked" one, which the workmen in every State but Victoria have signed. I need only point to the fact that there are ten signatories in Hobart. I do not suppose that anybody will contend for a moment that there are ten monumental mason employers in Tasmania. Then a number

of signatures have been duplicated. There are eight signatories to the petition in Armidale.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—I can show a "faked" petition upon the other side.

Mr. TUDOR.—Then let the honorable member produce it. This petition has been got up by the importers, who have compelled the workmen in every State but Victoria to sign it. Fourteen of the signatories to the petition are said to be located at Wagga.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I am surprised at the honorable member.

Mr. TUDOR.—I hope that I shall surprise the Treasurer a little bit more.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The rate proposed is that which operated under the old Tariff.

Mr. TUDOR.—No. The workmen are not satisfied that their raw material shall be taxed whilst the finished article is required to pay only a very small duty. They ask that the duty upon colored marble unwrought shall be 10 per cent., and that stone or white marble unwrought, including rough or scabbled from the pick, shall be admitted free. They want slabs or scantlings sawn on one or two faces to be admitted free; slabs or scantlings sawn on one or two faces, and one or more edges, to be made dutiable at 10 per cent., and the finished article at 45 per cent. I realize that there is no chance of carrying such proposals here. I believe that if a prohibitive duty should be imposed on any article it should be imposed on marble, because practically the whole value of the finished article lies in the labour. If we want to employ labour here we should see that a high duty is put on dressed marble. I do not suppose that any honorable member on the other side will put in a plea on behalf of the poor farmer that he should have a monument duty free.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Now that the honorable member has turned free-trader it is time for us to become protectionists.

Mr. TUDOR.—I have not turned free-trader. I am merely asking, as I have done in other cases, that the raw material of our monumental masons should be admitted free. Honorable members must know that they will not import the marble unless it is treated on one or two sides. Under my proposal, if adopted, our quarrymen would be able to get more work. Until it is sawn or dressed it is not possible to tell whether the granite is good or not.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—What is it that the honorable member wants?

Mr. TUDOR.—I want the raw material admitted free.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I will vote with the honorable member.

Mr. TUDOR.—I ask the Minister to insert at the beginning of his amendment the words "coloured marble."

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Nonsense! The whole trouble is that the men do not like the hard marble.

Mr. THOMAS.—Let us give the quarrymen a bit of protection.

Mr. TUDOR.—If the Committee is against me I cannot help it. I have done my best on behalf of the Australian workmen who are engaged in this industry. I feel convinced that it would be in its best interests if the proposals I read were adopted. Apparently honorable members are anxious to put a duty on white marble when they know that there is only one place in the world where it can be obtained. I trust that the Minister, if he carries his proposal to put a duty of 10 per cent. on white marble, will agree to increase the duty on the finished article. Will he promise to do that?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I will tell the honorable member when we reach the item.

Mr. TUDOR.—I suppose that when the item is reached the honorable gentleman will agree to some proposal from the Opposition, and alter the duty so as to wipe out the men who are engaged in this industry.

Mr. HANS IRVINE (*Grampians*) [11.10].—It may interest honorable members if I read a letter which has been addressed to me by a monumental and marble mason concerning this item. He writes as follows—

Will you please, when dealing with the duties on stone, use your influence and cast your vote in the interest of working masons by voting for a low duty on rough slabs and blocks of marble, so as to enable us to compete with the underpaid Italian workmen? Rough blocks of marble we would like to see on the free list, also slabs and scantlings. I may tell you that slabs and scantlings sawn on edges are of no advantage to us, as the sawn edges are liable to get chipped and broken, and we have to work the edges again. So if you would try to get A, B, C on the free list you will have the best wishes of every working mason in the Commonwealth. As regards wrought and wrought ornamental, D and E, the duty of 30 and 35 per cent. does not matter so much. It is the raw material that we want to get in free. The duty on the cases in which marble and granite headstones and monuments are packed is a hard

tax, as the cases are of no use to us, and are generally left in the cemetery after the headstone is unpacked. In conclusion, I may state that there is no white marble in the Commonwealth suitable for monumental work, or, at any rate, there is none on the market. There is a dove-coloured marble in New South Wales; but it is the white marble that we want, and until there is a local white marble on the market we would like to get our raw material as cheap as possible, so as to compete with the cheap labour of other countries.

That confirms the representations of the honorable member for Yarra. I ask that in the interests of the working masons the raw material should be admitted free. I am quite satisfied that there should be a duty on the finished article.

Mr. BATCHELOR (*Boothby*) [11.11].—A few weeks ago I had the pleasure of paying a visit to the studio of Mr. Summers. Until then I had not the remotest idea that such very fine marbles, especially coloured ones, were obtainable in Australia as were displayed in his studio. He, of course, is only interested in our marbles as a sculptor. He is not concerned in any quarries. Any duty which would render it more difficult for him to obtain his raw material would certainly be against his own interests, and therefore I placed great reliance on the statement which he made to myself and others. He declared that some of the white marbles which had been submitted to him, and which he had worked up, were as fine as he had obtained from anywhere else. He added that almost all marble quarries improved as they went down.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Does not the honorable member think that the very high price of Carrara marble is a sufficient protection for any marble which we may have—without imposing any duty?

Mr. BATCHELOR.—The high price of Carrara marble would, of course, be some protection, but if we have suitable marble in our own quarries we ought to develop them if possible.

Mr. HANS IRVINE.—We have coloured marbles, but not white marble.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—It is of no use for the honorable member to make that statement, because we have the assurance of Mr. Summers, a well known sculptor, that we have white marble. From a letter which I have received from Mr. Frederick Herring, a monumental mason, of South Australia, I gather that faked petitions are not confined to New South Wales. A sentence in this letter of Mr. Herring states that a circular was sent to him in which he

was asked to do his best to get the duty taken off, and to carry out the views enunciated in the petition which he signed. He says—

They are in error, as I never signed any petition. The duty put on sawn slips and slabs will be of great advantage to our industry.

Mr. Herring is not only a mason, but also has an interest in the Angaston quarries. No argument has been given as to why there should be any reduction in the duty. Hence I hope that the Government will stick to their proposal.

Mr. WILKS (Dalley) [11.17].—I shall support the Treasurer in regard to this item. We have very fine marble quarries in New South Wales. As to the statement that there is no white marble in Australia, I have to say that white marble has been obtained in New South Wales. The Treasurer has taken an interest in the industry in his own State for many years past, and has arranged for several exhibitions of the marbles obtained there. On one occasion, Dr. Macarthy, of Sydney, fooled the public with what he called a marble man. That was done with marble obtained in the neighbourhood of Orange—at Cow Flat. The block was so white that many people took it to be a petrified man.

Mr. CARR.—It was not white.

Mr. WILKS.—The honorable member for Macquarie must admit that the more marble quarries are worked, the better the quality becomes. So far as concerns the item under consideration, the honorable member for Grampians said that the working masons want articles in paragraphs A, B and C to be free. But there are other artisans employed in the industry besides the masons. There is the marble worker to consider. He wants protection as against the cheap labour of Italy. The marble workers prepare the slabs, finish them and polish them. It is a very important industry, indeed—far more important than that of the working mason or the monumental mason who turns the finished marble into tombstones. As under the old Tariff there was a duty of 10 per cent. on the rough marble, I shall vote for such a duty in this Tariff; and I shall also vote for duties in connexion with paragraphs B, C, and D, in order to give assistance to a class of very hard-working men, who have to compete against some of the cheapest labour in the world.

Mr. FISHER.—How much labour is there in quarrying?

Mr. WILKS.—There is a great deal of labour in chiselling and polishing. The duty of 10 per cent. on unwrought marble is not in the interest of the marble worker, but of the marble quarries of Australia. There are several quarries in New South Wales. Paragraphs B, C, and D are in the interests of the marble worker. The only paragraph to which I object is paragraph E, wrought ornamental marble, upon which the duty is 35 per cent. I should like to see it reduced to 30 per cent. The difference between the duty in paragraph C, 20 per cent., and that in paragraph E, 35 per cent., is too great. I shall vote for a duty of 30 per cent. in paragraph E.

Mr. WILSON (Corangamite) [11.21].—I believe, with the honorable member for Yarra, that unwrought marble should be free. The marble quarries of Gippsland have been referred to. I believe that the facts of the case are that the quarries cannot be conveniently worked because they are inaccessible.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—They are not.

Mr. WILSON.—There is absolutely no chance of getting that marble down to Melbourne until a railway has been built. That being the case, what the honorable member for Yarra says is quite correct—that a duty of 10 per cent. would simply be a tax on the raw material of men whose business it is to work up marble. I shall therefore vote with the honorable member in this case. I also believe that slabs or scantlings should be free. The marble has to be sawn before it can be used. I am advised by monumental masons that there should be no duty on account of the material covered by paragraph C. The same remark applies to that specified in paragraph B. When these men work up the imported marble, they have to take the edges off, because in coming out from Italy it gets chipped. Before it can be made into tombstones, the edges and faces have to be reworked. I shall therefore support the honorable member for Yarra as to the contents of paragraphs A, B, and C. As to paragraph F, dealing with dust and chips, I shall vote to leave the Tariff as it stands. I have seen the pay-sheets of these men, and can say that they are paid really splendid wages, and have nothing to complain about.

Mr. MALONEY (Melbourne) [11.25].—I understand that the honorable member for Wide Bay is willing to accept the suggestion of the honorable member for Yarra, and to allow white marble to be imported

free. I have given some study to this question, and I should feel very proud as an Australian if a block of Australian white marble could be carved into a statue. I may remark that the statue of Queen Victoria standing in Queen's Hall is generally supposed to be carved from one piece of marble. But when I was in Europe I was told that the headpiece was simply let in, and that the statue was a fraud to that extent. When it was being shifted from one end of Queen's Hall to the other, I determined to get up and have a look at it, in order to verify that statement. An attempt was made to prevent me, but I was determined, and I found that the statement was true. With regard to what the honorable member for Laanecoorie has said, I think he is aware that when I was a member of the State Parliament I obtained justice for Mr. Summers, who had been wronged for fourteen years in consequence of infamous treatment by the State Government. He was robbed for some years of the money which he should have received for the four statues which stand in front of the Exhibition Building, and has not been paid even interest on it. Indeed, he was barely saved from the claw of the great Lansell, of Bendigo. Loving this country as every Australian does, I should be glad to learn of the discovery of a real white marble here. Attempts to find such marble have been made in every country in the world. I have not heard of Mr. Summers making a statue of Australian marble; at any rate, he has not honoured me with an invitation to see it. A much greater sculptor in our community—the man who for the first time in the history of the English Academy won the prize for both painting and sculpture, and who modelled the monument above the *Age* newspaper—does not use Australian marble. How many statues are made in Australia? God knows that the sculptors have a hard time here. I have stood as a model to sculptors in London who I knew had scarcely bread to eat. Bates, whose head I lent to the National Gallery, and who has left perhaps the greatest name in England of late years, although he died prematurely, is one of these. Australia is not kind to its artists. Anyone who knows anything about them knows how hard it is for them to make ends meet. If white marble is wanted for statues, the only place where it can be got is Carrara, in Italy. The nearest approach to such marble that I have seen in Australia

Mr. Maloney.

has been cream coloured. I ask the Committee to allow real white marble to be imported free of duty. By all means, let us tax other marble.

Mr. HUTCHISON (Hindmarsh) [11.28].—The honorable member for Melbourne says that he has stood as a model for the sculptors in the Old Country; but I hope that if ever an appreciative country does me the honour to raise a statue to my memory it will be made of Australian marble. We have in South Australia and in Gippsland white marble which is quite as good as is necessary. In South Australia there is a statue of my national poet, Burns, executed in Australian white marble; and another of one of the greatest men who ever set foot on this country, John McDouall Stuart, also made of Australian marble. If statues like that can be made of Australian marble, the local stone should be good enough for any one who wishes to have a monument erected to his memory. It is white enough for the whitest man who ever lived on Australian soil.

Amendment (by Mr. FISHER) proposed—

That the amendment be amended by inserting the word "White" before the word "Marble."

Mr. HEDGES (Fremantle) [11.32].—Angaston marble is fit for all the purposes for which marble is required here, and I am very surprised to hear Victorian protectionists advocating the importation of tombstones free. The Angaston marble is very valuable, and the South Australian Government is proposing to build a railway to the locality where it is found. There are some of the finest marble quarries in the world there. The face is as high as the gallery, and slabs of very fine stone, 18 to 20 feet long, can be cut. The deposit of marble starts at Second Valley, runs through Macclesfield and Angaston, and crosses the Broken Hill railway line at Paratoo. That belt is 170 miles long, and has been opened up in only two or three places, so that even better quarries than are now open may yet be discovered. The marble is good enough for all the purposes for which we need such stone.

Mr. BOWDEN (Nepean) [11.34].—The Committee seems almost unanimous as to the advisability of admitting duty free unwrought white marble. With the exception of the quarry-owners, most of the witnesses who appeared before the Tariff Commission suggested that this marble should be admitted duty free. As to coloured marble, the evidence is contradictory. The

value of the monuments imported last year was only about £838, and if forty masons had been employed in making them, they would not have earned more than £20 each. The weight and bulk of monuments protect local makers from competition. The best Italian marble costs 10s. or 12s. per cubic foot; that would be free of duty. On the other hand, the Angaston marble can be delivered at Adelaide at a cost of about 4s. 6d. per cubic foot, so that no duty would cause the latter to be substituted for the Italian. The very fact that the price of Australian marble is at the present time so much lower than is that of the imported marble shows that the duty is not likely to affect the choice. The petition circulated amongst honorable members praying that the old duty should not be increased was signed by more than 95 per cent. of the monumental, marble, and granite trade of Australia.

Mr. TUDOR.—That was a faked petition.

Mr. BOWDEN.—We have to consider the petition as sent to us. It sets out that the cost of importing marble and granite averages about 40 per cent. or 50 per cent., and that under the old duty the native marble enjoyed a protection of from 60 per cent. to 70 per cent. In the face of these facts, I fail to see why the duty should be increased. It seems to me that we should be disposed, on the contrary, to place this marble on the free list.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [11.37].—By this time we should have heard all the pros and cons of the marble industry; but I have not heard any honorable member prove conclusively that we have in Australia pure white marble.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—What about the evidence of Mr. Summers, the sculptor?

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Has he investigated all the marble deposits of Australia? I think it is absurd to suggest that he has.

Mr. HUME COOK. — Mr. Cosmo Newbery said that the Gippsland marble was equal to that of Carrara.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The honorable member for Barrier suggests that it needs only a duty to turn Australian marble white, and I am beginning to think that there is something in the contention. I have seen a good many marble deposits in Australia, but have never come across a deposit of pure white marble, and am afraid

that I cannot hope to see in Australia a deposit equal to those of Carrara. I wish it were otherwise.

Mr. WISE.—Has the honorable member seen those deposits?

Mr. JOSEPH COOK. — I have seen stone taken from them. If the honorable member could produce in Australia marble equal to it, his fortune would be made.

Mr. SALMON.—If we miss our trains, we ought to sit up all night.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The Treasurer sat at the table for hours to-day fighting for a paltry 5 per cent. on a matter that was of no material consequence, and I, too, am prepared to stay here if necessary. What does the Treasurer propose to do?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I am going to retain the duty if possible. I am astonished that there should be a difference of opinion on the subject.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—If we are to have a vote on the question at once, I shall say no more.

Question — That the amendment be amended by the insertion of the word "White" (Mr. FISHER's amendment upon Sir WILLIAM LYNE's amendment)—put. The Committee divided.

Ayes	9
Noes	32
<hr/>			
Majority	23

AYES.

Bowden, E. K.	Thomson, Dugald
Brown, Thomas	Tudor, F. G.
Fisher, A.	<i>Tellers:</i>
Maloney, W. R. N.	Fuller, G. W.
Sinclair, H.	Johnson, W. E.

NOES.

Batchelor, E. L.	McDougall, J. K.
Carr, E. S.	McWilliams, W. J.
Catts, J. H.	Palmer, A. C.
Chapman, Austin	Quick, Sir John
Cook, Joseph	Salmon, C. C.
Coon, J.	Sampson, S.
Crouch, R. A.	Spence, W. G.
Ewing, T. T.	Storrer, D.
Forrest, Sir John	Thomas, J.
Foster, F. J.	Thomson, John
Frazer, C. E.	Watson, J. C.
Groom, L. E.	Willis, Henry
Hedges, W. N.	Wise, G. H.
Irvine, Hans	
Lyne, Sir William	<i>Tellers:</i>
Mathews, J.	Cook, Hume
Mauger, S.	Watkins, D.

Question so resolved in the negative.

Amendment of the amendment negatived.

Amendment (Sir WILLIAM LYNE's) agreed to.

Amendment (by Mr. FISHER) negatived—

That after the words "10 per cent.," paragraph A, the words "and on and after 4th December, 1907, free," be inserted.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [11.50].—I hope the Committee will accept this scheme of duties, which has been carefully considered, and is based upon the evidence of witnesses who were skilled workmen. It has been arranged into divisions in an ascending scale of 5 per cent., according to the value of the product. The duty on one item cannot be altered without disturbing the whole scheme, and the Committee should accept or reject it as a whole.

Mr. MATHEWS (Melbourne Ports) [11.51].—I am sorry to have to disagree with the honorable member for Bendigo, because the workmen assure me that paragraphs D and E should be dutiable at the same rate, since what is introduced under paragraph D may be in a more complete condition than what is imported under paragraph E.

Mr. JOHNSON.—The Treasurer proposes to make that alteration.

Mr. WILSON (Corangamite) [11.53].—I move—

That after the words "15 per cent.," paragraph B, the words "and on and after 4th December, 1907, ad val., 10 per cent.," be inserted. This item covers the raw material which is put into the hands of monumental masons to be worked up. It is the sawn edges of the slabs or scantlings that have to be worked up by the local masons. I can assure honorable members that my proposal is in accordance with the evidence of practical men who are earning their living by the making of tombstones. The matter is of great importance to the men engaged at this work. The industry is not one in which there is any sweating, because the monumental masons, I know, receive excellent wages.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—Does the honorable member mean to say that people will not purchase tombstones unless they can get them made of Carrara marble?

Mr. WILSON.—I do not say anything of the sort. A duty of 10 per cent. in regard to paragraph B would be distinctly to the advantage of the workmen.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [11.56].—This question stands very much on the same footing as the proposal which the Committee adopted with

regard to plate glass, that anything under 25 feet, being the raw material of bevellers and glassworkers, should come in free. In this case, however, it is not asked that the article should be free, as a duty has been put on the crude material. It is simply requested that the raw material for the workers in this industry should bear the same duty as the previous article. The Committee, having accepted the principle in the case of plate glass, should accept this proposal for the same reason.

Mr. STORRER (Bass) [11.57].—It was stated just now that the Minister intended to accept an amendment to make the duty in regard to paragraph D the same as in paragraph E, but there is a great difference between the two marbles. That in paragraph D is the raw material of the furniture-maker and builder.

Mr. TUDOR (Yarra) [11.58].—I urge the Minister to accept the 10 per cent. duty in paragraph B, because the bulk of the work will have to be done here. Honorable members opposite were anxious for the work to be done here, and the marble to be produced here. Any importers who bring the marble in will have to see that it is good. The duty in paragraph C could be increased, as it will mean that more work will be done here, and as a duty has been put on the raw material the duty in paragraph E could be increased also.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [11.59].—This amendment would do a great injustice to those manufacturers who have gone to the great expense of laying down sawing machines. It means admitting the sawn scantling at the same rate as the rough blocks. That means interfering with those who do the sawing here. Very strong evidence was given in every State on this point before the Tariff Commission. I am surprised at the honorable member for Yarra supporting such a proposal.

Mr. TUDOR.—I was anxious that the scabbled stone should come in free.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—That may be, but the honorable member is willing to allow the sawn stuff to come in at the same rate as the rough stone. That is an unfair classification, and is going in the teeth of those who want the sawing work to be done in Australia.

Question.—That after the words 15 per cent., paragraph B, the words "and on

and after 4th December, 1907, ad val. 10 per cent." (Mr. WILSON's amendment) be inserted—put. The Committee divided.

Ayes	12
Noes	28
—			
Majority	16

AYES.

Brown, Thomas	Thomson, Dugald
Cook, Joseph	Tudor, F. G.
Crouch, R. A.	Wilson, J. G.
Fuller, G. W.	
Irvine, Hans	<i>Tellers.</i>
Johnson, W. E.	Bowden, E. R.
Sinclair, H.	Liddell, F.

NOES.

Batchelor, E. L.	Palmer, A. C.
Carr, E. S.	Quick, Sir John
Catts, J. H.	Salmon, C. C.
Coon, J.	Sampson, S.
Ewing, T. T.	Spence, W. G.
Fisher, A.	Storrer, D.
Forrest, Sir John	Thomas, J.
Frazer, C. E.	Thomson, John
Groom, L. E.	Watkins, D.
Hedges, W. N.	Watson, J. C.
Hutchison, J.	Wise, G. H.
Lyne, Sir William	
Maloney, W. R. N.	<i>Tellers:</i>
Mathews, J.	Cook, Hume
Mauger, S.	Foster, F. J.

PAIRS.

Kelly, W. H.	Kingston, C. C.
Atkinson, L.	Deakin, A.
Livingston, J.	Hughes, W. M.
Edwards, R.	Bamford, F. W.
McWilliams, W. J.	Page, J.
Smith, Bruce	Hall, D. R.
Reid, G. H.	Harper, R.
Archer, E. W.	Webster, W.
Brown, Tilley	Chanter, J. M.
Glynn, P. McM.	Chapman, Austin
Mahon, H.	McDougall, J. K.
Fysh, Sir Philip	O'Malley, King
Fowler, J. M.	Wilks, W. H.

Question so resolved in the negative.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. WILSON.—I ask, Mr. Chairman, how the vote of the Minister of Trade and Customs was recorded in the last division?

The CHAIRMAN.—I ordered that the vote of the Minister of Trade and Customs should not be counted.

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—Why?

The CHAIRMAN.—After the tellers were appointed, the honorable gentleman was standing in the gangway, and I could not reasonably direct that he be counted on one side or the other.

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—I should like to have your ruling, Mr. Chairman, on this matter, so that an awkward precedent may

not be created. I was talking to the honorable member for Kalgoorlie in reference to the business before us; and when I heard your voice, I at once took my seat. It appears to me that under the circumstances, I ought to be counted in the division. Have I any, and, if so, what means, of protesting against your decision?

The CHAIRMAN.—I point out to the honorable member that the bells were rung, and I put the question. I had appointed the tellers, who had gone so far in their count as to reach the honorable member where he was standing; so that he could not have moved into his place so soon as he heard my voice. As the honorable member was standing in the gangway—whereas he ought to have been seated on one side or the other—I did not know on which side to count him, and, therefore, I ordered that he ought not to be counted at all. I further point out that whatever conversations go on under such circumstances are irregular; and, if such irregularities are allowed, the divisions will become a farce. That is a result which I as the officer responsible for the proper conduct of business cannot allow.

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN.—If the honorable member desires to go further, he must move a dissent from my ruling.

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—That is certainly what I feel I ought to do, because, in my opinion, there could be no doubt on which side I was voting.

Amendment (by Mr. JOSEPH COOK) negatived—

That after the words "20 per cent.," paragraph C, the words "and on and after 4th December, 1907, ad val. (United Kingdom), 15 per cent.," be inserted.

Amendment (by Mr. JOSEPH COOK) proposed—

That after the words "30 per cent.," paragraph D, the words "and on and after 4th December, 1907, ad val. (United Kingdom), 20 per cent.," be inserted.

Mr. TUDOR (Yarra) [12.9 a.m.].—Paragraph D—"wrought n.e.i.," refers to granite headstones, which often mean more work and cost more money than "wrought ornamental," and yet the former will come in at a lower rate of duty. I have no doubt that we shall be told that the scheme of the Tariff is all right, and should be adhered to; but I think that both the Treasurer and

the honorable member for Bendigo will admit that the stone which represents the greater amount of work should not be admitted at the lower rate.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [12.10 a.m.].—I desire to point out that under the scheme of the Tariff the stone which is highly wrought and highly decorative is charged the heavier rate of duty; the plain tombstone without decoration will be charged only 30 per cent.

Amendment negatived.

Amendment (by Mr. JOSEPH COOK) put—

That after the words "30 per cent.," paragraph D, the words "and on and after 4th December, 1907, ad val. (United Kingdom), 25 per cent.," be inserted.

The Committee divided.

Ayes	II
Noes	24
Majority	13

AYES.

Bowden, E. K.	Sinclair, H.
Brown, Thomas	Thomson, Dugald
Cook, Joseph	Wilson, J. G.
Forrest, Sir John	<i>Tellers:</i>
Fuller, G. W.	Johnson, W. E.
Irvine, Hans	Liddell, F.

NOES.

Carr, E. S.	Salmon, C. C.
Catts, J. H.	Sampson, S.
Chapman, Austin	Spence, W. G.
Coon, J.	Storrer, D.
Fisher, A.	Thomson, John
Foster, F. J.	Tudor, F. G.
Groom, L. E.	Watkins, D.
Hedges, W. N.	Watson, J. C.
Lyne, Sir William	Wise, G. H.
Maloney, W. R. N.	<i>Tellers.</i>
Mathews, J.	Batchelor, E. L.
Mauger, S.	Cook, Hume
Quick, Sir John	

PAIRS.

Kelly, W. H.	Kingston, C. C.
Atkinson, L.	Deakin, A.
Archer, E. W.	Webster, W.
Edwards, R.	Bamford, F. W.
Brown, Tilley	Chanter, J. M.
Willis, Henry	Crouch, R. A.
Reid, G. H.	Ewing, T. T.
Fysh, Sir Philip	Harper, R.
Glynn, P. McM.	Hughes, W. M.
Smith, Bruce	Hall, D. R.
Mahon, H.	Hutchinson, J.
Livingston, J.	McDougall, J. K.
McWilliams, W. J.	Page, J.
Fairbairn, G.	O'Malley, King
Fowler, J. M.	Thomas, J.

Question so resolved in the negative.

Amendment negatived.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [12.20 a.m.].—I move—

That the words "(E) Wrought ornamental, ad val., 35 per cent.," be left out.

I am informed that it is not considered necessary to retain this paragraph, which would be likely to be productive of complications. Stone and marble wrought ornamental will then fall under the heading of "wrought n.e.i."

Mr. TUDOR.—Therefore, the Treasurer has reduced the duty by 5 per cent.?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I know that I have.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [12.23 a.m.].—Is there any reason why the duty levied upon dust and chips under the old Tariff should be increased? I move—

That after the words "20 per cent.," paragraph F, the words "and on and after 4th December, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 10 per cent.," be added.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [12.24 a.m.].—I have endeavoured to adhere as closely as possible to the scheme recommended by the Tariff Commission. I shall propose presently to move the insertion of the following new paragraph—

"G. Dust and chips for use in Australian manufactures under departmental by-laws, free."

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [12.25 a.m.].—I should like to hear from the Chairman of the Tariff Commission the reason underlying his recommendation that a duty of 20 per cent. should be imposed upon dust and chips. It seems to me to be the acme of absurdity. It is really protection run mad. When it is proposed to protect dust and chips, I may well be pardoned for asking "What will be proposed next?"

Mr. WEBSTER. — Does the honorable member know that these things are used for the purpose of decorating the graves of the departed?

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Then for shame's sake the article ought to be admitted free. I should like to know why the duty on dust and chips has been increased from 10 to 20 per cent.

Mr. SALMON.—The B section of the Tariff Commission recommended a duty of 15 per cent.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The honorable member is wrong, because they made no recommendation.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The honorable gentleman is wrong, because there was a recommendation.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [12.26 a.m.].—The object is to place a duty on the by-products of marble in the workshops of

Italy, which are brought here in bags and packages and utilized for certain purposes, thereby competing with local dust and chips.

Mr. LIDDELL (Hunter) [12.27 a.m.].—In imposing this duty the Treasurer is placing a tax on the raw material of another manufacture with which we shall have to deal under another item. It is quite possible to make carbonic acid gas out of chips of marble, and under this Tariff it is proposed to levy a duty of 2d. per lb. on carbonic acid gas. It is absolutely ridiculous that a duty should be proposed on marble dust and chips, which are the raw material for the manufacture of another commodity. Probably the honorable member for Corangamite can enlighten the Committee about this duty more than either the Treasurer or the honorable member for Bendigo has done.

Mr. SPENCE (Darling) [12.29 a.m.].—I think that the Committee will act wisely if they keep marble dust and chips off the free list. The monumental mason has to import the marble at a high price, and he ought to be given a chance to make all the profit he can out of the chips which he breaks off. There is a considerable use for the chips. For instance, they are used in making pavements, and also in covering graves. In my opinion the Treasurer has done right in imposing a duty, because it will give a chance to the local marble workers to make a little profit.

Mr. WEBSTER (Gwydir) [12.30 a.m.].—The extreme levity which has been introduced by certain honorable members is not creditable to them. This is a grave question, and I am surprised that a doctor, who has so much to do with committing persons to their last resting places should find fault with the duty. Had he any sympathy with the relatives of those persons he would not hesitate to protect the material which covers their last home. If the honorable member for Parramatta had any sympathy with bereaved persons he would not attempt to dispute the item. These chips are practically part and parcel of an article on which a duty has been imposed to-night. The dust is used for the purpose of putting a polish on tombstones. There is a lack of sympathy shown by honorable members on the Opposition side on this very grave question.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I think that we ought to have a quorum to listen to these remarks. [*Quorum formed.*]

Amendment negatived.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

[246]

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [12.35 a.m.].—I had intended to propose a new item, but I find on further inquiry that the suggestion made to me does not apply to marble only, but to dust and chips of any kind. Under the circumstances, I do not feel disposed to move the new item.

Item 269 (Bathbricks); item 270 (Oil and whetstones, also lithographic and emery stones); item 271 (Pestles and mortars—agate); and item 272 (Stone, viz., in the rough n.e.i.) agreed to.

Progress reported.

SPECIAL ADJOURNMENT.

Motion (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) proposed—

That the House, at its rising, adjourn until 11 o'clock this day.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [12.37 a.m.].—What is the use of adjourning until 11 o'clock? Why not meet at half-past 10 o'clock if we are to meet in the morning at all? The extra half-hour is not worth while bothering about. We have now had two late sittings in succession; and I want to say plainly to the Treasurer that if he does not control the business within more reasonable hours we shall either have to have longer sittings when we are about it, or do more business before 11 o'clock at night. This is right down sheer brutality. That is what I call it.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The honorable member is one of those who caused it.

Mr. WISE.—The honorable member kept us for an hour and a half.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The honorable member for Gippsland might as well make that kind of incorrect statement as any other. There is not a word of truth in it, and he knows it.

Mr. WISE.—Is the honorable member for Parramatta in order in accusing me of telling an untruth? The honorable member said that what I stated was not true, and that I knew it.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I certainly did not hear the honorable member for Parramatta say that; but, if he did, he must withdraw the remark.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I did not say that. I said that the honorable member for Gippsland made an incorrect statement, and he knew it. He charged me with having kept the House for an hour and a half.

I have not spoken for fifteen minutes during the whole day, and the fact that the honorable member makes a statement of that kind about me only shows the reckless sort of individual that he is. I think that the Minister ought to propose an adjournment to a later hour than 11 o'clock this morning, or else the House ought to meet at half-past 10 o'clock and get more work done within decent hours. I, for one, shall decline to sit these long hours, and if he insists upon such sittings, the Minister must take the responsibility of what occurs. That is all that I have to say. I decline to be kept here for fourteen hours at a stretch when we could get through the business in much less time and with great advantage to all concerned. To-day, the Minister kept us for four hours which might have been saved to the conduct of public business. Time and again he has sat in his chair for a couple of hours at a stretch when there has only been a question of a paltry 5 per cent. dividing honorable members. It is unfair to keep the House sitting for fourteen or fifteen hours at a stretch in this way, and I tell the Treasurer again that I do not intend to put up with it.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

PAPERS.

Mr. MAUGER laid upon the table the following papers—

Public Service Act—Regulations Amended—No. 104—Statutory Rules 1907, No. 118; No. 66—Sunday Work (Substituted Regulation).—Statutory Rules 1907, No. 119.

House adjourned at 12.39 a.m. (Wednesday).

House of Representatives.

Wednesday, 4th December, 1907.

Mr. SPEAKER took the chair at 11 a.m., and read prayers.

DEFENCE FORCE: MEDICAL RESERVE CORPS.

Mr. SALMON.—I wish to ask the Minister of Defence a question, without notice, following up a matter to which I previously referred. I wish to know whether the honorable gentleman is in a position to make any statement with regard to his expressed desire to form a medical reserve in connexion with the citizen forces of the Commonwealth.

Mr. EWING.—I had previously told the honorable member that there were difficulties in the way that appeared to be insurmountable. They have now, however, been overcome, and instructions have been given to form the corps forthwith.

ALLEGED SWEATING: SYDNEY POST OFFICE.

Mr. J. H. CATTS asked the Treasurer, *upon notice*—

1. Will he state whether or not he is in favour of providing the necessary funds to give effect to the Postal Department's scheme for the abolition of sweating in the General Post Office, Sydney?

2. If not, when will the necessary funds be made available?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—In answer to the honorable member's questions, I beg to state—

1. I have no particulars regarding the alleged sweating.

2. Yesterday an application was received by me from the Postal Department for £12,000 for temporary assistance, and I am now considering this application. All that is voted is £9,000 for this purpose, and this sum is in addition to that amount. It is not to be supposed that such unexpected applications for sums not voted by Parliament can be given without due consideration and regard for the Treasurer's Advance Account.

TARIFF.

In Committee of Ways and Means
(Consideration resumed from 3rd December, *vide* page 6967):

Division IX.—Drugs and Chemicals.

Item 273. Acetic Acid, Extract, or Essence of Vinegar:

- (A) Vinegar, standard (as prescribed by Departmental by-laws), the product of malt or grain or fruit juice by alcoholic and acetic fermentation, containing not more than 6 per cent. of absolute Acetic Acid, per gal., 6d.
- (B) Vinegar, not the product of malt or grain or fruit juice, per gal., 2s.
- (C) Solutions, Extracts, or Essences, containing more than 6 per cent. but not more than 30 per cent. of absolute Acetic Acid, per gal., 3s. 6d.
- (D) Solutions, Extracts, or Essences, containing more than 30 per cent. of absolute Acetic Acid, for every extra 10 per cent., or part thereof, per gal., 1s. 3d.
- (E) Acetic Acid, in crystals or powdered form, ad val., 15 per cent.

Mr. LIDDELL (Hunter) [11.7].—I have given notice of an amendment to paragraph A, having for its object the imposition

of the duty recommended by the free-trade section of the Tariff Commission. I therefore move—

That, after the figure "6d.," paragraph A, the words "and on and after 4th December, 1907, ad val., 10 per cent.," be inserted.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. TUDOR (Yarra) [11.8].—Under paragraph B it is proposed to impose a duty of 2s. per gallon on "vinegar not the product of malt or grain or fruit juice." I suppose the object is to prevent the importation of acetic acid vinegar, and while I have no objection to the duty proposed for that purpose I suggest that it might be well later on to consider the advisableness of imposing an Excise duty on vinegar made from acetic acid to check its manufacture here.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume Treasurer) [11.9].—Paragraph E of this item is incorrect and misleading. Acetic acid is not imported in powdered form. Acetates for the manufacture of acetic acid are, however, imported, and I move as an amendment—

That, after the words "15 per cent.," paragraph E, the words "and on and after 4th December, 1907, Acetates for the manufacture of acetic acid, ad val., 15 per cent.," be added.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [11.10].—It seems to me that on the one hand we are trying to check the introduction of vinegar which is supposed to be not as good as is that made from grain, while, on the other, we are proposing to let in at a comparatively low duty that from which the objectionable class of vinegar can be made.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—Acetate is also used for industrial purposes.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—But it may be used for making acetic acid from which the vinegar objected to is produced.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—That can be met only by the imposition of an Excise duty as suggested by the honorable member for Yarra.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I do not know whether the Treasurer intends to take any further step in the matter.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I am making a note of it, and shall consider the question when we revert to the Excise duties.

Mr. SALMON.—The Treasurer will deal with the matter in connexion with the Excise duties?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Yes.

Amendment agreed to.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 274 (Acids) agreed to.

[246]—2

Item 275, Carbonate of Ammonia, per cwt., 5s.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) proposed—

That the following words be added: "and on and after 4th December, 1907, Item 275. Ammonia, viz.:—Carbonate Anhydrous, liquid, muriate, and sulphate, ad val., 15 per cent."

Mr. JOHNSON (Lang) [11.16].—The Treasurer has moved what is an entirely new item, and without any explanation expects the Committee on the spur of the moment to deal with it. I think that he ought to give us some information as to the reason for the alteration.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The item, as it stood, was wrongly worded. The Department has been carefully looking through these items to guard against any mistake, and has submitted this amendment to me.

Mr. JOHNSON.—I suppose that as long as the Department is satisfied the Committee should be satisfied. If that be so, the whole Tariff should be referred to the Department instead of Parliament being asked to deal with it. I should like to know what the proposed *ad valorem* duty is equivalent to.

Mr. FAIRBAIRN (Fawkner) [11.18].—The duty on anhydrous ammonia is equivalent to about 1½d. per lb. Anhydrous ammonia, which is used for refrigerating purposes, was at one time sold at 2s. and 2s. 6d. per lb., but we have now established here two large manufactories, and the price has been reduced to 1s. per lb. The duty proposed is a comparatively small one.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Is this a clear case of where the price has been brought down by a duty?

Mr. FAIRBAIRN.—The honorable member is quite right. The product is made entirely from Australian articles, such as the by-products of the gas companies. The industry is also a big consumer of coal; and the article is made largely from Australian lime. This is a native Australian industry and we are making the product much purer than any which is imported.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [11.22].—Is the duty to be protective, or for revenue purposes? If it is to be protective will 15 per cent. be enough?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The manufacturers are satisfied.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—15 per cent. is only a revenue duty. Is the Minister going to be content with that in the case of

this important and growing industry? My own opinion is that the proposed duty should not be agreed to. The article is manufactured from by-products, and there is abundant evidence that we can make it as cheaply as can anybody else in the world. At any rate, we ought to be able to do so. The item should either be placed on the free list or subjected to a small duty, say of 5 or 10 per cent. If there is to be a protective duty, 15 per cent. is too low. If there is to be a revenue duty, the proposal is too high.

Mr. SALMON (Laanecoorie) [11.24].—Most of these products are waste products, both here and in other parts of the world. There are five manufacturers of them in Australia, and the internal competition is very keen.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Does the honorable member know that we are exporting them?

Mr. SALMON.—I know that these products are being imported, and sold here at a lower price than they are sold at in the Old Land.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—What quantity was imported last year?

Mr. SALMON.—I could not say. Carbonate of ammonia is not made in Australia, yet it was the only one of these articles made dutiable in the Tariff as submitted. I am glad that the Government are prepared to impose a duty on these products. Fifteen per cent. will satisfy the manufacturers and give them the amount of protection necessary to enable them to enter into competition with the importations.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—If they are satisfied with 15 per cent., it is the best of all proofs that the duty is not necessary.

Mr. SALMON.—Hit high or hit low, we cannot satisfy the honorable member. The honorable member uses either argument to suit the particular circumstances of his case. I believe that 15 per cent. is too low, and am prepared to vote for 30 per cent.

Mr. PAGE.—I will do so if the industry is established.

Mr. SALMON.—It is established.

Mr. PAGE.—Then I will vote for 30 per cent.

Mr. SALMON.—The Australian manufacturers have to compete against products dumped from other parts of the world, which are really the waste products of large manufactories. It pays the manufacturer to send them to Australia for

much less than they are being sold for in the Old Country. I believe the Committee will be prepared to agree to a higher duty than 15 per cent.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [11.27].—Before I vote I want to know from the Minister whether this is to be a protective or revenue duty?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [11.28].—The honorable member has asked the question in a tricky way. I do not consider that 15 per cent in this case is a true protective duty, but I have letters from those interested to say that they will be quite satisfied with 15 per cent. Why, then, should I propose more? If I had proposed 30 per cent. the honorable member would have jumped over the table at me.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [11.29].—The honorable member need not try to pose before people in Melbourne. I know him of old, and his prowess in that direction. Is the new protection to apply to these manufacturers? We are told that the industry is flourishing, that the works are multiplying throughout Australia, and producing an exceedingly good article, which is much superior, according to the honorable member for Fawcner, to the imported. The manufacturers are able to compete with the imported article, and even to invade foreign markets. Even protectionists believe that when there is a considerable export business, import duties are no longer effective. Here we have a case in which, apparently, the Australian product can compete successfully with the product of the world, and yet manufacturers ask for a duty, which, of course, cannot be protective.

Mr. SALMON.—The duty is to prevent dumping.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The honorable member has been challenged as to the exports, and he evidently knows nothing about the matter.

Mr. SALMON.—This product is being sold in Australia to-day at a lower price than that at which it is sold in the Old Country.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Does not that afford the best proof that no duty is required? If, in spite of this "dumping," the local industry is flourishing, why impose a duty?

Mr. SALMON.—If the home market be taken away, the industry might just as well cease at once.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—It seems to me that the manufacturers ask for the duty for the sole purpose of putting it into their own pockets.

Mr. FAIRBAIRN.—No; there is undue competition at the present time, and prices are abnormally low.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Then I understand that the object of the duty is to raise prices?

Mr. FAIRBAIRN.—Yes; I suppose so— to enable the manufacturers to carry on the industry.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Now we know from the frank statement of the honorable member that the real object of the duty is to increase prices.

Mr. FAIRBAIRN.—Otherwise the factories must close.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The honorable member is departing from the usual protectionist argument that duties cheapen prices. I decline to be a party to putting up prices in view of the present prosperous condition of the industry.

Amendment agreed to.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 276 (Carbonic Acid Gas) agreed to.

Item 277. Carbide of calcium, ad val. (General Tariff), 10 per cent.; (United Kingdom) free.

Mr. GLYNN (Angas) [11.35].—This item ought to be made absolutely free. When the first Commonwealth Tariff was submitted, the proposal was to impose a duty of 20 per cent., but, after discussion, it was decided to make the item free. The official statistics show what the proposed preference to the United Kingdom is worth. The total imports from the United Kingdom last year were represented by £1,469, while the imports from foreign countries were represented by £63,132. Carbide of calcium is used for the manufacture of acetylene gas, which is the illuminant of many country people; and the duty simply means additional taxation to the extent of £6,300 per annum. I think I need say no more in favour of the suggestion that the item should be absolutely free.

Mr. EDWARDS (Oxley) [11.36].—Under the old Tariff, as the honorable member for Angas has pointed out, carbide of calcium was free; and I think the Treasurer might give some reason for the proposed duty of 10 per cent.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [11.37].—The duty of 10 per cent. is imposed in consequence of representations made from persons in Queensland,

who have entered into some arrangement with the State Government for the supply of motive power from Barron Falls. These people propose to manufacture carbide of calcium, and, as I say, it is in consequence of their representations that the duty is proposed.

Mr. EDWARDS (Oxley) [11.38].—I am much obliged to the Treasurer for condescending to give the Committee information which he should have afforded at the outset. However, I place no value on the information—I take it for just what it is worth. Carbide of calcium ought to be placed on the same footing as kerosene, because it is used as an illuminant mainly by country people.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—If the honorable member does not wish a duty to be imposed, I have no desire to press the matter.

Mr. EDWARDS.—My intention is to move that carbide of calcium be placed on the free list.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I accept the suggestion.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That after the words “10 per cent.” the words “and on and after 4th December, 1907 (General Tariff), free,” be inserted.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 278. Drugs and Chemicals, viz. :—

(A) Salicylic and boric acids and other food preservatives n.e.i.; salicylate of soda; sulphites and bisulphites of potassium; bisulphite of sodium, calcium, and magnesium; and foaming powders and liquids, including Malto-Peptide Yeast Food, Yeast Food Preservatives, Yeast Nourishment, Quillaya Bark, Saponarias, Glycyrrhizin and its compounds, ad val. (General Tariff) 25 per cent.; (United Kingdom) 20 per cent.

(B) Saccharin and other similar substitutes for Sugar, and substances capable of conversion into such substitutes for Sugar; when imported for medicinal purposes only, in accordance with Departmental By-law, in packages of not less than 11 lb. weight, per lb., 30s.

Mr. LIDDELL (Hunter) [11.42].—I fail to see why it is proposed to levy a duty of 25 per cent. upon the articles enumerated in paragraph A of this item, seeing that the protectionist section of the Tariff Commission recommended a duty of only 20 per cent.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Only 20 per cent. is proposed under the Tariff for the United Kingdom.

Mr. LIDDELL.—I should like to see 20 per cent. imposed under the General Tariff, and these articles admitted free from the United Kingdom. Take, for

example. quillaya bark. It is not grown in the Commonwealth. It is used principally for promoting the growth of hair. It may be used in the raw state by simply soaking it in warm water. When rubbed upon the bald pate, it has a tendency to make the hair grow. A considerable quantity of it is imported from America. Then salicylate of soda is a drug which is used in the treatment of rheumatic fever. Why should persons who are suffering from illness be taxed upon the drugs that they require to use?

Mr. WILSON.—The old rate was 20 per cent.

Mr. WATSON.—The honorable member wishes to reduce the duty levied under the old Tariff.

Mr. LIDDELL.—Honorable members who claim to represent the workers ought to recognise how important it is that the masses should be permitted to obtain their drugs cheaply. I move—

That, after the words "25 per cent." paragraph A, the words, "and on and after 4th December, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 20 per cent.," be inserted.

Question put. The Committee divided.

Ayes	14
Noes	35
Majority	21

AYES.

Atkinson, L.
Brown, Thomas
Catts, J. H.
Cook, Joseph
Edwards, R.
Glynn, P. McM.
Livingston, J.
McWilliams, W. J.

Smith, Bruce
Thomas, J.
Thomson, Dugald
Wilks, W. H.

Tellers:

Johnson, W. E.
Liddell, F.

NOES.

Bamford, F. W.
Batchelor, E. L.
Chapman, Austin
Coon, J.
Deakin, A.
Ewing, T. T.
Fisher, A.
Forrest, Sir John
Foster, F. J.
Fowler, J. M.
Frazer, C. E.
Groom, L. E.
Hedges, W. N.
Knox, W.
Lyne, Sir William
Maloney, W. R. N.
Mathews, J.
Mauger, S.

McDougall, J. K.
O'Malley, King
Page, J.
Palmer, A. C.
Poynton, A.
Quick, Sir John
Salmon, C. C.
Sampson, S.
Storrer, D.
Tudor, F. G.
Watkins, D.
Watson, J. C.
Webster, W.
Wilson, J. G.
Wise, G. H.
Tellers:
Cook, Hume
Thomson, John.

PAIRS.

Kelly, W. H.
Mahon, H.
Reid, G. H.
Fysh, Sir Philip
Archer, E. W.
Brown, Tilley
Bowden, E. K.
Fuller, G. W.
Willis, Henry

Kingston, C. C.
Hutchison, J.
Hall, D. R.
Harper, R.
Crouch, R. A.
Chanter, J. M.
Carr, E. S.
Fairbairn, G.
Foxton, Colonel.

Question so resolved in the negative.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. POYNTON (Grey) [11.53].—I move—

That the words "when imported for medicinal purposes only," paragraph B, be left out.

I point out that under the old Tariff the duty on saccharin was 550 times the duty on sugar, being equal to 30s. per lb.; but under this Tariff its use is prohibited except for medicinal purposes. I desire to elicit the reasons why the Government have submitted this proposal.

Mr. SALMON.—For Queensland reasons also.

Mr. POYNTON.—I think so, too. Some time ago a petition was presented to the Treasurer from the aerated water makers and brewers of non-intoxicating ales. It reads as follows—

We, the undersigned aerated water makers and brewers of non-intoxicant ales, desire to respectfully and urgently bring before the notice of you and your Government the hardships entailed on us by the prohibition of the importation of saccharin into the Commonwealth (for other than medicinal purposes). The endorsements of the medical profession show the properties of saccharin to be innocuous to man, only the mere fact of its having no food value can be advanced against its use. We do not pretend to sell our goods for their food value, though the sweetening properties of our aerated waters contain two-thirds sugar. Saccharin has been of inestimable value to us in lessening the risks of fermentation in aerated waters, and in keeping the spirit in non-intoxicating beers down to the 2 per cent. limit allowed by the Excise. To prohibit its importation means the total extinction of the non-alcoholic ale industry, it being impossible to keep within the limits of the Excise by the use of sugar only.

As a matter of fact it is claimed by all the manufacturers that they cannot produce tonic ales with less than 2 per cent. of alcohol if they have to use sugar only. What they do is to use two-thirds of sugar and one-third of saccharin, and the result is that they can keep the intoxicant percentage down to that which is prescribed by the Excise law. In a report, Mr. P. Wilkinson, the Victorian Government analyst, had made this statement—

Stringent prohibitions of the use of any saccharin in any food or beverage under extremely

heavy penalties are now in force in Great Britain.

In respect of that statement by Mr. Wilkinson, the petitioners say—

This is absolutely incorrect. Saccharin is prohibited in Great Britain in beer for revenue purposes, but is used freely, and to an enormous extent, in other beverages, mineral waters especially, and no case of any trouble through its use has been recorded here. It is quite harmless.

In proof of their contention, the petitioners cite an expert opinion by Thomas Stevenson, M.D., F.R.C.P., London, lecturer on forensic medicine and chemistry at Guy's Hospital, and Official Analyst to the Home Office. He says—

Saccharin is quite innocuous when taken in quantities largely exceeding what would be taken in any ordinary dietary. It does not interfere with or impede the digestive processes when taken in any practicable quantity. Our personal experience is that saccharin may be taken for an extended period without interfering with the digestive or other bodily functions; hence there is no reason to think that its continued use is in any way harmful.

The *Medical Press* of the 31st October, 1888, states that "saccharin is perfectly wholesome"; while Dr. T. Lauder Brunton declares that "saccharin has no injurious action in man." I have a list containing the names of scores of medical men of high repute who all claim that the use of saccharin is not injurious. I may mention that in the case of certain diseases it is prescribed because it is better than sugar for sweetening purposes. My object is to elicit the reason why the Government have taken this extreme step, because so far as I can see it is not warranted by any statement in the evidence given before the Tariff Commission.

Mr. TUDOR.—No evidence was given on this matter, except on behalf of the Department.

Mr. POYNTON.—No. If this high duty is imposed in the interests of the Colonial Sugar Refining Company, the Committee ought to be made acquainted with the fact. If the use of the article is injurious to health, we ought at least to be furnished by the Government with convincing testimony.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [12.0].—The reasons given for the proposed duty are these—

The limitations made by this item are identical with those framed and gazetted on the 11th December, 1906. The object is to place limitations on the use of saccharin, which is not viewed with favour by the medical faculty. The use of saccharin in the preparation of foods, cordials, &c., is prohibited in some States. The

importation of saccharin is forbidden except for medical purposes. The Tariff Commission is very strong against its use, and the duty is their recommendation. Its use is said to be very deleterious in many cases, and the local Acts of some of the States forbid its use. The health authorities are against it, and the duty is no doubt prohibitive.

I hope there will not be a long debate on the subject.

Mr. HEDGES.—Give way.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Why should I give way if this statement is true?

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—If that statement is true the Minister ought to go further.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The proposed duty is prohibitive.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—No, it is not.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I have this feeling about the matter—that it might reasonably be left to be dealt with by the States. If in some States the use of saccharin has been prohibited under local Acts, I do not see why we should waste time in discussing it, or take the responsibility for the exclusion of saccharin upon our shoulders. Attention will be drawn to the subject by the debate which we have had to-day, and the reasons for the proposed duty will be made known. Personally, I do not feel disposed to occupy much time about it, and if there is any serious objection to the proposed duty I will strike it out, leaving the States to deal with the matter. That seems to be the fairest thing to do. The information that the proposed duty would be prohibitive comes from the head of the Department.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The duty would be prohibitive for certain purposes, but not for others.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The proposal is to admit saccharin for medicinal purposes only under departmental regulations.

Mr. LIDDELL.—If it is prohibited under the Tariff, it can be manufactured in the country.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I am disposed to strike out the provision rather than waste further time in discussing it.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [12.5].—As the honorable member for Grey has shown, there are two widely different opinions amongst medical authorities as to the wholesomeness, or otherwise, of saccharin.

Mr. FISHER.—They all agree that it is not a food.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—It is not a food, but certain manufacturers have

found it desirable to use it in very small quantities in order to prevent the fermentation which often takes place if sugar is used, and which imparts alcohol to beverages. In some States the importation of saccharin has been interfered with really on the ground that its consumption reduces the quantity of sugar used; though that cannot be the case to any considerable extent. If its use is deleterious, we should be still admitting it for human consumption under the proposal of the Government. A duty of 30s. per lb., while it excludes saccharin for manufacturing purposes—for use in aerated waters, for instance—would not exclude it for consumption medicinally.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I will strike out the provision.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—But what about the prohibition of importation?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—That is a matter for the Department to deal with.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Saccharin is often used for putting in tea instead of sugar.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—What I suggest would be that the States should make their own regulations for the use of saccharin under their Pure Food Acts, and that the Department should do what the States desire to be done, unless there is a serious reason for doing otherwise.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The Minister would allow saccharin to be imported for human use in the way in which possibly it is most largely consumed. A man who takes saccharin with every cup of tea he drinks consumes infinitely more than he would do by drinking occasionally aerated waters. So that taken in the form in which its consumption would be largest and most deleterious it is proposed to admit it; because the duty of 30s. per lb. would not exclude saccharin for use in that form. The position is absolutely illogical. The aerated water manufacturers would be prohibited from using it on account of its price, but people could still consume it as a substitute for sugar under doctors' orders.

Mr. SALMON.—Doctors are allowed to prescribe arsenic.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—We do not exclude arsenic for manufacturing purposes. It is put in proprietary medicines. It would be absurd to exclude arsenic from being used by manufacturers of medicines, and still allow it to come in for personal consumption.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I have no doubt that a proclamation can be framed which will prohibit saccharin for use in certain cases, and admit it for use in certain other cases.

Mr. GLYNN (Angas) [12.9].—I am glad that the Minister has promised to allow the duty on saccharin to be struck out. The States can do whatever may be necessary. It seems to be fairly well established that saccharin is innocuous, but if it is not the States can pass the necessary legislation to prohibit its use. In any case, if we prohibited its importation we could not stop the English firm which manufactures and exports it from establishing a branch for its manufacture here. So that we might still have it used in mineral waters even if we prohibited its importation. I draw attention to a case which occurred in England in which it seems to have been shown that where the strength of saccharin was lower than 330 above the strength of sugar, it was not saccharin within the meaning of the Finance Act 1901. I draw attention to this decision in view of the possibility of the importation of saccharin being regulated by the Customs Department. As the matter stands now, saccharin seems to be a constituent which is 550 above the strength of sugar. In England it has been decided that saccharin is not saccharin unless it is over 330 and anything up to 550. It has been held that a substance possessing a sweetness of 329 is not saccharin. Therefore it is possible that, if paragraph B is not struck out, an inferior class of saccharin will be imported, notwithstanding our attempt to prohibit its importation. The matter was gone into thoroughly in the case of *McNicol v. Pinch*, 2 Q. B. R. 1906.

Mr. LIDDELL (Hunter) [12.11].—It seems to me that the action of the Minister will lead to the absolute prohibition of the importation of saccharin.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—No. Saccharin for medicinal purposes may be allowed to come in free under departmental by-laws.

Mr. LIDDELL.—But saccharin is used in the manufacture of aerated waters. Although the Minister has declared that the use of saccharin is injurious to health, the Victorian Pure Foods Act allows it to be used in the making of aerated waters, which honorable members, since most of them are teetotallers, should encourage. It is hardly fair that it should go abroad that saccharin is a harmful substance. After the most careful investigations, Drs. Stevenson and

Woolridge stated, in an article which appeared in the *Lancet* on the 17th November, 1888, that they had proved conclusively that—

Saccharin is quite innocuous when taken in quantities largely exceeding what would be taken in any ordinary dietary; saccharin does not interfere with or impede the digestive processes when taken in any practicable quantity; and our personal experience is that saccharin may be taken for an extended period without interfering with the digestive and other bodily functions. Hence there is no reason to think that its continued use is in any way harmful.

In certain diseases saccharin is prescribed by the medical profession to take the place of sugar, and, in my opinion, it has been maligned by the Treasurer.

Mr. FISHER (Wide Bay) [12.15].—Although the statement has been made that it is desirable to impose a duty on saccharin to protect the sugar industry, I do not support it on that ground. But there is no warrant for maintaining that saccharin is a food. Unless it is diluted before being taken, it is a very unwholesome product, in fact, dangerous if consumed in its raw state. But if saccharin were allowed to be imported freely, it would be used by unscrupulous manufacturers, not only in the making of aerated water, but also in the making of sweetmeats, to the injury of the health of the youth of Australia.

Mr. LIDDELL.—That is a matter for the health authorities of the States. The use of saccharin is allowed under the Victorian Pure Foods Act, and in South Australia.

Mr. FISHER.—Saccharin has such high sweetening qualities, that if it can be bought at rates which make it cheaper to use than sugar having the same sweetening equivalent it will be substituted for sugar, and the onus of making continual analyses to protect the youth of Australia from harmful adulteration will be thrown on the health authorities. We ought not to allow saccharin to be admitted duty free.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—Saccharin is used largely in the making of infants' foods.

Mr. FISHER.—It should be used with great care, and under proper supervision. If it can be obtained cheaply, unscrupulous persons will use it, to the danger of the public health. I do not oppose the proposition of the Treasurer, but I shall not be surprised if future Parliaments find it necessary to impose a prohibitory duty on saccharin.

Mr. POYNTON (Grey) [12.18].—I wish to move to strike out the words

“when imported for medical purposes, in accordance with departmental by-laws.”

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I think it would be better to strike out paragraph B.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Move to make saccharin free.

Mr. POYNTON.—I do not wish to do that. At present the uncertainty in connexion with the matter is seriously interfering with business. If the words which I propose are struck out, saccharin will be dutiable at 30s. per lb. I do not know what would be the effect of leaving out paragraph B.

Mr. SALMON.—The State authorities would be responsible for seeing that saccharin is not improperly used.

Mr. BATCHELOR (Boothby) [12.20].—I should like to know from the Treasurer what he proposes to do by proclamation. The Committee wishes to be sure that the importation of saccharin for use for certain purposes will not be prohibited.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—No, the proclamation will provide for its use under departmental by-laws. I have just consulted the Comptroller-General, who says that that can be done under the Customs Act.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [12.21].—Apart from any specific item in the Tariff, the Customs authorities have been in the habit of collecting a duty of 30s. per lb. on saccharin, on the ground that it is a substitute for, and a competitor with, sugar. They have a right to do that. This item merely proposes to crystallize or legalize the departmental practice.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—It does a great deal more.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—The first part of paragraph B does not do so.

Mr. GLYNN.—I think that the Department, under proclamation, can stop the importation of saccharin.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—I do not think it is necessary to absolutely prohibit its importation. It is used for some industrial purposes, but I am clearly of opinion that as a food product it is highly objectionable.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The Department can, by proclamation, prohibit its general importation, but allow it to be imported for certain purposes.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—That is true. I would point out that we must have an import duty on saccharin, since it is proposed to have an Excise duty of £5 per ton upon it. I object to paragraph B being struck out, although I should not object to the

omission of the words "when imported for medicinal purposes only." We must have an import duty on saccharin to regulate its importation, and also an Excise duty, otherwise we should have a wholesale production and consumption of this objectionable article, without any State regulation.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [12.23].—I disagree with the honorable member for Bendigo. There is no necessity to impose a duty on saccharin if it does not serve a useful purpose. Departmental by-laws can be made to meet the conditions. If we wish to prevent the wholesale manufacture of saccharin in Australia, we can impose an Excise without an import duty.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—Why should it not carry an import duty?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Many honorable members say they do not desire an import duty to be imposed, and that saccharin should be imported only under departmental by-laws. I have made a suggestion with a view to shortening the debate, but the Committee seemingly is not prepared to meet me.

Mr. FRAZER.—Why should not the duty be fixed by Parliament and not by proclamation?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The duty cannot be fixed by proclamation.

Mr. FRAZER.—The importation of saccharin could be prohibited by proclamation.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Yes; and even if we adopted the honorable member's suggestion, the importation of saccharin could be prohibited under the Customs Act.

Mr. FRAZER.—But the item would indicate the duty that would be collected on saccharin if it were admitted.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Quite so; but there is a strong feeling that it would be a good thing to prohibit its importation except under departmental by-laws. If I had my way, I would not allow it to come in, because I think that it is a very dangerous food product.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—Leave something to the States.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I am prepared to do so, but my experience on this occasion should be a lesson to me not to try again to meet the wishes of the Committee.

Mr. FISHER.—Why not leave out the words "when imported for medicinal purposes only"?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I am not particular; I would rather strike out the whole

item. I certainly do not wish the day to be wasted in dealing with it, but if it be the desire of the Committee, I will agree to the words just mentioned being struck out.

Mr. GLYNN (Angas) [12.25].—On consideration, I think that it would be well to adopt the method suggested by the honorable member for Grey. In England the local manufacture of saccharin is regulated under the Finance Act of 1901. Its regulation here must necessarily be in the hands of the Commonwealth authorities because otherwise one State might prohibit the use of saccharin in the manufacture of aerated waters, whilst another might have no such prohibition, and we should thus have a most invidious distinction between State and State. Let us retain the duty, strike out the words "except when imported for medicinal purposes only," and then under the Excise provisions we shall be able to regulate the production of saccharin just as it is done in England.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [12.27].—Is it proposed to allow the paragraph to stand, subject to the removal of these words?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Yes.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I think that there is an objection to the duty. I would far sooner leave the matter to the Minister, who has pledged himself to consult the health authorities of the States. The proper course would be to strike out the whole item, leaving the Minister, in conjunction with the health authorities of the States, to regulate the local production of saccharin.

Amendment agreed to.

Question—That the item, as amended, be agreed to—put.

Division called for.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—By leave we withdraw our call for a division.

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—I object.

The CHAIRMAN.—There being no tellers for the noes, the question is resolved in the affirmative.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 279. Cresylic acid, crude creosote oil and tar oil; saponaceous mixture of creosote; carbolic acid, per gal., 6d.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [12.35].—The position at present is that disinfectants are allowed in free, and this duty is a charge upon the raw materials. I therefore move—

That the words "and on and after 4th December, 1907, free," be added.

Amendment agreed to.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That the following new item be inserted—

“279A. Crude Naphthaline, on and after 4th December, 1907, free.”

Item 280. Naphthaline, ad val., 25 per cent.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) proposed—

That after the word “Naphthaline,” the letters “n.e.i.” be inserted.

Mr. LIDDELL.—What is the explanation?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—This will cover everything but crude naphthaline, which we had made free.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [12.38].—The Treasurer proposes a duty of 25 per cent. on naphthaline, which under the old Tariff was admitted free, and the honorable gentleman has given no reason for the increase.

Mr. SAMPSON.—It is in the Tariff Commission's report.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—We should have some reasons given for the acceptance of the Tariff Commission's recommendation.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—As I have told the honorable member before, I have followed as far as I could the recommendations of the Tariff Commission.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The honorable gentleman has frequently departed from them. I want to know the reason of the increase. Is the article made here? Is the duty needed? Is there to be any preference given in this instance?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—In this case, I do not propose any preference.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Why not?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I went through my catechism when a boy.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The honorable gentleman seems to have forgotten it since. As we can get no information from him on the subject, perhaps the Chairman of the Tariff Commission will explain why there should be a duty of 25 per cent. imposed on this article, which was previously admitted duty free.

Mr. LIDDELL (Hunter) [12.40].—I was under the impression that naphthaline was to be admitted duty free. It is used in connexion with one of our best manufactures. It is essential to the development of the leather industry.

Mr. WATSON.—Why?

Mr. LIDDELL.—Because it is used in the preservation of hides.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The naphthaline made here can be used for that purpose just as well as the imported naphthaline.

Mr. LIDDELL.—I have it on the best authority that it cannot be made here, and that it is necessary that it should be admitted duty free in the interests of the leather industry.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [12.42].—This question was brought under the attention of the Tariff Commission, and on the evidence of Mr. Dearman, a New South Wales witness, we found that—

An unsuccessful attempt was made in New South Wales to produce refined coal tar naphtha as a solvent for the use of india-rubber manufactures. There is plenty of the crude article available, but owing to the small duty, viz. :— $\frac{1}{4}$ d. per gallon, it was found impossible to compete with the English solvent naphtha, which is sold at 3s. 1d. per gallon.

Those are the grounds on which we recommended the duty; it was done at the express request of a New South Wales witness.

Mr. WILSON (Corangamite) [12.43].—I can see no necessity for this duty. The crude naphthaline is to be admitted duty free, and as there may be something in the manufacture of preparations of naphthaline from the crude material, a duty of 15 per cent. should be quite sufficient.

Mr. CARR (Macquarie) [12.44].—I wish to combat the statement that naphthaline is not produced here. Naphthaline and benzine are produced in large quantities at the refinery works of the Commonwealth Oil Company, near Lithgow. In the course of a few days I shall have samples here of all the oils manufactured by the company. Perhaps the Minister would postpone the item in the meantime.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—No.

Mr. CARR.—Then I merely wish to say that if it were postponed I should be able to furnish ample evidence that naphthaline is manufactured in Australia in hundreds of gallons.

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment (by Mr. WILSON) put—

That the words “and on and after 4th December, 1907, ad val., 15 per cent.” be added.

The Committee divided.

Ayes	20
Noes	33

AYES.

Archer, E. W.
Atkinson, L.
Bowden, E. K.
Brown, Thomas
Cook, Joseph
Fisher, A.
Fysh, Sir Philip
Glynn, P. McM.
Hughes, W. M.
Irvine, Hans
Knox, W.

Livingston, J.
McWilliams, W. J.
Poynton, A.
Thomson, Dugald
Wilks, W. H.
Willis, Henry
Wilson, J. G.

Tellers:

Johnson, W. E.
Liddell, F.

NOES.

Bamford, F. W.
Batchelor, E. L.
Carr, E. S.
Catts, J. H.
Chapman, Austin
Coon, J.
Deakin, A.
Ewing, T. T.
Forrest, Sir John
Foster, F. J.
Frazer, C. E.
Groom, L. E.
Hedges, W. N.
Lyne, Sir William
Maloney, W. R. N.
Mathews, J.
Mauger, S.

O'Malley, King
Page, J.
Palmer, A. C.
Quick, Sir John
Salmon, C. C.
Sampson, S.
Spence, W. G.
Storror, D.
Thomas, J.
Thomson, John
Tudor, F. G.
Watson, J. C.
Webster, W.
Wise, G. H.

Tellers:

Cook, Hume
McDougall, J. K.

Question so resolved in the negative.

Amendment negatived.

Amendment (by Mr. JOSEPH COOK)

put—

That after the words "25 per cent." the words
"and on and after 4th December, 1907, ad val.
(United Kingdom), 20 per cent.," be added.

The Committee divided.

Ayes	23
Noes	28

Majority	5
----------	-----	-----	---

AYES.

Archer, E. W.
Atkinson, L.
Bowden, E. K.
Brown, Thomas
Cook, Joseph
Forrest, Sir John
Frazer, C. E.
Fysh, Sir Philip
Glynn, P. McM.
Hedges, W. N.
Irvine, Hans
Knox, W.

Livingston, J.
McWilliams, W. J.
Palmer, A. C.
Poynton, A.
Thomas, J.
Thomson, Dugald
Wilks, W. H.
Willis, Henry
Wilson, J. G.

Tellers:

Johnson, W. E.
Liddell, F.

NOES.

Bamford, F. W.
Batchelor, E. L.
Carr, E. S.
Chapman, Austin
Coon, J.
Deakin, A.
Ewing, T. T.
Fisher, A.
Foster, F. J.
Groom, L. E.
Lyne, Sir William
Maloney, W. R. N.
Mathews, J.
Mauger, S.
McDougall, J. K.

O'Malley, King
Page, J.
Quick, Sir John
Salmon, C. C.
Sampson, S.
Spence, W. G.
Storror, D.
Thomson, John
Tudor, F. G.
Watson, J. C.
Wise, G. H.

Tellers:

Catts, J. H.
Cook, Hume

PAIRS.

Brown, Tilley
Fuller, G. W.
Reid, G. H.
Mahon, H.
Kelly, W. H.
Smith, Bruce
Fowler, J. M.
Fairbairn, G.

Chanter, J. M.
Crouch, R. A.
Hall, D. R.
Hutchison, J.
Kingston, C. C.
Harper, R.
Watkins, D.
Webster, W.

Question so resolved in the negative.

Amendment negatived.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 281. Cyanide of potassium, free.

Mr. FRAZER (Kalgoorlie) [12.55].—I move—

That after the word "potassium" the words
"sodium, and bromide salts," be inserted.

All those things are used in the one process. The cyanide of sodium would not be distinguishable from the cyanide of potassium, and I understand that the bromide salts are used to liven up the solution when it is beginning to get "dead."

Amendment agreed to.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 282 (Voltoids of sal-ammoniac), agreed to.

Item 283. Insecticides, sheep washes, and disinfectants, n.e.i.—free.

Mr. MATHEWS (Melbourne Ports) [12.57].—I should like the Minister to agree to place a duty on disinfectants, such as phenyles and other liquid preparations. So much tar is produced here in the gas-works that a lot of it is buried. We have hardly attempted the manufacture of all the by-products of tar.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Where do they bury the tar?

Mr. MATHEWS.—I do not say that that is being done at present, but it has been practically given away in Victoria. A duty might also be placed on liquid sheep washes, sheep-branding preparations, and insecticides. A number of powders are also used, including carbolic preparations.

Sitting suspended from 1 to 2.15 p.m.

Mr. MATHEWS.—As I was saying prior to the adjournment for lunch, large quantities of these phenyles, sheep dips, and disinfectants generally are used in Australia; and I have all the effrontery of a protectionist when I state that since the commencement of the local manufacture, prices have been considerably reduced. What I suggest is that cresylic acid, crude creosote oil, tar oil, and carbolic acid

should be free; that phenyles, liquid disinfectants, liquid sheep-washes, insecticides, sheep-branding preparations, and saponaceous mixture of creosote should bear a duty of 2s. per gallon; and that a new item, consisting of powder or paste sheep-dips and carbolic powder preparations, be made dutiable at 10s. per 100 lbs.

Mr. LIVINGSTON (Barker) [2.17].—I hope that the Treasurer will not make the alteration suggested in the item under discussion.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Why not?

Mr. LIVINGSTON.—Under the old Tariff this item was free, and the Treasurer must know that more sheep dip is used in Australia than, perhaps, in any other part of the world. In South Australia it is compulsory to dip sheep once a year, or, perhaps, twice a year, according to the discretion of the inspector. I am sure that the Treasurer, who is familiar with all matters connected with stock, would not do anything to injure or hamper those more particularly interested.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Does not the honorable member think that all articles of this class should be manufactured in Australia?

Mr. LIVINGSTON.—I repeat that under the old Tariff this item was free; and we all know that every farmer keeps sheep.

Mr. MATHEWS.—What would this small duty mean to a farmer?

Mr. LIVINGSTON.—It might mean a good deal. There are not only farmers, but poultry-keepers, sheep-raisers, and owners of horses, to be considered.

Mr. TUDOR (Yarra) [2.20].—I desire to read the following letter from Dr. Bull, of the Melbourne University—

Bacteriological Laboratory,
The University of Melbourne,
14th October, 1907.

S. J. Wiltshire, Esq.,

Dear Sir,—I have tested the disinfectant strength of your phenyle, and certify that, under the standard laboratory conditions, the bacillus of typhoid fever was destroyed in five minutes in a dilution of one part phenyle to 150 parts of water. The phenyle is, therefore, three times as potent as carbolic acid (Schering's).

I have here also another certificate by Dr. Bull, which appears on the circular of Messrs. Morris, Little, & Son, the proprietors of Little's phenyle, as follows:—

I have tested the disinfectant strength of a sample of Little's soluble phenyle forwarded by you. I certify that, under standard laboratory conditions, the disinfectant destroyed the bacillus of typhoid fever in five minutes in a dilution of 1 in 300 of distilled water. The details are

appended in the table, from which it will be noticed that your disinfectant proved half as strong again as carbolic acid.

It will be seen from these two certificates that Australian phenyle is twice as strong as the imported phenyle.

Mr. HANS IRVINE.—There are other sheep dips than that of Messrs. Morris, Little, & Son.

Mr. TUDOR.—And there are more Australian sheep dips than that of Mr. Wiltshire. I have quoted one Australian phenyle as against one imported phenyle, and have shown that the Australian article is twice as strong as the imported article. I trust that the Treasurer will insist on a duty being imposed. Manufacturers of these dips and disinfectants will have to pay a duty on their bottles and packages, and observe Australian conditions of labour; and I trust to see this industry firmly established.

Mr. SALMON (Laanecoorie) [2.21].—I should like to read a Sydney analysis of Australian sheep dip as compared with Quibell's dip. It is as follows—

We hand you the analysis, made by Mr. C. A. Burnet, of Quibell's sheep dip, Little's phenyle, and our "Triumph" brand of sheep dip, and "Triumph" phenyle:—

<i>Little's Phenyle.</i>	<i>Quibell's Sheep Dip.</i>
Tar oil, 40 per cent.	Tar oil, 30 per cent.
Water, 40 per cent.	Carbolic acid, 15 per cent.
Soda, 6 per cent.	Soda, 7 per cent.
Resin, 14 per cent.	Water, 32 per cent.
	Resin, 16 per cent.
<i>Burnet's Triumph Sheep Dip.</i>	<i>Burnet's Phenyle.</i>
Carbolic acid, 18 per cent.	Tar oil, 25 per cent.
Tar oil, 33 per cent.	Carbolic acid, 15 per cent.
Water, 23 per cent.	Water, 34 per cent.
Soda, 8 per cent.	Soda, 8 per cent.
Resin, 18 per cent.	Resin, 18 per cent.

Sheep dip is imported in a concentrated form, and water has to be added after its arrival; but the importer is so anxious about the welfare of the community that a certain percentage of water is added before its arrival. Honorable members should be made aware that, not only in Victoria, but in other States, there is being manufactured sheep dip which will compare most favorably with the imported article. Honorable members may ask why the local producers do not obtain the whole of the trade. The reason is simply because, like other Australian manufacturers, they have to compete not only against enormous capital, but also against enormous prejudice. As a matter of fact, it

is prejudice which prevents the local manufacturers obtaining the market. Only a little while ago, £10,000 worth of sheep dip was landed here at something like one-third below ordinary cost.

Mr. PAGE.—What does the honorable member mean by "ordinary cost"—the selling price?

Mr. SALMON.—Yes; the ordinary selling price.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—How many times has that been done?

Mr. SALMON.—That is one case.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—One case, and, therefore, a duty for ever!

Mr. SALMON.—I am giving a specific case. The importer, by reason of his greater capital, is able to employ large numbers of advertising agents; and it is in this connexion that the local manufacturer is seriously crippled. The latter has not the capital at his command necessary to send agents throughout the length and breadth of the country; and we all know that orders are generally secured by travellers who personally call on the squatters and farmers.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Surely the local manufacturer can pay a commission to travellers?

Mr. SALMON.—The local manufacturer cannot afford to pay anything like the commission that is allowed by the importer. Travellers are either paid salary and commission, or commission only; and the person who is able to send out large numbers of travellers is able to compete successfully against the man who has to depend on ordinary newspaper advertising. This industry has already been established in Australia; and, as pointed out by the honorable member for Yarra, those engaged in it have to pay duty on the bottles and tins they use.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Tin is free.

Mr. SALMON.—I am glad to hear it.

Mr. LIVINGSTON.—It is strange that those engaged in the industry did not ask the Tariff Commission for any assistance.

Mr. SALMON.—I do not think that the honorable member is quite correct in his suggestion. At any rate, those engaged in the industry have appealed to me, and to this Committee, for assistance, seeing that they have sent circulars to honorable members.

Mr. LIVINGSTON.—I did not get a circular.

Mr. SALMON.—Perhaps they knew from the honorable member's predilections that

he was not likely to be favorable. It is true that the duty has been taken off a portion of the raw material of this industry to the extent of 6d. per gallon; but that is a small matter when we consider what is necessary in the manufacture of disinfectants.

Mr. LIDDELL.—Is the honorable member advocating a duty on disinfectants?

Mr. SALMON.—Yes.

Mr. LIDDELL.—I am surprised at the honorable member.

Mr. SALMON.—Of course the honorable member is surprised, though he ought not to be, when we recollect that the local production is equal, if not superior, to the imported article. It is only because of prejudice on the part of people like the honorable member that the local manufacturers are unable to secure the market to which they are entitled. I hope the Committee will agree to a reasonable duty.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [2.28].—The Tariff Commission, in their report, say—

A firm in New South Wales, it was stated, was prepared to largely manufacture a valuable sheep dip from saponaceous mixture of creosote, provided that adequate protection was provided. This sheep dip is produced on a very limited scale at present.

The evidence as it stood was very meagre; and, therefore, we did not feel justified in recommending a duty. I have no hesitation, however, in saying that if the information now laid before honorable members had been available to the Tariff Commission a duty would have been recommended. I find that not only are these disinfectants made in New South Wales, but that there are nineteen manufacturers in Victoria.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—There are two manufacturers in South Australia.

Mr. LIVINGSTON.—Did the South Australian manufacturers approach the Tariff Commission?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—No; but had they done so their case would have been given favorable consideration. In view of the new information available, I shall support the Treasurer if he proposes a duty.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS (Robertson) [2.30].—From the arguments which have been advanced, it appears that Australian phenyle, as a sheep wash, is far superior to the imported article. It seems to me, therefore, that the industry is one which does not require protection. If it were otherwise, the representatives of the firms which have embarked upon it would have

given evidence before the Tariff Commission. To levy a duty upon insecticides, sheep washes, and disinfectants, in a country like Australia, where there are so many insect pests, is altogether out of the question. Further, any Customs impost would not induce stock owners to purchase a particular sheep wash in preference to others on account of its slightly decreased cost. Their great object is to obtain the very best sheep wash that is procurable, altogether regardless of its price. Consequently sheep washes should be admitted free. If imported sheep washes are superior to the Australian article they will command the trade, and *vice versa*. I hope that the Treasurer will stand firm upon this item.

Mr. HUTCHISON (Hindmarsh) [2.32].—I can indorse all that has been said by the honorable member for Laanecoorie in regard to the prejudice which exists against Australian disinfectants. No difficulty whatever is experienced in manufacturing them. As a matter of fact, they are being made in South Australia at the present time.

Mr. SAMPSON. — The manufacturers could not have required the aid of a duty very badly. Otherwise they would have appeared before the Tariff Commission.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—It may be that they were too busy to attend before that body. But the question which we have to determine is, "Can these disinfectants be produced in the Commonwealth, and are they capable of doing all that is required of them?" As a matter of fact they are being made in Australia, and I have the assurance of Messrs. Faulding and Company that the disinfectants which they manufacture will accomplish all that is claimed for them.

Mr. LIVINGSTON.—Do they make a sheep wash?

Mr. HUTCHISON.—Yes. I hold in my hand a certificate by R. J. Bull, M.D., B.S., Director of the Bacteriological Laboratory at the Melbourne University, dated 27th January, 1907, and addressed to Messrs. McKellan and Ramsay, which reads—

Dear Sirs,

I have tested the disinfecting strength of a sample of phenyle (McKellan and Ramsay), received on 22nd December, 1906, and certify that, under standard laboratory conditions, the bacillus of typhoid fever was destroyed in five minutes, when the disinfectant was employed in a dilution of 1 : 400 in distilled water.

Mr. LIVINGSTON.—There is no occasion to fear any more typhoid fever then?

Mr. HUTCHISON.—I am quoting absolute evidence. Dr. Bull states that—

A dilution of 1 : 400 was equivalent to carbolic acid, 1 : 100, indicating that the former was four times as powerful as carbolic acid as a disinfectant.

Surely that is conclusive evidence that we can produce in the Commonwealth any kind of disinfectant that may be required. I am sure that the Treasurer will recognise that this is a fair item upon which to impose a duty.

Mr. EDWARDS (Oxley) [2.35].—I should like to know what is the precise nature of the proposal before the Committee.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Half-a-dozen honorable members have suggested that this item should bear a duty.

Mr. EDWARDS.—Who made the suggestion in the first instance?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The honorable member for Melbourne Ports.

Mr. EDWARDS.—Considering the frequency with which that honorable member has voted against the Government. I hope that the Treasurer will not be influenced by his representations. I trust that he will strictly adhere to the Government proposal. To stock owners it is a matter of the utmost importance that sheep washes should be admitted free. Instead of endeavouring to increase their price to the consumer we ought to do everything in our power to lessen it. I hope that the Treasurer will not allow even one of his supporters to influence him in this matter.

Mr. SALMON (Laanecoorie) [2.37].—I wish to read a few figures which will effectually dispose of the contention of the honorable member for Oxley that the imposition of a duty upon this item will have the effect of increasing the cost of the articles specified therein. The particular sheep wash, the price of which I intend to quote, is being manufactured in Melbourne.

Mr. EDWARDS.—That information is quite sufficient. The honorable member cannot see beyond Victoria, and a little portion of Sydney.

Mr. SALMON.—This sheep wash is being manufactured from a recipe supplied by sheep-dip manufacturers in the Old Country. It is identical in every respect with the dip which is imported by this company. Yet the price charged to the user for the imported article in 5-gallon drums is 6s. per gallon, whilst the price of the Australian wash to the consumer is only 4s. per gallon.

Mr. HANS IRVINE.—The sheep-owners must be very bad judges of quality.

Mr. SALMON.—The honorable member has had as much experience as has any honorable member of the benefits which flow from advertising. All that I have said about the opportunities which outside firms enjoy for ruling the people of Australia seems to have fallen upon deaf ears.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Sheep washes are made by some of the biggest firms in Australia.

Mr. SALMON.—I have spoken of only two firms, neither of which are very large. They are merely struggling concerns. The 40-gallon casks containing this sheep wash from abroad are sold to the user at 5s. 6d. per gallon, whilst the Australian article is supplied to him at 3s. 9d. per gallon. It will be seen, therefore, that the statement of the honorable member for Oxley is an utterly fallacious one. Further, I hold in my hand an undertaking from the manufacturer of this particular sheep wash, that if a duty be imposed upon the imported article, he will not increase the price of the Australian article to the consumer.

Mr. EDWARDS.—For how long? For three months?

Mr. SALMON.—The honorable member is begging the question. The manufacturer will guarantee that the sheep wash which is at present being supplied to the consumer for 33½ per cent. less than is the imported article, will continue to be supplied at its present price.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The honorable member must be a simple Simon to quote that sort of undertaking.

Mr. BOWDEN.—It is not worth the paper upon which it is written.

Mr. SALMON.—Honorable members opposite affirm that if we impose a duty upon this item the cost of sheep washes will be increased, and the moment that I submit evidence to refute their statements they say that I must be a simple Simon.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The honorable member produces an undertaking which might last for only one day.

Mr. SALMON.—Parliament would be impotent indeed if it permitted a manufacturer to trifle with it in that fashion.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The price of the raw material of the wash might be increased.

Mr. SALMON.—In that case Parliament would not dream of holding the manufacturer to his engagement.

Mr. LIDDELL (Hunter) [2.42].—It is a shame that the Treasurer should listen for

a moment to a suggestion to levy a duty upon this item. The articles specified in it were admitted free under the old Tariff and the protectionist section of the Tariff Commission have also recommended that they should be placed upon the list of special exemptions. Strangely enough, the free-trade section of that body recommended that they should be dutiable at 5 per cent. These facts furnish convincing evidence that the question is one which should be considered from two points of view. Various reasons have been advanced in favour of the imposition of a duty. The honorable member for Laanecoorie has brought forward the stale argument that by adopting that course the price of the articles would not be increased. Yet we hear complaints every day that the imposition of duties under this Tariff has led to an increase in the price of goods. That circumstance, I think, effectually disposes of the honorable member's contention. Unfortunately, we have persons coming to the precincts of the Chamber and button-holing various honorable members. From what I have noticed this morning, and also this afternoon, I suspect that the honorable member for Kooyong is in favour of increasing this duty. I do not see any reason why I should not mention an incident of that sort. It is not right that this button-holing should take place. Only the other day, a man sued in a Court for the payment of a certain sum because he had influenced the votes of honorable members on items in the last Tariff.

Mr. CHANTER.—We have had the principal agent of the free-traders about the premises since the consideration of the Tariff began.

Mr. LIDDELL.—I propose to read a letter which I have received from a gentleman who is interested in the question of sheep dips and disinfectants, and who represents Arnold's Balsam Co. If this industry is fairly established in Australia—and I think we have good ground to believe that it is—there is no reason why a protective duty should be imposed. The Chairman of the A section of the Tariff Commission quoted the evidence of Mr. E. Dearman. I notice that the witness stated that this article was not produced in quite such a large way as it might be, and the reason which he gave for that state of things was not the want of a duty, but simply the fact that people would not buy the local article. He asserted that not only was there a prejudice against the local article, but that it existed to such an extent

that the local article was sold under an English name, so that the imposition of a duty has very little to do with the matter. My correspondent, who represents Arnold's Balsam Co., says—

We are importers of "phenyle," mentioned in the Tariff as a saponaceous compound of cresylic acid, carbolic acid, tar, &c. The duty proposed is 6d. per gallon. For years this has been made in the different States from coal tar, to be had in large quantities from the gas-works. The formula is simple, very little labour required. It is sold in Melbourne by Chas. Atkins and Co., 472 Flinders-street, at 1s. 4½d. per gallon, and Morris and Ladwig, Prahran, at the same price. The cost to make will work out at under 1s. per gallon. In our opinion there is no necessity for a duty; the freight is sufficient protection.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—One fellow saw the honorable member for Kooyong, and the other fellow saw the honorable gentleman.

Mr. LIDDELL.—This man did not see me; but he forwarded to me this letter which I have quoted in support of my argument. He states that, in his opinion, there is no necessity for a duty, and that the freight is quite sufficient protection to the local manufacturers. When an item of this kind is brought under consideration, it is only right that the Committee should hear both sides of the question. The letter I have read represents one side of this question, and if honorable members wish it, I am prepared to quote from several letters which I have received, and which will support an argument to the contrary effect. I have received a letter from McKellan & Ramsay, chemical manufacturers, of 62 and 64 Bouverie-street, Carlton, with a town office at 317 Little Collins-street, Melbourne. No doubt, honorable members will recognise that the writers are quite capable of expressing an opinion. They write in these terms—

We write to bring under your notice a gross anomaly which affects the disinfectant and sheep dip manufacturers. Under the present Tariff, coal-tar oil and carbolic acid, both formerly free, are now dutiable at 6d. per gallon, whereas disinfectants and sheep dips are admitted free.

Coal-tar oil and carbolic acid form the raw materials in our manufactures, and thus we have the absurd anomaly—raw material, duty 6d. per gallon, manufactured article admitted free.

We would respectfully ask that the duty on coal-tar oil and carbolic acid (our raw material) be at once removed, and a duty placed on disinfectants and sheep dips, and the duty on saponaceous mixture of creosote increased, as the local manufacturers (numbering at least nineteen in Victoria) could easily manufacture enough disinfectants and sheep dips to supply the whole of the Commonwealth, if they were protected.

There are one or two matters to which I desire to draw the attention of honorable members. A manufacturer of sheep dips and phenyle writes—

Regarding item 279 in the Tariff, we wish to bring before your notice the anomaly of placing the duty of 6d. per gallon on carbolic acid and tar oil, while allowing sheep dips and phenyle to come in free.

All phenyles as Little's, Jeyes' fluid, Quibell's, &c., and all liquid sheep dips such as Cooper's, Quibell's, &c., are made by treating carbolic acid and tar oil with soda to make soluble, then dissolving with resin. We do an extensive business in the manufacture of sheep dips and phenyle, and our manufactures are identical in composition with the above brands.

In importing tar oil and carbolic acid we have to pay 6d. per gallon duty. We then mix with soda and resin as above explained and manufacture into sheep dip and phenyle.

By instructing the manufacturers of carbolic acid and tar oil to neutralise them with soda and dissolve with resin it comes in free either as sheep dip or phenyle. This anomaly works out very unfairly, and as the phenyles and liquid sheep dips are made from carbolic acid and tar oil, the whole group of products should be either free or dutiable.

Here is a gentleman who is arguing in one instance in favour of a duty, and who recommends that the whole group of products should be, as he puts it, "either free or dutiable." He goes on to say—

The analyses of duty free Little's phenyle and Cooper's sheep dip, as undernoted, will indicate this very plainly:—

Little's Phenyle.

Tar oil	40 per cent.
Water	40 " "
Soda	6 " "
Resin	14 " "

Quibell's Sheep Dip.

Tar oil	30 per cent.
Carbolic acid	15 " "
Water	32 " "
Soda	7 " "
Resin	16 " "

Locally made dip referred to above:—

Tar oil	33 per cent.
Carbolic acid	18 " "
Water	23 " "
Soda	8 " "
Resin	18 " "

I have several other letters in my possession, but no doubt most honorable members have received a copy of each letter, and studied its contents at their leisure. This is another instance in which, for the sake of bolstering up a few miserable manufacturers within the limits of the cities, our great primary industries are to be taxed. We know very well that these disinfectants and sheep dips are what might almost be called the raw material of the wool-growers. For that reason alone

they should be able to purchase them as cheaply as possible. The honorable member for Laanecoorie has attempted to argue that if we place a heavy duty on the articles, they will become cheaper, but I think I have shown conclusively that his argument was entirely without any weight. I am opposed to the imposition of a duty. The Minister, in his wisdom, has proposed that the article should be free. The Chairman of the Tariff Commission made no comment on the matter: very little evidence was placed before him. Every one knows that the Treasurer is the last man to show want of backbone. If any one can sit tight and fast he can do so. I trust that on this item he will sit tight and fast as he has done on other occasions, and will refuse to have his schedule altered.

Mr. CARR (Macquarie) [2.59].—I wish to protest against the sweeping generalities in which the honorable member for Hunter has indulged. He has spoken about this being a petty and miserable manufacturing industry confined to the limits of a few cities. The manufacture of disinfectants and sheep dips is so easy that they are made in many country towns in New South Wales. Apart from several manufactories in Sydney, there is a company operating in Bathurst. The question of the duty on creosote and tar oils was involved in the question of the duty on sheep dips, but now that these oils have been made free, it is only consistent on the part of the Government to impose an effective protective duty on disinfectants and sheep dips, particularly on the latter. The honorable member for Hunter mentioned the constituent parts of certain sheep dips without making any deduction from them. The deduction is that the constituent parts of the local article go to show that it is much stronger and much more efficacious than the imported article, and it is sold at a cheaper price. The imposition of a duty could not possibly have the effect of raising the price because, as I mentioned, almost any one can make the article. The manufacturers give the whole formula without any reservation so that any one can obtain the material parts and mix the dip for themselves. If anything calls for a duty I maintain that this article does. The imported article is decidedly inferior to that which is locally made.

Mr. WILSON.—Does the honorable member mean to say that Quibell's dip is inferior to the locally-made article?

Mr. CARR.—I do. The honorable member, as a medical practitioner knowing the value of these ingredients, should be aware of that.

Mr. WILSON.—A medical practitioner is not supposed to know anything about sheep dips.

Mr. CARR.—I should have thought that the rudiments of medicine would have taught a man the value of these materials, and that one who professed to know anything about medicine would be aware that when certain constituents appear in a certain mixture of greater strength than in another mixture—presuming that strength is desired—the stronger must be the more efficacious. No harm has ever been done by the local article, though it is stronger than the imported dip. I strongly support the demand for a duty.

Mr. PALMER (Echuca) [3.2].—The recommendation of the Tariff Commission with regard to this item was that it should be free. It was free under the old Tariff and it is free under the Tariff proposed by the Government. I am one of those who believe that as protection is the policy of the country we should give a reasonable amount of protection on a commodity which can be manufactured in Australia. But this is a commodity which affects the largest producing interest in the Commonwealth.

Mr. CARR.—Does the honorable member say that sheep dip cannot be made in Australia?

Mr. PALMER.—I have not said anything of the sort. As it can be made in Australia, the makers are entitled to a measure of protection. But in view of the great importance of the industry, affecting not only large sheep stations but small farmers and the bulk of the people generally—it is one which we cannot afford to trifle with. I should not have risen except for the statement of the honorable member for Laanecoorie to the effect that certain manufacturers of this commodity in Australia were prepared to give a guarantee that the price would not be increased to the consumer. I view guarantees of that sort with a great deal of suspicion. We must take every precaution to see that the cost of these commodities is not increased.

Mr. CARR.—Local competition will keep the price down.

Mr. PALMER.—I hold in my hand a statement—a copy of which has been sent to every honorable member—which shows the value of guarantees that prices will

not be increased. As a matter of fact, the stern logic of events proves that in regard to almost every item in the Tariff, where an increased duty has been imposed, an increased price to the consumer has followed. Numerous invoices have been produced in this Chamber to prove that statement. The honorable member for Laanecoorie assures us that some person who is making these sheep dips is prepared to give a guarantee. I reply that the value of such guarantees is shown by a document that has been forwarded to honorable members by Mr. McDougall, of the firm of Sands and McDougall. His letter contains the following paragraph—

In giving my evidence before the Tariff Commission, I said that if the duty on strawboard was increased by £1 per ton, the Australian Paper Mills Co. Pty., Limited, would not increase their price for strawboard; but as the House of Representatives has not yet dealt with that item, we have a perfect right to increase our price until such time as the duty is determined upon.

In view of that statement, coming from one who gave a guarantee that the price of an article would not be increased as the result of a duty, what value can be attached to such a statement as has been made by the honorable member for Laanecoorie? Although my vote may be at variance with what may be supposed to be protectionist policy, I am determined to cast it in such a direction that the larger interests of this community shall not be sacrificed for the benefit of the smaller ones.

Mr. LIVINGSTON (Barker) [3.5].—I understand that it is not possible for a private member to move to increase a duty or to add a new duty to the Tariff. I wish to ask the Treasurer whether he intends to propose a duty in regard to the commodity with which we are dealing? If he does not we are wasting time in discussing it. If he does, I shall have a little more to say hereafter.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [3.6].—I think that there is a great deal in some of the statements which have been made. There is no question in my mind that the commodities under discussion can be successfully made in Australia. I intend to test the feeling of the Committee upon the point by proposing a new item. I therefore move—

That the words "and on and after 5th December, 1907, 283A, Phenyles, liquid disinfectants, liquid sheep washes, insecticides, sheep-branding preparations, per gallon, 2s.; (B) Sheep dips

and carbolic preparations in powder or paste form, per cwt., 10s.; (C), Disinfectants n.e.i., free," be added.

I have listened very attentively to the statements which have been made, and think that there is a great deal in them. An honorable member remarked in the course of the debate that I know something about this matter. So I do. I believe that I know as much about it as any one present, and I know that the best sheep dips are made in Australia. The bulk of them ought to be made here. There should be no importations in this line at all. It is ridiculous to say that the simple mixtures which these commodities are cannot be made in Australia. A very strong expression of opinion has been given this afternoon in regard to the matter, and I have determined to test the feeling of honorable members by taking a vote upon the new item which I have submitted.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [3.10].—I should like to ask the Treasurer to consider the advisableness of attaching the honorable member for Melbourne Ports to the Trade and Customs Department. The Minister in charge of this Tariff, with all the resources of the Government at his command, with the recommendations of the Tariff Commission to boot, and with the assistance of Dr. Wollaston and his officers, only discovers to-day that sheep washes can be made in Australia, and that, therefore, a duty ought to be imposed. If the honorable member for Melbourne Ports is possessed of knowledge which is without the ken of men whose special duty it is to investigate such matters, the Minister ought to give him a huge salary, and attach him to the Department.

Mr. MATHEWS.—I quite agree that I am worth more than I get!

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—There is no doubt that the honorable member is earning more than his £600 a year, judging from what has occurred to-day. I make the suggestion to the Treasurer in all seriousness that he should discharge some of his officers and give the honorable member the run of the Department. I am sure he would look after the revenue.

Mr. SALMON.—The honorable member was complaining yesterday that the officers of the Department gave the Minister too much information; to-day he is complaining that they do not give enough.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The officers seem to know nothing about these matters at all. The goods in question have always

been free. Only to-day—after the Chairman of the Tariff Commission has inquired into the subject, he being a strong protectionist, almost a prohibitionist in some things, and after all the resources of the Department have been utilized—it is discovered on the floor of the House that we want a high duty upon sheep washes and disinfectants.

Mr. MATHEWS.—Not a high duty.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I understand that what is proposed does not amount to more than about 50 per cent. That, of course, is a small duty from the honorable member's point of view. But what does he regard as a high duty? Yesterday he was clamouring for duties up to 200 per cent. and 300 per cent. to be retained. What would the honorable member regard as a high duty?

Mr. MATHEWS.—Just exactly the opposite to what the honorable member would regard as a high duty.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—That is about as reasonable an answer as could be expected from the honorable member. But unreasonable as he proves himself to be, he is able to dictate a policy to the Department of Trade and Customs. He is able to dictate a protectionist policy for Australia. I congratulate him. I congratulate the Minister on his susceptibility. Hitherto, it appears, the ignorance of the Department and the ignorance of the Minister were in need of enlightenment.

Mr. SALMON.—Mr. Kingston proposed a duty on the same goods.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Surely the Treasurer, before introducing this Tariff, investigated the history of the last one. If Mr. Kingston proposed a duty, why were the goods made free?

Mr. SALMON.—Because the importers lobbied so successfully while the last Tariff was under consideration.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Did they lobby the Minister to make the goods free? I think that the honorable member ought to stop these explanations, which are really a reflection upon the Treasurer.

Mr. THOMAS.—The Treasurer is absent just now. Who is in charge?

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Unfortunately, the Minister in charge of the Trade and Customs Department at present seems to be a perfect cypher in regard to the whole question.

Mr. THOMAS.—The Postmaster-General seems to be in charge just now.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I despair of asking him for an explanation about anything. We had evidence the other day of the stores of knowledge that are wrapped up in his cranium. I do not wish to go to that source of information. It is about time that the Treasurer either pleaded total ignorance in regard to most of the matters connected with the Tariff and acknowledged that he is prepared to accept the direction of the honorable member for Melbourne Ports, whom he might very well attach to his Department, or investigated matters for himself. He told us that he knew all about sheep, having had to do with them all his life, and was therefore quite aware how his proposal would affect the pastoral industry. If he considered that the local manufacture of sheep dips should be protected, why did he not provide for its protection when framing the Tariff, or move in that direction when the last Tariff was under consideration. One begins to understand the criticism of the Minister of Defence, that the Treasurer seems to know nothing about protection except when he is out of office. Now that he is in office, he has to take his policy from the honorable member for Melbourne Ports. The proposed duty is outrageously high. I am told that sheep dips are sold here at 4s. a gallon.

Mr. MATHEWS.—The imported dips cost 5s. and 6s. a gallon.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The pastoral industry is the basis of the prosperity of the Commonwealth, and why should we lay it under tribute, to give employment to persons in making sheep dips. We should rather take action in the direction of cheapening all the requirements of the industry. But the Minister in the hands of the honorable member for Melbourne Ports is like a marionette pulled with strings.

Mr. WILKS (Dalley) [3.20].—The honorable member for Parramatta has found fault with the honorable member for Melbourne Ports for suggesting the imposition of a duty on sheep dip. Let me refresh the memory of the Committee as to what occurred when this item was under discussion in connexion with the consideration of the old Tariff. The Treasurer was a Minister in the Protectionist Government which introduced that Tariff, the Government being supported by strong protectionists such as the then honorable member for New England, Mr. Sawers, and the then honorable member for Gwydir, the late Mr. Cruickshank. But when the item sheep dip was under consideration, Mr. Sawers, who

was a pastoralist, strongly supported a motion that it be placed on the free list, and that proposition was also supported by Mr. Cruickshank and carried. Apparently the sheep in the large pastoral properties owned by the honorable member for Melbourne Ports on the shores of Hobson's Bay do not need dipping, and therefore he is ready to impose a tax on sheep dip. The Minister on the last occasion had nothing to say against sheep dip being admitted duty free. He then knew as much about the pastoral industry as he knows now, and as much about the manufacture of sheep dip, and yet he did not suggest that it be made dutiable. The proposed duty of 2s. per gallon is largely duty on water. As the honorable member for Barker has pointed out, disinfectants are used in connexion with other live stock besides sheep. The proposed tax would be a very heavy one on primary producers, and therefore I hope that it will not be agreed to, and that sheep dip will be placed on the free list.

Mr. HANS IRVINE (Grampians) [3.25].—The Treasurer should stick to his original proposal, and not spring an amendment of this sort on the Committee at a moment's notice. The honorable member for Melbourne Ports is always ready to build up city businesses at the expense of country industries. Every farmer has to use disinfectants of one kind and another in connexion with live stock, and a medical man like the honorable member for Laanecoorie should be one of the first to encourage their use, because the greater the precautions against disease, the greater the health of the community, and of the stock, and the larger the production of the country.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—Disinfectants are used in connexion with the cultivation of plants.

Mr. HANS IRVINE.—Yes; they are used for cattle, sheep, poultry and plants.

Mr. MATHEWS.—The duty will not raise the price.

Mr. HANS IRVINE.—One of the witnesses before the Tariff Commission guaranteed that if the duty which he suggested were agreed to, he would not raise his price. But when he found that some of his requirements had been made dutiable, he paid no regard to that statement, and increased his charges. I was also told that shortly after the Tariff was introduced, the price of a certain kind of bottle was to be increased by 2s. 6d. per gross. Those who

are making sheep dips in Australia have been engaged in the business long enough to be able to do without this protection. If their dips are valuable, the pastoral and farming community will buy them, because those engaged in rearing sheep know what best suits their business. They would not use imported dips if they thought Australian dips were better. The proposed duty is equal to 50 per cent. *ad valorem* on the cheaper imported dips, though it is not so high on concentrated dips, such as Cooper's, which cost 10s. per gallon. The proposed duty will be a tax on primary production, and against the interests of the public health. The honorable member for Laanecoorie ought to encourage the use of disinfectants.

Mr. SALMON.—The imported dips are 50 per cent. dearer than the locally-made dips, although they are admitted free of duty.

Mr. HANS IRVINE.—The pastoralists and farmers are not fools, and if they pay more for imported dips, they do so because they know that those dips are better than the locally-made dips.

Mr. SALMON.—Many people drink imported wine in preference to Australian wine.

Mr. HANS IRVINE.—That does not concern me. I have always been in favour of the reduction of the wine duties, which have been imposed largely for revenue purposes. In my opinion, the wine-making industry does not need protection of that kind. I hope that the Treasurer will reconsider his proposal.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [3.30].—The honorable member for Grampians is, perhaps, unaware of the fact that the value of our imports of dips and disinfectants in 1903 was £29,000, whereas those imported in 1906 were valued at £52,000.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—In 1906 we had far more sheep in Australia.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The imports in 1905 were valued at £51,000, and in 1904 at £41,000. There has been a strong expression of opinion in favour of a duty on sheep dips, and I have been asked to submit this proposal to the Committee since it is not competent for a private member to do so. It is a disgrace to Australia that even a gallon of these dips should be imported, and the big men who introduce it are not in sympathy with Australian sentiment.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—And yet the Tariff as introduced provided that sheep-dips should be free.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Yes; but that was because of the recommendation of the protective section of the Tariff Commission, and because also sheep dips were free under the old Tariff. It seems to me that a large number of people are anti-Australian, and are prepared to obtain what they want anywhere but in the Commonwealth.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—Do not use that sort of argument.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The honorable member is also in it.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—Why should the honorable member be a better Australian than I am?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I think that I am

Sir JOHN FORREST.—It is impertinent on the part of the honorable member to say so.

The CHAIRMAN.—Order. These interjections must cease.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not wish the whole afternoon to be devoted to a discussion of this item. I felt that it was my duty to submit the amendment so that honorable members might have an opportunity to express an opinion upon the question.

Mr. GLYNN.—In the Tariff of 1901 a duty of only 15 per cent. was proposed, but the House decided that the item should be free.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—This is a much superior House, from a protectionist standpoint, to that of 1901. If the Committee desire a more moderate duty, let some honorable member take action. I shall not object. I merely wish to have the question settled.

Sir JOHN FORREST (Swan) [3.35].—The concluding observations of the Treasurer must commend themselves to the Committee; but I certainly do not appreciate the arguments he used at the outset of his speech. He is accustomed to resort to them when he does not get his own way, and to insinuate that those who are opposed to him are anti-Australian. By what process of reasoning he arrives at the conclusion that he is a better Australian than those who happen to differ with him on the Tariff I do not know, and to use such an argument is only to be offensive. As to the item itself, I think that sheep dips and disinfectants should be free. New discoveries are constantly being made, and there should be no obstacle in

the way of the introduction of any improved disinfectant or insecticide into Australia. Our climatic conditions are such that we have to fight against pests of all kinds, which attack both live stock and plant life, and I am of opinion that it would not be in the interests of the country to impose a duty on sheep dips, insecticides, and disinfectants. The honorable member for Laanecoorie has said that local manufacturers of these articles are able to sell their products at one-third less than the price charged for the imported article. That being so, it cannot be said that they need protection. The protectionist section of the Tariff Commission recommended that sheep dips should be free, and, as has been pointed out, the proposal in the first Federal Tariff that the duty should be 15 per cent. was rejected. I hope that the item will stand as printed.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [3.39].—I propose to move—

That the amendment be amended by inserting after the word "preparations," paragraph A, the word "free."

If my amendment be rejected, I shall move a further amendment, providing for the reduction to 1s. of the duty proposed by the Treasurer.

Mr. SALMON.—I should like to know, Mr. Chairman, whether the amendment is in order. Is it not substantially the same as the motion on which the amendment has been made?

The CHAIRMAN.—The amendment relates only to paragraph A. The honorable member intends, I understand, in the event of his amendment being carried, to move the omission of the figure "2s." I rule that his amendment of the amendment is in order.

Mr. FAIRBAIRN (Fawcner) [3.41].—I hope that the Treasurer will not persevere with his proposal. It has been suddenly sprung on the Committee, and we have no opportunity to inquire into its probable effect. Sheep wash is used to a large extent to improve the quality of the wool, and so to increase its value. If the manufacture of disinfectants in Australia were an extensive industry, I should be in favour of granting a reasonable duty.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I should be very much surprised if the honorable member were.

Mr. FAIRBAIRN.—It suits the Treasurer to make such remarks, but when I am voting with him no one is more ready

than he is to speak approvingly of me. We know that he has to say these things to keep his end up, and we do not blame him. This proposal made me gasp when I first heard of it.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I dare say it would. It would probably cost the honorable member something too.

Mr. FAIRBAIRN.—No; I do not have much dipping to do. Most of my properties are in Queensland, and the climate there assists us in dealing with these pests. I am speaking now in the interests of New South Wales, Victorian, and Tasmanian wool-growers, who should receive a certain amount of consideration. The Treasurer has suddenly seized on a suggestion made by the honorable member for Melbourne Ports, our Bourke-street farmer.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—It was made by about a dozen honorable members.

Mr. FAIRBAIRN.—We should be given an opportunity to look carefully into the matter, and should not be rushed headlong into carrying a duty which might do a great deal of harm.

Mr. FOSTER (New England) [3.46].—I have listened with interest to the arguments on this item. What sheep-owners require is not a cheap, but an effective sheep dip, one which will do the work required of it. Any quantity of cheap disinfectants might be poured into a drain or sewer, but if they were not effective for the purpose of destroying the bacillus of typhoid, the spread of the disease would not be checked. I am inclined in this matter to support the proposed duty in order to secure the preparation of an efficient sheep dip in Australia. If such an article were manufactured here, local competition would regulate the price, and if it were found that local manufacturers formed a trust or combine to keep up prices, I should be willing to have the Government take over the whole business. It is most important that our people should be in a position to obtain reliable medicines of all kinds and effective disinfectants, and in this connexion the Government might well be asked to interfere in the interests of the health of the people, as well as of the progress of our industries. Money spent upon ineffective disinfectants is only thrown away. With a view to having this preparation made under local supervision, I shall support the proposed duty. At the same time, I ask the Treasurer to give consideration to the question of requiring every package of imported

disinfectants to be accompanied by a certificate as to the nature and strength of the preparations. It is quite time that we dealt a blow at the importation of the rubbish which is introduced in the form of chemical preparations.

Mr. BOWDEN (Nepean) [3.50].—The arguments of the honorable member for New England would be efficacious if used in opposition to the duty. The honorable member is quite right in saying that what sheep-owners require is not a cheap, but an effective sheep dip. I suppose it is on that account that imported disinfectants are able to find a sale. We have been informed that locally manufactured disinfectants are sold at 4s. per gallon, whilst the imported article is sold at from 5s. to 6s. per gallon. This shows that what is wanted is not increased protection through the Tariff. No matter what may be added to the price of the imported article, those who prefer it will continue to use it.

Mr. MATHEWS.—Then we shall never sell any Australian iron.

Mr. BOWDEN.—If the manufacturer who requires to use the best iron believes the imported article to be the best, he will buy it. When we find that the local article is sold for two-thirds of the price asked for the imported article, we must look to some means other than a protective duty to force the local article upon the market against the will of the consumer. I protested the other night against the Treasurer springing new items on the Committee, and I now repeat the protest. It is utterly impossible for honorable members to deal properly with this question on the spur of the moment. The result of the imposition of the proposed duty will probably be to force people to use tobacco disinfectant, since we have already agreed that tobacco used in the manufacture of sheep dip is to be admitted free.

Mr. CARR.—We have agreed to admit carbolic oil and palm oil free.

Mr. SALMON.—And they, as well as tobacco, are the raw materials of sheep dips.

Mr. BOWDEN.—The discussion on this item proves how necessary it is that the Treasurer should keep the promise he made to give honorable members notice of the amendments he intended to propose. I enter my protest against the line of argument adopted by the honorable gentleman, that because we do not see eye to eye with

him and those behind him we have not the interest of the country as much at heart as they have.

Mr. SAMPSON (Wimmera) [3.55].—In common with other honorable members, I think it is rather a pity that this new item should have been sprung upon the Committee at the last moment, when honorable members have no opportunity to sufficiently consider it. When, as in this case, both the Government and the Tariff Commission propose that an article shall be admitted free, honorable members are justified in assuming that the item will go through in that form, and are, therefore, not likely to look into the question. Consistently with my protectionist principles, I always lend a ready ear to any argument in support of the establishment and development of Australian industries. The arguments put forward in this instance have influenced me to a certain extent, but not sufficiently to induce me to support the duties proposed by the Treasurer. The honorable gentleman proposes a duty of 2s. per gallon, and of 10s. per cwt. on powder disinfectants. I think these duties should be reduced by one half. I am sorry that the item should have been brought forward in the way it has been, and, while I am prepared to support a reasonable duty of, say, 1s. per gallon, I am opposed to the present proposal of the Minister.

Mr. ARCHER (Capricornia) [3.58].—The arguments used by the honorable member for New England are futile. I can see no justification whatever for the imposition of a duty upon a sheep dip mixture or any other form of disinfectant. It should not be forgotten that the interests of the country are bound up with the interests of the stock industry. Honorable members must be aware that all sorts of pests are constantly threatening those engaged in that industry. It is not so long ago since we had to face the tick pest, and had to discover a dip to deal with it effectively.

Mr. SALMON.—And we did not have to import it either.

Mr. ARCHER.—I am glad that we did not have to import it while the present Government were in power, because it is very likely that we should have had to pay a duty of 5s. per gallon on it. We have here a sweeping provision to impose a heavy tax on dip mixtures which might be patented elsewhere, but which the owners of stock might be obliged to get. It is

difficult to discover the most effective mixture for certain purposes, and it took some years of experimental work to discover an effective dip for the tick pest. The Government propose an absolutely prohibitive tax, and even the duty of 1s. per gallon suggested by the honorable member for Wimmera would be much too high. It would mean a duty of 5s. on a 5-gallon drum of what might be a patent mixture. Many honorable members in this House have a knowledge of the rearing of stock, and they know what the effect of such a duty is likely to be. The big squatters are not the persons who will have to suffer. They would probably be in a position to afford to pay something extra for an effective dip, but it is the people who are engaged in dairying and small sheep farmers whom the Treasurer is proposing to tax. There seems to be an idea that the only people concerned in stock-raising in this country are wealthy squatters. The day when that was so has long gone by. Those who will feel this tax are the small farmers and dairymen.

Mr. WILSON (Corangamite) [4.1].—I am astonished at the Treasurer's action in proposing a duty on this item. It amounts on some phenyle preparations to a duty of over 50 per cent., as the invoice price in some cases is 3s. 6d. a gallon. Phenyle preparations are used not only for keeping stock clean and healthy, but also largely for sanitary purposes around dwellings. The duty on liquid disinfectants would exclude such preparations as Calvert's carbolic acid, of which large quantities are used for disinfecting drains.

Mr. SALMON.—It is far too expensive for much of it to be used for that purpose.

Mr. WILSON.—It is used largely both in the powder and liquid forms. In some places it is not used to the extent that it might be—in this building, for instance. The proposal to put a duty on liquid sheep washes raises the question of the great necessity throughout Australia for the proper dipping of sheep, in order to preserve our principal industry. These patent sheep washes, both liquid and powder, are used more by the smaller farmer than by any one else, because it is usual for the big stations to prepare their own sheep dips, using arsenic, soft soap and sulphur. The small farmer uses these patent preparations in a handy form.

Mr. PAGE.—What does the honorable member call a small farmer?

Mr. WILSON.—A man who runs any thing less than 5,000 sheep.

Mr. PAGE.—Is the honorable member pleading for the poor farmer with 5,000 sheep? I wish all our farmers had 5,000 sheep each.

Mr. WILSON.—I am pleading simply for common sense in the treatment of this item. The man who has less than 1,000 sheep uses these patent preparations.

Mr. SALMON.—He generally dips them at the nearest squatter's place.

Mr. WILSON.—The honorable member is wrong. I have seen them in my district with their small dips, lifting the sheep in and out one at a time. So important is this process to the whole industry, that they will go to all that trouble. If we impose this duty Australia will be in the unique position of being the only country in the world that taxes preparations of this kind. Russia, one of the most conservative countries admits dips like Cooper's free, because it is for the national good. They are admitted free in the Argentine. America, which is often held up as one of the most protected countries in the world, admits Cooper's sheep dip free. If the Treasurer had given the people of Australia time to consider this matter, he would have been as eager to take the duty off as he was to take it off wire-netting.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I did not take the duty off wire-netting.

Mr. WILSON.—The honorable member voted for duties of 15 and 10 per cent. I remember voting with him.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Tell the whole story, and do not manipulate what happened.

Mr. WILSON.—This question is similar to that of wire-netting—it is a case of keeping out pests. The Treasurer, who is an able representative of one of the largest and most important rural constituencies, now actually proposes a duty on something which is used to the advantage of every man who earns his living on the land. Phenyles are used as a wash for poultry, sheep, horses and dogs, and also as household disinfectants.

Mr. MATHEWS.—We will climb down by a half if the honorable member will sit down.

Mr. WILSON.—Then presumably the duty of 2s. per gallon was only proposed for amusement. The honorable member for Melbourne Ports says "We will climb down." How many new honorary Minis-

ters have recently been added to the Cabinet? Other important articles included in the Treasurer's proposal are insecticides and sheep branding preparations. We have already dealt with some forms of sheep branding preparations under other items. A duty of 2s. per gallon on these patent preparations amounts to over 20 per cent. At the same time, they are made from secret formulæ, and therefore cannot be made or sold here. We could not possibly manufacture Cooper's dip and sell it as such, or make the same article and sell it under another name. All sheep dips are not alike, but Cooper's dip is unique. Its use has considerably increased the value of our great national asset. The local preparations can be bought for one-third less than can the imported. Surely, then, there is no necessity for a duty. I suggest that these articles should be allowed to come in free as before. I hope honorable members realize that if we impose this duty we shall be going far beyond what has been done in either Russia or America.

Mr. WEBSTER (Gwydir) [4.15].—Springing a proposal of this kind on the Committee without notice is not calculated to assist our deliberations and, further, I see no justification for imposing the duty proposed by the Treasurer. The arguments this afternoon show that if there are any articles in the Tariff that should be made free they are the articles now under discussion. When we consider the value of some of these disinfectants to the community, it is bordering on a criminal act to impose a duty amounting to 50 per cent. or over. The result of making a proposal of this kind without notice is that several hours have been occupied in its discussion.

Mr. LIVINGSTON (Barker) [4.19].—At an earlier stage of the debate, I said that the Treasurer knew as much about stock as any man in Australia. At that time, however, I thought it was the honorable gentleman's intention to make this article free, but shortly afterwards I discovered that he proposed to impose a duty; and that, of course, very much altered my opinion of him. I may inform the Committee that in South Africa all such requisites are carried free over the Government railways; and I think that example might be very well followed here, instead of increasing the cost by imposing a duty. Some years ago I was induced to try one of the new dips, but three months afterwards I found the sheep as though they had never been treated at all; and I had to

go back to the well-tried article. If sheep are not thoroughly dipped the wool will be reduced to nearly half its value; and that, of course, is a very serious matter. I hope the Committee will not vote the proposed duty.

Mr. CARR (Macquarie) [4.20].—I cannot let some of the arguments on the other side go unchallenged. From one section of the Opposition we hear that no duty should be placed on these commodities because they cannot be made here—that there is a special virtue in particular brands.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Who said that?

Mr. CARR.—The honorable member for Capricornia. Then we have it from the honorable member for Corangamite that squatters make their own dip; and, as that is a fact, it shows that there is no virtue in sheep dip which cannot be attained in Australia. We have been further told that the locally-made article is not equivalent to the imported article; but I have before me the formula of both Quibell's and Burnett's sheep dip. In the imported article, the tar oil is only 30 per cent., as against 33 per cent. in the locally-made article; carbolic acid is 15 per cent., as against 18 per cent.; soda is 7 per cent., as against 8 per cent.; water is 32 per cent., as against 23 per cent.; and resin is 16 per cent., as against 18 per cent. respectively. In every case but water the percentage is higher; and the local dip has been tested and found to be not so strong as to be injurious. The wider sale of the imported sheep dip is due, not to superior quality, but to more judicious advertising, by which people are easily influenced.

Mr. PAGE (Maranoa) [4.21].—I suggest to the Treasurer that he should postpone the consideration of this item until we have heard his understudy, the honorable member for Batman, express an opinion. We have not yet heard that honorable member on this particular item; and as the honorable member for Yarra and the honorable member for Melbourne Ports say that sheep dip can be made in Victoria—

Mr. MATHEWS.—And the honorable member says that it cannot.

Mr. PAGE.—I do not say anything of the sort—the honorable member ought not to put words into my mouth. Anything that promotes the brilliancy of wool ought to receive earnest attention from this Committee, seeing that the wool industry is the backbone of the Commonwealth. But for the wool industry, I do

not know what the people of the cities would do for a living. Thank goodness, in Western Queensland the sheep are free from diseases which prevail elsewhere, and sheep wash has not been regarded as necessary. But I am told that, in order to promote brilliancy in the wool, it is intended to resort to dipping. This fact ought to be taken into consideration, and attention paid to this primary industry, as well as to the manufacturing industries in the cities.

Mr. CARR.—If the amendment before the Chair be defeated, I intend to move that the duty be 1s.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [4.23].—I have already notified my intention to move an amendment. I move—

That the amendment be amended by inserting after the word "preparations," paragraph A, the word "free."

Question put. The Committee divided.

Ayes	36
Noes	27

Majority	9
----------	-----	-----	-----	---

AYES.

Archer, E. W.	Mahon, H.
Atkinson, L.	McWilliams, W. J.
Batchelor, E. L.	Page, J.
Bowden, E. K.	Palmer, A. C.
Brown, Thomas	Poynton, A.
Cook, Joseph	Sampson, S.
Edwards, R.	Sinclair, H.
Fairbairn, G.	Spence, W. G.
Fisher, A.	Storrer, D.
Forrest, Sir John	Thomas, J.
Fowler, J. M.	Thomson, Dugald
Frazer, C. E.	Webster, W.
Fuller, G. W.	Wilks, W. H.
Fysh, Sir Philip	Willis, Henry
Glynn, P. McM.	Wilson, J. G.
Hedges, W. N.	
Hughes, W. M.	
Irvine, Hans	
Livingston, J.	

Tellers:

Johnson, W. E.
Liddell, F.

NOES.

Bamford, F. W.	Mauger, S.
Carr, E. S.	McDougall, J. K.
Catts, J. H.	O'Malley, King
Chapman, Austin	Quick, Sir John
Coon, J.	Salmon, C. C.
Crouch, R. A.	Thomson, John
Deakin, A.	Tudor, F. G.
Ewing, T. T.	Watkins, D.
Foster, F. J.	Watson, J. C.
Groom, L. E.	Wise, G. H.
Harper, R.	Wynne, A.
Lyne, Sir William	
Maloney, W. R. N.	
Mathews, J.	

Tellers:

Cook, Hume
Hutchison, J.

PAIRS.

Kelly, W. H.	Kingston, C. C.
Smith, Bruce	Hall, D. R.
Brown, Tilley	Chanter, J. M.
Reid, G. H.	Knox, W.

Question so resolved in the affirmative.
Amendment of the amendment agreed to.
Amendment, as amended, negatived.
Item agreed to.

Item 284. Fly-papers, chemical and sticky, ad val., 15 per cent.

Mr. LIVINGSTON (Barker) [4.32].—I think that these fly-papers should be admitted free. In Australia the fly pest is rapidly becoming a very dangerous one, and we shall have to find some means of combating it. The use of fly-papers is one method by which we can deal with the small flies in houses. Therefore, I move—

That the words "and on and after 5th December, 1907, free," be added.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [4.33].—I should like to know whether the Treasurer intends to accept the amendment? After the Committee have decided that sheep-washes shall be admitted free, surely he cannot persist in making fly-papers dutiable at 15 per cent.

Amendment agreed to.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 285. Thio sulphates (Hydrosulphites), and Hydrosulphites containing zinc sulphite and formaldehyde, free.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That the words "hydrosulphites" be left out, with a view to insert in lieu thereof the words "hyposulphites."

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 286 (Chemical compounds and simple drugs) agreed to.

Item 287. Bacteriological products and serum, as prescribed by departmental by-laws, free.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN (Calare) [4.40].—I should like to know whether this item will cover the microbe proposed to be introduced by Dr. Danysz, and whether the imports under this heading last year, which were valued at £3,268, were confined to that and other similar cultures?

Item agreed to.

Item 288 (Carbonate and bi-carbonate of soda) agreed to.

Item 289. Tartaric acid, cream of tartar, and citric acid, ad val. (General Tariff), 5 per cent.; (United Kingdom), free.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That after the words "5 per cent.," the words "and on and after 5th December, 1907 (General Tariff), free," be inserted.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 290 (Essential oils, non-spirituous) agreed to.

Item 291. Medicines—

(A) Pharmaceutical Preparations: Patent and Proprietary Medicines and other Medicinal Preparations and Compounds (not chemical); Medicinal Extracts; Essences; Juices; Infusions; Solutions; Emulsions; Confections; and Syrups; Pills; Pilules; Tabloids; Soloids; Ovoids; Tablets; Capsules; Troches; Cachets; Suppositories; Pessaries n.e.i.; Plasters; Poultices; Salves; Cerates; Ointments; Liniments; Lotions; Pastes and the like; Medicinal Waters and Oils n.e.i.; and Medicines for Animals, ad val., 15 per cent.

(B) Spirituous, ad val., 15 per cent.

(Or according to the rates provided in Division I. whichever rate returns the higher duty.)

Amendments (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That after the word "Preparations," line 4, paragraph (A), a semi-colon be inserted; that the word "and" immediately following be left out, with a view to insert in lieu thereof the word "medicinal," and that the word "Troches," line 10, be left out.

Mr. LIDDELL (Hunter) [4.43].—I think that plasters should be placed upon the free list. Of course we all know that there are varieties of plasters. I hold in my hand a book, a copy of which has been forwarded to every honorable member. It shows how important the matter must be if the agents of Messrs. Johnston and Johnston, manufacturing chemists, will incur that expense.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I will agree to the omission of the word.

Mr. LIDDELL.—I move—

That the word "Plasters" be left out.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. LIDDELL.—I want to move that plasters be made free.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—So they will be.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Under what item will plasters fall now that they have been removed from this item?

Mr. LIDDELL.—I want to have no dubiety about this matter.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I will see that the article is made free.

Mr. LIDDELL.—Since the honorable gentleman has given me that binding promise I am satisfied.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 292. Opium, for use as medicine only, and not capable of being used for smoking purposes, per lb., 30s.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [4.47].—I desire this item to be so amended as to read—

Opium, for medicinal purposes only, under departmental by-laws, per lb., 30s.

On the next item, I shall move a consequential amendment. I move—

That the words “use as medicine only and not capable of being used for smoking purposes” be left out, with a view to insert in lieu thereof the words, “medicinal purposes only, under departmental by-laws.”

Mr. THOMAS BROWN (Calare) [4.48].—I desire to know whether the Treasurer has proposed this alteration with a view to meeting certain representations which have been made to him by the Friendly Societies' Medical Institutes and Dispensaries' Association of New South Wales?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I propose to ask the Committee to so alter the next item as to make it read—

Opium, contained in any medicinal preparation when such preparation would not be liable to duty under another heading at a higher rate per lb., 30s.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—That does not touch the point which has been raised by the association I mentioned. On the 21st August last, its secretary forwarded to me the following resolution concerning the supply of opium—

That this meeting of accredited representatives of 25,000 members of Friendly Societies, representing 100,000 souls in Sydney, Paddington, Redfern, Balmain, Newtown, Parramatta, Marrickville, North Sydney, Leichhardt, and Petersham, whilst congratulating the Federal Government in its attempt to control the importation and sale of pernicious drugs, &c., desires to enter its emphatic protest against the Customs authorities' regulation restricting the supply of opium for medicinal purposes, when prescribed by legally-qualified medical practitioners, as in its various forms the drug is frequently administered both internally and externally in relieving the intense sufferings of the membership.

Mr. BOWDEN.—The regulation has been altered to meet that, I think.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—I wish to ascertain whether the position has been met?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—There is no doubt about it. The alteration was for that purpose to a very large extent.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—The honorable gentleman is referring to his amendment?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Yes.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—Do I understand that the honorable gentleman is de-

sirous of meeting the representations of this association both by legislation proposed and by regulation?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The proposal I am making will have that effect.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [4.50].—I desire to raise an additional point. I do not know whether it has been altered, but at one time there was a regulation which allowed only a limited quantity of opium to be sold to any chemist, and all the chemists of the country were put on the same footing; they must all purchase the same quantity.

Mr. SALMON.—That would be an interference with State rights. The Commonwealth could not possibly do that.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I am told that, nevertheless, it is a fact.

Mr. SALMON.—What control have we over the chemists?

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—My own chemist informed me that in a fortnight he used as much opium for horses and stock alone as the Department allowed him for the year.

Mr. SALMON.—Does the honorable member say that the Department of Trade and Customs control the amount of opium which is to be dispensed by any chemist?

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I assure the honorable member that it was done, and I believe is still done.

Mr. SALMON.—I accept the honorable member's assurance, and will assist him to remedy the matter.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I wish to know whether the regulation has been altered in any way?

Mr. MALONEY.—Does the honorable member's chemist use opium only for a fortnight in the year?

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—He is stuck up when he has used his supply. He cannot get any more in the year.

Mr. MALONEY.—I have been buying opium in fair quantities, and I have not been stopped.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—My chemist told me that sometimes a farrier, who is making a tour of the district, will come along and get almost as much at one time as he is allowed to get for the whole year.

Mr. MALONEY.—That may be the case in New South Wales, but it is not so in Victoria.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [4.53].—I will read to honorable members the notice which has been sent out

by the Assistant Comptroller-General to the inspectors. It reads as follows:—

Inform all ports *re* opium supplied by pharmacists, no restriction is imposed on the supply of the drug for legitimate uses, but regular inspection of importers' books must be continued, and explanation asked of any large increase in the quantity issued to retailers.

That is the instruction which is now being acted upon.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—That is satisfactory, I think.

Mr. SALMON (Laanecoorie) [4.54].—I am very sorry that I did not hear the Minister's explanation, as I was making an inquiry of the Comptroller-General regarding the statement of the honorable member for Parramatta. I understood the latter to say that he had been assured by a chemist that the Commonwealth Government had passed a regulation which restricted the quantity of opium to be sold by any chemist in a particular time. I have been assured by the Comptroller-General that it has not been done. I question the validity of such a regulation.

Mr. LIDDELL.—I have letters to show that it has been done.

Mr. SALMON.—It is a question of the importation of opium.

Mr. LIDDELL.—It is a question about the sale of opium, in order to restrict its use by Chinese.

Mr. SALMON.—The Department has the power to restrict the importation of opium, but no power to restrict the sale of it. That is a matter which rests with the States.

Mr. J. H. CATTS (Cook) [4.55].—The point which the Friendly Societies' Medical Institutes and Dispensaries of New South Wales desire to be dealt with has not yet been touched. Paragraph 4 of the departmental regulations referring to opium reads as follows:—

Before granting any licence to import opium, the collector must be satisfied by statutory declaration that the applicant for such licence is a legally-qualified medical practitioner or a person lawfully carrying on business as a wholesale or manufacturing chemist or druggist or pharmaceutical chemist.

Friendly Societies' Medical Institutes and Dispensaries do not come under that definition, and consequently they are prohibited from importing opium. What they desire is stated in a letter covering the resolution which was read by the honorable member for Calare. The letter reads as follows—

In accordance with a resolution passed at a meeting of the Executive of the above Association, held last night, it becomes my duty to sub-

mit the following copy of two resolutions, and to respectfully ask if you will kindly use your best endeavours to secure the exemption of our institutions from the regulation regarding the supply of opium for medicinal purposes, and to strenuously oppose the imposition of the increased duties on drugs, medicinal preparations and medicine bottles when the new Tariff proposals are submitted to the House.

The association I mentioned point out that their medical institutes and dispensaries, simply because they are not carrying on the business of an ordinary chemist, are prohibited by the regulation from importing opium, and they desire that they also may be granted a licence for the purpose.

Mr. BOWDEN.—Does not the regulation refer to wholesale chemists?

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—It refers to wholesale or manufacturing chemists.

Mr. SALMON.—It refers to a wholesale or manufacturing chemist or druggist or pharmaceutical chemist.

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—At any rate, under the regulation Friendly Societies' Medical Institutes or Dispensaries, although conducted by duly qualified chemists, are not allowed to import opium for medicinal purposes.

Mr. SALMON.—They should be allowed.

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—Certainly. I ask the Treasurer if he will see that the regulation is so altered as to extend to medical institutes and dispensaries which are conducted by duly qualified chemists the same privilege which is now enjoyed by other chemists. I do not think he can fairly object to the request. In Sydney and suburbs alone the regulation affects 25,000 poor persons connected with friendly societies.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The honorable member means that that should be provided for by departmental regulation?

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—Yes; I wish to ask the Treasurer to introduce a departmental by-law so as not to exclude the chemists in the Friendly Societies' Institutes from being able to import opium in the same manner as chemists carrying on business outside.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [5.1].—My only reason for hesitation about this matter was that I felt that the opium traffic ought to be restricted to the fullest extent. When the matter was before me as Minister of Trade and Customs I was very particular in endeavouring to restrict the traffic in every way. I hold to the terms of the proclamation that I issued at that time. If what is asked for

can be done without running any risk of opening the door to the increased consumption of opium for other than medicinal purposes, I will advise that it shall be done. That is all that I can say. I hesitate to do anything suddenly which may open the door wider, because opium smoking is undoubtedly an awful curse, and I have always done my best to stop it.

Mr. BOWDEN (Nepean) [5.2].—The position in regard to Friendly Societies' Institutes has hardly been properly stated by the honorable member for Cook. The Department of Trade and Customs made certain regulations as to the importation of opium. They considered that in order to carry out their regulations effectively they ought to be able to trace the opium to the place where it was consumed. They endeavoured to do that in every case.

Mr. HUME COOK.—Quite right, too.

Mr. BOWDEN.—I do not say whether it was right or wrong, but it did not work well. Where the Customs found that a certain amount of opium, which they considered excessive, was going in a certain direction—say to a country chemist—they drew the attention of the wholesale chemists to the fact and said, "If this goes on we will not allow you to import." The Department put the screw on the wholesale men, who in turn put the screw on the retailers. The effect was that they apportioned out what they thought was a fair consumption, prescribing how much John Brown, a country chemist, or John Robinson, a town chemist, ought to sell in a certain time. In other words, they endeavoured to determine what was a legitimate medicinal use of opium in any particular place. Now, the dispensary in Parramatta serves a very large district, and the restriction imposed by the Department of Trade and Customs, or by the wholesale importers under pressure from the Department, had this effect. The allowance made to the Parramatta Dispensary was so small that in about a fortnight they had used in doctors' prescriptions the amount of opium they were allowed to use for a whole quarter.

Mr. CROUCH.—Does the honorable member know what quantity they were allowed?

Mr. BOWDEN.—They were allowed a certain amount for a quarter, which they used in about a fortnight. The consequence was that the dispensary could not properly dispense the doctors' prescriptions. I drew the attention of the Minis-

ter to this matter about six months ago, and he directed that the regulations should be altered so as to allow greater latitude and to insure that the legitimate use of opium would not be hampered. I believe that something has been done in that direction. I inquired the other day of Mr. Button, the secretary of the dispensary, and he told me that they were now allowed the opium they wanted. I presume, therefore, that the Minister of Trade and Customs has altered the regulation. I am as keen as the Treasurer, or any one else can be, to stop the use of opium absolutely for any but medicinal purposes. But it is such an alleviative of pain that the legitimate use of it should not be hampered in any way when prescribed by doctors.

Mr. JOHNSON (Lang) [5.9].—I think that the Treasurer is perfectly right in safeguarding, so far as he can, against the illegitimate use of opium. I also recognise that no arbitrary regulation can be framed to fit all cases of chemists selling opium? What I think should be done is, to allow a certain amount of discretion to the responsible officers of the Department to deal with cases on their merits. For instance, where it is known that there is a large Chinese settlement, or that there is an unusually large amount of opium going into a certain district, there would be a legitimate case for interference if there was reason to believe that the limits of ordinary medicinal uses were being exceeded. But, in addition to the demands of dispensaries and friendly societies and institutes, I point out that abnormally large quantities of opium are used by chemists who happen to have large veterinary customers. I happen to have one in my own electorate who is in that position, and who uses as much opium in a week as a chemist in another part of the country would use in a year.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Provision has already been made to meet cases like that.

Mr. JOHNSON.—The Minister is quite right in making regulations to meet such cases, and each case should be investigated on its merits. So long as proper safeguards are taken, I have no particular objection to offer to what is proposed, though I think that the duty on opium for medicinal purposes is too high.

Mr. LIDDELL (Hunter) [5.11].—I do not think that the remarks of the honorable member for Laanecoorie should be allowed to pass without comment. Let me quote from information forwarded to me

some time ago in connexion with the sale of opium by chemists—

The Acting Collector of Customs of New South Wales has issued the following memorandum to the licensed importers of opium:—"In future, any licensed importer of opium or extract of opium shall be held responsible for the supply of any retail pharmacist of any of the drugs mentioned in excess of the following quantities per annum:—Gum opium, 4 ozs.; solid extract of opium, 2 ozs.; liquid extract of opium, 5 ozs.; tincture opium, 2 quarts. In addition, besides keeping books, such licensee shall supply the Department with a monthly statement, showing the quantity of opium and its preparations imported and manufactured, with a list of the names and addresses of persons to whom such preparations, &c., were sold and the quantities supplied."

A great many chemists sell much larger quantities of opium per week than is mentioned in that memorandum. Naturally, the issue of it caused a considerable amount of consternation. The honorable member for Nepean and the right honorable member for East Sydney, brought the matter up in Parliament. Thereupon, the following memorandum was issued by the Minister of Trade and Customs—

There is no restriction to the *bona fide* use of opium preparations for medicinal purposes. It was, however, found that special vigilance is imperatively necessary, in order that the supplies should not be diverted to improper purposes. Inquiry was made as to the fair average quantities ordinarily required each year by chemists, and the Department was advised that such average quantities were:—Gum opium, $\frac{1}{2}$ lb.; solid extract, 2 ozs.; liquid extract, 1 oz.; tincture of opium, 2 quarts. The collectors were advised so that the above should afford a guide to trade requirements, and aid them in supervising the distribution. That this was absolutely necessary may be realized from the fact that in one case we found a country chemist being supplied with over 2 lb. in weight of extract of opium each fortnight. In regard to three chemists, whose supplies prior to July, 1906, did not reach 1 lb. each year, we found they were supplied by licensed importers as follows for nine months ending 31st March last:—No. 1, $3\frac{1}{2}$ lbs., about 1 lb. per week; No. 2, 47½ lbs., about 1½ lbs. per week; No. 3, 22 lbs., about $\frac{3}{4}$ lb. per week. It is obvious these quantities were not required for legitimate purposes, and the action recently taken is to insist upon those persons who are licensed to import opium exercising every reasonable precaution, so that the law may be observed. The Minister has already decided that if he finds reasonable care is not exercised by any persons licensed to import opium for medicinal purposes, he will not hesitate to cancel the licence. It will be quite impossible to give effect to the desire to suppress the evil of opium smoking if the irregularities drawn attention to were permitted.

This was the effect of the protest made by the honorable member for Nepean and the right honorable member for East Sydney.

As regards the question whether the duty is too high, I point out that it operates as almost a prohibitive impost on a number of proprietary lines, containing only an infinitesimal quantity of opium. The duty is therefore hardly fair to the ordinary consumers of opium medicinally. It certainly is not right to tax the users of a proprietary article to the full extent of the amount of opium contained in the preparation. The duty will press hardly upon friendly societies.

Mr. MAUGER.—The Treasurer has agreed to an amendment to meet their case.

Mr. LIDDELL.—The Government tack and change about so often that it is difficult to keep pace with their proposals.

Amendment agreed to.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 293. Medicinal preparations containing opium, per lb., 30s.

Amendment (by Mr. MAUGER) agreed to—

That the following words be added—"and on and after 5th December, 1907, opium contained in any medicinal preparation, when such preparation would not be liable to higher duty under any other heading, per lb., 30s."

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 294. Perfumery; including Perfumed Ammonia; Camphor (in tablets); Toilet Preparations not containing spirit (perfumed or not); Cachous; Skin Foods; refined Lanoline; refined Glycerine and Vaseline; and Perfumed Petroleum Jelly, ad val. (General Tariff), 35 per cent.; (United Kingdom) 25 per cent.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN (Calare) [5.20].—I wish to point out that vaseline and camphor form the basis of a number of preparations, and it seems to me that the rates of duty which it is proposed to impose on them are altogether too high. On this subject, the Chamber of Commerce, Sydney, has furnished the following information—

Vaseline was subject to 20 per cent., and now proposed to be 35 per cent. Is largely used in making ointments. The duty will work out, including the duty on the bottles, at 10s. 3d. per gross of 2 oz. bottles or equal to 120 per cent. on the cost. Vaseline is not producible here, and should not carry more than 10 per cent.

Camphor, 1 oz. blocks Japanese, old duty 20 per cent., and proposed 35 per cent. It is not producible here, and 10 per cent. should be a fair thing.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—Who says that vaseline is not made here?

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—No doubt, anything can be made here; but what concerns us is whether vaseline is now made here in sufficiently large quantities to meet the demand for it.

Mr. MAUGER.—It is.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—The Sydney Chamber of Commerce, whose members are intimately connected with business operations, say that it is not. I think that both camphor and vaseline should be left out of the item, and I move—

That the words "camphor (in tablets)" be left out.

Amendment agreed to.

Item further amended to read as follow—

Perfumery; including Perfumed Ammonia; Toilet Preparations (perfumed or not), non-spirituous and spirituous, when the duty payable under item 8 is less than that payable under this item; Skin Foods; refined Lanoline; refined Glycerine; and Petroleum Jelly.

Amendment (by Mr. JOHNSON) agreed to—

That after the words "35 per cent.," the words "and on and after 5th December, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff). 30 per cent.," be inserted.

Amendment (by Mr. JOHNSON) proposed—

That after the words "25 per cent.," the words "and on and after 5th December, 1907, ad val. (United Kingdom), 20 per cent.," be inserted.

Mr. BOWDEN (Nepean) [5.27].—I hope that the Committee will agree to this amendment. Twenty per cent. is the old rate. The Treasurer, in regard to other items, has been very careful to insist upon the fact that he has followed the recommendations of the A section of the Tariff Commission, and I therefore point out that it was the unanimous recommendation of both sections that the old duty should be retained in this case. Moreover, the Minister has consented to a reduction of the general rate from 35 to 30 per cent.; and as he originally proposed a preferential difference of 10 per cent. in favour of Great Britain, he should, to be consistent, agree to this amendment in order that that preference may remain. He has offered no explanation of his reasons for putting aside the recommendation of the Tariff Commission.

Question put. The Committee divided.

Ayes	18
Noes	39
				—
Majority	21

AYES.

Archer, E. W.
Atkinson, L.
Bowden, E. K.
Brown, Thomas
Cook, Joseph
Edwards, R.
Forrest, Sir John
Glynn, P. McM.
Johnson, W. E.
Liddell, F.

Livingston, J.
Mahon, H.
Poynton, A.
Sirclaire, H.
Thomson, Dugald
Willis, Henry.

Tellers:
McWilliams, W. J.
Wilks, W. H.

NOES.

Bamford, F. W.
Carr, E. S.
Catts, J. H.
Chanter, J. M.
Chapman, Austin
Coon, J.
Crouch, R. A.
Deakin, A.
Fairbairn, G.
Fisher, A.
Foster, F. J.
Frazer, C. E.
Groom, L. E.
Hedges, W. N.
Hutchison, J.
Irvine, Hans
Irvine, W. H.
Knox, W.
Lyne, Sir William
Maloney, W. R. N.

Mathews, J.
Mauger, S.
McDougall, J. K.
O'Malley, King
Page, J.
Palmer, A. C.
Quick, Sir John
Salmon, C. C.
Spence, W. G.
Storror, D.
Thomas, J.
Thomson, John
Tudor, F. G.
Watson, J. C.
Webster, W.
Wilson, J. G.
Wise, G. H.
Tellers:
Cook, Hume
Watkins, D.

PAIRS.

Kelly, W. H.
Reid, G. H.
Smith, Bruce
Fuller, G. W.
Fysh, Sir Philip
Fowler, J. M.

Kingston, C. C.
Ewing, T. T.
Hall, D. R.
Batchelor, E. L.
Harper, R.
Sampson, S.

Question so resolved in the negative.

Amendment negatived.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 295. Unrefined Glycerine and Unrefined Lanoline, free.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN (Calare) [5.36].—I should like to know what the Treasurer proposes to do in regard to camphor and vaseline, which were omitted from the previous item. I think they should be inserted in this item, and am prepared to move accordingly.

Mr. SALMON (Laanecoorie) [5.38].—On behalf of the honorable member for Hunter, I would suggest that the words "plasters: adhesive and all unmedicated" should also be added to this item.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [5.39].—I propose to add to this item the words "Camphor in tablets"—

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Why not all camphor; it is not produced here.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Very well. I move—

That after the word "Lanoline," the words "Camphor, Vaseline (not being Petroleum Jelly), and Plasters, adhesive and all unmedicated," be inserted.

Mr. BOWDEN (Nepean) [5.40].—The idea was that plasters should be free.

Mr. SALMON.—The words used are recommended by the Chemists and Druggists' Association.

Mr. BOWDEN.—I simply wished to obtain an expert assurance on that point. Then, again, is not "petroleum jelly," merely a synonym for vaseline?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—No. By adding the words "not being petroleum jelly," we shall, for the purposes of the Department, distinguish between the two.

Amendment agreed to.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 206. Essential Oils and Fat, containing Extract of Flowers used in making Perfumes, ad val., 20 per cent.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [5.44].—I have received a report in reference to this item, stating that—

This item was recommended by the Tariff Commission, provided that certain other recommendations were carried out, namely, an additional duty on perfumed spirit.

That recommendation has not been adopted, and as it has been found that this duty will fall heavily on the manufacturers of toilet soaps, I move—

That the words "and on and after 5th December, 1907, free," be added.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [5.46].—I wish to point out that the Treasurer is in error in saying that this duty was recommended by the Tariff Commission. It was only recommended conditionally.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I said so, and that the condition had not been complied with.

Amendment agreed to.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 207. Sulphuric Ether and other ethers n.e.i., non-spirituous or containing not more than 5 per cent. of proof spirit, free.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [5.47].—This item has been introduced inadvertently. It is already provided for in item 9, Division 1 of the Tariff, and I propose to delete it.

Item negatived.

Item 208 (Soda Crystals) agreed to.

Mr. TUDOR.—What about the Excise on saccharine and vinegar?

Mr. HUME COOK.—That will not be forgotten.

Mr. TUDOR.—I do not intend if I can help it that it shall be forgotten.

[247]

Division X.—Wood, Wicker, and Cane.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [5.48].—I move—

That items 299 to 302 inclusive be postponed until after the consideration of item 303.

Mr. GLYNN.—Why not deal with item 301, Chairs, at once?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Because honorable members have asked me to deal with the timber duties before we deal with furniture.

Mr. STORRER (Bass) [5.49].—We have delayed the consideration of item 301—Chairs—for the last three or four months, whilst the goods have been kept in bond, and now when we reach the item in the ordinary course the Minister asks that its consideration be postponed.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Only for a few hours.

Mr. STORRER.—Strong opposition was expressed months ago to the imposition of a duty of 7s. 6d. each on chairs, and a few hours are of importance to a man who has a thousand chairs in bond and wishes to get them out in time for the Christmas trade. The item is not much affected by the duties on timber, and we should deal with it before we deal with those duties. If the Treasurer would agree to place chairs, lounges and settees in one item it could be dealt with in five minutes.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I will not agree to do that at present. I am going to conduct the business in my own way or not at all.

Mr. STORRER.—Of course the Minister must please himself in the matter, but I will oppose the postponement of these items. As I am known to be in the business, I have received letters on this subject from every part of Australia, which show the hardship which people in the trade have had to put up with during the last three months.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Then I ask the honorable member to agree to postpone the item for three hours.

Mr. STORRER.—I do not think that the Minister will get the timber duties through in three hours.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—If the proposal were unreasonable I should not make it, but we should have the whole of these matters dealt with to-night.

Mr. STORRER.—I intend to oppose the motion.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I will do what I have said, or I shall not go on with the Tariff at all. Honorable members propose to take the business out of the hands of the Government.

Mr. HEDGES (Fremantle) [5.51].—I hope that item 301 will not be postponed. I brought it under the notice of honorable members months and months ago. I showed that the increase of duty involved an increase in the amount payable on one shipment to Fremantle from £76 to £1,000 odd. As a result, the chairs included in that shipment are still in bond.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The honorable member is delaying the consideration of the item by talking.

Mr. HEDGES.—The Treasurer is the cause of the talking, by proposing to postpone the consideration of the item. After what the importers of chairs have had to put up with the motion to postpone the consideration of the item is a disgraceful proposition. They had a right to expect that, at least, when we came to the item in the ordinary way we would deal with it, and now the Treasurer asks us to postpone it. I hope that the Committee will not permit the postponement of the item.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [5.53].—I have been asked by a dozen or more members this afternoon to postpone these items until after the consideration of the timber duties.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Not item 301.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Yes, the whole of the furniture items.

Mr. HEDGES.—There are more than twelve members in the Committee.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The honorable member talks nonsense. I have agreed to do what I was requested to do, and I will do it or will not go on with the Tariff. If the Committee is to take the control of business out of the hands of the Government we should know it at once. If I were making an unreasonable request I should not object to the opposition to it, but when I was asked to take the timber duties before furniture I considered the request a reasonable one. I hope that we shall be able to deal with all these duties to-night.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—Hear, hear. Pass the lot to-night.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I am going to fight very hard to do so. I hope we shall be able to pass the timber duties, the furniture duties, and, perhaps, some other duties to-night. I tell honorable members that if they will stand by me we shall do so. I am sorry the honorable member for Bass has taken up an attitude of opposition to the proposal, as I should not do anything to which he could take excep-

tion if I could help it. I have given my promise at the request of a large number of members to postpone these items until after the consideration of the timber duties, and I hope that honorable members will now go on with the business.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [5.55].—I know nothing of any promises made by the honorable gentleman, but I should like to say that it is a great shame to postpone the consideration of item 301 for one moment longer than is necessary.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—It will be dealt with to-night.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Who says it will?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—That settles it, I suppose. I point out that the honorable gentleman could deal with it now without any debate whatever. There is bound to be considerable debate on the duties proposed in connexion with general furniture, and a very long debate on the timber duties is inevitable. This item of chairs might be taken at once, and dealt with almost without debate. It is one which we singled out weeks ago as being of an urgent character. The importers of chairs have had to keep them in bond. They have been out of their money during all this time, and their business has been injured. In the circumstances, is it fair that now, when we have reached the item in the ordinary way, it should be postponed until some other items are dealt with? I think the Minister's proposal is a most unreasonable one.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I think it is most unreasonable that some members of the Opposition should ask me to do what I have proposed and then turn on me.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—What member of the Opposition asked the Minister?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—One of the leading members of the Opposition.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—To postpone chairs?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—To postpone the whole division relating to furniture.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—General furniture, perhaps, but not chairs.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Are not chairs furniture?

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Yes; but in this Tariff they are treated differently from general furniture, and an impost that is neither more nor less than infamous is placed upon them. If they were

treated as ordinary furniture with a duty of 30 or 40 per cent., there would be no trouble.

The CHAIRMAN.—The honorable member must not enter into details.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I am offering reasons why we should deal with the item "Chairs" at the earliest possible moment.

The CHAIRMAN.—The honorable member must see that if he goes into details with respect to the duties on general furniture, his remarks may lead to a general discussion.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Assuming that some honorable members did ask the Treasurer that the items dealing with furniture should be postponed, I say that item 301 is treated differently from the other items of furniture. In this Tariff, chairs are treated separately, and dealt with in a way, the reason for which no one, with the exception, perhaps, of the Treasurer, is able to understand. I am certain that the Treasurer intends to reduce the proposed duties on his own motion, and why can he not do it now. I feel bound to vote with the honorable member for Bass if he pushes his objection to the postponement of these items to a division.

Mr. WILSON (Corangamite) [5.57].—I suggest to the Treasurer that he should postpone only item 299. The honorable gentleman's object is to prevent a long discussion on furniture before we have dealt with the duties on timber, and I suggest that he should content himself with moving the postponement of item 299.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I cannot agree to that.

Mr. WILSON.—Then I am prepared to move an amendment upon the motion which would prevent the postponement of items 300, 301, and 302.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—That would be a vote of want of confidence, and I shall not stand that sort of thing.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The honorable gentleman can avoid it if he will agree to a reasonable and fair deal. If the Treasurer will agree to that, we will undertake to put the items referred to through before dinner.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Let us have a debate of two or three hours, and waste more time.

Mr. GLYNN (Angas) [5.58].—I hope that the honorable member for Corangamite will not be forced to press the amendment he has suggested, because it would put the

Minister in a rather unfortunate position. I do not think that a vote taken on such an amendment would be a true indication of the wish of the Committee. I appeal to the Minister in a friendly way to give us an opportunity of determining the question of whether 7s. 6d. each shall be charged as an alternative to the duty on chairs. We could probably deal with the matter within ten minutes. I make the appeal, because as far back as the 30th August last I made a strong request on remonstrances against the duties put before me that item 301 should be taken at once, and at the time Ministers were inclined to accept that suggestion. It was subsequently pointed out that it would perhaps be better to wait until the item came on in the ordinary course. Now we have reached it, and this very day I have received communications from Adelaide with respect to the item. It is pointed out that importers cannot take their chairs out of bond, and are actually threatened with law suits for the non-fulfilment of orders.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [6.0].—I will withdraw the motion and go on with "Furniture."

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. JOHNSON.—I am sorry that there has been a little misunderstanding. I mentioned to several honorable members on this side that there was a probability of the Minister proposing to postpone the furniture items until after the timber duties, because the furniture duties would hinge largely on what was done in the case of timber. There seems, however, to have been a slight misapprehension, as some of those to whom I spoke thought that it was proposed to postpone only the item "Furniture." I did not understand it so, although other honorable members did.

Item 299. Furniture (except of Metal, Wicker, Bamboo, and Cane), n.e.i., in parts or finished; including Billiard and Bagatelle Tables and Boards and Accessories; Trays; Crumb Trays and Brushes; Mattresses; Bolsters; Pillows; Window Shade or Blind Rollers; Rollers with Blinds; Screens; Portieres; Dress Stands and Show Figures for draping or other purposes; Writing Desks and Cabinets; Stationery Cabinets; Type Cabinets and Cases; Mirrors framed or not, n.e.i.; Blinds not being textile; Panels for incorporating into furniture; Ice Chests or Refrigerators; Housemaids' Boxes; Meat and other Household Safes; Bath Cabinets; Dental and Surgical Cabinets; Invalid Furniture and Chairs on wheels; Aseptic Hospital Furniture, including Trolleys, Stretchers, and the like, ad val. (General Tariff), 40 per cent.: (United Kingdom), 30 per cent.

Mr. STORRER (Bass) [6.4].—I am sorry that I caused any disturbance, because I have always supported the Government as far as possible. I desire to add after the word "Furniture" the words "Chairs, Lounges and Settees," and to strike out the words "except of Metal, Wicker, Bamboo, and Cane." Then, lower down, I wish to strike out the words "and Chairs on wheels." The whole item would then deal with all furniture, which would come in at the one rate.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [6.5].—I have a proposition to make which will meet what the honorable member desires. I move—

That the words "and on and after 5th December, 1907, Furniture n.e.i., including any article of wood, or partly of wood, wholly or partly made up or finished, and used in any building or premises, including hospitals; also Show Figures of all kinds, ad val." be added.

Those words embrace all that was previously contained in the item in a much more comprehensive and less cumbersome form. They have been prepared by the Department. As to the rates of duty, I intend to propose 40 per cent. in the General Tariff and 30 per cent. against the United Kingdom. I shall afterwards move to bring the rates of duty on the next two items into accord with whatever rates are agreed to on this item.

Mr. STORRER (Bass) [6.9].—I am not particular about the wording of the item, so long as lounges, chairs, and settees come in at the same rate as other furniture. I will not proceed with my amendments.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [6.10].—I thoroughly approve of the Treasurer's generalization, embracing, as it does, in a comprehensive manner every possible description of furniture. It is a very convenient and logical description of furniture, and is better than the minute specification of a large number of articles in detail. I think a duty of 30 per cent. all round is quite sufficient. Although the Treasurer proposes a generalized description in this item, I am disposed to think that lounges, settees, and chairs should be separately dealt with, so that the Committee may have an opportunity of giving a straight-out vote in those cases. The reason why the specific duties on those articles, apparently high on the face of them, were proposed, was because the Tariff Commission were informed that most of the articles of this description

came from cheap labour countries, such as China, where they were turned out at such a dirt-cheap rate that an *ad valorem* duty of 30 per cent. would be practically useless and inoperative.

Mr. PAGE.—How many bent-wood chairs are made in China?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—I do not intend to argue the question, because I know that the feeling of the Committee is against the proposed high specific duties, but I wish to cite the evidence upon which it was proposed. If the Committee do not think that those fixed duties are reasonable, I ask them to impose such other fixed duties as they may consider operative or effective. Evidence was given in Melbourne by furniture manufacturers. One witness was Mr. George Dellit, representing John Dellit and Sons, wickerware furniture manufacturers, North Melbourne. In reference to the wicker and bamboo furniture trade, he said—

We cannot compete against Japanese and Chinese, whose labour only costs 4d. per day. For example:—

1 chair in China, 1 day's work, 4d.

1 chair in Melbourne, 1 day's work, 6s.

The only way we can settle same is to fix a fixed duty on each chair and lounge, as Chinese chairs are sold in Melbourne, four days' work in each, 10s. to 12s. each.

In another part of his evidence he stated—

This part of our trade is crippled through the importation of goods from China, India, and Japan, including the Straits Settlement, where wages range from 5d. to 9d. per day. Some of the lounges and chairs coming from these countries would take any man three days to make, and 25 per cent. (*ad valorem*), say, on a lounge with three days' work on it, invoiced at 5s. in Canton, scarcely alters the price of it here, as we have seen them sold at 12s. 6d. to 15s., including all costs. We, therefore, ask that a duty of 10s. be placed on each lounge or settee, and 7s. 6d. on each chair.

Mr. WATSON.—It should have been specified as bamboo or wicker.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—I do not know whether it is confined to bamboo or wicker; but that is the evidence on which we decided to recommend the fixed duty; and, without comment, I leave the matter entirely with the Committee.

Mr. MAHON (Coolgardie) [6.15].—Personally, I think 5 per cent. more or less on furniture used by private individuals is not a very vital matter. But the honorable and learned member for Bendigo ought to have read a little more of the evidence, in order to have shown the other side of the case.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—The honorable member for Bendigo has not informed us what the imports are.

Mr. MAHON.—All we have had is the testimony of one gentleman interested in the manufacture of these goods. I rise, more particularly to urge that there ought to be a differentiation in favour of hospitals and kindred institutions.

Mr. TUDOR.—Why? Such institutions are maintained with public money.

Mr. MAHON.—Exactly; they are maintained by private and public subscription; and we shall be merely taking money out of one pocket and putting it into the other, if we impose a duty on their requisites. We ought not to have an impost which will make it more difficult to maintain those institutions. We know the difficulty there is, especially in the remoter parts of the Commonwealth, in carrying on hospitals.

Mr. CROUCH.—Let us pass this item, and insert a special item in favour of hospitals.

Mr. MAHON.—If the Treasurer will accept that suggestion, I have no more to say.

Mr. WATSON.—Chinese goods would be used.

Mr. MAHON.—I do not believe any hospital committee would use Chinese goods if, by payment of a little more, they could purchase Australian goods.

Mr. MATHEWS.—My experience is that public institutions and public bodies use imported goods.

Mr. MAHON.—Possibly; such institutions are conducted by people who wish to make the funds go as far as possible; and for that we can see some justification. I think that public and private hospitals are entitled to some consideration.

Mr. WISE.—No differentiation is made with regard to other articles which are used in such hospitals.

Mr. MAHON.—I think that in the case of surgical appliances, some differentiation is made.

Mr. WISE.—But there is no differentiation in regard to bedding, linen, and so forth.

Mr. MAHON.—Bedding and linen are not so large an item as is furniture. I hope the Treasurer will accept the suggestion of the honorable member for Corio, and place furniture for hospitals under a different heading. Not all hospitals are subsidized from the public Treasury, and great difficulty is experienced in conducting

them on the public subscriptions which are raised by the utmost efforts of the committees of management.

Mr. HUME COOK.—Is not that a reason why they should buy locally-made goods?

Mr. MAHON.—Committees of management go where they can buy the cheapest goods, and do the most with the money. If I give £1 to a hospital, I want it to be spent in such a way as to give the utmost benefit to the patients.

Mr. HUME COOK.—I should like my £1 to be spent in Australia.

Mr. MAHON.—The unfortunate patients ought to receive 20s. in value for every £1 given by the subscribers. I hope the Committee will see their way to remove hospital furniture from this item, and, at any rate, make it subject to a lower duty.

Mr. JOHNSON (Lang) [6.20].—I had intended raising the very point suggested by the honorable member for Coolgardie, and but for the prior amendment by the Treasurer I should have moved the insertion of a new item, as follows—

299A. Aseptic Hospital Furniture, including Operating Tables, Trolleys, Stretchers, and the like, free.

Mr. WATSON.—We cannot distinguish in that way.

Mr. JOHNSON.—I think we can. These are goods of special manufacture. When it is clearly shown that the goods are for a public institution, conducted on charitable lines, every facility should be given for obtaining them at the lowest possible cost. The funds of charitable institutions will suffer severely if subscribers know that their money will be used largely for the purpose of putting increased profits into the pockets of local manufacturers.

Mr. MATHEWS.—What a question to raise! Does the honorable member really believe what he is saying?

Mr. JOHNSON.—Everybody knows what an invalid's chair is, and that special furniture is required for use in hospitals.

Mr. HUME COOK.—An invalid's chair might be used by a millionaire outside.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Of that we shall have to take the chance. Where there is one millionaire there are a million or more destitute or impecunious people. Some hospital furniture is specifically mentioned as subject to duty, and I think we can just as easily specify furniture of the kind I refer to as free of duty.

Mr. HUME COOK.—Could the goods be traced and differentiated?

Mr. JOHNSON.—I think so. However, the Treasurer's proposal must first be dealt with.

Mr. WATKINS (Newcastle) [6.23].—I do not think that the suggestion of the honorable member for Coolgardie is practicable. Personally, I do not know of any hospital the committee of management of which directly imports the furniture required.

Mr. MAHON.—They would directly import if they could get the goods 50 per cent. cheaper.

Mr. WATKINS.—I do not think that any arrangement of the kind suggested would cause any committee of management to resort to direct importation; the quantity of furniture required at any one time is never sufficiently large to make such a plan payable. Just imagine, in the case of a country hospital, struggling for existence, the committee proceeding to directly import one or two lounges! If a hospital committee went to a local dealer, would the duty be refunded on the particular article sold? The common experience is that committees of management, when purchasing furniture, do not ask whether the goods are made by Chinese or black labour, but simply purchase what they require. As a matter of fact, most of the furniture used in hospitals is locally made, because it is then possible to get articles made to order. I should be very glad, indeed, to do anything to assist the hospitals; but I fail altogether to see how any assistance can be rendered in the way suggested by the honorable member for Coolgardie. In my opinion, it is a mistake to have the word "hospital" mentioned, because it may only tend to lead subscribers and others to believe that some relief is to be given when no relief is possible.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS (Robertson) [6.26].—I do not think that the honorable member for Coolgardie has made out a case. I should be prepared to support a general reduction of the duty; but I cannot see how it would be possible to provide special exemptions in the case of furniture required by hospitals.

Mr. MAHON.—The Tariff Commission made a similar recommendation in various other items.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—I do not know of any hospital which has refurnished in any general or extensive way, single articles of furniture, such as wheel chairs, being replaced as they wear

out. Of course, if a new hospital were built in Melbourne, there might be extensive furnishing, and such a concession might prove of substantial benefit; but I do not see that the suggestion of the honorable member for Coolgardie can be carried out. A reduction in the duty, however, would benefit every one concerned.

Sitting suspended from 6.30 to 7.45 p.m.

Mr. SPENCE (Darling) [7.45].—I do not think that the Committee need concern itself very much about the question which has been raised by the honorable member for Coolgardie. My own experience in connexion with hospitals is that those institutions are never called upon to pay anything like the retail price for the furniture which they require. The liberality of our merchants prevents that. In order to overcome the difficulty, I would suggest that a new line should be added to this item to read, "Chairs, the product of coloured labour, each 7s. 6d."

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—We have not reached the item of chairs yet.

Mr. SPENCE.—All other chairs would then be included in the item that we are discussing.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—A difficulty might be experienced in tracing the source of their manufacture.

Mr. SPENCE.—Their country of origin would have to be declared. But, in any case, we import a comparatively small quantity of furniture from the East. In conclusion, I am in favour of the new proposal of the Treasurer in regard to the classification, and I hope that the Committee will adopt it.

Mr. LIDDELL (Hunter) [7.49].—I think that the Treasurer will be acting very wisely if he agrees to hospital furniture being placed upon the free list. We all know that our public hospitals are intended primarily to assist the suffering and the needy, and that they are almost entirely supported by voluntary subscriptions.

Mr. STORRER.—How can we distinguish between furniture which is intended to be used in hospitals and furniture which is to be used elsewhere?

Mr. LIDDELL.—I shall presently show the honorable member the difference between ordinary furniture and hospital furniture. These institutions are established primarily for the purpose of assisting the suffering and the needy, and it would be unwise on our part to add to the cost of

their maintenance. The honorable member for Robertson, I am sorry to say, did not appear to know very much about this subject, because he stated that all the requirements of hospitals in the matter of furniture would be met by the occasional mending of a wheel chair, or something of that sort. In his own electorate there has recently been erected a cottage hospital which has been equipped in modern fashion. The furniture which it contains is of a special class, and has been designed for a special purpose. It is what is known as aseptic furniture. It has recently been discovered that many of our surgical diseases are aggravated by the presence of germs in the atmosphere, and it is with a view to combating these germs that furniture of this special type has been introduced. It is usually made of iron enamelled and glass. Every up-to-date hospital erected since this new theory was adopted has been furnished in this style. Nevertheless, the demand for this class of furniture is exceedingly small, and consequently it does not pay to manufacture it locally. The greater portion of it is imported, and will continue to be imported for many years. Let me instance the ordinary table which is used by surgeons in operating theatres. In some respects it is a very simple contrivance, whilst in others it is a very intricate one. Many of these tables are patented, so that it is impossible to manufacture them in Australia.

Mr. SPENCE. — The merchants import them.

Mr. LIDDELL. — But if the merchants charge the hospitals only the wholesale price why should they be specially taxed for their philanthropy? There is too much of that sort of thing in connexion with our public institutions. I am perfectly satisfied that the Treasurer will consent to the admission of hospital furniture free. I claim that it may fairly be included in the same category as surgical appliances. We need not be afraid that Chinamen will manufacture it, because it is altogether beyond their capacity to do so. It requires to be made by specialists. I would also point out that this furniture is extremely expensive. Only the other day a new hospital was erected in my own electorate, and the cost of equipping it was so heavy that a special call had to be made upon the inhabitants of the district. They responded by organizing two race meetings, the profits of which were about £400, and

with this money the operating theatre was furnished. There is practically no country in the world where hospital furniture is dutiable. I again urge upon the Committee that it should be placed upon the free list, so that the cost of maintaining our hospitals, which are almost entirely dependent upon public subscriptions, shall not be increased.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS (Robertson) [7.58]. — The honorable member for Hunter has given us a long dissertation upon hospital furniture. As he was good enough to say that I understood very little about the subject, may I point out that he is evidently unfamiliar with the item that we are discussing, which reads—

Furniture (except of metal, wicker, bamboo, and cane).

Now, the whole of his speech was devoted to hospital furniture, which technically does not embrace wood or wicker ware, but all those articles used in equipping hospitals which are made of metalware. It will thus be seen that the honorable member has still something to learn in reference to this matter. I take it that the Treasurer will consent to a reduction of the duty upon this item, so that it will affect all persons concerned and not a particular section of the community.

Mr. COON (Batman) [7.59]. — I find that last year £212,526 worth of furniture was imported into the Commonwealth.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON. — That was inclusive of chairs?

Mr. COON. — Of that amount chairs to the value of £161,000 were imported. Had those chairs been made in the Commonwealth their manufacture would have provided employment for 400 men at good wages. In connexion with this industry the man in charge of the turning machine is paid £2 18s.; the frenchpolisher gets £2 15s., and the persons driving the engines receive £2 17s. and £2 15s.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON. — How do these rates compare with the rates prevailing in the United States, from which a number of these chairs come?

Mr. COON. — A number of the chairs are imported from that country and dumped here at less than the sale price there. About 120 chairs can be sent from the Old Country to Australia at a cost of about 17s. 6d., because they can be packed in a small compass.

Mr. JOHNSON. — The chairs are sent out in parts and put together here.

Mr. COON.—I repeat that 120 chairs can be landed here from the Old Country at a cost of about 17s. 6d.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Not complete chairs, but parts of chairs.

Mr. COON.—I propose to quote the evidence of a man who is not a manufacturer, and therefore is not concerned with the amount of this duty. He was called before the Tariff Commission to give evidence respecting the conditions of labour in Japan. I refer to a representative of the Queensland Government who was travelling through Japan.

Mr. JOHNSON.—How many chairs do we get from Japan?

Mr. COON.—The question is not what we do get, but what we may get. This witness said that the average mechanic's wages in Japan was 9d., and that the hours of labour were from 13 to 14 per day, including Sundays.

I was assured by the manager that two of his artisans were capable of turning out the work which would be done by a first-class English mechanic.

Mr. PAGE.—That is only hearsay evidence.

Mr. COON.—It is sworn evidence.

Mr. PAGE.—He was never in Japan.

Mr. COON.—It is sworn evidence.

Mr. PAGE.—Somebody told him.

Mr. COON.—It is the evidence of Mr. Frederick Jones.

Mr. PAGE.—I know him better than I know the honorable member.

Mr. COON.—I ask honorable members to listen to the evidence, in which he summed up the position—

76114. *By the Chairman.*—Kindly summarize, for my benefit, your ideas about the state of labour in Japan as a competing country with Australia?—I singled out Java and Japan. I say there is an immediate danger from Java with respect to the furniture trade. By the furniture trade, as I have explained to the Commission, I do not mean fancy furniture, but every-day articles, such as chairs and tables, wardrobes, office-desks, and similar things. I know, of my own knowledge, they are preparing now to enter into competition here. I say also it is impossible for us to compete with them under the present Tariff of 25 per cent. That refers to Java only. The wood is teak, which is very cheap, and a very high class of wood. I also explained to the Commission that during my last visit to Java I met an Australian merchant there, who was on the spot preparing to introduce the furniture here.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Last year £24 worth was imported from Java.

Mr. COON.—He continues—

I also told the Commission, in answer to a question, that if I were not engaged at the pre-

sent time, and I thought the Australian Tariff would not be raised, I myself would enter into the business of importing furniture from Java.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Does the honorable member think that the importation of £24 worth of furniture from Java is a serious question to talk about?

Mr. COON.—It is not a question of what is coming in, but of what may come in. We are legislating not for to-day but for the future. This witness also said that he had seen women with children on their backs engaged in loading ships. If we could get this duty imposed it would give employment to hundreds of men. The machinery has been ordered, and is on its way to the Commonwealth for the purpose of making a large quantity of this furniture. I hope that honorable members will give favorable consideration to the testimony of an independent witness who is not a Victorian or a New South Wales man, nor interested in a factory. I trust that they will give to this industry the protection it is entitled to receive.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN (Calare) [8.8].—I think that the suggestion of the honorable member for Coolgardie to exempt furniture for hospitals and charitable institutions is worthy of consideration, but my difficulty is to devise some means by which it can reasonably be done.

Mr. MAHON.—The Government themselves do so in the Tariff.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—If the Government are able to do that I am prepared to support the honorable member in that regard. We are now dealing with a line of articles which practically enter into every home which has any pretensions to decency and civilization. This duty if imposed will fall upon a very large section of the community. Under this Tariff the poorer classes who are compelled by their needs to buy the cheaper lines of furniture will have to contribute to a larger extent towards the revenue. The proposed minimum duty of 7s. 6d. per chair means that a number of the more expensive chairs will probably cost twice as much as they do. But a large percentage of the chairs which are used by the working people do not cost much more than about half that sum. It means that the burden of this taxation will fall upon those who are least able to bear it, and who should receive some consideration at our hands. The honorable member for Bendigo has informed the Committee how these high duties came to be proposed.

Some witnesses went before the Tariff Commission, and raised the Asiatic bogey. They said that Australia was suffering from or threatened with competition from the East of such a character that the imposition of high duties was absolutely essential to maintain the Australian industry. The position was stated as one Chinaman making one chair per day at a wage of 4d. competing with a white man making one chair per day at 6s. It was asked, was it possible under those conditions for white people to compete with importations from the East. The honorable member did not state the extent of the competition or quote the figures derived from the Customs returns. I hold in my hand a return prepared by the Commonwealth Statistician and giving the figures for last year.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Is it customary to pay 6s. for the making of a chair valued at 3s. 6d.?

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—After this Tariff has passed through the House, I am very much afraid that the honorable member will have to pay that. According to this return, which covers all descriptions of furniture, the total importations for 1906 amounted to £244,355. Only about £24,572 worth came from the East, namely, £8,577 from Hong Kong, £1,146 from the Straits Settlements, £878 from China, and £13,971 worth from Japan. The new bogey which has been raised by the honorable member for Batman—Java—is not mentioned in the return.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Yes; it shows that in 1906 we imported £24 worth from Java.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—I had not noticed the figures for Java. At any rate, that is an item which the Commonwealth can very well disregard. In 1906 £219,000 or £220,000 worth of this furniture was imported from European countries, Great Britain sending £102,000 worth, and Germany £63,000 worth; while from the United States we imported £46,000 worth. That is a complete reply, I think, to the scare which was raised before the Tariff Commission, and which may be raised here as to the competition from eastern countries. I remind the Committee that the competition is in a line of articles which do not enter very largely into general use. It relates chiefly to cane and wicker-work chairs, settees, and articles of that description which are not used for the general purposes to which the kinds of furniture under consideration are adapted.

The chair which is more commonly used now is a bentwood chair known as the Austrian chair, but not necessarily made in that country. It is practically the only description of chair which is suitable to the varying temperatures which obtain in the Commonwealth. To place a duty of 7s. 6d. on a chair of that class is simply to prohibit its use, and to inflict a great burden on a large section of the citizens. The amendment foreshadowed by the Treasurer is certainly an improvement on the item as it stands, and will, I hope, be adopted. I trust that a very reasonable reduction will be made, and that the specific duty will be replaced by an *ad valorem* duty, because the former places a very heavy burden on those who are compelled to buy the cheaper descriptions of chairs.

Mr. TUDOR (Yarra) [8.14].—I regret that the Government have seen fit to amend their proposals, and to place a number of items together. I understand that the Treasurer has proposed to put all furniture and all settees, lounges, and chairs under one heading.

Mr. STORRER.—He has not done that.

Mr. TUDOR.—That, I believe, is the proposal which the Treasurer made before the adjournment for dinner—"Furniture n.e.i."

Mr. STORRER.—No; he is going to move in respect of settees, lounges, and chairs separately.

Mr. TUDOR.—When we come to those items no doubt the Minister will have them struck out.

Mr. STORRER.—No; they will be put on the same footing as other furniture.

Mr. TUDOR.—What is the difference? They might just as well be allowed to stand as they appear in the schedule.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Does the honorable member flatter himself for a moment that he can get more duty put on chairs than on anything else?

Mr. TUDOR.—I intend to put the case for chairs before the Committee, and to show that they differ from other furniture on account of the cost of packing. Some honorable members have spoken about the poor shopkeepers who have had thousands of cases of chairs kept in bond. Now, if a shopkeeper is in such a position as to have thousands of cases of chairs consigned to him, he is by no means a poor man. There are four dozen chairs in each case.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—What sort of chairs?

Mr. TUDOR.—Ordinary Vienna bentwood chairs and American chairs.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Not bentwood chairs, surely?

Mr. TUDOR.—Yes; they are taken to pieces and packed for export. They take up less than one-fourth the amount of space that ordinary furniture does, so that the cost of freight would only be one-fourth as much.

Mr. STORRER.—Furniture is knocked down for packing, too.

Mr. TUDOR.—But it cannot be taken to pieces and packed so closely as chairs can be.

Mr. STORRER.—Yes; it can be packed in a much smaller space.

Mr. TUDOR.—There are four dozen chairs in 16 cubic feet of space. The honorable member for Batman stated yesterday that goods had been brought out to Australia at a cost of 5s. per cubic ton. As a matter of fact, a ship which arrived in Melbourne last week brought out goods that were consumed in the fire on Saturday night at less than 5s. per ton measurement.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—What vessel?

Mr. TUDOR.—The *Metropolis*. She is the last, I believe, of the cheap-freight vessels, because the shipping companies have arrived at an arrangement amongst themselves, and I have no doubt that freight will go up.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Where did the goods come from?

Mr. TUDOR.—I do not know; but freight went down below 5s. per ton measurement recently. Goods were brought out at that figure, not only to Melbourne, but also to Sydney. There is no trade in which labour represents so large a proportion to the value of the article as it does in regard to furniture. If we take the timber as it stands in the forest, and consider the amount of labour expended upon it before it takes its place as furniture in the homes of the rich or of the poor, or in the hospital, we shall find that the labour in some cases represents 95 per cent. of the value of the article.

Mr. HUGHES.—Does not that apply to everything?

Mr. TUDOR.—The proportion is not nearly so great in other lines as it is in regard to furniture.

Mr. HUGHES.—Take the iron line.

Mr. TUDOR.—Take the honorable member's suit of clothes. From the raw wool to the suit of clothes, the labour cost does not represent anything near the same

percentage as the proportion of labour involved in furniture, from the timber to the finished article, although wool is a more valuable product to start with than timber is. I regret that the Government have not seen fit to adhere to their original proposal. The Tariff Commission went carefully into this matter, and the Chairman has told us that the chairs they had in mind in making their recommendation for a duty of 7s. 6d. per chair were the cheap chairs that are imported into this country from places like China and Japan. Speaking of furniture generally, honorable members who have taken the trouble to look into the figures, will have observed that the imports have increased during the last three years. In 1904, the imports were valued at £181,620; in 1905, they went up to £201,284; and in 1906, to £212,526. It may be said that there has been an increase in local manufacture, but I think we are entitled to have the whole of this trade for the benefit of Australian workmen. I believe that Australians have a greater right to share in the prosperity of this country than any foreigner has, no matter where he may be domiciled.

Mr. HUGHES.—The honorable member wants trade for Ah Wong of Little Bourke-street.

Mr. TUDOR.—No; I have always been in favour of securing the trade for the white workman. There is not to-day, and there has not been, a Chinaman employed in the only chair factory in Melbourne, which, I am given to understand, is the only chair factory pure and simple in the Commonwealth. Of course, any cabinet-maker can make a chair, but not at a price to compete with articles imported at very low figures. An invoice has been handed to me by the honorable member for Batman, which shows the low price of imported chairs. Messrs. John A. Dunn's chairs, imitation walnut, imitation rosewood, imitation mahogany, and imitation antique oak, are sold at £1 11s. 3d. per dozen f.o.b., New York. Chairs in natural oak, antique oak and English oak, are sold at £1 15s. 5d. per dozen f.o.b., New York. I admit that the duty proposed on chairs is probably the highest duty in the Tariff. But that does not frighten me.

Mr. HUGHES.—I suppose the honorable member has bought all the chairs he wants?

Mr. TUDOR.—I think not. Even in such a well-kept family as the honorable member has, the children will occasionally break the furniture. I am a family man

myself, and I do not think I have all the chairs that I shall require if I live much longer, as I have no doubt that my children will break chairs. Referring to the imports from foreign countries, the honorable member for Lang endeavoured to ridicule the amount of furniture imported from Java.

Mr. JOHNSON.—I referred to the statistical returns for last year.

Mr. TUDOR.—I have the same returns before me. They show that the value of the imports from Germany was £49,160.

Mr. JOHNSON.—The honorable member for Batman was complaining about Java.

Mr. TUDOR.—The value of the imports from Japan was £14,194; and from China, £7,489. We can, at any rate, deal with the Chinaman whom we have in this country; but we cannot deal with the Chinaman in China. We have no control over the conditions under which he lives and works. In Victoria, we have endeavoured, by means of our Factories Act, to insure that the Chinaman shall receive the same wages as are paid to Europeans. According to their employers, they receive more; although I and many others, especially those in the trade, doubt this.

Mr. JOHNSON.—The honorable member for Batman said that the competition which we have to fear is the Javanese.

Mr. TUDOR.—I say nothing about that, because the Javanese competition does not appear to be very great according to these figures. From Great Britain we imported £60,000 worth, and from Austria £16,000 worth, of the total of £212,000 worth of furniture, and I have not the slightest doubt that by far the greater proportion of that furniture could be made here.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Is it sent here for nothing, or do we send anything of ours in return?

Mr. TUDOR.—According to the export returns for last year we sent away a great deal more than we got in return. We do not receive in return the full amount of the goods that we send out. I hope the Committee will agree to the duties on general furniture proposed by the Government—40 per cent. and 30 per cent. If I could get a majority to vote with me, I would support a duty of 40 per cent. all round. I have never said that I was going for preferential trade; or, rather, I would vote for preferential trade in precisely the same way as free-traders do. They vote

for preferential trade to reduce duties, and I will vote for preferential trade if by so doing I can increase them. If I can only get a comparatively small duty against Great Britain, and a large duty against other countries, I am to that extent a preferential trader. But I did not try to get elected on the preferential trade ticket. My attitude is perfectly clear on that subject.

Mr. WILKS.—Is not Great Britain the "dear old Motherland"?

Mr. TUDOR.—I have nothing to say against the Mother Country. I had as good a time when I was there as most Australians have. But we are now considering the interests of Australia. I trust the Committee will recollect that by far the larger part of the cost of furniture goes in labour, and, further, that it is a highly skilled trade, and that in that respect it is a more important industry than any other. It is true that the furniture trade in this State is to-day practically monopolized by the Chinese. If I had my way I would impose a heavy Excise duty against them. If we could impose an Excise on Chinese furniture, as we have done against black-labour sugar, I would heartily welcome such a proposal.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—It is unnecessary, if the trade is worked under a sufficient award of the Arbitration Court.

Mr. TUDOR.—The difficulty is to enforce a Wages Board determination, or an Arbitration Court award, in the case of Chinamen. No matter how fair the decision of the Judge may be, if the employer and employé like to act in collusion the award can be broken down. That is what I fear is being done in regard to the furniture trade. About 500 Chinese are employed in the furniture industry in Victoria. We have been told by the honorable member for Dalley, in one of his lectures, that we should not go outside the reports of the Tariff Commission for our information.

Mr. WILKS.—Well, read the blue book.

Mr. TUDOR.—I intend to read from the red book; the honorable member can afterwards read from the blue book, if he desires to do so. This is some of the evidence of Mr. Archibald Dobson, the secretary to the United Furniture Trades Society, Melbourne—

Eighty per cent. of the furniture imported could be made in the Commonwealth. The furniture that cannot be made locally is bent wood.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—That is not quite correct, because a plant has been put down for the manufacture of such furniture.

Mr. TUDOR.—Yes. A firm in Melbourne has gone to the expense of ordering machinery which will be useless unless a high duty is placed on chairs.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Are we to save rash speculators?

Mr. TUDOR.—The members of the firm knew that the Tariff Commission had recommended a duty of 7s. 6d. each on chairs, that the Government were pledged to protection, and that in addition to the Ministerial supporters, many of the honorable members sitting on the Opposition corner benches were elected to support effective protection. Mr. Dobson continued—

The furniture that cannot be made locally is bent work, though chairs are produced in Australia that take the place of bent wood chairs to a great extent. One of the greatest troubles is the Chinese competition. This, in conjunction with the imports, leaves very little for the white cabinetmakers in Australia to do. There are factories in Melbourne which used to employ numbers of men in making furniture, but which employ none now. In New South Wales the trade has been saved somewhat by the piano factory being established. A great number of furniture makers are now employed at that work. They wanted more duty and fewer Chinese.

Mr. FRAZER.—What does Mr. Dobson know about the conditions of employment in Sydney?

Mr. TUDOR.—Mr. Dobson has made many journeys to Sydney during the last few years, and as secretary to a federated society knows the conditions that obtain in both Sydney and Melbourne. Melbourne workers often go to Sydney to obtain employment, while many Sydney workers are to be found in Melbourne. It has been stated in this chamber that high duties tend to increase prices, but, according to a witness before the Tariff Commission—

Prices have decreased under increased protection. Under a 15 per cent. duty the price for a five-drawer cedar chest was £3 17s. 6d.; under a 25 per cent. duty the increased output enabled them to sell the same article at £2 10s. A seven-drawer chest, formerly sold at £4 17s. 6d., afterwards sold at £2 15s.; and an eight-drawer serpentine Scotch chest, sold then at £9 unpainted, is now £6.

That is the evidence of Mr. Mathias, of South Australia.

Mr. MAHON.—Apparently, if we make the duty high enough, furniture will be given away.

Mr. TUDOR.—It was also stated that—

A certain imported overmantel is quoted at 5s. 6d., or in half-dozens at 8s. To produce

that locally it would cost 5s. 6d. for labour, 8s. for glass, and 4s. or 5s. for timber. Mantels and overmantels vary in price. A mantelpiece is sold as low as 7s. 6d., and an overmantel at the same rate—or 15s. for the complete article.

Some honorable members have contended that hospitals should get their furniture free; but hospitals, and all public institutions, which are supported by Government money, should pay duty on imported furniture, just as private persons must do.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Such duties are a tax on the suffering and sick.

Mr. TUDOR.—I trust that the Committee will impose a sufficiently high duty on furniture to increase the employment available to the men engaged in the chair-making and general furniture trade, so that the industry will be more profitable to the workers engaged in it in the future than it has been in the past.

Mr. GLYNN (Angas) [8.36].—The honorable member for Yarra has spoken with great vigour, as he always does, in favour of high duties on furniture. He might appropriately have said, in the language of Macbeth—"This line 'will chair me ever, or disseat me now.'" Although he asks for more protection to the furniture trade, I have evidence that in South Australia that trade is in a very flourishing condition. He has read Mr. Mathias' evidence, and I would accept Mr. Mathias' statements, even if they were not sworn, because I know his character and ability. He is managing a factory which was started under him a few years ago, about 3 miles from Adelaide, and did so well under the old Tariff that it can scarcely cope with its orders. It turns out a tip-top article, with the result that its output has increased enormously, and I believe that Mr. Mathias would be able to find work for 50 or 100 hands to-morrow, at high wages, if the honorable member for Yarra could supply them to him.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—He could take on fifty men.

Mr. GLYNN.—I speak from knowledge. I do not think that he wishes for a higher duty than 25 per cent. The factory to which I allude has been successful from every point of view, and this afternoon I received a letter in regard to the condition of the furniture-making industry in South Australia, in which the writer says—

Referring to the policy of a high Tariff upon chairs and upon furniture generally, the trade desires to point out that the equipment of the manufacturing trade, though large and increasing, is quite unsuitable to adequately increase the

supply of locally-made goods. In men alone, the trade is most seriously deficient, and every State is competing with every other, almost unsuccessfully, to obtain men. In an instance of which I have personal knowledge, the largest manufacturer in Adelaide has had an order for twenty-four dozen chairs of one pattern for over five weeks, and has only succeeded, after serious delay, in delivering half-a-dozen, and subsequently a few more, whilst there is no prospect in sight of obtaining sufficient for pressing needs. This kind of difficulty has been chronic for over twelve months with regard also to all furniture.

As a matter of fact, I believe that it does not pay to manufacture in Australia chairs of the kind upon which a duty of 7s. 6d. each has been imposed. Such chairs will not be made here for many years to come; one of the reasons being that, with skilled labour so scarce, it is more profitable to employ men in making better-class furniture. There is a great disparity between the wages paid in Austria and America, from which countries most of these chairs come—or in Japan—from which there is a small importation—and those paid in Australia. It does not pay the Australian manufacturers who have a big business in better-class furniture to make chairs which are exported for 2s. 11d. each.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The cheapest chairs come from America.

Mr. GLYNN.—Ten firms have quoted the f.o.b. price to me as 2s. 11d. each. As regards the proposed duty of 7s. 6d. each, I will quote the figures of two invoices, which show how unfair it is. The value of twenty-seven chairs imported was £7 7s. 9d., on which the old duty would have been £1 2s. 5d., but on which the new duty will come to £10 2s. 6d. On 888 other chairs, valued at £183 8s., the old duty of 20 per cent. would have been £42 2s., whilst the new duty of 7s. 6d. each will be £333. Should such a duty as that be allowed to remain? My opinion is that the furniture trade, which is a flourishing one, would be fairly treated if an all round duty of 25 per cent. were imposed.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [8.43].—There are one or two figures which I should like to put before the Committee. The more I see of the reports signed by the Chairman of the Tariff Commission, the more surprised I am at the manner in which they have been framed in respect to the evidence upon which they have been based. To-day we were informed that one witness told the Commission that Australian manufacturers could not compete against importations from China and Japan; that in

China, men got 4d. for making a chair, while here they would get 6s. That statement was, on the face of it, absurd. Who would pay 6s. for the making of a chair which could not be sold in the open market for more than 3s. 6d.? Such statements carry their own refutation. Yet the Chairman of the Tariff Commission has built up his reports on them, and has made them the ground for recommending high duties. There is very little furniture imported from the countries I have named, only £8,000 worth coming from China; and £14,000 worth from Japan, or £22,000 worth altogether from the East; while from Great Britain, Canada, and the United States we get £120,000 worth. Clearly, there again we have to fear not the cheap pauper labour, but the highly-paid, intelligent labour of the world. That is the cause of our trouble, if trouble there be. We import about £212,000 worth of furniture per annum. I find from the *Statistical Year-Book* that as far back as 1904 we had engaged in this industry in Australia 5,000 male hands, in addition to about 428 females. I presume that the number has since greatly increased; but for the purposes of our argument let us assume that there are only 5,000 male hands engaged in the industry to-day. I have just made some inquiries from a practical man in the chamber, who tells me that it is safe to say that the total market value of the furniture turned out in twelve months by a fair average furniture-maker is at least £500. That being so, and assuming that these 5,000 men are fully employed, we are annually manufacturing furniture of the value of £2,500,000. That is really an under-estimate, for even in 1904 there were, as I have said, 5,000 males and 428 females engaged in the industry. We import about £1 worth for every £11 10s. worth of furniture that we make in Australia; in other words, our total importations to-day represents only about 8 per cent. or 9 per cent. of the value of the furniture that is locally made. Does that show that we cannot hold up our heads under the old duties? Does it show that the industry is strangled? On the contrary, it clearly and unmistakably indicates that we are able to-day to compete with the rest of the world—that the industry is flourishing, and that we do not need the imposition which the Treasurer, acting on the recommendation of the protectionist section of the Tariff Commission, has seen fit to propose. I wonder why the Chairman of the Tariff Commission has not been able

give us some of the information that I have just furnished to the Committee, and which any honorable member could obtain by referring to *Coghlan*. I fail to understand why we have been paying thousands of pounds to enable the Commission to make investigations when, by reference to *Coghlan*, we can obtain better information than it furnishes. The honorable member for Bendigo must be playing with the Committee when he declines to give us any information except from one interested individual who says that he cannot carry on, and that if we do not put a stop to Chinese labour he will have to go under. The figures I have quoted show that it is the Chinaman in Australia and not the Chinaman abroad that is hurting us. Does the honorable member for Yarra expect me, as a self-respecting decent white man, to decline to take the furniture made by men of my own kith and kin in order to find work for Chinamen in Melbourne? Before he asks for these prohibitive duties he ought to tell us what he is going to do with the Chinese in the furniture trade in Australia. He is frank enough to tell us that the furniture industry here is in the hands of the Chinese, and yet he is clamouring for prohibitive duties in order to protect them against our own kith and kin at Home.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—What about the white men engaged in the industry in South Australia?

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—So far as I am able to see, the white men in the furniture trade of South Australia are doing very well; I have not heard that their industry is being strangled. The industry in Sydney is not. Most of the large warehouses in Sydney are making their own furniture, and excellent it is. On visiting Anthony Hordern's warehouse, one finds that furniture equal to anything that the world can produce is being manufactured there. The figures I have quoted show that under the old duty of 20 per cent. furniture-makers in Australia have found no difficulty in competing with imports from China, Japan, and the rest of the world.

Mr. CROUCH.—Does not all the bamboo furniture come from China?

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I have just quoted the figures.

Mr. CROUCH.—I do not think that they were fair.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Mr. Knibbs shows that only £8,000 worth of furniture was imported last year from China.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—Has the honorable member any figures as to the imports from Straits Settlements?

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Our imports from the Straits Settlements last year were of the value of £1,100. Can we survive such an importation? We are annually manufacturing furniture of the value of £2,500,000, and £1,100 worth is coming in from the Straits Settlements! I wonder that the Chairman of the Tariff Commission did not sink to the earth when he heard of those figures. We ought at once to cease passing Tariff enactments under which £1,100 worth of furniture can be imported from the Straits Settlements; we ought to pass a general prohibition Act, preventing anybody or anything from coming into Australia. As to the 7s. 6d. chairs, I do not think that we need trouble about them. If I am any judge of the common-sense of the Committee, they are doomed, and I hope that we shall not waste time in debating that phase of the question.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Does the Minister intend to include them in this item?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—They will not be in this item unless I strike out an item below.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Is the Treasurer going to do that?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not know.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The honorable member would save a great deal of time by telling us what he intends to do. At any rate, I invite the Committee to consider well the broad facts of the situation. If there were any danger of our furniture-makers going under, I should not object to the old duties being increased. But they have established themselves in the Commonwealth, and all the statistics I can find show that they are prospering, and need not fear outside competition. They are doing very well, and we ought not to increase the duties.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—Why should they not do better?

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—We ought not to impose further duties, because when we have brought our industrial enterprises into a state of fair competition with outside industries we have done, even from a protectionist point of view, all that we ought to do. If we do more, we close the gates; we prohibit importations of any kind, and assuredly in such cases our industries will not thrive. The moment it begins to build walls to keep out the skill, efficiency, enterprise, and competition of the world, a nation begins to decay. That is the history of the world, and therefore those honorable members who talk about effective protection simply mean to level the conditions

of competition, and not to abolish competition altogether.

Mr. J. H. CATTS (Cook) [8.56].—The honorable member for Parramatta has just told us that 5,000 males are engaged in the furniture trade of the Commonwealth, and he has chided the Chairman of the Tariff Commission for not putting before the Committee information gleaned in the course of its inquiries. The honorable member, however, instead of seeking information from the *Minutes of Evidence* taken by the Commission in 1906, has turned to *Coghlan* for 1904. Had he examined the reports of the Commission, he would have found that the employment of Europeans in the furniture trade of Australia is, not as he suggests, increasing, but is decreasing, and that the Chinese are largely displacing the white man in the industry.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—And yet the honorable member proposes to grant further protection to the Chinese.

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—I hope that the honorable member will join with others on this side in their efforts to place some kind of an embargo on the employment of coloured men in this industry, and to grant substantial protection to the white-workers. At page 404 of volume V. of the *Minutes of Evidence* taken by the Commission appears a statement by the Secretary of the United Furniture Trade Workers of Melbourne that—

One of the greatest troubles that we suffer from in the States is, of course, the Chinese difficulty. What with the Chinese in the furniture trade, and the imports, there is very little left for the cabinetmakers of Australia to do. In Victoria, I think the last returns show that there were not more than 145 cabinetmakers working in the whole State . . . whereas I am given to understand that the last returns available show that there were 672 Chinese working at furniture in Melbourne alone.

I hope that the honorable member for Parramatta will examine this sworn evidence, which shows that, according to the latest returns available, there were 672 Chinese engaged in the furniture trade in Melbourne as against 145 white men so employed in the whole State.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—And the honorable member wishes to put a ring-fence round the Chinamen. There is a fine lot of White Australians on that side of the House.

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—We shall know what kind of a White Australian the honorable member for Parramatta is when we ask him to vote for an Excise duty on furniture made by aliens in Australia, with the object of lessening the number of Chinese

employed in the furniture trade. The witness from whom I have quoted dealt later on with the wages paid to Chinese in Victoria, and he said—

"We have come to the conclusion, reckoning the cost of material and so forth, that the Chinese are not getting more on an average than 10s. or 11s. per week in the furniture trade. We do not feel disposed to come down to that standard of living, and therefore they can beat us every time. It is a matter of impossibility to compete against them."

At question 76223 the witness was asked—

"Can you say whether these Chinese furniture makers are as a rule properly-trained tradesmen?"

and his answer was—

"They are not. They used to come here imported in batches. About nine years ago one Chinaman who could not pay his creditors went away, and he agreed with eighteen Chinese to pay them 2s. 6d. per week and their rice. He went away without paying the half-crown a week. Those Chinese came out here, not as boys, but as grown-up men, and they were put on to clean up stuff. Chinese are very good copyists. They do not work from drawings or designs, but from the finished article in front of them."

We often hear statements made about the States Parliaments introducing legislation to check the employment of Chinese in factories. In answer to question 76177 this witness admitted that the Chinese had an unlimited right to work at the furniture trade in Victoria, and I am in a position to say that they have the same right in New South Wales. Mr. Dobson is an expert in the furniture trade, and understands its conditions in all of the States. In another part of his evidence he made this startling statement in reference to Victoria—

"We should also be glad if some recommendation could be made in connexion with the Chinese difficulty. The Chinese, as I have explained, have got the furniture trade of Victoria in their own hands. In New South Wales they have it nearly in their own hands; and in Western Australia, not only have they gone into the manufacturing part of the business, but they are doing the retail trade as well. They have their warehouses, and they pocket the middle-man's profits by selling to the public direct."

He states what, in his opinion, the ultimate outcome is likely to be, and he says—

"If the Chinese have come here to stay, and nothing can be done to stop them, all I can say is that the cabinet-making industry will go ultimately out of the hands of white workers. There is no question at all about that."

I admit the necessity for a duty on furniture to protect our white workers in the trade against the cheap labour of Germany, China, Japan, Java, and other places where furniture is manufactured very cheaply, and we can apply the new protection to protect the public. But it is just

as necessary that we should do something to protect the white workers in the trade in Australia from the unfair competition of Chinese within the Commonwealth. Coloured labour is as great an evil in the furniture industry as it was in the sugar industry, and we know that in the past this Parliament made special provision to meet the disabilities under which white workers in the sugar industry have to labour. I ask the Minister now to say whether he will not make some attempt to deal with the Chinese in the furniture trade, and protect the white men engaged in that trade by means of an Excise provision such as that which has been applied to the sugar industry and to the agricultural implement trade. In dealing with the sugar industry this Parliament has already given effect to the principle that white workers must be protected against coloured labour in the cane-fields. It is not sufficient to protect the white men employed in the furniture trade against the products of black labour outside of Australia. It is absolutely imperative that we should do something to prevent white men from being expelled altogether from the furniture trade by the employment in Australia itself of coloured labour in the industry. The necessity for action in the matter is shown by the statement that in this trade there are 672 Chinese employed in Melbourne alone, as against 145 white men throughout Victoria. I ask the Treasurer now to say whether he will not make some statement on this matter?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I cannot be always making statements.

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—If there is a big evil in our midst we should take advantage of every opportunity afforded to us to deal with it. An opportunity is afforded now in dealing with the Tariff, and it is only at rare intervals that a Tariff is before Parliament. We can make some provision to protect white workers against the competition of Chinese in this industry in Australia. I say that the Treasurer should inform the Committee whether the protection to this industry for which he is asking is to be for the benefit of the white men or the coloured men engaged in the industry. If I did not believe that we might do something to secure the protection asked for by these duties for the white workers in the furniture trade I should be prepared to vote free-trade on these items. If the Treasurer will not make a statement on the subject, and if he is not concerned—

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—What right has the honorable member to say that I am not concerned, when he knows that I am? He is asking me to interpose something which should be dealt with at another time. He is asking me to make a statement that would provoke a debate quite outside the question before the Committee.

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—If we do not ask the Treasurer at this stage for protection for the white man against the Chinaman in this industry, when are we to ask him for it?

Mr. BATCHELOR.—We do not want it.

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—I am surprised to hear a Labour man say that. From an intimate knowledge of men engaged in the furniture trade, and from associating with them in the Trades Halls of Melbourne and Sydney, I say without fear of truthful contradiction that the white men in the furniture trade do require protection against the local Chinese. Is it not well known that they have been seeking in vain to secure that protection by means of State legislation? They cannot get the protection they desire under State laws, and as we have the opportunity now to give it to them we should do it. If we let this opportunity pass, we do not know when we shall have another opportunity to impose Excise duties on Chinese made furniture, which would give a real protection to the white men engaged in the industry.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—What is the honorable member going to do about it?

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—I am going to do my best to secure Excise duties on Chinese made furniture. I find that the Treasurer will not make a statement on the subject.

Mr. HARPER.—Of course he will not.

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—I am not asking the honorable member for Mernda to make a statement.

Mr. STORRER.—The honorable member is out of order, any way.

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—When I am asked to vote for a duty on furniture I cannot be out of order in asking the Treasurer whether he will see that the white workers in the industry obtain the benefit of the protection proposed. If I cannot get the information I desire now, I suppose I shall have to be content to get it later on. The honorable member for Parramatta laughs, but it is very likely that when the time comes we shall not find him ready to secure protection for white men engaged in this industry.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I am tired of the honorable member's blank cartridge.

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—I think we shall find that the honorable member will not be ready to fight the battle of the white workers of Australia. I hope the Treasurer will take some note of what has been said in connexion with the employment of Chinese in this industry. There is no phase of the question of so much importance to the white workers in the furniture trade as that connected with the competition of Chinese within the Commonwealth.

Mr. SAMPSON.—Is this a second reading speech?

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—A number of honorable members, and especially those in the capitalistic corner, grin when we talk about protecting the white man against the Chinese; but this is a most serious matter, and I hope that the Treasurer, when we come to deal with the Excise duties will see that protection is given to white men in the furniture trade just as it has been given to white men engaged in the sugar industry and other industries in the Commonwealth. I hope that when the Tariff is finally dealt with it will be found that we have done something, not only to protect this industry in Australia, but to conserve it for white men.

Mr. JOHNSON (Lang) [9.14].—I did not intend to speak on this matter, but as several supporters of the Government have made speeches so closely resembling a stone-wall of the Tariff, I may be pardoned for attempting to reply to some of the statements that have been made, which are of such a nature that we cannot allow them to pass without criticism. The arguments advanced by those of the Labour members who support these high duties,

show that their only effect will be to give a greater monopoly of the work to the Chinese in Australia, particularly in Little Bourke-street and other parts of Melbourne. The original reason why the Chinese have outstripped the Europeans in the manufacture of furniture was the imposition of the high Victorian duties. Twenty-five years ago, when the Chinese came here, they were not expert cabinetmakers. They manufactured a low grade of common cedar chair. When the Victorian duty was imposed, the dealers, owing to the low price of the imported low-grade chair, were forced to go to the Chinese for their supplies, and under their tuition the Chinese gradually became more expert. At that time we had no Chinese cabinetmakers in Sydney, but as the Melbourne Chinese became experts, they crossed the border and entered into competition with the European cabinetmakers of Sydney. Consequently, we in New South Wales have had to bear the burden of this Chinese competition, resulting from the high Victorian duty in the past. A return called for by the honorable member for Koo-yong showed that in New South Wales in 1898 there were sixty-nine factories, and 1,075 adult males employed; while in 1900 there were seventy-seven factories, and 1,333 adult males employed in cabinet-making, &c. In Victoria in 1898 there were fifty-six factories, and 808 adult male operatives; while in 1900 there were fifty-nine factories, and 922 adult males employed. The following return shows the proportion of male and female adults and children employed, and the total number of operatives in each State:—

CABINET MAKING AND BILLIARD TABLES.

			No. of Factories.		Adult Males.		Adult Females.		Male Children under 15.		Female Children under 15.		Total Operatives.
<i>New South Wales—</i>													
1898	69	...	1,075	...	6	...	6	...	—	...	1,087
1900	77	...	1,333	...	8	...	5	...	—	...	1,346
<i>Victoria—</i>													
1898	56	...	808	...	12	...	7	...	—	...	827
1900	59	...	922	...	20	...	—	...	—	...	942

UPHOLSTERY, BEDDING, ETC.

<i>New South Wales—</i>													
1898	22	...	308	...	80	...	1	...	—	...	389
1900	27	...	315	...	134	...	7	...	—	...	456
<i>Victoria—</i>													
1898	18	...	214	...	100	...	1	...	2	...	317
1900	24	...	283	...	124	...	—	...	—	...	407

Includes Bedsteads, not included in New South Wales.

These figures make it clear that under the lower New South Wales Tariff there were more factories, giving more employment, and making a better class of furniture, and that altogether the industry was much more flourishing than it was in Victoria under the higher protective Tariff. From evidence given by representatives of the Upholstery and Cabinetmakers' Unions of Sydney and Melbourne, it would appear that the competition of the Chinese was not felt very severely at that time, and that the wages in Sydney were higher than in Melbourne before the trade in the latter city was put under Wages Boards, and were somewhat higher even for some time afterwards. The following evidence was given before the Royal Commission on the Victorian Factories Act, sitting in Sydney, in July, 1901. Mr. T. H. Thrower, president of the Sydney Labour Council, and well known in New South Wales as a prominent trades unionist, said—

In the furniture trade the work was mostly done on the piece-work system, in the cabinet branch the average earnings being from £2 5s. to £2 7s. 6d. for forty-eight hours. The Victorian Factories Act had not drawn any of their best men from Sydney.

On the same occasion Mr. E. W. Cutler, secretary of the Cabinetmakers' Union, of Sydney, stated—

Wages average £2 12s. 6d. for barely forty-eight hours per week. The average is as high as in Melbourne under the Wages Board determination.

Mr. A. Dobson, secretary of the Furniture Operatives' Union, of Melbourne, addressing the Trades Hall Council, as reported in the *Argus*, of the 2nd August, 1901, quoted a letter received from the secretary of the Sydney union, showing wages to be higher in Sydney than in Melbourne. Mr. Dobson added—

Wages of furniture makers and polishers in Sydney have never come down to the level of those ruling in Victoria. Men receive 45s. in Sydney for work for which men are paid 35s. in Melbourne.

This was all under the influence of the lower duty in New South Wales, where the wages paid were higher than those paid in Melbourne, although the workers in the latter city were supposed to be getting the benefit of the higher protective duty, which was presumably imposed in the interests of the workers. The conditions in Melbourne before the minimum wage enactment was passed are shown by evidence given by delegates of various trades at a conference held between the Trades' Hall Council and the Anti-Sweating League, as reported

Mr. Johnson.

in the *Age* of 11th June, 1900. The wickerworkers' delegate stated that under the piece-work system boys were employed to do the work, one factory having fourteen men, twenty boys, and three improvers. The Chief Inspector of Factories of Victoria, in his annual report for 1897, stated that adult furniture operatives earned an average of 31s. 1d. per week at that time. A comparison of prices of most of the furniture is almost impossible, but it can be made regarding some lines. Kohn's Vienna chairs may be cited, the prices being those of Messrs. Anthony Hordern and Sons, of Sydney, and Messrs. Wallach Brothers, of Melbourne, before 8th October, 1901. For number 14 the Sydney price was 4s. 9d., and the Melbourne price 5s. 6d. for the same chair. For number 20 the Sydney price was 5s. 6d., and the Melbourne price 6s. 3d. I have here a great deal of statistical information, as well as a number of invoices, which I might quote to the Committee, but I do not want to occupy too much time. I wish to be as brief as I can, consistently with giving the necessary reply to some of the arguments which have been advanced on the other side. At the present time some of the best furniture made in Melbourne is being made by Chinese workers. I went with Mr. Lonsdale, who formerly represented New England in this House, through one of the furniture factories of Melbourne. When we were admiring some magnificent specimens of cabinet work on exhibition, we were greatly surprised to learn that the furniture which we most admired, and thought to be high-class European manufacture, had been made by Chinese in this city, who were receiving wages higher than those paid here to Europeans.

Mr. BAMFORD.—A Chinaman cannot turn out a good article.

Mr. JOHNSON.—That statement is not borne out by facts which are easily obtained in this city. The honorable member is not in possession of the facts as Mr. Lonsdale and myself were. I am speaking from my own personal observation of the work. The manufacturers said to us, "We do not mind telling you that this is all Chinese-made furniture, that we pay the highest wages to Chinese, and get the best class of goods from them; but it would not do for us to tell that to our ordinary customers, because there would be a prejudice against the furniture on

that account." I mention those facts to show that the effect of the high Victorian duty in the beginning was to encourage the making of furniture by Chinese, and to establish them firmly in our midst, and that the only effect of the high duty now proposed will be to further entrench them in this trade, and give them a practical monopoly as against their white competitors in America, Canada, and Great Britain. In the light of those figures, I hope that honorable members who claim to represent labour interests will pause before they consent to the imposition of such a high duty, or anything approaching it, as is proposed in this Tariff.

Mr. BATCHELOR (Boothby) [9.28].—I wish to reply briefly on one or two points. I believe there is a general understanding in the Committee as to what duties are to be agreed to. The honorable member for Angas, in referring to the great prosperity of the furniture factory at Edwardstown, South Australia, spoke as though its proprietors and manager did not desire increased duties. The honorable member argued that the previous duties had brought about such an era of prosperity that the firm required nothing further. But the evidence of Mr. Mathias, the manager, given before the Tariff Commission, in Adelaide—and since repeated to me and a good many other honorable members personally—was that they could compete with the high-class goods imported, but complained that under the existing low Tariff the markets were flooded with cheap importations from foreign countries, where low wages were paid. This is the largest firm of furniture makers in Australia. Their manager added that they were not afraid of outside competition in high-class goods, such as bed-room suites, roll-top desks, &c.; but they could not compete against shoddy importations, such as overmantels and wire doors, closet seats, and similar articles. He mentioned that the firm were about to start the making of bentwood furniture from Tasmanian and Australian blackwood. Since that time they have put down the necessary plant, and have successfully experimented with the bending of Australian and Tasmanian blackwood for making bentwood chairs. The plant has now been put down, and work will be proceeded with as soon as the necessary operatives can be secured. The honorable member for Cook suggested that some special anti-Chinese legislation should

be passed, but to any proposal of that kind I am strongly opposed. Ever since I have had a seat in Parliament I have protested against the introduction of Asiatics or any undesirable persons, but I have always taken the view that if these people are admitted into the country we ought to treat them as we treat other citizens.

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—The Chinese cannot be made to observe European conditions.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—Our great objection to the Chinese is really that their work is cheaper than ours. I would point out, however, that this problem has been solved in South Australia without the aid of any special legislation. In that State formerly, as in Victoria and elsewhere, the furniture trade was practically in the hands of the Chinese until the firms of A. Pengelly and Company, Edwardstown, and Marshall and Company, Adelaide, erected up-to-date machinery, and by this means drove the foreigners out of the business. There are more white men employed in the one factory at Edwardstown than, according to the honorable member for Cook, there are employed in the trade in the whole of Victoria. This is not a matter of protection against the outside world, but one of internal competition between whites and Chinese. New protection, wages boards, and so forth, which make for equal conditions for all, ought to be sufficient, in combination with up-to-date machinery, to enable white men to successfully compete against the Chinese workers.

Mr. MATHEWS.—We require special legislation as well.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—In my opinion it is a reflection on us as white men and on our civilization, to admit that any special legislation is necessary. Given equal conditions, we can compete with the Chinese every time.

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—Why was an Excise duty placed on black-grown sugar?

Mr. BATCHELOR.—In order that the kanakas might be deported.

Mr. MATHEWS.—We ought to get rid of the Chinese who are here.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—I am afraid we cannot quite do that. It is necessary to have a duty sufficiently high to secure the home market, and thus make it worth while to invest in thoroughly up-to-date machinery. Under such circumstances furniture would probably be cheaper than under free-trade conditions.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [9.34].—The acting leader of the Opposition complained that I had not afforded sufficient information or evidence to justify the recommendations of the Tariff Commission, and particularly the recommendation in reference to chairs and lounges. I do not deem it necessary in all cases to go through the reports of the Commission, which are accessible to all honorable members.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Does the honorable member not think it his duty to justify this very large increase of the duty on chairs?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—I did not think it necessary to make a long statement. I merely desired to draw attention to one passage in the evidence, though I might have referred to many. However, as the honorable member has challenged me I shall invite his attention to another passage in the report of the Tariff Commission, page 471—

In Victoria it was pointed out that the wages in China, India, and Japan (including the Straits Settlements) are abnormally low—from 5d. to 9d. per day. Some of the lounges and chairs coming from these countries and invoiced at 5s. would take three days to make.

Similar statements were made by Mr. Lowe and Mr. Dobson, who are engaged in the trade in Victoria. In Western Australia, Mr. Baker, a furniture maker, voiced the complaints of the manufacturers as to the bitter competition caused by imports from the Straits Settlements, and as to extensive dumping on the part of the United States. Another wickerworker, named Jarvis, in Western Australia, complained that the price of wicker furniture in that State had decreased considerably during the last fifteen years, owing to the importation of inferior goods, while in some cases the cost of material had increased, and in other particular lines had decreased, during that time. Mr. Baker further said that locally-made rattan lounges, which are of superior make, were sold wholesale at from 25s. upwards, while the imported article was retailed at 17s. 6d.; and that chairs were sold at Singapore, f.o.b., at 4s. 6d., while similar chairs were marked in the shop windows at Adelaide at 11s. 6d., and had been sold at auction for 9s. 6d. That price, Mr. Baker said, does not pay local manufacturers, and Mr. Jarvis added that ordinary lounges could be produced locally at about 22s. 6d., while the imported article was sold at 10s. or 12s. It will be seen, therefore, that it was not only the evidence of the three witnesses in Melbourne on which this fixed duty was based.

By the way, this duty was intended to operate on wicker and bamboo work; but, unfortunately, by inadvertence in the drafting of the Tariff, it was made generally applicable to all chairs. I propose to ask the Committee to so amend these items as to confine them to wicker and bamboo chairs, leaving other chairs and lounges to come under the general duty of 40 per cent. In regard to importations, the Commission and myself have been accused of negligence in not giving consideration to that question. However, I invite the attention of honorable members to the complete details, as shown on page 475 of the Tariff Commission's report, as follows—

The following figures, taken from *Trade and Customs Returns*, 1904, pages 420-1, show the value of imported wickerware into the Commonwealth for the years specified:—1900 (prior to Commonwealth Tariff), £90,397; 1901, £117,528; 1902, £153,764; 1903, £104,408; 1904, £120,607; total, £586,704. The total imports from Germany of wickerware were:—1900, £6,652; 1901, £7,568; 1902, £9,206; 1903, £9,486; 1904, £6,658; total, £39,554. The imports into Australia from the Straits Settlements were:—1900, £5,980; 1901, £12,458; 1902, £5,627; 1903, £6,432; 1904, £7,198; total, £37,695.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The imports were practically stationary with an increasing population.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—The population was not increasing in the same ratio as the importations.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Yes, and in greater ratio. The importations from the Straits Settlements last year dropped to £1,100.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—Importations fluctuate. I have now laid before honorable members the information which was available to the Tariff Commission; and I submit that the acting leader of the Opposition was not justified in his charge that we did not properly investigate the matter or place sufficient material at the disposal of honorable members.

Mr. JOHN THOMSON (Cowper) [9.42].—When this item was reached, before the dinner-hour, the Treasurer led us to understand that its consideration would occupy only a few minutes. As a matter of fact, the discussion has continued for a considerable time; and it would be out of place on my part to prolong it further than to make a suggestion which I think may meet with approbation. If I am able to judge the feeling of the Committee, the duty is objectionable chiefly in its application to chairs; but I understand that the Treasurer will so arrange the items as to meet that objection—the duty of 7s. 6d.

being abandoned. There seems to be a feeling that the general duty on furniture is rather high; and I think that the discussion might be shortened if the Treasurer were to accept duties of 35 per cent. and 25 per cent.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [9.45].—I wish to say a word or two in reply to the honorable member for Bendigo, who acted as Chairman of the Tariff Commission. I am glad that he quoted the figures which he did, because they furnish incontestable proof that higher duties are not needed to protect our furniture trade. The honorable member referred to wicker furniture. But I have learned from the Customs officers in attendance upon the Treasurer that last year the total importations of this class of furniture into the Commonwealth were valued at about £25,000. So that there has been a huge drop in the importations since the period to which the honorable member referred.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—The figures which the honorable member has quoted have been obtained since our report was drawn up.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The honorable member's own statistics show that our furniture manufacturers have "scotched" the importations—

Sir JOHN QUICK.—No. They fluctuate a great deal.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The increase in our importations of furniture has not been proportionate to our increase in population. Last year the total value of the importations of wickerwork furniture into the Commonwealth was less than £25,000. The honorable member for Bendigo talked about our importations from Japan and China. I invite his attention to the fact that the furniture used in Australia represents more than £2,500,000 annually, and that our total importations from Japan and the Straits Settlements were valued at only £10,000. The Government proposal is so absurd as not to merit serious consideration. For every pound's worth of furniture imported from those countries we manufacture £250 worth in Australia. Could any better proof be forthcoming that these extraordinary duties are not required to protect the furniture industry from outside competition?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [9.48].—I should very much like to adhere to the duties scheduled in connexion with this item, namely, 40 per cent. under the general Tariff, and 30 per cent. under the Tariff for the United Kingdom. But

after listening to the exhaustive debate which has taken place, I feel that I shall be meeting the temper of the Committee if I propose to substitute for those duties 35 per cent. and 30 per cent. respectively.

Mr. HEDGES.—Will those rates also apply to the next two items?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I think so. Wicker furniture will be dealt with under item 304. Under the circumstances, I am compelled to accept lower rates than I should have liked to see imposed. If I thought that by prolonging the debate I could attain my desire, I should have no hesitation whatever in consenting to the House being called together immediately after Christmas for the purpose of completing the consideration of the Tariff. I do not think it is right that we should sacrifice duties merely for the purpose of securing an adjournment before Christmas. But I do not know that I can do any better than agree to the rates upon which the Committee have evidently determined. Consequently, I intend to move that the amendment be amended by adding after the words "ad val.," the words "(General Tariff), 35 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 25 per cent."

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [9.50].—I ask the Treasurer to accept a duty which will be a little more reasonable. An hour ago I understood that the rates to be proposed were 30 per cent. and 25 per cent. Whilst I was willing to agree to such a compromise I cannot see my way to support a duty of 35 per cent. under the general Tariff, and of 30 per cent. under the Tariff for the United Kingdom.

Mr. HUGHES (West Sydney) [9.51].—Do I understand that the next two items are to be dutiable at the same rates?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Yes.

Mr. HUGHES.—I think that is a fair proposal.

Mr. HANS IRVINE (Grampians) [9.52].—Will item 301, which relates to chairs, be dutiable at the rates indicated by the Treasurer?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—It will be.

Mr. HANS IRVINE.—The Treasurer would have saved a lot of time if he had made that announcement an hour ago. But he seems to comprise the entire Ministry. He does just as he chooses, and endeavours to unduly dominate honorable members. But he cannot dominate me. Under the circumstances, and simply with

a view to saving time, I think that we might accept his proposals.

Amendment (Sir WILLIAM LYNE'S) agreed to.

Amendment (by Mr. JOSEPH COOK) negatived—

That after the words "ad val.," the words "(General Tariff), 25 per cent.," be added.

Amendment (by Mr. JOSEPH COOK) negatived—

That after the words "ad val.," the words "(General Tariff), 30 per cent.," be added.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That after the words "ad val.," the words "(General Tariff), 35 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 25 per cent.," be added.

Mr. JOHNSON (Lang) [9.59].—I desire to move the insertion of the following new paragraph—

299A. Aseptic Hospital Furniture, including Operating Tables, Trolleys, Stretchers, and the like, free.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The Committee have already decided that these articles shall be dutiable at 35 per cent.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Oh, no. I do not intend to be bluffed in this matter. I gave notice of my amendment some time ago, and the articles enumerated in it are not specifically mentioned in this item.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—Will that include furniture for private hospitals?

Mr. JOHNSON.—It will include furniture for all hospitals.

Mr. MAHON (Coolgardie) [10.0].—I hope that the Committee will accept the amendment. I understood the Treasurer and a number of honorable members to say that they were unable to differentiate between furniture intended for hospitals and furniture intended for other institutions. But I point out that the Government have already managed to devise a scheme for differentiating between articles. If honorable members will turn to item 426, they will find that the following articles are allowed to come in free—

Articles specially designed and imported for the use of the Blind, Deaf, and Dumb, when imported by governing bodies of public institutions having the care thereof.

I challenge the Government to deny that that item is a precedent for their adopting the amendment.

Mr. MATHEWS.—But the articles have to be "specially designed."

Mr. MAHON.—Why cannot we treat in the same way furniture specially designed for hospitals? Again, under item 413, no duty is imposed on—

Works of Art, being Statuary and Paintings, oil or water colours, framed or unframed, im-

ported for public institutions or purposes under departmental by-laws.

How will the Customs officers know that any water-colour paintings are going to public institutions? Why should not the requisites of hospitals, which are intended for the needy, the destitute, and the sick, be allowed to come in on the same conditions as water-colour paintings and other articles for public institutions? There is every justification for this amendment, which I hope the Committee will adopt. Probably the Treasurer has the numbers at his back, but I point out that the excuse about being unable to differentiate between articles will not hold water. It is absolutely hollow, as he knows.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [10.3].—I think that when the honorable member for Lang moved this amendment he must have forgotten the wording of the previous amendment, which includes every article of furniture which is made of wood or partly of wood, and is used in any building or premises including hospitals.

Mr. JOHNSON.—On which the Committee has imposed a duty of 35 per cent., whereas I want this particular furniture made free.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE. — We have agreed to that duty.

Mr. JOHNSON.—The previous amendment did not deal with aseptic hospital furniture, whereas my amendment does, and that makes all the difference.

Mr. WATSON.—That furniture is not made of wood.

Mr. JOHNSON.—I think it is made partly of wood.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I think that the furniture to which the honorable member has referred comes under the designation of scientific furniture. However, we have dealt with hospital furniture.

Mr. MATHEWS (Melbourne Ports) [10.6].—I hope that the Treasurer will not agree to the amendment. I intend to take the risk of being called unsympathetic if there is anything intended to be worked in that direction. I am prepared to allow my actions outside the House to show whether I am unsympathetic in the way which has been hinted at. No doubt this is a very good free-trade idea to get in the thin end of the wedge. The public of Australia contribute to the maintenance of the hospitals, and the patients have no greater desire to rest their bodies on imported furniture than have other people. I think that the hospitals might as well use

the furniture which is made here, and therefore I hope that the Treasurer will not give way.

The CHAIRMAN.—I am of opinion that the amendment is not in order. The Committee has already passed an item which refers to furniture—

Furniture n.e.i., including any article of wood or partly of wood, wholly or partly made up or finished, and used in any building or premises, including hospitals.

If I were to accept the amendment of the honorable member for Lang, another honorable member could move to exempt other special furniture, and we might be left with nothing but the original item "Furniture n.e.i."

Mr. JOHNSON.—Before you give a definite ruling, sir, may I point out that in order to guard against the possibility of exception being taken on that score I was careful to put the word "aseptic" before the word "furniture." That kind of furniture has not yet been dealt with. It is totally different from all other descriptions of furniture. It is specially manufactured for hospitals.

The CHAIRMAN.—I rule that the amendment is out of order.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 300. Lounges and Settees, each 10s., or ad val. 30 per cent., whichever rate returns the higher duty.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [10.7].—I move—

That the following words be added :—"up to and including 4th December, 1907."

I have submitted this amendment for the purpose of protecting the revenue. These articles will, of course, fall under the previous item.

Amendment agreed to.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 301. Chairs, each 7s. 6d., or ad val. 30 per cent., whichever rate returns the higher duty.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That the following words be added :—"up to and including 4th December, 1907."

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 302 (Billiard Balls) agreed to.

Item 303. Timber, viz. :—

(A) Timber, undressed, n.e.i., in sizes of 12 in. x 6 in. (or its equivalent) and over, per 100 super. feet, 1s. 6d.

*NOTE.—Definition of a Superficial Foot.—A superficial foot of timber shall mean an area of one square foot on one surface, and being one inch or less in thickness.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [10.11].—I want the Committee to strike out the asterisks after the expression "super. feet" wherever it occurs in this item. In the first instance, I move—

That the asterisk, paragraph A, be left out.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE (Flinders) [10.12].—I understand that the object of the honorable gentleman is to abolish the foot-note and that the effect will be that the mode hitherto adopted for measuring timber will be continued?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Yes; I was going to give some details, but that will really be the effect of the amendment.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [10.13].—I wish to explain that this foot-note was introduced in order to secure a statutory definition of the term "superficial feet." It appears that in the various States, there was a conflict of definition. The Customs authorities investigated the matter, but were unable to arrive at a satisfactory conclusion. The Tariff Commission were asked to remove doubts by introducing a statutory definition, and we accepted one which was given to us in Queensland, and which was supported by a certain measure of authority. I was never very "sweet" on this definition. I have always thought that a superficial foot should mean an area of one square foot on one square surface, and not less than 1 inch thick. I could never see the justice of charging as an inch that which was under an inch; but some of my colleagues thought that that was the true definition, and for the sake of having the point discussed by Parliament, I signed a report embodying that definition. Parliament is now afforded an opportunity to deal with the question. I shall not regret the omission of the definition. I think it will remove a considerable cause of complaint and irritation, especially in connexion with dressed timber dutiable at 3s. per 100 superficial feet.

Mr. FISHER (Wide Bay) [10.14].—This question has been discussed a good deal in connexion with the old Tariff. Undoubtedly, a number of timber workers have claimed that the real intention of the old Tariff was that whatever the thickness of a board might be, it should be charged duty as if it were an inch thick. It was contended, in various States, that if a board were a quarter of an inch thick, it should be treated as if it were an inch thick.

Mr. BAMFORD.—That is the trade practice, anyhow.

Mr. FISHER.—That is so; but the Crown Solicitor advised the Department that under the old Tariff, it had no authority to do so. The idea of the Government in putting the asterisk in this line was to give them legal authority to charge for 1 inch, whatever the thickness of the plank. I think that the Treasurer might very well have stated the real reason why he desired to omit this definition.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—In some cases it would make the duty four times as much.

Mr. FISHER.—There exists a difference of opinion as to how the duty should be charged. If this authority is not inserted, it means that if planks are $\frac{1}{2}$ -inch thick eight of them will come in as 1-inch timber. What the Committee want to keep clearly in mind is, that if they omit the asterisk with the accompanying footnote, we shall simply be declaring that everything will be charged up to the inch. If sixteen planks go to make an inch, then sixteen thicknesses will be charged as 1-inch timber.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—It means that if we omit the definition the timber will be charged in proportion to its thickness.

Mr. FISHER.—That is what it really means. A great deal of evidence was given before the Royal Commission. The Treasurer might very well explain the far-reaching consequences of the amendment which he has moved. Some people thought that authority existed under the old Tariff to charge as the Customs have been charging during the time of the temporary collection of duties under the new Tariff. The Attorney-General and the Crown Law officers always advised that no power to charge in that way existed under the old Act.

Mr. THOMAS (Barrier) [10.20].—I desire to know whether I shall be in order if the Treasurer's amendment is carried in moving another amendment to the effect that oregon and New Zealand pine be added after the word "undressed"?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Does the honorable member desire to make them free?

Mr. THOMAS.—Yes.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. BATCHELOR).—The honorable member would not be entitled to go back.

Mr. THOMAS.—In view of that information from the Chair, I take it that the Minister will be prepared to withdraw his amendment for the time being.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [10.22].—Perhaps in view of the speech of the honorable member for Wide Bay, I had better carry out my first intention, and give the Committee some details as to the method that will be adopted regarding measurements. I thought the Committee would be satisfied after what I said in reply to the interjection of the honorable member for Flinders, and that it would be sufficient to simply say that the old system would be reverted to as far as measurements are concerned.

Mr. FISHER.—I think there was a difference of opinion, and the Crown Law officers gave their view.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The method is as follows—

In the timber trade "superficial foot" means timber measuring 12 inches long by 12 inches wide by 1 inch thick. A piece of timber measuring 12 x 12 x $\frac{1}{2}$ measures in the trade half a superficial foot. In other words, the timber trade, in selling timber by the superficial foot, measures it on its actual thickness. The provision in the Tariff as recommended by the Commission, however, directs that when timber has a thickness of less than 1 inch, the thickness shall be taken as 1 inch for purposes of duty.

E.G.—A piece of timber measuring 12 x 12 x $\frac{1}{2}$, which in the trade is sold as half a superficial foot, is regarded for purposes of duty as being 1 superficial foot. If it is desired to revert to the practice under the old Tariff (which was the same as the trade practice mentioned), it is only necessary to strike out the asterisks wherever they appear against "super. foot," and delete the footnote.

That is a description which I put on record with a view of showing what I am proposing. By removing the asterisk we revert to the old system of measuring, instead of slicing the timber, so to speak, into so many small thicknesses. I think that honorable members will be satisfied with that explanation, which shows the *bona fides* of what we are proposing.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. THOMAS (Barrier) [10.23].—I move—

That after the word "undressed," paragraph 1, the words "oregon and New Zealand pine" be inserted.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—Why confine it to oregon and New Zealand pine? What about yellow pine and other varieties?

Mr. THOMAS.—I shall raise no objection to the addition of yellow pine and

other varieties, but, for the moment, I am confining myself to oregon and New Zealand pine. The reason why I move that these timbers be admitted free in these sizes is because they are timbers which are used very extensively in the Broken Hill mines. I will confine myself to the case as it affects those mines, leaving other honorable members to speak on behalf of their constituencies. It is absolutely necessary for the safety of the mines at Broken Hill that a large amount of oregon timber should be used. In the first place, it is used on account of its lightness; secondly, on account of its cost; and also because we are informed by the mine managers and by the men who work in the mines that oregon timber gives notice by creaking when some portions of the mines are, as they say, "coming together."

Mr. HEDGES.—It is also much lighter to handle.

Mr. THOMAS.—It is, and consequently it is very advantageous to use it in some portions of the mines. But the great advantage, apart from that, is that it does not snap off suddenly, as hardwood does, but gives the men notice by creaking. To use a term that is employed at the Hill, "it talks," and the men in the stopes have ample notice before a collapse takes place.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—Would the companies refuse to use it if the duty were made higher?

Mr. THOMAS.—No; in certain portions of the mines oregon timber must be used, irrespective of the duty. Even if the duty were considerably higher than the 1s. 6d. proposed, it would have to be used.

Sir JOHN FORREST. — What about jarrah?

Mr. THOMAS.—In the first place, it is too costly a timber, and, in the second place, it does not offer the advantage that I have referred to in the case of oregon. I will give a few figures as to the added cost that this duty means to the mines at Broken Hill. As far as the Broken Hill Proprietary Mine is concerned, the duty will mean an increase of £4,000 a year. Under the old Tariff £2,000 per annum was paid. The new duty would mean an added cost of £4,000, making the total duty £6,000 in that mine alone. In the Broken Hill South Mine the duty would mean an added cost of £1,653; in Broken Hill Block 10 an increase of £846; in the British Broken Hill an increase of

£620; in Broken Hill Block 14, £300; in Junction North, £320; in South Blocks, £245; to the Sulphide Corporation, £2,687; in North Broken Hill, £2,200. That means a total of £12,871 in added cost for the mines which I have mentioned. Then there are a number of smaller mines, whose expenses in connexion with timber have been increased by the duties by, say, £3,000, making the extra taxation of the Broken Hill mining industry in respect of timber duties alone, over £15,000. Besides oregon, a great deal of stringy bark is used in the mines, over 500,000 superficial feet being needed in a year for lining. A small quantity of South Australian timber is used, but its use is limited because of its weight, and the consequent cost of freight and handling.

Mr. ARCHER.—Is oregon used in the round?

Mr. THOMAS.—No; in the square.

Mr. ARCHER.—It is put in in sets, roughly squared.

Mr. THOMAS.—Yes. In connexion with the big wide lodes which occur at Broken Hill—some of them 300 feet wide—square sets of timber have to be used. Some of the mines which I have mentioned pay handsome dividends, and perhaps could afford to contribute more largely to the revenue; but it must be remembered that the extra duties will have to be paid by all mines, both those which are being worked at a profit, and those which are not.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—That is the strongest point which the honorable member has made.

Mr. THOMAS.—I think the strongest point which I have made is that oregon timber is required to insure the safety of the men working in the mines. Some of the Broken Hill mines are not very profitable at the present time. Only recently it was stated that the Junction mine, which has been employing a good many men, is likely to be closed down, except for some exploration work. No doubt, the main reason for closing that mine is the fall in the price of lead, but another reason is the fact that it is now more costly to carry on mining operations than it was before the new Tariff was imposed. Whatever our fiscal faith may be, we must acknowledge that duties when first imposed make commodities dearer. No industry has been more heavily penalized by the Tariff than

the mining industry, which has had to carry the baby all along. Nothing has been done for the benefit of that industry.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Have not the machinery duties been reduced to almost nothing?

Mr. THOMAS.—If the honorable member was importing machinery, he would not say that to pay £30 or £35 on every £100 worth was nothing. The machinery duties were imposed to benefit, not the mining industry, but the engineering trade. I do not say that our engineers and artisans should not receive assistance; but I feel bound to point out that this Parliament has done, and can do nothing, directly for the benefit of the miner, although, to assist other people, he is being taxed on everything he uses. I trust that an unduly heavy tax will not be placed on the timber that is necessary for the safety of mining operations. Not only do the miners desire to obtain undressed timber free, but, according to a paper which I have received from the Melbourne Timber Merchants' Association and the Federated Saw-mills Employés' Association, the employers and employes connected with the timber trade ask that oregon timber, 12 x 7, and larger sizes, be admitted duty free.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Those connected with the timber industry ask for higher duties on other timber.

Mr. THOMAS.—We must deal with that request when we come to the item which it concerns. While I may not be prepared to vote for the rates asked for, I shall, if the Government gives reasonable and fair treatment to undressed timber, deal in like fashion with dressed timber.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—Is dressed timber used at Broken Hill?

Mr. THOMAS.—Not underground, though a great deal is used for house building and other purposes. There is a large saw-mill at Broken Hill for the dressing of timber, which employs a number of men and does a great deal of work.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—The honorable member proposes that the rich companies shall get their timber free, and that the poor men who live in cottages shall pay duty.

Mr. THOMAS.—I do not desire that the rich companies shall escape their fair share of taxation, but if a duty is imposed on undressed timber, a still higher duty will be imposed on dressed timber. The

cheaper the production of ore, the more the employment that will be given. It is better to have a dozen mines working than to have only two or three, because, when there is a great demand for men, wages are higher than when men have to run after the mining managers to get employment. I ask, too, that New Zealand pine for the manufacture of butter boxes be admitted duty free, though I shall leave it to other honorable members to speak at length on this subject. In the last Parliament we did not act fairly in allowing New Zealand pine to come in free and taxing oregon for mining purposes. The butter export trade is a big one which we all would like to see grow, and those connected with the butter industry should be able to get the best and most suitable timber for making butter boxes. But, at the same time, an industry which employs a great many more persons, pays better wages, and has a much more valuable export trade, should be allowed to get its raw materials as cheaply as possible. However, if I were to speak for a considerable time I should probably not alter a vote, and, therefore, having put my case before the Committee, I hope that honorable members will allow this timber to come in free.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [10.45].—I suggest that this would be a convenient time to report progress. We have had two long nights and three long days this week. I venture to say that if the honorable member permitted us to get a good night's sleep, it would tend to facilitate, rather than to retard business. I promise him that he will not lose anything by acceding to my request. We all recognise the necessity of pushing on with the Tariff, and it will tend to facilitate business if we adjourn to-night at a reasonably early hour.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [10.46].—I am quite agreeable to progress being now reported, for I admit that the two long sittings that we have had this week have been rather exhausting.

Progress reported.

SPECIAL ADJOURNMENT.

Motion (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That the House at its rising adjourn until 11 a.m. to-morrow.

House adjourned at 10.47 p.m.

House of Representatives.

Thursday, 5 December, 1907.

Mr. SPEAKER took the chair at 11 a.m., and read prayers.

PETITION.

Mr. MALONEY presented a petition from persons engaged in the retail furniture trade praying the House to reduce the duty on chairs.

Petition received.

ALLEGED SWEATING—POST OFFICE, ZEEHAN.

Mr. KING O'MALLEY.—I wish to ask the Postmaster-General a question, without notice, and in order to do so it is necessary that I should first read a letter I have received from two honorable members of the State Parliament of Tasmania. The letter is to the following effect—

We desire to bring before you an injustice of considerable magnitude to a large number of officials in our local post-office. There are less hands employed now than there were four years ago, although the business has so greatly increased that one man is doing two men's work, for which no extra remuneration is received. Some officers begin work at 6.45 a.m. and work on until 8.30 p.m., with short intermissions for breakfast, dinner, and tea, and only receive an annual salary of £126 a year, which no honest man would consider a square deal.

Mr. MCWILLIAMS.—What post-office is referred to?

Mr. KING O'MALLEY.—The post-office at Zeehan.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—They do get extra pay.

Mr. KING O'MALLEY.—The letter continues—

Another matter for serious complaint is that, although the postal employes have been promised a climatic allowance of 10 per cent., up to date, they have not received one cent.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Climatic allowances for Tasmania!

Mr. KING O'MALLEY.—Yes; on the west coast of Tasmania, where there is a rainfall of from 12 to 20 feet a year. The letter is signed by Mr. J. Earl and Mr. J. E. Ogden. I ask the Postmaster-General if he will look into this matter?

Mr. JOHNSON.—The Post Office is the most sweated institution in the Commonwealth.

Mr. MAUGER.—The statement of the honorable member for Lang is not correct. In so far as wrongs exist in connexion with the Department in Tasmania, and I can right them, they will be righted. The granting of the climatic allowance is a matter with which the Public Service Commissioner is charged, and the responsibility is his if that matter has not been attended to.

REBATES ON BUTTER BOXES AND FRUIT CASES.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—I wish to ask the Minister of Trade and Customs without notice, whether he is now prepared to make any statement in regard to a matter which I have brought under his attention on several occasions, namely, the proposal to allow a rebate on butter boxes and fruit cases of the duty paid on the timber used in their manufacture.

Mr. FISHER.—The timber of which they are made is free of duty in the log.

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—The matter referred to by the honorable member for Flinders has had considerable attention because it was feared that if the recommendation of the Tariff Commission, which the Government adopted, to give a rebate on the timber used in butter boxes and fruit cases were carried out, it was extremely likely that the rebate might get into the wrong pockets. Consequently, I have, with the Treasurer, been giving considerable attention to the matter. My honorable colleague intends to make a statement on the question to-day, and we propose that timber used for the manufacture of butter boxes should be admitted free.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—And not for fruit cases?

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—No; it is contended that we have plenty of local timber from which fruit cases can easily be made.

Mr. FISHER.—Is not the Minister aware that New Zealand pine, from which butter boxes are made, is at the present time admitted free in the log?

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—There is a great deal of timber imported, and used for butter boxes and fruit cases, which, as the honorable member for Wide Bay must be aware, is not free of duty. As I have said, the Treasurer intends to make a statement on the subject.

Mr. FISHER.—Following up the question asked by the honorable member for Flinders, I wish to ask the Minister of Trade and Customs whether he is not aware that, under item 303 of the Tariff submitted by the Government, of which he is a member, all log timber is free, including New Zealand white pine, from which butter boxes are made?

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—Log timber; yes.

Mr. FISHER.—What more do honorable members want?

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—I am well aware that log timber is free, but I again remind the honorable member for Wide Bay that other timber imported and used in the manufacture of butter boxes and fruit cases is not free, and that is the timber to which the honorable member for Flinders referred.

Mr. FISHER.—Honorable members are fine protectionists when they are willing that this timber should be prepared abroad.

EXCISE TARIFF (AGRICULTURAL MACHINERY) ACT.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—As I understand that the time has now expired within which manufacturers of agricultural machinery were to reply to the notices requiring them to furnish security for the payment of Excise, or the granting of reasonable conditions to their workmen, I wish to ask the Minister of Trade and Customs, without notice, how many manufacturers have replied, what action he intends to take with respect to those who have not done so, and when he proposes to take action?

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—In reply to the honorable member, I have to say that the time has not yet expired. Instructions were given to give the manufacturers fourteen days' notice. Of course, it took some little time for the instructions to reach the Collectors, and for the Collectors to get the notices out. Immediately the time expires I shall inform the House as to the result, and it is the intention of the Government to see that their proposals in this connexion are carried out.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—It would be well if we had the information before harvesters are dealt with.

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—The Government cannot give the information to the House until the fourteen days' notice has expired. On the expiry of the notice the of the information will be made to honorable members.

ADVERTISING AUSTRALIA.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—I wish to ask the Prime Minister the following questions, without notice—

1. Has his attention been called to a telegram from Sydney in this morning's *Age* stating that the State Department of Public Intelligence had called attention to what is described as "serious overlapping" by the Commonwealth Government of that State's efforts at advertising its resources in the United Kingdom?

2. Will he take steps to see that, in advertising Australia in Europe, State efforts in a similar direction are not seriously overlapped?

3. Will he consult with the States Governments with a view of seeing whether arrangements can be made by which the work of advertising Australia in Europe may be done by the Commonwealth Government on behalf of the whole of Australia?

Mr. DEAKIN.—Answering the honorable member's last question first, I would say that a proposition has already been submitted by us more than once to the States Governments in a general way, and, so far, has not been accepted. So far as we are aware, nothing has been done, and I am certain nothing is likely to be done in the way of exactly duplicating any advertisement which they are already supplying, although we have to see that the advertisements apply to Australia, and not merely to a particular part of it.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—Is the Prime Minister aware that the complaint from New South Wales regarding overlapping relates to a map of Australia which is being prepared by the Commonwealth Government, the allegation being that a similar map has been prepared by the State Government, and is at present being exhibited in the schools and other places of public instruction in the Old Country?

Mr. DEAKIN.—I have seen that statement, but have not seen any such map, nor have I heard of its being exhibited in the Mother Country. Both statements may be true, but it is at least unfortunate that we are not supplied with copies of these documents. In any case, that work has not yet been duplicated.

PUBLIC SERVICE: INCREMENTS.

Mr. FOYNTON.—I wish to ask the Prime Minister whether he intends to make arrangements to enable Commonwealth officers entitled to increments to receive them before Christmas, in view of the fact that the Estimates have not yet been dealt with?

Mr. DEAKIN.—I do not know that I ought to give an undertaking that the increments will be paid before Christmas,

but will consult with my honorable colleague, the Treasurer, and will give a more definite reply later.

NEWSPAPER POSTAGE.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—I wish to ask the Postmaster-General a question, without notice. I have here a publication called *Elder's Weekly Review*. It contains twenty-eight pages and a cover, but less than one page of ordinary reading matter, and yet it is registered for transmission through the post as a newspaper. I wish to ask the honorable member whether he thinks that is in accordance with the regulations, and that the revenue is being sufficiently protected when such a publication is carried at newspaper rates by his Department?

Mr. MAUGER.—I will have the matter inquired into. These publications are all submitted to the Crown Solicitor before they are registered.

EXCISE TARIFF (SPIRITS) ACT.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—I desire to ask the Minister of Trade and Customs whether the wages and hours of labour in the distillery trade are satisfactory, and, if not, whether Excise is being collected.

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—Replies and information have been received from nearly all the distillers. We find that most of them are paying fair and reasonable wages—in fact, up to the scale that we have laid down. In the case of those who say that they are unable or unwilling to pay the fair and reasonable wages specified, the proper course will be taken. They will be required to pay either the proper wages or Excise. There are only one or two small cases in which the employers have given special reasons for not paying the specified wages, but we have replied that they must pay the wages, or the payment of Excise will be insisted on.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—Will the Minister make available to honorable members and to the public the replies of the distillers, showing the rates of wages and hours of labour which the Minister considers are satisfactory, in order that they may be tested?

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—The scale of wages fixed by the Department has already been made public. I understand that very great satisfaction has been expressed with it by all concerned. As a matter of fact, I have

had letters of thanks from some of the employés. I take it that what the honorable member desires to know is the names of those who are paying those rates of wages. I shall certainly be glad to give that information. So far, the results have been very satisfactory indeed, but in those isolated cases where the wages have not been paid we are now making every effort to see that they are paid.

PARCELS POST OFFICES.

Mr. STORRER.—I notice in yesterday's *Age* an announcement by the Postmaster-General that it is intended to acquire some land on which to erect a building for parcels post business near the railway station. I desire to ask the Minister if the House will have an opportunity of considering the wisdom of that policy before it is put into effect, because it would cause a great deal of additional expense, and the accommodation could be provided at the existing post office.

Mr. MAUGER.—It is my intention to ask the House to vote on the next Estimates provision for parcels post offices, both in Sydney and Melbourne, as near the central railway stations as possible, with receiving offices in the centre of the city.

CANCELLED MAIL CONTRACT: GUARANTEE.

Mr. THOMAS.—Has the Postmaster-General yet received the £25,000 due on the bond of Messrs. James Laing and Co. in the matter of the defunct mail contract?

Mr. MAUGER.—Final instructions have been sent to London, and the matter is being dealt with.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—When were those final instructions sent to London?

Mr. MAUGER.—I think they were sent immediately after the recent contract was consummated.

MANUFACTURES ENCOURAGEMENT BILL.

Mr. PALMER.—I desire to ask the Prime Minister, in view of the fact that probably the bulk of the bounty to be voted under the Manufactures Encouragement Bill will go to the Lithgow Iron Works, whether he will cause to be laid upon the table of the House a return showing the extent to which, and the various ways in which that company has been subsidized by the New South Wales Government?

Mr. DEAKIN.—I by no means admit that the enterprise at Lithgow will be the

only iron enterprise affected by that measure. On the contrary, the Bill will be presented in such a way, and, if necessary, can be added to, so as to encourage the development of the iron resources of the Commonwealth elsewhere. But the honorable member is entitled to have his question as to Lithgow answered, if he conceives it to be material. I have no doubt that my colleague will supply all the information the honorable member requires.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—May I suggest that when the Prime Minister is securing the information asked for concerning the Lithgow Iron Works, he should at the same time obtain similar information concerning the Victorian coal mines, and their relation to the Victorian State Government?

Mr. DEAKIN.—Certainly.

STRIPPER HARVESTERS.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN asked the Minister of Trade and Customs, *upon notice*—

1. How many Stripper Harvesters have been imported into the Commonwealth between the 1st January and 30th November, 1907, and what was the value of the same?

2. How many Stripper Harvesters have been exported from the Commonwealth during the same period, and what was the value of the same?

3. How many Stripper Harvesters have been manufactured in the Commonwealth between 1st January and 30th November, 1907?

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—The information will be obtained.

POSTAL DEPARTMENT, TASMANIA: PROMOTIONS.

Mr. KING O'MALLEY asked the Postmaster-General, *upon notice*—

1. How many officers in the Fifth Class, Clerical Division, in the Postal Department of Tasmania were recommended for promotion to the Fourth Class, for the year 1906-7?

2. How many such recommended promotions were provided for in the Estimates for that year?

3. In cases, if any, where recommendations were disallowed, what were the general reasons for such disallowance?

4. How many promotions from the Fifth Class to the Fourth Class have been recommended for the year 1907-8?

5. How many such recommended promotions have been provided for in the Estimates for the year 1907-8?

Mr. MAUGER.—The following answers have been furnished by the Public Service Commissioner:—

1. None.

2 and 3. Answered by No. 1.

4. Two.

5. One.

TARIFF.

In Committee of Ways and Means
(Consideration resumed from 4th December, *vide* page 7024):

Division X.—Wood, Wicker, and Cane.

Item 303. Timber, *viz.*:—

(A) Timber, undressed, *n.e.i.*, in sizes of 12 in. by 6 in. (or its equivalent) and over, per 100 super. feet*, *rs.* 6d.

*NOTE.—Definition of a Superficial Foot.—A superficial foot of timber shall mean an area of one square foot on one surface, and being one inch or less in thickness.

Upon which Mr. THOMAS had moved, by way of amendment—

That after the word “undressed” the words “oregon and New Zealand pine” be inserted.

Mr. FISHER (Wide Bay) [11.18].—There is evidently a good deal of misunderstanding about these duties. The Minister of Trade and Customs talks of giving a rebate on timber which under this Tariff is absolutely free. I do not know what more honorable members would like.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The log timber is free.

Mr. FISHER.—What more is required? I could understand any but a protectionist Government asking that the timber should be cut up elsewhere before it is imported to Australia.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Does the honorable member think that logs can be cut here into case timber economically?

Mr. FISHER.—To say that we cannot cut them in Australia is a reflection on this country, because they must be cut somewhere.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—It is commercially impossible, because the best timber in the log is not used for cases.

Mr. FISHER.—I could not get a better illustration of the want of knowledge existing on the question than the statement of the honorable member for North Sydney, because if the logs were brought in here and were all cut up here, not only would the best timber be picked out for butter boxes, but the inferior timber, which is ordinarily good enough for fruit cases, would be available on the spot for the fruit-growers at a much cheaper rate than it is now.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—By that means we should pay the freight and charges on all the waste.

Mr. FISHER.—But there would be no duty. Surely the importer has to pay the ordinary freight on any goods

imported? Why should he not do so on timber as well as on anything else? As a matter of fact, there has been a great deal of outcry regarding this timber, largely because soft timber is grown in Australia in only one State.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—That is not so.

Mr. FISHER.—It is largely so. In the northern part of New South Wales a considerable amount of soft timber—and very good timber too—is grown. The Queensland people are neither afraid nor ashamed to take their supplies from New South Wales, but it would be only fair if there were some reciprocity on the part of that and other States.

Mr. GLYNN.—Queensland cannot supply the demand.

Mr. FISHER.—If so, what more can be desired than to have the raw material admitted duty free? It is of no use arguing this question at great length; the main point, in a protectionist Chamber, is whether it is desired, not only to have the raw material admitted free, but also the prepared material, with a drawback. The proposal of the honorable member for Barrier is clever and double barrelled; and no doubt he has a strong case, especially in regard to the timber required for the Broken Hill mine. We are told that oregon is the best for that purpose, but I do not know that it is better than hardwood, except for the expense connected with the latter.

Mr. HEDGES.—What about the Mount Morgan mine?

Mr. FISHER.—The Mount Morgan mine is bigger than any mine at Broken Hill.

Mr. THOMAS.—Mount Morgan is an open quarry!

Mr. FISHER.—That is not so.

Mr. WATKINS.—I have myself been down Mount Morgan for 700 feet.

Mr. FISHER.—I speak from personal knowledge, and I am supported by the honorable member for Newcastle. When the old Tariff was under discussion this question was argued at great length, and I then proved conclusively that at Mount Morgan, where hardwood is used, there has never been a case in yielding timber of loss of life.

Mr. HEDGES.—There is no weight for the timber to carry at Mount Morgan.

Mr. THOMAS.—And what is the timber bill at Mount Morgan?

Mr. FISHER.—The honorable member is shifting his ground.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—In the whole of the Tasmanian mines Australian timber is used.

Mr. FISHER.—Honorable members will observe that interjection by the honorable member for Franklin. I do not dispute the statement that oregon timber suits the mines at Broken Hill.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—That timber has caused some very disastrous fires.

Mr. FISHER.—That may be, but I am not here to dictate to the Broken Hill mine-owners what timber they shall use; that is a matter for themselves. My business just now is to refute the arguments put forward by the honorable member for Barrier, quite apart from any reference to the use of oregon timber at Broken Hill. The honorable member told us that the mining industry has been hard hit by this Tariff. But, supposing that be true, what may not be said as to the timber-getters? Those who produce the timber are also taxed heavily by means of this Tariff. Are not their waggons and other tools of trade subject to heavy duties? The difficulties of the timber-getters are quite as great as are those of the miners, because both are pioneers. The honorable member for Barrier has proposed that log timber from every part of the world shall be admitted free, and, further, that partially dressed timber shall also be free.

Mr. WATKINS.—Is all log timber free now?

Mr. FISHER.—Yes; and always has been. When the Tariff was introduced I drew attention to the fact; and I feel sure that honorable members are under an entire misapprehension in regard to this item. A circular has been sent to honorable members from the Melbourne and Suburbs Timber Merchants' Association, and the Federated Sawmill and Timber Yard and General Woodworkers' and Employés' Association suggesting certain duties. One of these suggestions is that this particular item shall be free. Why? In every other instance these bodies suggest higher duties.

Mr. DUGALD THOMPSON.—I think the honorable member is wrong in his reading of the circular.

Mr. FISHER.—It is suggested in the circular that oregon, 12 x 6 and over, shall be free.

Mr. DUGALD THOMPSON.—But it is suggested that other classes of timber shall also be free.

Mr. FISHER.—Quite so; and could anything be more selfish?

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I am not supporting the suggestion, but merely pointing out the facts.

Mr. FISHER.—These people suggest that the timber on which they can make any profit shall be free, but that those concerned in the manipulation of other timber shall face the free competition of the world. Why should the Government, especially a protectionist Government, desire to have this timber prepared outside the country? If this proposal be carried, we shall next have it suggested that a bonus shall be paid on imported timber. That there is misapprehension in this connexion is shown by the fact that the honorable member for Flinders has just asked the Minister of Trade and Customs when a drawback is to be allowed on an article that is not dutiable. I trust that there will be some closer examination into the motives which underlie the proposal to have this particular item admitted duty free. I shall not deal with every item mentioned in the circular, but in nearly all instances a duty is suggested on the smaller sizes of timber. If we have protection, let us have protection all round, and, more especially, give some attention to the pioneer, who is doing so much to open up the country. I suggest to the honorable member for Barrier that New Zealand pine should be excluded from his proposal. The two timbers mentioned in his amendment are not alike, and in regard to New Zealand white pine the honorable member cannot urge that duty is charged upon the logs.

Mr. THOMAS.—But the freight upon the logs would be from 6d. to 1s. more per hundred superficial feet.

Mr. FISHER.—The honorable member takes refuge in the statement that logs cannot be carried so cheaply as can prepared timber.

Mr. THOMAS.—Decidedly.

Mr. FISHER.—Upon the same line of reasoning, one might argue that no raw material whatever should be imported, on the ground that the freight charges would be heavier than it would be in the case of the finished article.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—Dressed timber requires more handling.

Mr. FISHER.—I venture to say that timber in its dressed state can be handled a great deal easier than it can in the rough, in addition to which it can be packed a great deal better. So that if

the freight upon log timber is 6d. per hundred superficial feet more than is charged upon dressed timber, the importers of the former enjoy other compensating advantages. For instance, there is the cost of cutting the logs to be considered.

Mr. THOMAS.—That would amount to 1s. 6d. per hundred superficial feet.

Mr. FISHER.—The dairying industry already enjoys the advantage of getting log timber admitted free. What more does it require? I thoroughly sympathize with the idea that it should be permitted to obtain the timber which it requires as cheaply as possible. As a matter of fact, I was the first honorable member to suggest that a drawback should be allowed upon timber exported in the form of butter boxes. Of course, I am referring to the period when the first Commonwealth Tariff was submitted to this House. The charge which was then preferred against Queensland timber was that it was unsuitable for the manufacture of butter boxes. That charge has now been entirely abandoned, because the proof to the contrary has been overwhelming.

Mr. FULLER.—Men who desire that timber for butter-box purposes have unfulfilled orders extending over two years.

Mr. FISHER.—I am not prepared to say that at the present moment we can supply all the timber for butter boxes that is required. I merely affirm that as log timber is admitted free, it is only fair that the duty levied under paragraph A should be retained. Upon that point I hope that the Treasurer will remain firm.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Importers will not import log timber.

Mr. FISHER.—Then they must have a good reason for refusing to do so. If they can import timber in this way, and obtain a drawback upon it—

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—That proposal is based upon the recommendation of the A section of the Tariff Commission.

Mr. FISHER.—I would remind the Treasurer that upon the very day that this Tariff was introduced I asked him whether the proposal to admit log timber free was fair to the timber-getters. At that time I did not think that the Government proposal, in respect of paragraph A, would be seriously attacked. But the honorable member for Barrier has moved a double-barrelled and subtle amendment, on the plea that the Broken Hill mining companies require Oregon timber, and that dairymen must

have timber for their butter boxes. He discreetly omitted to mention that the raw material of these industries was admitted free. His amendment strikes a blow at the protective policy of the Government, inasmuch as if it be carried it will prevent a certain amount of work being provided in the Commonwealth. It is strange, therefore, that Melbourne protectionists should be found supporting the admission free of the timber specified in paragraph A. Apparently they want the logs to be sawn into convenient sizes in other parts of the world, and admitted free. There is not a spark of honesty in that proposal from a protectionist point of view. This Parliament is meeting in Melbourne—in a centre where influence can be brought to bear upon honorable members in a way that it cannot be exerted by persons located in the more remote portions of the Commonwealth. To us in Queensland this question is important, but it is not so important as to tempt me to ask a favour from any honorable member. We shall survive, I have no doubt, any unjust treatment we may receive. I fearlessly assert that if a timber industry of the sort we are considering were distributed through the States such a proposal as has been made here to-day would not be listened to.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The honorable member must not take it for granted that the Government are going to support the proposal.

Mr. FISHER.—I am making no charge against the Government.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I understood that the honorable member was.

Mr. FISHER.—No; but at the same time I am submitting the matter seriously to the Government. I know that there has been an attempt made to effect an arrangement, but I hope that the duty will stand. In my opinion the timber duties are reasonable. I have nothing to do with the recommendation of the Tariff Commission. I do not take such serious notice of all their recommendations as do some honorable members. As regards the timber for fruit cases, if it does cost 6d. more per 100 superficial feet to import the timber in the log than it would cost to import large squared timber, I contend that the fruit-growers would benefit, because in ordinary circumstances the scantlings are good enough to be cut up for the purpose of making fruit cases. If logs can be sawn and made into butter

boxes here, surely logs can be sawn and the scantlings used for making cheaper fruit cases? That information is not given to the Committee.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—That is a small consolation to the fruit-grower, because in the meantime he is paying on each case an extra 2d., and in some instances 3d.

Mr. FISHER.—Why is he called upon to make that payment? It is simply because there is not available any scantling timber out of which to make fruit cases. According to the terms of the petition, the saw-millers want the duties to be so arranged that they may be able to import only high-class timber. I hope that the Treasurer will not support a proposal of that kind. I suggest to the honorable member for Barrier that he should omit from his amendment the words "and New Zealand pine," so that we may be able to secure a fair vote on the question of admitting logs.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The honorable member wants to divide and conquer.

Mr. FISHER.—No; I want to get an opportunity to take a fair vote. If, however, the honorable member for Barrier—and there is no more astute general than himself in a case of this kind—will not accede to my suggestion, I shall be compelled to move an amendment to his proposal, which is double-barrelled and submitted with the intention of securing the support of the representatives of the dairy-ing industry, which is not affected, the fruit industry, and the mining industry. On the plea that the miners deserve special consideration it cannot be justified any more than it can be justified in the interests of the timber-getters, who are hit quite as hard, and who are entitled to any little modicum of protection which can be given under the Tariff.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—There are many other interests besides those of the miners to be considered.

Mr. FISHER.—This is a native industry in at least two of the States. It is a very proper industry for the Parliament to assist. The timber-getter goes out into the most difficult parts of Australia and, speaking generally, he is the pioneer of agriculture. If we can do anything to assist him surely we should do so, especially in such a small way as is now proposed.

Mr. THOMAS.—There are more accidents in the mines in one week than there are in the forests in one year.

Mr. FISHER.—Speaking off-hand, I have no hesitation in saying that the honorable member is in error. There are more men killed, and more men injured in timber-getting than in mining.

Mr. THOMAS.—Not proportionately.

Mr. FISHER.—I do not know that the mining industry is more dangerous to life than is timber-getting. I have had some experience of mining. I have also cut down a tree or two. I am acquainted with the conditions of both industries, and I recognise that those who are engaged in them are entitled to the greatest sympathy in respect of the nature of their occupations. I wish that we had a method of preventing accidents of any kind. But I do not know that a duty of 6d. more or 6d. less per 100 superficial feet on the timber will greatly affect that phase of the question. In the Parliament of 1902, New Zealand pine was made free by one vote, and the honorable member for Mernda has explained that through a mistake he voted on the wrong side. I am not going to challenge his statement. Clearly, the intention of that Parliament was that New Zealand pine should not be made free. That is a statement which cannot be controverted. I trust that the present Parliament, which, unlike the first Parliament, was elected on a protectionist basis, will not do an injustice to the timber getters in the several States, who are endeavouring to supply an indispensable commodity.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [11.46].—The honorable member for Wide Bay has based almost the whole of his argument on the fact that logs are admitted free. He has stated that, even if a considerable duty is imposed on the timber of which butter boxes and fruit cases are made, there is no necessity for any allowance of a drawback, because the makers of those boxes have the opportunity of importing the timber in the log, which is not dutiable. On its face, that looks a fair argument, but I point out to the honorable member that, although logs are free under this Tariff, and have been free for the last five years, and there has been a duty on different sizes of timber cut from the log, yet logs have not been generally imported, for the simple reason that it does not pay any one to import them.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—It ought to pay them.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I shall explain to the Minister why it does not.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—If they do not get a rebate, they will bring in the logs right enough.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—They will not.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—They import New Zealand logs.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—No.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—Well, all the kauri timber comes to us in logs.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The honorable member will find that he is wrong.

Mr. STORER.—The greater part of the kauri comes to Tasmania in logs.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—It comes to Hobart in logs.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I will get the figures looked up to see what the importation of logs amounts to. The fact is that logs are more costly to handle. They cost more per 100 feet in freightage, and when a man is bringing them in, he is bringing in at a high cost of freight—2s. 3d. or 2s. 6d. or more per 100 feet—a great deal of waste.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—There is not much waste.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—What nonsense! The honorable gentleman need not tell me that there is not much waste, because I have had some experience in this business.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—They utilize almost every bit.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—No; there is a great deal of waste with the log, and all that has to be paid for. But we have the plain fact before us that the logs have not been imported, except for some few special purposes, and in small numbers, although we have had the other duties in operation. If there were a saving to the extent of the smallest fraction, the logs would be imported. They are not imported, because it costs more to turn out timber from the log than it does to pay the duty on the smaller sizes.

Mr. PAGE.—If the Government proposed to do the same in regard to timber as they did in regard to marble, they would impose a duty on sawdust and chips.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Yes. That is a remarkable sort of protection, surely. The best evidence of all is that keen business men, anxious to make every penny they can, have not, under the old Tariff, imported the logs except for a few special purposes, although they have imported the cut-up timber.

Mr. FISHER.—Flitches were free, too, under the old Tariff.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Not in all timbers.

Mr. FISHER.—In the case of New Zealand pine.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I am speaking of the other timbers that were not free.

Mr. PAGE.—An export duty has to be paid on the logs in New Zealand, so that the importers do not save in that way.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Yes; and they threaten to put a higher export duty on. The fact that keen business men have continued to import the sawn timber shows the uselessness of contending that they can profitably import logs.

Mr. FISHER.—Then they have sacrificed the fruit-growers for the sake of 1d. or 2d. a box.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—If they could save 1d. or 2d. per box by importing the logs they would do so, but it is because they would lose money by importing logs that they have imported the sawn timber and have had to charge more to the fruit-growers for their boxes. If we could by any means compel the timber merchants to bring in the logs, and cut them into timber for fruit cases, the cost to the fruit-grower would still be greater than it is.

Mr. FISHER.—We should have cheaper fruit boxes.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—It is perfectly evident that if people now handling timber are paying duties on sawn timber rather than import the logs, if we were to compel them to import the logs, we should simply force an extra charge on to the users of the products.

Mr. FISHER.—Logs were brought in last year to the extent of 1,133,329 superficial feet.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—But look at the trifle that is in comparison with the total imports, which run into many more millions. I think they run up to over 220,000,000 feet super. The honorable member for Wide Bay said, quite truly, that this is a protectionist Parliament. He argued, "Let us have protection all round." Well, the old Tariff was protective in the case of timber. But it is proposed now to go to a much greater length, and to impose duties on timbers that we especially left free in our own interest when the last Tariff was dealt with.

Mr. FISHER.—Yes; by a mistaken vote.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I can only go by the votes recorded. Let honorable members recollect into how many industries timber enters. It affects our constructive industries, the erection of buildings and bridges, and the homes of the poorer classes.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Do not white ants eat New Zealand timber?

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—This duty would not prevent white ants from eating it.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—It would be very much better to use other timber.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—What other?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Colonial pine.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—If the Treasurer refers to Queensland pine, I point out that only a small quantity of it is available. We are not dealing with a duty to prevent white ants from eating timber. They will eat nearly all kinds of timber. New Zealand pine is a timber of the utmost importance in many industries. It enters into the making of furniture, agricultural machinery, and a host of other industries. It affects the fruit trade and the butter industry. Surely we should pause before we place those trades at a disadvantage for no real advantage to any one else.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Does the honorable member say that there is no timber available in North Queensland?

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Of course there is plenty of timber in Queensland.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Why not compel people to use that instead of New Zealand pine?

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—There is an enormous demand for Queensland timber. The demand is so great that they cannot execute orders, and are refusing many.

Mr. TUDOR.—They are even refusing to quote prices.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—They are, as I can show from the evidence given before the Commission. Yet they come down here, and want us to penalize other industries by putting a duty on 70,000,000 feet super. of timber, affecting nearly every industry in the Commonwealth. I also point out that when, in connexion with the last Tariff, we were asked to put on a duty of 1s. per 100 feet, at the request of Queensland, the proposal was defeated. Queensland pine was then selling at 16s. 6d. To-day it is in demand, and cannot be supplied at 21s. 6d. per 100 feet.

Mr. FISHER.—That seems high, but timber has gone up all over the world.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Then there is no need to complain and to demand a protective duty. The price of this class of timber all over the world is increasing, and the value of our supplies every year is going up. When this timber was selling at 16s. 6d., a duty of 1s., which would have given our saw-millers an opportunity to secure only another 1s. per 100 feet, was asked for. Since then they have been obtaining more than 1s. increase, and to-day they cannot book orders at 21s. 6d. That being so, their whole case falls to the ground. We are asked to impose duties on imported timbers used in the manufacture of butter-boxes, fruit-boxes, and furniture, in order to assist an industry that is so flourishing that it cannot book orders for long periods ahead at 5s. per 100 feet in excess of the price which prevailed in 1902.

Mr. FISHER.—Who refuses to book such orders?

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The Melbourne and other agents for the Queensland companies. This demand is not justified; it would not benefit the industry to the extent of one farthing. I would remind honorable member that this question relates not only to Queensland, but to New South Wales, since a good deal of the timber now under consideration comes from the Mother State. It is stated that something like 6,000,000 feet of timber from New South Wales was imported in one year into Queensland.

Mr. FISHER.—That shows our Federal spirit.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—It shows that Queensland merchants are anxious to make money. I have sufficient information to justify the statement—although I cannot vouch for its absolute accuracy—that Queensland is importing from New South Wales more hoop or other pine than she is exporting.

Mr. FISHER.—That must be a gross mistake.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—It may be a mistake as to the quantity, but it cannot be denied that steamers have been running to Brisbane carrying cargoes of timber from New South Wales. Queensland has also been importing from New Zealand white pine for butter boxes.

Mr. FISHER.—A Minister of the Crown, who changes his politics as often as the sun rises, has been doing so.

Mr. ARCHER.—Queenslanders are only just discovering that the local pine is as good as any other, and the importation of New Zealand pine is gradually being dropped.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—It has taken them a long time to make that discovery. Other States found it out long ago.

Mr. ARCHER.—I was referring to the use of Queensland pine for butter boxes.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Queensland pine has been used in that State for the last eight or ten years for making butter boxes.

Mr. ARCHER.—But there has been a certain prejudice against it.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I do not think that the prejudice now exists, so that it cannot be advanced as a reason for the present importation of New Zealand pine into Queensland. With all goodwill towards Queensland and New South Wales, we ought to hesitate before we handicap other industries by imposing a duty on 70,000,000 feet of New Zealand timber, for the sake of Queensland's export of 4,500,000 feet to other States, seeing that she is absolutely unable to supply further orders, although highly profitable prices are offering. Queensland and New South Wales timbers enjoy some advantage over New Zealand pine since the wharfage at Melbourne is 5d. per 100 feet, and in Sydney 3d. per 100 feet, less than it is in the case of New Zealand pine. This duty will increase the price of fruit cases by 1½d. each, and butter boxes by 2½d. each.

Mr. FISHER.—That is assuming that those concerned will not import this timber in the log.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—If they did, the cost would be greater.

Mr. FISHER.—No fear.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I do not speak without some practical knowledge, and the honorable member, on consulting an expert, will find that my statement is absolutely borne out.

Mr. SAMPSON.—It is estimated that there would be an increase of 50 per cent. in the cost if this timber were imported in the log.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I am not prepared to say that the difference would be so great, but I know that there would be an increase. I am surprised that the honorable member for Wide Bay, with his natural alertness of mind, has not realized that men who are anxious to save every penny that they can would readily import

this timber in the log if they knew that by doing so they would reduce the cost of their butter boxes and fruit cases. Timber, to which duties on sawn sizes relate, is not imported in the log, except for a few special purposes.

Mr. FISHER.—I have known logs to be shipped from South America to the Old Country for twenty years.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—That is in cases where it does not pay to treat them locally. The practice has been declining all over the world, because it is found to be unprofitable.

Mr. THOMAS.—Years ago people used to travel in coaches instead of in trains.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Yes. Where the exporting country has up-to-date saw-mills, it does not pay to send away timber in the log. The honorable member for Barrier has shown that the use of oregon at Broken Hill is advantageous, not so much because of its lowness of cost—though it is a cheap soft-wood timber—but because it gives warning of settlements in the mines. The prices of hardwood and oregon show that there is no real competition between them on the score of cheapness. Hardwood is retailed in the Commonwealth at the present time for from 9s. to 10s. per 100 feet.

Mr. JOHN THOMSON.—Market sizes of hardwood cannot be obtained in Sydney for those prices.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I am speaking of large sizes. Oregon, on the other hand, costs from 14s. 6d. to 17s. per 100 feet. I am able to vouch for these prices, because I took special care in getting them.

Mr. BAMFORD.—The honorable member must be mistaken in his figures.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—No; I can substantiate them fully. The difference in price between local hardwood and oregon is so great that there is no competition between them on the score of cheapness. The question we have to consider is, therefore: Shall we handicap our producing interests by increasing the price of butter boxes, fruit cases, furniture and building materials?

Mr. EDWARDS.—According to the Postmaster-General, a duty does not increase prices.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Admitting that Queensland has all the timber we need, her people at the present time cannot book all the orders which they receive, and will not be able to largely increase their

delivery for many years to come. But the New Zealand pine is becoming more costly, because it is harder to obtain as the forests near the water get cut out, and consequently each year will make the Queensland timber more valuable. The imposition of the proposed duty would be of no real advantage to Queensland. It is asked for merely on sentimental grounds.

Mr. GROOM.—It was not sentiment that moved the Queensland Director of Forests to give evidence as to the quantity and quality of the timber of the State.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The quantity and quality of the Queensland timber are not denied; but I say that the imposition of the proposed duty will not benefit the State. Queensland timber is now in demand at prices 5s. higher than those ruling in 1902, when a duty of 1s. was asked for. Although the Postmaster-General asserts that duties do not increase prices, even he, notwithstanding his audacity in regard to fiscal matters, would not say that duties will not increase prices when the internal production does not amount to more than 4,500,000 feet, while the demand amounts to between 70,000,000 and 75,000,000 feet. The prices of Queensland timber were low in 1902 because in that year, owing to depression, there was very little local demand, and the value of the timber not having been proved in the other States, persons there were reluctant to buy it. Now, however, Queensland is brisk and active, and the local demand for her timber is so great that it is with difficulty that orders for export can be executed, and to-day timber merchants there will not book orders. I have a letter here which says that an order for about 120,000 feet took about thirteen months to deliver. I trust that honorable members will support the amendment of the honorable member for Barrier.

Mr. PAGE.—He is always up to tricks against Queensland.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The proposed duty will not benefit either Queensland or New South Wales—where, on the northern border and coasts, there is a very large quantity of good pine timber; its only effect will be, by increasing the price of timber, to put a tax on all industries in which it is a raw material.

Mr. BAMFORD (Herbert) [12.19].—We are now faced with a problem which often confronts us in dealing with duties of this nature. Timber is the raw material of the building and furniture trades, and

by imposing a duty on it, we must, indirectly at any rate, injure those trades to some extent. But the honorable member for North Sydney would appear to be unfavorably disposed to the imposition of any duties, because his arguments went to show that any duty imposed on the classes of timber with which we are dealing would be reprehensible. I do not go with him to that length. I am willing to admit that there is no timber in Australia so suitable for use in the mines at Broken Hill as is oregon. I am willing also to admit that, in view of its cost and the ease with which it can be worked, no timber can be used there more economically, but I cannot follow the honorable member for Barrier in his desire that 12 x 6 timber should be admitted duty free. I understand that the timber chiefly used at Broken Hill is 10 x 10 timber, and if the honorable member is prepared to make his amendment apply to oregon timber of that size I am willing to vote for it.

Mr. THOMAS.—Timber 10 x 10 would suit me, but there are other interests besides those of Broken Hill to be considered.

Mr. BAMFORD.—I think that the free admission of oregon timber 10 x 10 would meet the case amply. If the honorable member were dealing with other interests than those of Broken Hill, he should be prepared to vote for a higher duty, or to make the size 12 x 12 or any larger size, so that the cutting up of the timber might be done here. I am at a loss to understand why the honorable member should include New Zealand pine in his amendment, and in order to meet the views of honorable members who are prepared to vote with him on one line and are opposed to him on another, he would do well to separate the two items. A good deal has been said by the honorable members for Wide Bay and North Sydney on the subject of the importation of timber in the log. I do not see why New Zealand white pine should not be imported in the log. The duty would be very little higher than if it were imported in planks, because in these days almost every portion of a log can be utilized. On my way to the House every morning from South Melbourne I see lorries going along the City-road loaded with log timber. I do not know whether this timber comes from New Zealand, Tasmania, or Vancouver, but there can be no doubt that if the importers found it cheaper to import this timber in planks they would do so, and, therefore, the argument that it

costs 6d. a 100 feet more to import it in the log will not stand. I admit that this timber is squared to a certain extent, but the corners are left. I have seen cedar brought here from Cairns in the round, and when it is remembered that the freight in the coastal trade is higher than the oversea freight, it is clear that the argument that it is cheaper to import squared timber or timber in the plank does not appeal to the people most interested. To-day almost every atom of a log of timber can be used in some form or another. The flitches cut off in squaring it can be used for the manufacture of cases, pieces smaller still are used for chair legs, and, in fact, everything but the sap is used. In the circumstances, there is no reason why timber should not be imported in the log, and it would then be free of duty. I do not, in this matter, speak on behalf only of Queensland pine, because I agree with the honorable member for North Sydney that the demand for that timber to-day cannot be satisfied, although all our mills are working full time. After all, it is really a serious question whether we should not be doing right in admitting all timber free of duty, seeing that, by doing so, we should be conserving our own forests. The day will come, in the not very distant future, when timber will be at extravagant, if not exorbitant, prices, and there is a good deal to be said for its free admission from abroad, when the effect would be to denude the forests of other countries while we preserved our own. However, we are not so far-sighted as, perhaps, we ought to be; the present, and the immediate future appeals to us more strongly, and I suppose we shall continue to impose these duties. I am not opposed to the introduction of New Zealand pine free of duty for the manufacture of butter boxes, but the difficulty is that, to my certain knowledge, timber which is ostensibly imported for that purpose goes into use in quite other directions.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The honorable member should not forget fruit cases.

Mr. BAMFORD.—Almost any kind of waste timber that we have here can be used for the manufacture of fruit cases. I say that if timber for the manufacture of butter boxes is to be admitted free of duty, it should be cut into such lengths as would render it useless for any other purpose.

Mr. MATHEWS.—That would deprive men here of work in cutting the timber.

Mr. BAMFORD.—That work does not amount to much, and it is not right that

timber admitted free for the manufacture of butter boxes should be used for other purposes.

Mr. GROOM.—Surely the honorable member for Melbourne Ports does not object to give some protection to the timber getter?

Mr. O'MALLEY.—Yes; the honorable member is a protectionist for South Melbourne.

Mr. BAMFORD.—A few days ago, I had a paragraph taken from one of the northern newspapers in which it was stated that a Sydney or Melbourne firm had made inquiries to know what timber we had in North Queensland that would be suitable for furniture making and bending. Some people in the trade at Cairns got a piece of crow's foot elm, from which great numbers of axe handles are manufactured there, and rounded it to about a $1\frac{1}{2}$ -inch diameter. It was then steamed, and tied in a knot, and in that form was sent to those who made the inquiries, with the request to know whether that would suit. That conclusively proves that we have supplies of timber suitable for this purpose. There is one other remark I wish to make in reference to the claim made by timber merchants that the duty on timber should be on the actual contents; that, for instance, a board 12 inches by $\frac{1}{2}$ inch should pay duty only as a $\frac{1}{2}$ -inch board.

Mr. TUDOR.—The Minister is making that alteration.

Mr. BAMFORD.—I do not wish the alteration made. There is a footnote attached to this item which some honorable members think should be deleted. I am not in favour of that. According to the Queensland practice—and that practice applies elsewhere, though not to the same extent—if you purchase a 12-inch x $\frac{1}{2}$ -inch board, you pay for it as a 12 x 1 inch board.

Mr. TUDOR.—I do not think that applies here.

Mr. JOHNSON.—It does not apply in New South Wales.

Mr. BAMFORD.—It applies in this way, that the board is not sold at the $\frac{1}{2}$ inch price, and the additional price charged amounts to a good deal more than is sufficient to pay for the extra cut. I have asked for price lists, with which I expect to be furnished before the debate on this item is concluded, and if they come to hand, I shall bring them under the notice of the Committee. In the circumstances, I am entirely opposed to the removal of the footnote. Timber merchants claim that a 12

x $\frac{1}{2}$ board should be dutiable as such, but no matter what they may do with respect to $\frac{1}{2}$ -inch timber, there is no doubt that they charge the 12 x 1 inch price for 12 x $\frac{1}{2}$ -inch timber.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Because they lose something in the cutting.

Mr. BAMFORD.—They get an extra board out of the timber, and they get a price which more than pays them for cutting the timber into 12 x $\frac{1}{2}$ -inch sizes. I give notice now that if the honorable member for Barrier persists in his amendment, I shall move that the size of the timber to which it refers shall be 10 x 10, which is the size chiefly used at Broken Hill. I hope the honorable member for Barrier will accept that amendment.

Mr. THOMAS.—If I were the Minister of Trade and Customs I should do so at once.

Mr. BAMFORD.—If the honorable member does not do so, I shall have to vote against the 12 x 6 proposal.

Mr. GLYNN (Angas) [12.36].—One remark made by the honorable member for Herbert, although perhaps not directly related to the item, is worthy of public attention. He mentioned the practical sweeping out of our forests, without any attempt being made to replant. Commissions are sitting in different parts of the world at present on the question of afforestation. One of those is sitting in the United Kingdom, and is at present, I believe, in Ireland. The matter is regarded as of such great importance that most extensive reports are published in the daily papers to keep alive the public interest in the question of replanting. A similar remark applies to America. I hope that the Government during the recess—because the less time is lost in this matter the better—will approach the States with a view to arranging some united policy, either by the States on behalf of the Commonwealth, or, with the permission of the States, by the Commonwealth.

Mr. CHANTER.—New South Wales has a Commission at work now.

Mr. GLYNN.—I was not aware of that. The matter is of such supreme importance that it is now being attended to in America on a large scale, and in the United Kingdom, where I think the forests are far more dense and extensive in proportion to area than they are even in Australia. The honorable member for Herbert has complained about an understanding having been arrived at yesterday to

leave out the footnote to this paragraph, under which measurements under 1 inch would have been taxed as inch measurements. I differ from him upon that point, because it is pointed out to me that that class of timber is chiefly used in the country for the building of the poorer class of cottages, so that, from the point of view of the masses, it is just as well that it has been agreed to remove the footnote. My attention has been called to these duties by the timber merchants of Adelaide, who assure me in a joint letter, which, unfortunately, I cannot place my hand upon at the moment, that there is no Australian timber to take the place of oregon, redwood, baltic, kauri, and white pine. They also assure me that the demand is so great that they cannot possibly get their orders attended to locally, and that the limited quantity of Queensland pine produced is chiefly absorbed in New South Wales and Victoria, while the Australian hardwood is principally used for such structures as bridges. The question of price has been mentioned. I have here what I believe was a circular letter sent to honorable members on 26th November by the Australasian Marbut Carving Company, Proprietary Limited. There are in it one or two paragraphs to which I wish to draw attention on the question of the limited local supply that exists to cope with the increasing demand, and also of the increase of prices since the introduction of this Tariff. This is a letter from a company who are asking for increased protection of their particular product—picture mouldings—in consequence of the increased cost of the raw material under the operation of the present duties. They mention that the protection on their manufactures of 20 per cent. *ad valorem* against imported mouldings was not sufficient under the old Tariff, when they were working under more favorable conditions than at present, as then a large proportion of their raw material—American timber—was charged duty at the rate of 1s. 6d. per 100 superficial feet, whilst sundry New Zealand woods used by them in large quantities were admitted free. They say that their position is now rendered still worse, as the new timber duties have been increased to 2s. 6d. per 100 superficial feet on American woods, which formerly came in at the lower rate, and to 2s. 6d. on the New Zealand timbers, which have hitherto been free. Regarding the

Mr. Glynn

difficulty that they find of getting their orders coped with, they mention that recently they tried to place orders with three Queensland sawmillers for delivery next year, but the contracts were declined owing to the inability of the sawmillers to supply their wants, while applications for quotations to eight sawmillers in their own State—presumably Victoria, as the firm is stationed in Melbourne—were met with silence on the part of six, while only two took the trouble to advise them that they could not supply any wood that would be suitable for their mouldings. They draw attention also to the fact that since 1904 orders totalling 477,500 superficial feet of Queensland timber have remained till this day unexecuted. Since the new Tariff came into operation the timber merchants have increased the price of bally-gum and caloon from 16s. 8d. to 24s. per 100 superficial feet; of hoop pine from 19s. 3d. to 21s. 6d.; of silky oak from 24s. to 40s., and other woods in proportion, while even at those figures they cannot execute orders.

Mr. PAGE.—That is the same as though Japan sent here for a million tons of wool, and declared, because we could not execute the order at the moment, that there was no wool produced in Australia.

Mr. GLYNN.—Of course the honorable member is perfectly just in making that remark, but I do not think much weight can be attached to it.

Mr. PAGE.—If half-a-dozen people wanted the honorable member to appear for them, and he could only appear in one case, they might just as well claim that there were no barristers.

Mr. GLYNN.—In that case, I should simply lament the fact that I was not twins. Still I do not think much weight can be attached to what the honorable member for Maranoa says, in view of the statement of this firm that since 1904 orders covering 477,500 super. feet have been unexecuted, and that they cannot even get promises to supply where their orders are two years in advance. It is, therefore, not a recent matter.

Mr. PAGE.—The ships will not bring the timber.

Mr. GLYNN.—On the question of ships, I might say that one of the greatest difficulties in connexion with the local supply from Queensland is the cost of Inter-State freight. That is a very heavy drawback, and must be taken into consideration in connexion with these new duties. Before

we dealt with the timber duties in 1901, the export of Queensland timber had largely fallen off. It has certainly not increased since then. That shows that there must be very great difficulty in the local consumption being met by the local supply. If anything is conclusive as to the great difficulty of our local forests meeting the demand, it is the fact mentioned by the honorable member for North Sydney that the total importation of logs last year was about 1,500,000 super. feet, whereas I believe in Broken Hill alone—if the figures are the same now as they were in 1901—the consumption is about 15,000,000 super. feet of timber. Considering the many avocations into which timber enters, that it is the raw material of so many industries, and that the price of building in South Australia—where the houses are built of stone, but where, of course, a fair amount of wood has to be used in their construction—has recently gone up by from 30 to 35 per cent.. I would really appeal to honorable members to place a moderate impost, not only upon oregon, and upon sizes that would suit the ordinary importations of oregon, but upon timber generally, in the interests of trade throughout the Commonwealth.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—Would the honorable member admit New Zealand pine free?

Mr. GLYNN.—Certainly; and oregon also. Of course, if we get a sixpenny duty, I shall rejoice, because that would not kill enterprise at Broken Hill; but my vote, in a matter of this importance, for reasons which I do not wish to elaborate, will go for freedom in connexion with these timbers. We ought to be especially considerate to the mining industry. Broken Hill, which has a present population of 40,000 persons, is the mainstay of a good many people who do not live there. It is a large consumer of timber.

Mr. CHANTER.—And there is a splendid natural forest on the Murray, not far away.

Mr. GLYNN.—We can only go on the evidence placed before us, of experts and of experience, which certainly shows, as the honorable member for Herbert has honestly admitted, that, as regards oregon for Broken Hill, we shall really be putting an insurance on the lives of the miners if we allow the mines to use oregon. It is more easily worked, and always gives indication of creep or subsidence. Considering that we are indebted to a large extent for our prosperity to the development of

those mines, and that the mining output is of the value of something like £32,000,000 per annum, surely honorable members will not think we ask too much when we ask that these woods should be admitted free, especially those which are not grown in Australia at all. I expect with some confidence that the amendment of the honorable member for Barrier will be agreed to.

Mr. WILKS (Dalley) [12.48].—I do not wish to elaborate the question, as the honorable member for North Sydney put a very strong case before the Committee, and we had a long struggle over the matter in the consideration of the last Tariff. On that occasion, we reduced the duties considerably. I cannot understand why the Government should propose such a largely increased impost on timber. I am pleased that they have agreed to an alteration with regard to measurement, and are prepared to revert to the old system. What I am concerned about is the amendment of the honorable member for Barrier; and I desire to point out that oregon is largely used in ship-building work, for ceilings, linings, and so forth. Then, nothing better than kauri can be used for deck planking; and if duties be placed on these timbers, the result will not be to force Australian woods into use, but merely to increase prices to the users. Further, we know that pine is necessary for the making of butter boxes, and that Queensland pine is not so suitable as white or clear pine is in pattern-making. The Queensland pine is objected to on account of its knotty character.

Mr. GROOM.—That is a mistake, surely?

Mr. WILKS.—There is no mistake at all; pattern-makers do not care to use hard or knotty wood.

Mr. GROOM.—What timber do they require?

Mr. WILKS.—The white or clear pine of New Zealand. I wish that the Treasurer were present, because I desire to point out what I consider to be an anomaly in the Tariff. What I mean is that undressed American ash is made dutiable, whereas it ought to come under "Hickory undressed" in paragraph x. American ash is similar to hickory, and obtained from the same part of the world; and is preferred by coachbuilders on account of its strength and lightness. It is contended that we should at least make our own buggies and other vehicles; and even protectionists will not say that this industry can be carried on with hard woods or pines. Some of the

largest users of timber happen to be within the Dalley electorate; indeed, in any industry of a substantial character, we may be sure of finding the leading workshops there situated. The marvel is that these industries should have all been created and have flourished without the assistance of any Tariff. I suppose that the Dalley electorate will, in the future, become more and more a manufacturing centre.

Mr. GROOM.—Especially under this Tariff.

Mr. WILKS.—These industries were established without the aid of a Tariff; but, of course, if a protective Tariff is to be passed, I do not see why something should not be done for my constituents. My own opinion is, however, that it is better to admit timber as under the old Tariff than to impose a duty which will not have the effect of forcing the use of Australian timbers, but will merely increase the price of the imported article. I can understand the action of the honorable member for Barrier in the interests of large users of timber at Broken Hill; because we know that, although within 40 or 50 miles there is plenty of timber available, that timber is not suitable for the purpose. I should like to point out that baltic timber is largely used in the making of spars, for which no one will contend Australian wood can be utilized. The honorable member for Cowper will admit that, even in the river ship-building of New South Wales, kauri is used to a large extent. As to the talk about the export of hardwood, the honorable member to whom I have just referred will bear me out when I say that it is difficult to get sufficient for the local consumption. I think honorable members ought to pay some attention to the honorable member for North Sydney, who is not one to exaggerate his statements, and who has more special knowledge than most men.

Mr. FISHER.—The honorable member for North Sydney was seriously wrong when he said that, in the case of Queensland, more timber is imported than exported.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—The honorable member for North Sydney merely said that he was so informed.

Mr. FISHER.—Then his information is seriously incorrect.

Mr. WILKS.—If the honorable member for North Sydney has made a mistake, he will be ready to admit it.

Mr. WILKS.—Since the sitting was suspended, my attention has been directed to the fact that under paragraph BB of this item, spars in the rough are admitted free, so that that portion of my argument which had reference to baltic pine falls to the ground. It is somewhat of an anomaly that whereas under paragraph A, ash, undressed, will be taxable at 1s. 6d. per 100 superficial feet, under paragraph X hickory will be admitted free. Now, it is well known that our coach-builders largely use American ash in the construction of buggies. They prefer it because of its lightness, its durability, and its toughness, and, consequently, this duty will prove a tax upon them.

Mr. PAGE.—Queensland produces good timber for buggies.

Mr. WILKS.—It is not as good as is American ash.

Mr. PAGE.—Yes it is. But the public do not know that. The honorable member did not know it when he bought his buggy.

Mr. WILKS.—I have never been able to purchase even a wheelbarrow. If I were a member of the Labour Party, probably I should have both a buggy and a motor car.

Mr. PAGE.—Every Labour member possesses those things, I suppose?

The CHAIRMAN.—The honorable member for Maranoa must not interject from the Treasury bench.

Mr. PAGE.—Under what standing order do you refuse to allow me to interject from this bench?

The CHAIRMAN.—I rule that the honorable member must not interject from the Treasury bench.

Mr. PAGE.—Then I disagree with your ruling.

The CHAIRMAN.—Will the honorable member put his dissent in writing?

Mr. PAGE.—Most certainly. I desire to have this matter settled. If you, sir, will tell me under what standing order I am prevented from interjecting from the Treasury bench, I shall be satisfied.

The CHAIRMAN.—Under standing order 48.

Mr. PAGE.—If there be a standing order bearing on the subject, I shall withdraw my dissent from your ruling.

Mr. WILKS.—As hickory has received special treatment under this item, I fail to see why similar treatment should not be accorded to American ash. The honorable member for Riverina stated, by way of interjection this morning, that there was

good timber in Australia which might be used in the Broken Hill mines. I recollect journeying with the Consul for Canada, Mr. J. S. Larke, some ten or eleven years ago, as far as Broken Hill. That gentleman was then on his way to inspect the forest at Menindi.

Mr. CHANTER.—There is no forest there.

Mr. THOMAS.—What is there?

Mr. CHANTER.—Merely scrub.

Mr. WILKS.—Mr. Larke had always feared that American timber would lose its hold on the Australian market, but his visit to Menindi effectually allayed his apprehension in that regard. Seeing that the Broken Hill mines use such an enormous quantity of timber, I do not favour imposing further taxation in this direction. Had the timbers at Menindi been suitable for mining purposes there is no doubt that the honorable member for Kooyong, who is a shrewd business man, would have purchased the entire forest. I shall support the proposal of the honorable member for Barrier in regard to the admission of oregon pine and kauri pine free of duty.

Mr. KING O'MALLEY (Darwin) [2.25].—The honorable member for North Sydney stated that hardwood could be purchased for 9s. per 100 superficial feet, while imported softwoods cost from 14s. to 17s. per 100 superficial feet. If that be so, why should there be such tremendous opposition to the duty proposed?

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Because it will increase the price of oregon.

Mr. KING O'MALLEY.—The imposition of a duty upon timber is necessary to encourage Australian productions. The moment that we have Australian mills working up to their highest capacity a market will be available alike to the merchant and to the local timber-getter. The honorable member for Dalley has pointed out that American ash ought to be admitted free, because buggies are chiefly built of that timber. But assuming that blackwood can be obtained in Tasmania which is superior to American ash, why should not its production be encouraged?

Mr. WILKS.—Australian timbers are not sufficiently seasoned.

Mr. KING O'MALLEY.—How can we expect the Australian mill-owner in the bush, whose banker is calling upon him about once every fortnight to reduce his overdraft, to season his timber if we do not provide him with a market for it? But if we place him in such a position that he is able to say to the local financier "I am

able to produce this timber and I have an Australian market for it, but I wish to store it until it is thoroughly seasoned," he will be able to get the necessary assistance to tide him over the dull season. Members of the Opposition will admit that, if they have studied even the elementary principles of finance.

Mr. THOMAS.—Let us establish a national bank.

Mr. KING O'MALLEY.—I will discuss that subject on another occasion. I merely wish to point out the necessity for developing our timber industry as the Americans and the Canadians have developed theirs.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Suppose that Australia were competing with America; what would the honorable member do?

Mr. KING O'MALLEY.—I should do exactly what I am doing now. I am an Australian. More than that, I am not an accidental Australian. The honorable member for Barrier has stated that he wants pine admitted free for the Barrier mines.

Mr. THOMAS.—No, no.

Mr. KING O'MALLEY.—The honorable member for Wide Bay has said that Queensland can supply the best pine in the world for the making of butter boxes, and, as regards mining requirements, stringy bark or blue gum is used in all the Tasmanian mines.

Mr. THOMAS.—Broken Hill gave an order for a month's supply of stringy bark, but it paralyzed Tasmania. The sawmillers could not supply the order.

Mr. KING O'MALLEY.—Some of the largest mines in the world are in Tasmania. The world's biggest tin mine is at Mount Bischoff, and Tasmanian timber is used in all the mines. From that State timber is being sent to South Africa, to be used in the Transvaal. It is found to be the best kind of timber in competition with American timber. Most of the mines in South Africa are managed by Americans. Their patriotism would encourage them to get American pine if it were superior to Tasmanian timber, but it is not. How, then, can my honorable friends on the other side stand up and say that Tasmanian timber is not fit to be used for the purpose of developing the Broken Hill mines? Their minds are affected by this accursed prejudice in favour of "foreignism"—this black-hearted bigotry—against the use of everything Australian. We ought to have a duty of 10 or 15 per cent. to wipe that feeling out of their souls, and

so that they may be led to love their own country. I intend to move that logs be not allowed to come in free. Let me read to honorable members a tribute to the merits of Tasmanian hardwood from the report of the A section of the Tariff Commission—

Tasmanian hardwood has not got into general use, as it is more difficult to be worked than imported pine, and also because of the low duty on the latter. Hardwood lasts twice as long as pine—in fact flooring of hardwood will last for 100 years with ordinary usage—but first cost, and not durability, is the chief consideration.—(H. Jones, Q. 35229.) In Tasmania, very little other timber than hardwood is used for flooring; but it is not so utilized in other States.—(Q. 35265-6.) The chief objection to hardwood for mining purposes is its weight, which increases the cost of railway carriage. A piece of hardwood 9 ft. 6 in. x 4 in., is equal in strength to Oregon 9 ft. 12 in. x 6 in., and the one would be as easy to handle as the other, strength for strength.—(Q. 35274-75.) Hardwood has twice the straining power of Oregon, and one-third less the quantity of the former would suffice for mining purposes as against the latter. This meant, to some extent, a reduction of cost.—(Q. 35277-80.) Tasmanian blackwood and Huon pine are said to be two of the finest timbers in the world for cabinet and other uses. Hardwood is more white-ant resisting than pine; less inflammable, and therefore more suitable for mining purposes.—(Q. 35296-98.) Hardwood flooring boards when tongued and grooved, are not liable to tear.—(Q. 35335-37.)

Every one knows that pine boards are liable to tear—

Tasmanian stringybark and bluegum, unlike some other hardwoods, do not snap suddenly and without warning. For this reason, those timbers, the witness contended, were both safe and suitable for mining purposes, and large quantities had been used at Broken Hill prior to the introduction of Oregon on account of saving in freight on the latter.—(Q. 35407-11.) In most cases, hardwood thoroughly seasoned can be used for building purposes quite as economically as Oregon. In the case of long spans, it is more difficult to obtain seasoned hardwood, as outside sizes are not generally kept in stock. That is exactly what I have pointed out—that the sawmillers in small places are not financially in a position, owing to the fact that they have not got the Australian market, to saw their own timber and keep it for years to season it.

Mr. MCWILLIAMS.—They are supplying the British Admiralty with the longest span timber in the world—160 feet long.

Mr. KING O'MALLEY—Exactly. The report continues—

A 12 in. x 2 in. joist, witness said, if put green into a building, would shrink fully $\frac{1}{2}$ to 2 inches.—(Kemp, Q. 36168-74.) With the exception of flooring boards, no attention was paid to the seasoning of timber, and builders nearly always used it green—very often before it had

been out of the log a fortnight.—(Q. 36238-41.) Dry hardwood cannot be so rapidly worked as Oregon and kindred woods. Weatherboards take double nailing, and particular care has to be taken of the thinner edge. There is a larger outlay in insurance on Oregon than on hardwood.—(Q. 36254-59.)

The report goes on to deal with the position in other States. In Tasmania we have every kind of timber required to supply the needs of the Commonwealth for some thousands of years.

Mr. THOMAS.—The mines could not get a supply from Tasmania.

Mr. KING O'MALLEY.—Is it not amazing, sir, that honorable members get into their minds this fiction that they could not get a supply from Tasmania? I propose to read a few opinions from a letter which has been placed in my hands by the honorable member for Franklin. It does not emanate from the sawmillers of the large cities, who want everything admitted free except their own product. I am not fighting for the privileges of the large cities, but for the rights of the small sawmillers, who have cleared the bush, and have been followed by settlement. In Tasmania there are places where hundreds of farmers are settled behind the sawmills.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—There is a duty on hardwood.

Mr. KING O'MALLEY.—What is the use of having a duty on hardwood when none is imported? It does not amount to anything unless we can shut out the pine.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Would the honorable member make them use hardwood for butter boxes?

Mr. KING O'MALLEY.—If the honorable member will vote with me to put a duty on pine, I am quite willing to take the duty off hardwood.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Would the honorable member make butter boxes out of Tasmanian timber?

Mr. KING O'MALLEY.—Queensland and Tasmania can furnish enough pine to make all the butter boxes used here for the next 10,000 years. The sawmillers close their letter with a statement that if these proposals were adopted, it would mean 12,000 more employés working directly and permanently in the industry, and 30,000 selectors, artisans, and tradesmen to supply their wants. Let it not be forgotten that when the sawmills take down the timber they clear the land, and settlement follows. Honorable members, with the Prime Minister as their leader, are fighting to bring

emigrants from the Old Country to Australia. An opportunity to find places to settle immigrants is afforded by encouraging the local timber producers. We can introduce immigrants and dispose of them in this way to the immense benefit of local industries. I have had too many years of business experience not to know how hard it is to induce business men to change from the old ways to which they are accustomed. I venture to say that if I went down Collins-street or Flinders-lane, and offered a new thing to a business man, no matter how valuable it might be, if he had been in the habit of handling a certain thing in a certain way for twenty or thirty years, he would not change his practice. We are told that the manufacturers, business men, and mine-owners know what is best for their purposes. I say that they do not know what is best. The reason why they stick to what they are accustomed to is largely because they have entered into contracts. What is the use of talking about equality of opportunity? There is no equality of opportunity, if we give the big man an opportunity to swallow up the little fellow.

Mr. HANS IRVINE.—The big fellow was a little fellow once, I suppose.

Mr. KING O'MALLEY.—The honorable member himself was a little fellow once, but now he is a big fellow. Knowing what it is to struggle and fight as a little man, with every one against him, I want to give the little man who is running a mill, an opportunity; and on this ground I claim the vote of the honorable member for Echuca. I suppose that the minds of honorable members are made up. I can only put the case to them to the best of my understanding, and ask them if they can find it in their consciences and souls to do something for the small saw-miller of this country, to help me on this occasion.

Mr. SPENCE (Darling) [2.48].—This question is one of the most important that we have had to deal with in considering the Tariff. It strikes me as having a good many sides. Forestry as an industry has been very much neglected by all the States. All over the world, an alarm has been created as to the probable shortage of timber. It is heart-breaking to observe what little interest is taken in the preservation of the magnificent forests we have in all the States of the Commonwealth. Some of our timbers are unique; all of

them are valuable. But still a good deal of careless destruction takes place. Splendid trees are cut down and only portions of them are utilized. It occurs to me that as forestry is not cared for as it ought to be, there is no need for us to rush in to encourage timber cutting until the people of the various States are awakened to the necessity of properly utilizing their resources. We are not ready, by means of a protective policy, to bring about the proper care and use of our timbers. The question whether they can be profitably utilized cannot be considered solely from the timber-getter's point of view. He has to go out into the forest in very rough country, where nothing is done by the States Governments to help him. It is easier to get a railway line constructed into an agricultural district than to get a line put into a forest. During the last Tariff debate, we were told by Queensland representatives that there are magnificent forests in that State, but that, unfortunately, they are inaccessible. That means that nothing has been done to take railways to them. There is no country that is inaccessible, if ordinary means of access are adopted.

Mr. EDWARDS.—It is going to be done in the near future.

Mr. SPENCE.—We hear nothing but what is going to be done. I do not take much notice of things that are going to be done. It is sufficient for me that in the past our timber resources have been neglected. In Queensland, railway carriage, road carriage, and water carriage can be provided, and if the State goes ahead sufficiently to warrant a good Government providing for plenty of timber-carrying ships, and for railways into the forests, we shall begin to think more favorably of the importance of the timber industry. There are magnificent timber resources which are at present practically untouched, and which, even with a very high duty, would not necessarily be forced into use, because the cost of getting the Queensland timber down to the big centres in the several States would be so high that it would be cheaper for the timber merchants to pay the duty and import. We have imported during the past nine months—taking returns which have come to hand this week—£1,126,042 worth of timber. At the same time we exported £525,199 worth. These figures show that we are sending away about half as much as we import.

That is just one of those anomalies that face us in connexion with our industries. We have supplies of our own, but we are not utilizing them as we ought to do. It does not follow that a high duty would alter that neglect. There has been some talk about imposing a duty on logs. Let me say at once that putting logs on the free list is simply frill and trimming. It means absolutely nothing. It is better for the importers to pay the duty on cut timber than to take the logs free. Not only is that proved by the facts quoted by the honorable member for North Sydney, showing that there is no import of logs for cutting-up purposes, but it is also proved by the fact that the only logs that are imported are used as large timber for special purposes. The honorable member for Darwin, who is a business man, will understand the position of affairs when I quote figures from this week's price list. It shows that the price of New Zealand kauri pine logs runs from 20s. to 24s. per 100 superficial feet. The price for kauri pine sawn is from 20s. to 30s. So that the best sawn timber sells at practically the same price as kauri logs. What timber merchant would be mad enough to pay for logs, which he would have to put labour into for cutting up, when he could get sawn timber for the same money? Furthermore, if he bought logs he would not be sure that some of them would not have flaws in them, whereas when he buys sawn timber he knows that he is getting the best. Furthermore, when ships are laden with cut-up timber they can be loaded heavily, and the stuff is easy to handle. But when you put logs into a ship there is waste of space owing to their differing shapes and lengths. Therefore all this talk of admitting logs free simply means the advantage of a few people who want great blocks of wood for special purposes. Then, again, the price list shows that New Zealand kauri pine fitches are sold at from 22s. to 25s. per 100 superficial feet. Those facts, it seems to me, do away with the idea that it is necessary to make provision for the free import of logs. I also desire to say that Broken Hill is not the only mining centre that needs to import oregon. In my own electorate, on the Cobar field, there are enormous quarries. Some of the holes are so large that the whole of these Parliament buildings could easily be dropped into one of them. When a mine reaches a certain depth, they cannot quarry any more, but have to use timbers, and the only way

Mr. Spence.

of preventing a collapse is by adopting what is known as the square set—the method followed at Broken Hill. The only suitable timber is oregon. If hardwood is used, there is danger. It is true that hardwood is used in mines all over Australia, but it is not suitable at places like Broken Hill. There are thousands of miners there who have been mining all their lives, and there are also mine managers who have been specially trained to the work. Very strong evidence would have to be brought forward to convince honorable members who are impartial that these men do not understand what they want. They take what suits their particular locality as any other sane and wise man would do. To attempt to apply one universal rule to differing conditions is merely foolishness. The advantage of using oregon where the square-set method of mining is adopted is that when there is danger it begins to "talk," as the miners say, and so gives the men time to get out of danger. I have worked in mines for many years myself. I have been in mines that were timbered with some of the strongest wood that Australia can produce—box, which will withstand fire as well as steel. But this strong timber will collapse suddenly with a noise like a clap of thunder. It gives no warning. Those who talk about developing our forestry for the benefit of the mining industry are therefore talking beside the issue. They do not touch the necessities of mines like those at Broken Hill and Cobar, and even at Stawell, where the same method will have to be adopted. For the square-set system, after experiment, no timber has been found so suitable from the point of view of safety as oregon. That there is timber that is stronger is admitted. It is not a question of strength, but of suitability—of giving warning to the men of the crash that is coming from the settling of the country. An honorable member has interjected that we ought to consider the question of safety from fire. Very few fires occur in the mines.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—There have been a few in the Broken Hill mines.

Mr. SPENCE.—We have to take precautions against fire in mines just as we have to do in our own homes. Stringy bark will burn well in a draught. The imposition of even a very heavy duty will not cause the use of oregon for mining purposes to be discontinued.

Mr. THOMAS.—The only way to prevent the use of oregon in mines would be to prohibit its importation.

Mr. SPENCE.—Exactly. The duty will not increase employment, and it will simply be a tax upon an industry which is not producing something the price of which can be regulated. It will not cause an additional foot of timber from Tasmania or the Murray district to be used in the mines. I would therefore urge honorable members to give special consideration to this paragraph. There is no conflict between oregon and Australian timbers, and I think that the items mentioned should be dealt with separately.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—What are the sizes of the oregon used in the mines?

Mr. SPENCE.—The timber is obtained in sizes of 10 inches x 10 inches, and is cut on the mines. A large quantity of hardwood is also used in Broken Hill and other mining districts, and it seems probable that we shall continue to use a lot of it. At the present time in my district mining timber has to be carried a distance of 460 miles, so that the cost of carriage alone is a serious item, and the timber should be made available at as low a rate as possible. When the first Federal Tariff was under consideration some timber merchants complained that if oregon were allowed to come in free it would compete unfairly with Australian timbers. On this occasion, however, they ask that oregon in sizes of 12 inches x 6 inches or of equivalent sizes shall come in free. The workers in the industry and the timber merchants themselves are therefore in agreement.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—They are not timber getters; they are only timber-cutters, carrying on business in Melbourne and other large cities.

Mr. SPENCE.—If we can extend consideration to the timber getter—the primary producer—we ought to do so. The timber merchants have asked that certain timbers that are not produced here shall be allowed to come in free since they do not compete with Australian timbers. I disagree with the attitude taken up by some honorable members, who seem to object to the free introduction of certain imported timber on the ground that it enters into competition with Australian timbers which, although not suitable, might well be used as a substitute. As a matter of fact the great mining companies at Broken Hill and in my own electorate are obliged to obtain oregon irrespective of the cost, and as that

is the position of many other mines, such an argument ought not to carry any weight. I shall leave experts to deal with the question of whether or not New Zealand white pine is absolutely necessary for butter boxes.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I hope that they will not do so at any length.

Mr. SPENCE.—I have been endeavouring to put up a fight for the great mining industry, which gives employment, not to a lot of women and girls, but to 112,000 men. So far, although the Treasurer has met us to some extent by a re-arrangement of the item, I have not been very successful. Honorable members have not given to the industry the consideration that it deserves. I have endeavoured to make the demands of the mining industry fit in with the requirements of other industries; but I hope that honorable members will recognise that this is an exceptional item. Tasmania could not supply the demand for hardwood at Broken Hill.

Mr. STORRER.—That is incorrect.

Mr. SPENCE.—I am informed that it cannot do so, although I know that Tasmania has magnificent forests, and that the Broken Hill mines use a great deal of Tasmanian hardwood. I know sufficient concerning the dairying industry to be able to say that timber that will not taint the butter is absolutely necessary for butter-boxes, and we should not unnecessarily tax an industry when the selling prices of its products cannot be regulated. The honorable member for Herbert has suggested an alteration in the size of the timber dealt with under this paragraph. I would remind him, however, that the size of 12 in. x 6 in. is generally recognised by timber merchants as one that readily lends itself to cutting. The size 10 in. x 10 in. would not be so suitable, and the alteration of the minimum, as suggested by the honorable member, would be unsatisfactory. I think that we should adhere to the proposal that the minimum size dealt with under this paragraph shall be 12 in. x 6 in. or its equivalent, which will be more convenient and at the same time enable the mines to obtain the size of timber that they require.

Mr. JOHNSON (Lang) [3.10].—I have in my electorate timber merchants who have written to me complaining of the effect of these duties, and have asked me to lay certain facts before the Committee. I shall endeavour to do so as briefly as possible. One point that they emphasize is that oregon does not seriously compete

with Queensland pine. Some of our Queensland friends seem to think that it does; but, as a matter of fact, oregon, owing to its peculiar suitability for building and mining purposes, as well as for spars, will continue to be imported, regardless of any duty that may be imposed. It is far superior for the special purposes for which it is used to any of the hardwoods which some honorable members suggest should be substituted for it. I should like the honorable member for Barrier, who I understand proposes to insert the words "oregon pine and white pine" before n.e.i. in paragraph A to also include the words "baltic and redwood."

Mr. THOMAS.—I have no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON.—I think that the timbers dealt with in paragraphs A, B and C should be subjected to the one duty. An all-round duty of 6d. per 100 superficial feet would about meet the case, although I would prefer to see them all made free. Redwood is used almost exclusively for joinery purposes—for door panels, skirtings, mouldings, sashes, architraves, and the like. Baltic is a cheap class of timber used largely by artisans and settlers for flooring, lining, and weatherboards; it is rarely employed in the construction of the more expensive buildings, where the more expensive kauri flooring is preferred. I have here a statement from Messrs. Langdon and Langdon, timber merchants of New South Wales, which I shall read to the Committee, believing that I shall thereby save time—

We are admittedly the largest distributors of Oregon in the State, and we can therefore speak with some confidence upon the matter, and have no hesitation in saying that the graduated duties will not have that effect—[stop the importation of smaller sizes]—and that the specifications for future delivery will not in any way be altered. As a matter of fact, since we were notified of these duties, we have sent specifications away to America for four separate shipments, aggregating over six million feet, and we have made not the slightest alteration in the specification in consequence of the altered duties. The reason for this must be apparent to any one having any knowledge of the building trade; as builders have so long been accustomed to getting what is termed "foreign cut" (full cut), that they are not likely to pay for sizes $\frac{1}{2}$ inch more in thickness and in width than they actually get, which would be the case if cut out of ordinary junk; and, on the other hand, the timber merchants could not afford to cut smaller sizes, such as 3 in. x 2 in., 4 in. x 2 in., &c., full, out of such big sizes without charging an additional price to cover the waste caused by the saw cut. Taking this into consideration, with the extra handling, it will still pay the

timber merchants better to import the smaller sizes and pay the additional duty. In other words, it would not pay us as merchants to cut up the large-sized timber, as the cost of labour and the waste would amount to more than the additional duty.

Therefore, it will be seen that, no matter how high the duty on sawn timber is made, the timber merchants will still find it pays them better to import certain sizes ready cut up than to import the logs and have them cut here. It would cost them more than they would save in duty. With regard to what has been said about the possibility of supplying the requirements of the Commonwealth with locally-grown timber, I have here a number of letters containing the complaint that orders placed with local mills months ago have not yet been executed. One correspondent says—

In September, 1906, we wrote complaining of the great delay in the execution of orders, and they replied stating that we must not blame them for being short as they would hurry up our orders, and that they would run the particular item in question, viz., flooring, as soon as they could; but it would be at least a fortnight before the timber was properly dry, and, notwithstanding this promise, the order still remains unexecuted.

Again, in August of this year, we had an inquiry from one of our builders for the following, viz.:—

5,000 feet ... 4 in. x $1\frac{1}{4}$ in. T. G.
2,000 feet ... 4 in. x 1 in. T. G.

Thinking we might get this down in one consignment, we communicated with the Sydney agents of the Queensland Timber Combine, asking for a quotation for the same. They replied to the effect that at the moment they could not accept any further orders for Queensland hoop pine. Therefore, you will readily see that, notwithstanding our desire to obtain this timber, the Queensland people are not in a position to supply even our smallest order within a reasonable time. Our requirements are of such a nature that we could take this timber by the full shipload, and pay cash against documents, and yet we are receiving such small consignments—even down to 2,000 feet—that when it does arrive, it is really not worth our while to incur the expense of taking delivery, as we have to take delivery by punt, and it costs us very nearly as much to take delivery of 2,000 feet as it would for 50,000.

As a further instance of the unsatisfactory position of the Queensland trade, the tendency of the increased duties seems to be putting the Queensland mills in such a position that they will not accept orders at ruling or schedule prices, but are seeking for offers by competition among the timber merchants, which means that this business is being conducted upon an absolutely unsatisfactory basis. We dare not book orders in advance for this class of timber, as when we have done so in the past we have invariably had to substitute some other timber in consequence of its not coming to hand in time.

Not only is the supply of Queensland pine unequal to the demand, but the Queensland mill-owners are refusing orders at schedule prices, holding back to secure still higher prices by means of combination.

Mr. CHANTER.—They cannot get their timber away. The Shipping Ring will not take it.

Mr. JOHNSON. — That is nonsense. There are plenty of sailing vessels to be chartered if the steamers of the Shipping Ring are not available. The firm to which I have alluded is willing to take the whole of their shipments, and yet cannot get its orders executed. It cannot even get a small quantity like 3,000 feet without waiting an unduly long time. However, I shall not labour the question, although I could say a good deal on the subject. I hope that the duties will be considerably reduced. The Committee should not forget that the imported timbers have special uses which the Colonial pine will not serve, and, therefore, do not come into competition with it. Timber merchants are willing to take as much Colonial pine as they can get, but, in addition, they find it necessary to make large importations of oregon, baltic, redwood, white pine, and kauri to meet their obligations to the building and other trades.

Mr. KNOX (Kooyong) [3.25].—I desire to emphasize one or two points which have been made during the discussion. The alteration in the definition of superficial area to which the Minister agreed last night will make a great difference to the position. That should not be lost sight of. The honorable member for Darwin made a forcible appeal for the use of Tasmanian timbers. I wish to see Tasmanian and Australian timbers used as much as possible, and at Broken Hill a large quantity of Tasmanian timber is used. Last year we used 750,000 feet of Tasmanian timber. But the total quantity of timber required there for mining purposes is 15,000,000 feet—a pretty big order to fill. Undoubtedly, for mining purposes oregon possesses qualities which the Australian timbers do not possess. In the first place, it is much lighter. Seven hundred superficial feet of oregon, 960 feet of baltic, or 360 feet of hardwood go to the ton. From Port Pirie to Broken Hill the freight on timber is 26s. 2d. per ton. Therefore, it costs 37s. 4½d. to transport 1,000 superficial feet of oregon over that distance, and 72s. 7½d., or 35s. 3d. more, to transport the same quantity of Tasmanian hardwood.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—Is not the hardwood twice as strong?

Mr. KNOX.—The tensile strength of oregon is not so great as that of hardwood; but it is of great advantage to miners to be able to use a timber which is not too heavy to be easily handled, and there is a great saving in freight in using the lighter timber. Moreover, in the working of large ore bodies—some of them 120 to 150 feet wide—the lives of the men depend upon the indications given by the supporting timbers that the strain upon them is too great.

Mr. CHANTER.—Would not the miners be safer if stronger timber were used?

Mr. KNOX.—No. Hardwood timber, being short in the grain, breaks suddenly, whereas oregon, being long fibred, buckles, and gives evidence of strain long before it breaks. Oregon timber may appear to be strained to a dangerous extent, when as a matter of fact there is really no danger, since the miners know that, in spite of appearances, its bearing strain is by no means exhausted. These features of oregon timber are of great importance, since they give miners necessary warnings, and, as a consequence of the use of this timber, very serious accidents have been prevented at Broken Hill. The difficulty of shaping hardwood, owing to its hardness, is, in addition to its weight, a matter of importance to the mines. It may be interesting to honorable members to learn that of the 8,000,000 feet of timber used per annum by the Broken Hill Proprietary Co. alone, 47 per cent. is 10 x 10, and 53 per cent. 10 x 8 timber. Other companies at Broken Hill import timber cut to sizes of 10 x 2 and 10 x 4, but the Broken Hill Proprietary Company have their own saw-mills in which they cut the smaller sizes required at the mine. There are reasons why I should be glad to see the amendment proposed by the honorable member for Barrier carried, but in dealing with Tariff items I have always endeavoured to support fair and reasonable proposals, and I am not prepared to believe that it is the intention of the Committee that the large quantities of timber that have been referred to should be imported free of duty. My own feeling is that we shall have done what is fair if we succeed in inducing the Treasurer to agree to a duty of 6d. per 100 feet.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—That is the old duty.

Mr. KNOX.—Yes, the old duty. That would be an equitable and workable duty, and one to which the various interests involved could take no exception.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Does the honorable member wish to bring all the timber duties down to the level of those imposed under the old Tariff?

Mr. KNOX.—No, my suggestion would not have that effect. I have not proposed to interfere with other duties set out in this Tariff. If the amendment of the honorable member for Barrier is not carried, and I do not anticipate that it will be, I shall be prepared to move that the duty should be the same as under the old Tariff. The Treasurer would save his own time and the time of the Committee if he would accept that alteration. I have information regarding the timber duties in my possession with which I might occupy the time of the Committee for an hour or two, but I have not the remotest intention of doing so. I have risen merely to accentuate the fact that oregon timber for mining purposes has peculiar advantages over and above the hardwood timber referred to by the honorable member for Darwin.

Mr. CHANTER.—Why is it not used in the mines at Ballarat, Bendigo, Newcastle, and other places?

Mr. WYNNE.—Because they mine on an entirely different principle from that followed at Broken Hill.

Mr. THOMAS.—What is the width of the lodes at Ballarat?

Mr. KNOX.—It is true that they mine in the places referred to on a different principle from that followed at Broken Hill. Most of the timber used at Ballarat is round timber. I ask the Treasurer to say whether he is willing to accept the suggestion I have made. If he is, I think a majority of the Committee will be found prepared to agree to it.

Mr. JOHN THOMSON (Cowper) [3.35].—The debates which have taken place in this Chamber for weeks past have clearly shown that the Committee is in favour of protecting native industries. Honorable members have shown their willingness to impose duties, not only where it is clear that to do so would give encouragement to established industries, but where it is shown that it would probably lead to the establishment of industries. If there is any industry in Australia of which it can be said that it is native to the soil, and ought to be encouraged by those who be-

lieve in assisting local industries, it is the timber industry. Yet I venture to say without hesitation that there is no industry natural to Australia which has been so much neglected. We have in each of the States forest wealth which even our own people do not appreciate, because we have not yet been able to place our timbers on the market in such a way as to impress them with their value. I am afraid that the action that is likely to be taken in this Committee will not help the industry very much. We have considered that the imposition of protective duties on imports of foreign goods which come into competition with goods manufactured here is helpful to the local industries. Why should this principle be considered helpful when applied to the production of iron, to the clothing, or to any other local industry, and not helpful if applied to the timber industry? Very complimentary things have been said to-day about timbers which are imported from other parts of the world; but I want to say that there is no timber in the world like the Australian hardwoods, and for all practical purposes the soft woods of Australia compare favourably with the foreign timbers of which we have heard so much. I hope the Government will be able to carry the duties they have proposed. Several speakers have referred to peculiarities of imported timbers which render them suitable for certain classes of work. I shall not dispute what has been said about the special requirements of timber used for mining purposes. But, in view of all that has been said, it does seem strange that at Newcastle—and the honorable member for Newcastle can bear me out—it is found that even inferior Australian hardwood can be used for props in the mines. I am afraid that it is not so much the special quality of the imported timber that is considered, but the fact that the people of Broken Hill have to pay railway freight on the dead weight of timber, and our colonial hardwood being heavy, they wish to save the expense in freight to which they would be put if they used hardwood instead of oregon. I remind honorable members that the superiority of the breaking strain of Australian hardwoods has been proved over and over again; and hardwood beams of half the size of the oregon timber used would carry all the weight they would have to carry in the Broken Hill mines. Much that has been said about the advantage of the use of imported timbers for building purposes is

merely absurd. No one who knows anything at all about the subject would think of comparing oregon with Australian hardwoods for joists. No one can tell me that there is anything superior to red mahogany for flooring joists, whilst for flooring tallow-wood will last longer than the people who use it. When it is shown that imported timbers come into competition with our local timbers, we should be able to appeal to honorable members to study our own people, and protect the local timber industry. We have thousands of men engaged in the industry in Australia, and no men are more hard working than those engaged in getting timber in the bush. No people work under greater hardship or receive less for their work, and yet we find honorable members cavilling about the few pence additional protection which would assist these men to obtain a good living. We often hear talk of our timber supplies becoming exhausted, but we need fear no such contingency. They are not likely to become exhausted, even though we should make a small effort at afforestation. If the States Governments would give the assistance to afforestation which has been over and over again promised—

Mr. WEBSTER.—And never given.

Mr. WYNNE.—How old must a tree be before it is fit for cutting?

Mr. JOHN THOMSON.—To what tree does the honorable member allude?

Mr. WYNNE.—An Australian gum. Must it be 40 years old?

Mr. JOHN THOMSON.—I could show the honorable member a tallow-wood tree 7 feet 6 inches in girth that is not as old as I am by a long way, and he could cut a thousand feet of marketable timber out of it. I wish to say in connexion with the suggested exhaustion of our timber supplies, that the very primitive means on which we have to depend in most cases for getting our timbers to market have restricted our operations to a very small area. It is not possible for a man drawing timber with a bullock team to work more than 10 miles from a saw-mill; working at that distance he is able to deliver no more than three logs a week, for which he would receive perhaps £1 each at the stump, or hardly that. The imposition of the duties proposed would do something to make the timber industry profitable to those engaged in it; then a good deal more might be done if saw-mill companies could, or preferably the States Governments would, construct

tram lines to open up our forests. There are thousands of acres of virgin forest in New South Wales that have never had an axe in them, but the nature of the country, and the means of transport, are such that the timber is practically inaccessible. The condition of things is such that the people in the industry are practically unable to help themselves. There are no more resourceful men in the world than are bullock drivers, but in this matter, they are able to do but little to help themselves. Perhaps I should not be in order in speaking of afforestation, but I wish to say that our Australian hardwoods do not require afforestation on the lines which some people think necessary. We hear men talking about planting gum trees as if they were talking of planting cabbages. That kind of assistance is not required at all. The gum forests may be left to themselves. I know of many places which have in my time been denuded of timber, and which will be covered with another growth before I die. In connexion with pine timber, we have been told that we have no pine available, or that it is not of a marketable character. With the assistance which I hope the proposed duties will give to the industry, people who have pine on their properties will be able to place as much on the market as Australia can consume. I have a letter from a settler on the Richmond River, near my own district, though not in it, in which reference is made to the timber available on his property. I am able to inform the Committee that in the district which is known as the Don Dorriggo, there is the finest pine I have ever seen. There are virgin forests of pine there that have never had an axe in them, because there has been no means of getting the timber to market. As a result, the people who take up the country are burning off timber which could be put to use if sufficient inducements were held out to those engaged in the industry to put it on the market.

Mr. THOMAS.—The honorable member is referring to difficulties of transit, and the remedy for that is a railway, and not a duty.

Mr. JOHN THOMSON.—To show the quantities of timber in these areas, the settler to whom I have referred writes to Messrs. Langdon and Langdon, saw-millers, of Sydney, as follows—

We hope to be sending to Sydney market in the near future, and have about five million feet growing and paid for, two million on our own

land and three million we have purchased on outside land, and for this three million we may want to find a market, and will no doubt send to Sydney market if prices are all right.

That is on one man's selection. Very valuable evidence was also given before the Tariff Commission, showing the amount of timber available, and surely with such wealth as this at our disposal it is worth our while to do something for those engaged in producing it. The protectionist section of the Tariff Commission in their report state—

A return from the Department of Lands (May, 1905) showed that the forest area of the State upon which timbers of commercial value occur is roundly estimated to comprise 20,000,000 acres, of this 7,250,000 acres have up to date been reserved for forestry purposes. Of the resumed area about 4,500,000 acres comprised coastal hardwoods, 2,000,000 acres inland forests of box, ironbark, and redgum, and about 1,000,000 acres highland brush forests, carrying hoop or Moreton Bay pine and other soft woods. On this latter area the amount of hoop pine available for present cutting is roundly estimated to be about 400,000,000 superficial feet.

With regard to Queensland, the Commission report—

The Government Director of Forests supplied your Commission with some valuable information, to the following effect:—"The area of the State is 427,838,080 acres, of which about 40,000,000 acres contain merchantable timbers, and it is estimated that about one-third of the entire State contains timbers at least suitable for local purposes. There are 338 reserves, embracing 3,606,709 acres, which have been proclaimed as reserves for forestry purposes. It is estimated that on reserves there are 2,000,000,000 super. feet of pine, and on Crown leased and freehold lands, 1,000,000,000 super. feet, making a total of 3,000,000,000 super. feet.

All that goes to show that we should do something to encourage those in the timber country to make this wealth available, and to give them markets and facilities by which they can bring this valuable asset within the reach of the people of Australia. With regard to freights, the Tariff Commission report—

In Western Australia it was said that the freight of local timber from that State to the eastern States was about 10s. a ton. Similar timber from Canada or the United States was about 28s. per 1,000 feet, or equal to 3s. per 100 feet.

We pay from 2s. 9d. to 3s. per 100 feet for the carriage of timber from the northern rivers of New South Wales, between 200 and 300 miles, to Sydney. Therefore, according to the sworn evidence given before the Commission, timber can be brought from Canada or the United States to Australia as cheaply as it can be from the Bellinger and other rivers of Northern New South Wales

Mr. John Thomson.

to Sydney. The timber people in those countries can handle it more easily, because they have large rivers down which they can raft it, whereas our people, as our top rivers are not sufficiently large to float the timber, have to haul it through the bush with bullocks, carried on the trucks. The same condition applies to other parts of the Commonwealth, as is shown by the evidence regarding Western Australia. Oregon, 12 by 6 and over, is landed in Hobart duty paid at about 10s. to 12s. per 100, and in Sydney at about 10s. per 100. We in New South Wales have engaged in the production of timber in a very large way, and have invested a considerable amount of money in it, especially in the case of hardwood timbers. Our mills are the most up to date in Australia, and the wages are such as those concerned need not be ashamed of. A fresh arrangement has lately been made by which the hours of labour have been reduced. There is a very marked difference between the wages there and those paid in the Baltic trade. This Committee has rightly given consideration in the case of other industries to the difference in the rates of wages paid here and elsewhere, and we should therefore take them into account in this case. The Tariff Commission in their report, on the authority of a Queensland witness, state—

The highest rate of wages paid in the production of Baltic timber was 2s. per day, whilst the rate for corresponding work in Queensland was 1s. per hour.

It stands to reason that if our sawmillers are paying from 1s. per hour—and those are low wages for some of the men, because expert benchmen and others are paid much higher—we cannot compete with people who only pay 2s. a day. I hope that the Committee will give to the timber getters as much consideration as has been extended to those engaged in other Australian industries.

Mr. THOMAS.—Does the honorable member say that the timber cutters in America are paid less than those in Tasmania?

Mr. JOHN THOMSON.—I was comparing the rates of wages in New South Wales and Queensland with those in the Baltic. The honorable member for Barrier has moved that certain timbers be admitted free, with particular reference to the sizes of oregon used in the Broken Hill mines. He also includes New Zealand pine, which competes very extensively

with our pine and other timbers. I fail to see why it should be admitted free. The only direction in which our timber may not be able to compete with New Zealand pine is in the making of butter boxes, because I understand that our pines are more resinous, and if used for butter boxes would deteriorate the butter. I intend to move when the opportunity offers, that New Zealand pine cut to sizes for butter boxes made in bond shall be free. I hope that the Committee will help the sawmilling industry of Australia to overcome some of the disadvantages under which it suffers. Another fact, which is not known to most people, is that we in New South Wales are under a heavy disability in the amount of royalties which we pay to the Crown for our timber.

Mr. THOMAS.—Does the honorable member want a duty to compensate for that?

Mr. JOHN THOMSON.—I think that when a man is loaded in one way, we should help to unload him in another. The men with whom we are competing do not pay such royalty. We in this Committee cannot interfere with the royalty system, but we can help the timber getter in another way. The New South Wales Government demand as royalty on ironbark in the log, 7d. per 100 superficial feet.

Mr. THOMAS.—Does the honorable member think it fair that all Australia should pay a duty in order that New South Wales may collect a royalty?

Mr. JOHN THOMSON.—I understand that there are conditions in other States which, although not quite identical, have a similar effect to that of the New South Wales royalty system. On other hardwoods we have to pay 5d. per 100 superficial feet; on redgum in the log, 1s. 6d.; on brush timber, other than cedar, 6d.; Richmond River pine, 6d.; Cypress pine, 9d.; and cedar in the log, 1s. 6d., per 100 superficial feet.

Mr. WEBSTER.—Do they expect to get it for nothing?

Mr. JOHN THOMSON.—I am drawing attention simply to the way we are handicapped in our competition with timber from outside. Those royalties are on log measurement. Out of a 1,500-foot log, which is only a fair measurement for a tallow-wood log, no saw-miller will get more than 1,000 feet of marketable timber; but still we have to pay royalty on all that the log contains, which is always

a good deal more than we get out of it in marketable timber. The older and more faulty the timber is, the greater are the losses. No miller could cut up logs from the very best forest that I know of with less waste than one-third, while in the majority of cases, there is a loss of 50 per cent. in the cutting up. All those are reasons why the Committee might give assistance to the timber getters. I hope that the duties proposed by the Government will be retained, or, if not, that at least substantial rates will be agreed to.

Mr. EDWARDS (Oxley) [3.56].—This is a question of the utmost importance to all the States; but, as it has been very ably dealt with by the honorable member for Wide Bay and others, I do not propose unduly to prolong the debate. I must say at the outset that I have no intention of supporting the amendment of the honorable member for Barrier to include in this item oregon and New Zealand pine.

Mr. THOMAS.—Then the honorable member for Barrier will consider whether he will give assistance to the Queensland sugar industry in the future.

Mr. EDWARDS.—We get a little support in regard to the sugar industry. This is another matter that affects every State in the Commonwealth. I hope the honorable member does not regard it as of interest to Queensland alone. The duty proposed by the Government is exactly what the Tariff Commission recommended, and, generally speaking, we have endeavoured to keep as near to their recommendations as possible. I desire to place before the Committee some evidence given before the Commission. They say—

A Tasmanian saw-miller complained that the existing duty on dressed and undressed timber was insufficient protection for the local industry, and requested that on all classes of imported pine there should be an increase of 2s. per 100 feet super., or 1s. per 100 lineal feet, of dressed timber 6 inches wide.—(H. Jones, Q. 35227-8.) In reply to a question, witness further stated that a majority of the saw-millers of Tasmania favoured an increase of 2s. per 100 feet super. on all pine, dressed or undressed, including kauri, sugar pine, and spruce.—(Q. 35315-16.) A timber merchant in this State opposed any alteration in the existing duties, on the ground that the Tasmanian hardwood was about 75. per 100 feet cheaper than the imported Oregon, and that the imposition of even 4s. per 100 would not make any difference in the sale of local hardwood.—(Kemp, Q. 36158-63.)

The Commission also report—

In Western Australia a complaint was made that the Customs Department insisted upon duty

being paid on the invoiced original rough measurement of American shelving (12 in. x 1 in.), while the actual measurement does not exceed 11½ in. x ¾ in. It was contended that the imposition of duty on a larger quantity of timber than actually goes through the Customs increases the cost to the consumer.—(Dove, Q. 40027.) He said importers decline to invoice at 11½ in. x ¾ in., giving as a reason that they would not specially invoice for Australia.—(Q. 40042.) Under the Customs Act the authorities have no option; but he complained that the Act was unjust.—(Q. 40102.)

I think that the question of measurement has been taken in hand by the Treasurer, and a rectification made to the satisfaction of the majority of honorable members. The report of the protectionist section of the Tariff Commission continues—

In the same State, the President of the Boulder Chamber of Commerce contended that the duty on Oregon and Baltic timber was excessive.—(Spencer, Q. 42436.)

As against this contention, the general manager of Millar's Karri and Jarrah Company Ltd. complained of insufficient protection under the Commonwealth Tariff as against foreign timber, including New Zealand pine, and asked for the following duties:—New Zealand pine, sawn, 2s. per 100 super. feet; New Zealand pine, dressed, 4s. per 100 super. feet; Oregon, all sizes, undressed, 3s. per 100 super. feet.—(Smith, Q. 45078, 45084.)

A timber merchant of Queensland asked that New Zealand timber should be placed on the same footing as timber from other countries. New Zealand white pine was being imported ostensibly for the making of butter boxes, but was being used for shelving and other purposes.—(Campbell, Q. 90761-73.) In the same State complaint was made by the Secretary of the Associated Timber Merchants that an entirely erroneous interpretation is placed on the meaning of the word "superficial" in the Tariff, inasmuch as it is held to mean "solid" instead of "length and breadth," without thickness.

The manager of a firm of timber merchants at Maryborough asked for a reversion to the State Tariff of Queensland. He complained of the free admission of New Zealand white pine, which in that country was encouraged by railway concessions to the extent of 40 or 50 per cent. Also of the competition of cheaper timbers, such as Oregon and Baltic. He estimated that there were about 15,000 persons dependent upon the timber industry in the Maryborough district, and of this number fully 3,000 men were directly employed.—(Green, Q. 92823-24-25.) He also supported other witnesses as to the method adopted in assessing duties on dressed timbers under 1 inch in thickness.—(Q. 928832.)

Honorable members will see that in the neighbourhood of Maryborough alone 3,000 men are directly employed; and that this means a total of 15,000 persons who depend for their living on this industry.

Mr. WEBSTER.—How does the honorable member account for Mr. Campbell, the president of the association, declaring that

Mr. Edwards.

he would not care twopence if there were no duty on white pine?

Mr. GROOM.—That was only in connexion with butter boxes.

Mr. EDWARDS.—I am not aware that Mr. Campbell did say so; but, at any rate, some honorable members will recollect that when the Tariff was under discussion in 1902, and this question was debated at great length, Parliament was, doubtless, in favour of a duty on New Zealand pine. But the proposed duty was lost by one vote owing to an error on the part of an honorable member. I do not know how the error occurred, but that honorable member certainly intended to vote in favour of a duty. I am informed that in nearly all the mines throughout the Commonwealth, with the exception of mines at Broken Hill, local hardwood is being used.

Mr. WEBSTER.—There are other places besides Broken Hill where only Oregon is used.

Mr. EDWARDS.—But only to a small extent. I am told that at Broken Hill Oregon is regarded as more suitable owing to the peculiar formation of the country, or, perhaps, it may be, owing to the system of mining there adopted.

Mr. WEBSTER.—Oregon timber gives the necessary warning.

Mr. EDWARDS.—Yes, I am told that Oregon "talks," as it is called, and thus gives warning when it is really weary of the burden, and likely to give way. I point out, however, that if hardwood were used, there would be no "talking" for the simple reason that it would last for ever, and, in the end, would prove really cheaper than Oregon. I desire to place the following letter and resolution before honorable members—

3rd October, 1907.

R. Edwards, Esq., M.H.R.,

Dear Sir,

Enclosed is a copy of a resolution unanimously adopted by a representative meeting of saw-mill employers of Brisbane and surrounding districts. We invite your consideration of the same, and trust you will see your way clear to plead our cause as outlined in the said resolution.

We are, on behalf of the Committee,

ALEXR. SHEARR, Chairman.

R. D. ROBERTS, Secretary.

Newstead Terrace, Brisbane.

Resolution unanimously adopted at a meeting of the saw-mill employes of Brisbane, held in the Albert Hall, Wednesday, 2nd October, 1907:—

"That this meeting of saw-mill employes of Brisbane protest against any alteration being made in the Tariff on foreign timber, and that we view with

alarm the proposal made to the Minister for Customs by a deputation, including Mr. Sharp, of Messrs. Sharp and Sons, and Mr. Sutch, representing the Woodworker's Association, to admit free of duty all timber of the sizes of 12 x 6 and over in Oregon pine, 7 x 2½ and over in Baltic and Spruce deals, 8 in. superficial measurement and over in New Zealand pine, and all other timbers of 6 x 2 and over. This would mean that practically the whole of the timber imported into the Commonwealth would come in duty free. To preserve the trade of Queensland and keep the men employed who are connected with the industry, it is absolutely necessary that the Tariff as proposed by the Minister for Customs be maintained; and we earnestly hope the Commonwealth Government will succeed in doing so, thus affording some little protection to those engaged in the timber industry in Queensland."

I do not know the exact number of men employed in this industry in and about Brisbane, but they are very numerous, and the timber-getters are more numerous still. Most of these men have wives and children, and everything they use or consume is heavily taxed.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—There is such a strong demand for their product just now that they cannot supply it.

Mr. EDWARDS.—I am very glad to hear that occasionally these people enjoy good times, because what life could be harder than that of the timber-getters? I hope and trust that the Committee will be prepared to afford the encouragement which this industry deserves. As to the millers of Queensland not being able to execute orders, there may be some truth in the statements made. However, the fault is being remedied, and in the near future there will be no complaint on that score.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I merely mentioned the fact because the millers will not take orders for a year ahead.

Mr. EDWARDS.—Larger and more powerful plant is being procured, so as to enable the millers to directly increase the output. A further cause of the delay in executing orders is the difficulty of access to the forests of Queensland; but the State Government, which went out of office two or three weeks ago, had prepared plans and specifications for ten or a dozen different railways, some of which were intended to tap the timber country. We may depend upon it that the present Government of Queensland, if they remain in office, will see that these proposed works are carried out. The session of the State Parlia-

ment commences shortly after Christmas; and it has been stated by Mr. Philp that amongst the first business will be the passing of these Railway Bills, with a view to the early construction of the lines. In many parts of Queensland, there are inexhaustible supplies of timber of all kinds. In the Wide Bay, the Moreton, and the Darling Downs electorates there are immense supplies, which represent a valuable national asset, and which ought to be utilized in preference to timber from other countries. I appeal to honorable members to give this matter their most earnest consideration, in view of the fact that in Australia there is an abundant supply of timber, which is at all times a marketable commodity.

Mr. McWILLIAMS (Franklin) [4.14].—It is rather strange to hear the fierce fight made against a proposal which, after all, does not represent more than 15 per cent.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—It amounts to 100 per cent. in the case of butter boxes.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—We are talking about a duty on Oregon pine, and a duty has been proposed which does not amount to more than 15 per cent. I do not intend to vote for high duties upon timber. So far, we have not imposed a protective duty of less than 15 per cent. upon any article in this Tariff. It has been stated during this debate that we are not in a position to supply our own requirements in respect of timber. That I absolutely deny. When I recently visited my own electorate I found that there were four vessels loading with timber, one bound for Mexico, another for South Africa, a third for Plymouth, and another for Dover. As a matter of fact, we are now exporting to South America, South Africa, and Europe, and yet we are told that we cannot supply the timber requirements of the Broken Hill mines. It has further been alleged that Australian hardwood is unsuitable for use in those mines. May I remind honorable members that in Tasmania are to be found some mines which are exceedingly difficult to work? The Tasmanian mine is admittedly one of the wettest in Australia. The pump upon it is draining the country for 5 miles around, and the ground is of a very treacherous nature. Notwithstanding this, however, there has never been 1,000 feet of timber other than Tasmanian timber used in that mine. I recently saw a letter from the manager to that effect,

and he further added that he had found Tasmanian timber exceedingly satisfactory for all purposes. I would also remind the Committee that the directors of the Mount Lyell mine are practically the same men who compose the directorate of the Broken Hill Proprietary mine. If it is dangerous to use Australian timber at Broken Hill, why did the Mount Lyell directors recently make a contract for the supply of Tasmanian timber "for all requirements?" As a matter of fact, I believe that more than 70 per cent. of the mines of the Commonwealth are using Australian timber. The one consideration which affects this question is the freight which is charged upon the Government railways. The honorable member for Kooyong has pointed out that Tasmanian timber is twice as heavy as is oregon. That is perfectly correct. But whilst a piece of oregon of the same size as a piece of stringybark weighs only 34 lbs. as against 60 lbs., its breaking capacity is only 780 lbs. as against 1,220 lbs. So that a 5 x 5 piece of Tasmanian hardwood is equal in strength to an 8 x 8 piece of oregon.

Mr. THOMAS.—Why is not Australian hardwood used in the Broken Hill mines?

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—There is one mill in Tasmania which will supply the Broken Hill mines with all the timber that they require if the latter will only give it the contract.

Mr. THOMAS.—Why does not that mill supply them?

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—Because the directors of the Broken Hill mines will not give it an opportunity to do so. The honorable member for Kooyong stated that the whole of the Broken Hill mines consumed about 15,000,000 superficial feet of timber per annum. I say that there is one mill in Tasmania which has been erected at a cost of about £100,000 by a Scottish company, and which is in a position to supply the whole of that timber immediately. The question is entirely one of freight upon the Government railways. It has been stated that Tasmanian timber is not suitable for the manufacture of fruit-boxes. In this connexion, I would point out that Tasmania produces 5 bushels of apples to every bushel produced in all the other States, and yet there is not an imported fruit-box used in the apple trade of that State. If the fruit-growers of Australia are prepared to enter into a contract, the Tasmanian saw-mills can supply them with fruit-boxes, f.o.b.

Hobart, for 4½d. each, landed in Sydney for 6½d. each, and in Melbourne for 6½d. each.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—They can be purchased for 6½d. in Sydney.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—The honorable member for Parramatta has just received a telegram from one of the largest fruit dealers in New South Wales—I refer to Mr. Hunt—who states that the price of gin cases is 1s. 2d., of half-bushel cases 7d., and of bushel cases 10d. That information ought to be authentic. I cannot fail to recognise that in Australia to-day there are men who are receiving the advantage of abnormally high protective duties in respect of their own products, and who the moment they wish to send those products abroad put them into cases made of imported timber. Had the Treasurer asked for a 15 per cent. protective duty for any manufacturing industry, he would have been at once assailed with the charge that he would ruin it. In dealing out these protective duties, surely we ought to give the man in the bush a little "cut." In visiting my own electorate recently I was particularly struck with the fact that the position of the bushmen there to-day is better than it ever was previously.

Mr. THOMAS.—What wages are they paid?

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—The wages paid by the timber mills in the bush are not under 8s. per day, and in most cases the bushmen are provided with houses free of rent. So far, the big timber mill to which I have already referred has not made a profit of a single shilling, despite the large amount of capital which has been invested in it. I venture to say that if a manufacturer in Victoria occupied a similar position, this Committee would be doing its utmost to assist him in every possible way.

Mr. McDougall.—What does it matter how the man in the bush fares, so long as the man in the trust does well.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—If the lot of any person is hard, surely it is that of the bushman. If the timber industry were located within the four walls of a city, this Committee would have extended to it a protection of from 30 per cent. to 40 per cent. Under these circumstances, we ought to give to the man in the bush the benefit of a protection of at least 15 per cent.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN (Calare) [4.28].—I have listened with considerable interest to the appeal of the honorable member for Franklin on behalf of the bushmen, but I

fail to see how the proposed duties would be of any assistance to that individual. In the production of hardwood it is undeniable that Australia can hold its own against the world. At the present time we are not only supplying our own needs in that connexion, but we are finding a market for our timber outside our own borders. Indeed, the drain upon our sleepers is of such a serious character that in New South Wales the Government is being urged to levy an export duty upon them.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—That is entirely the result of exportation from the North Coast.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—Yes. We are within measurable distance of the period when the available supplies will be exhausted.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Only so far as the supply of a certain class of sleeper is concerned.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—Whilst we possess an immense quantity of timber—timber which is unequalled for certain purposes—we do not possess that wide variety that is necessary for supplying our own needs. We are compelled to import large quantities of soft woods in order to meet our requirements in that respect. The Committee may put heavy duties upon soft woods, but it is not in a position to replace them by any woods at present available in Australia. That importation must, to a greater or less extent, continue, and the taxation will simply act as a revenue-returning medium, increasing the price of the article to the consumer. I will admit that a great quantity of soft woods is used for a purpose to which, very likely, a considerable quantity of Australian wood could be devoted. But there remain the broad facts which I have stated, and which honorable members seem to lose sight of, particularly the last speaker, in his plea for the Australian bush worker. At an earlier stage of the debate, a reference was made to the ruthless destruction of our valuable timbers. Pioneer occupation is purely pastoral, and pastoralists destroy timber for the purpose of increasing the carrying capacity of their country. In my electorate, places which were heavily timbered 35 or 40 years ago, have been served in that way. The ringbarker's axe and the firestick have completely denuded vast areas of timber. In view of the increasing demand for timber as settlement has progressed, that timber, if it had been allowed to stand or had been judi-

ciously thinned, would have been more valuable to-day than the land itself. That state of affairs obtains through large areas of the different States. Serious attention should be given to the question not only of preserving our timber supply, but also of increasing it by planting suitable Australian timber, and acclimatizing suitable timber from other countries. That question should speedily engage the attention of the States Governments. But the imposition of Customs duties with a view to increasing the supply of timber and bringing it to market does not appeal to me as the correct method to remedy the evils from which we are suffering. Honorable members point to the large forests in Queensland and say, "There are your supplies. All you have to do is to lock out the competing timber, and those supplies will be opened up." Why are they not opened up under present conditions? On a previous occasion, when we were debating this matter, an honorable member said that the reason why the timber supplies of Queensland were not brought into use was because they were inaccessible. Who is going to make them accessible? As one honorable member has pointed out here, the value of timber has never appealed to the States Governments in the matter of railway construction. They will construct railways to develop the agricultural possibilities of the country, but when one calls their attention to the timber question, it does not appeal to them to nearly the same extent. I think that something may be done in the direction of developing our forests by making them more accessible, and bringing them more readily within the points of consumption than they are at the present time. But I do not see that the imposition of duties is likely to do very much in that way. It will punish the user without materially assisting the man who wants to develop our timber resources. These duties fall very heavily upon, first, the mining industry, secondly, the agricultural industry, more particularly its dairying and fruit-growing branches, and thirdly, on the general community in regard to house-building and other timber work. A very strong appeal has been made on behalf of the mining industry by the honorable member for Barrier. Imported timbers enter, perhaps, more largely into use in the Broken Hill mines than in any of the other mines. I understand that in Western Australia

they are used to some extent, and now, as mines like the Cobar mine have got to greater depths, and are meeting with greater difficulties, the disposition is to use oregon timber. I think that the appeal of the honorable member for Barrier ought to have weight with honorable members. It is not merely a question of cheapness, but a question of safeguarding human life. The honorable member has indicated the peculiar character of the mining which is carried on at Broken Hill, and how oregon timber operates in giving timely warning before a fall takes place. That is a consideration which appealed to the previous Parliament, and which, I hope, will have weight with this Parliament. According to a comment in a recent issue of the *Argus*, the increased cost of timber to one company at Broken Hill will, at their present rate of consumption, amount to about £2,200 per annum, and the other companies have the same impost to meet. With the increased duties on mining machinery and timber, it is estimated that the six companies in Broken Hill will have an increased charge of about £33,000 to meet.

Mr. POYNTON.—We are told that the duty ought to make the prices cheaper.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—According to the protectionists, it ought to cheapen the prices, but this is one of the instances where that does not work out. That fact ought to appeal to my protectionist friends, who believe in the cheapening argument; because it does not operate here. On the contrary, the duty helps to make the operations of the great mining industry at Broken Hill more difficult and expensive, particularly in view of the fact that it has to meet a rapidly depreciating metal market. Do honorable members realize that by the imposition of these duties they are loading one of Australia's most important primary industries, and one which in the markets of the world has suffered a depreciation of about £90,000,000 in the value of its metal production, as compared with the prices which obtained last year? That depreciation dates from the beginning of the present year, and, so far as we can judge, it is likely to continue for some time. On the top of that the Government seek to load the Broken Hill mines to the extent of £33,000 per annum, and a large proportion of that sum represents the increased price which they will have to pay for timber supplies. The same thing applies to Cobar. In the case

of one machinery order given there, the Customs taxation represented about £25,000, being an increase of £17,000 on the amount payable under the old Tariff. Now that the Cobar company have got to a greater depth, and are meeting with more difficult ground, they will be compelled to use oregon timber. Hitherto they have been using with advantage Australian timber; but under this Tariff, their operations will be further loaded. That means that a large number of mining operations will be reduced from a payable to a non-payable basis. As soon as the latter stage is reached, they will close down. Thousands of working men will thus be adversely affected by the Tariff, as compared with the comparatively few timber getters who will secure any advantage therefrom. The requirements of the dairying industry should also be taken into serious consideration. Any one who is acquainted with the handling of butter knows that it is at once affected by contact with any odorous substance. It is undeniable that the timber used for boxing the article for export should be absolutely free from resin, or any of those substances which so readily affect its condition. It becomes a question of where that timber is to be secured suitably, and at what particular price. It is estimated that the Customs duties will increase the price of the butter boxes to the extent of about 2½d. each, or to the extent of 5d. per 112 lbs. of butter. The industry has had a very big fight with a shipping monopoly, and only recently, as the result of the action of this House in approving of a mail contract, which prescribes the rate for the carriage of butter, has any reduction been made. Still a very considerable freight has to be paid for the carriage of the article which, I may mention, was exported last year to the extent of 140,000,000 lbs. If that quantity is repeated this year, every one hundredweight exported will bear an increased cost of 5d. as an automatic effect of the operation of this Tariff. That is an instance of the way in which the butter industry is being loaded. We have had circulars setting out to what extent other industries are being adversely affected, notably the coach-building and carriage industry, in which a large number of people are engaged throughout the Commonwealth. It is an industry that is not limited to the big cities. Almost every town has its coach and buggy

factory. These men tell us that under this Tariff their trade will be completely ruined for the reason that they are compelled to import certain timbers, especially from America, that are suitable to this kind of work, and that no timber grown within the Commonwealth can replace them. The imposition of this taxation, therefore, must restrict their trade, and in many instances practically annihilate it. Here is an instance where taxation falls heavily upon the poorer man. The man who can use his four-wheel conveyance will not have to pay so much as the man who is compelled to be satisfied with a sulky; and nearly every farmer in the country districts has a sulky to do his light work. The duty will fall as a very heavy impost upon nearly all our primary industries, and it will give no compensation in the opposite direction. I invite the attention of the Committee to the representations made to the Tariff Commission by those who are interested in this business, not merely as consumers, but as sawmillers and as workmen who use imported timbers. I find that the Adelaide Saw-mills Woodworkers' Association and the Victorian representatives of a like association appeared before the Tariff Commission. Their recommendations were that oregon 12 x 6 and over should be free; that deals, baltic, in the solid, 7 x 2½ and over should be free; that red pine, Californian, 7 x 3 and over should be free; and pine, American, clear sugar, and yellow, 7 x 3 should be free. We have a circular issued and signed by the chairman of the Timber Merchants' Association of Melbourne, and by the secretary of the Federated Sawmillers and Timberyards and General Woodworkers' Employés Association, Mr. W. G. Sharp and Mr. James Sutch respectively. They recommend that baltic and spruce deals, Californian red pine, sugar pine, yellow pine, oregon pine, and New Zealand pines over 8 inches superficial measurement, should be placed upon the free list. If there were not a substantial reason for asking that these timbers should be free, it is not likely that these men would make such a proposal, for they are protectionists, and want protection upon every other line but this.

Mr. STORRER.—They are protectionists when it suits themselves.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—So far as I can judge, every man professing protectionist principles in this Committee is a protectionist when it suits himself, and a free-trader when it does not.

Mr. GROOM.—No; when it suits the country.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—Some people's ideas of what suits the country do not reach beyond their own personality. The honorable member for Wide Bay is prepared to allow certain timbers to come in free, but he wants them to be imported in the log. But log timber cannot be introduced except at very heavy expense. It is very difficult to handle, and there is considerable waste connected with it. So difficult is it to handle, and so great the waste and the consequent loss, that, as has been pointed out, the quotations for log timber and cut are practically identical on the Australian market. The timber can best be shipped in bulk and most easily handled when it has been squared and the waste parts reduced. That is the form in which the sawmillers and the industries most concerned ask for it. I hope that the Committee will not be unreasonable about this matter, but will exercise a wise discretion, and be guided by the recommendation of practical people. I trust that they will especially have in view the interests of the Broken Hill miners, and those engaged in the dairying and similar industries, who, whilst they do what they can to encourage the development of an Australian timber trade, cannot profitably use Australian timber for certain special purposes.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS (Robertson) [4.52].—I think that the interests of those concerned in the Australian timber trade will not suffer at the hands of this Parliament. Every honorable member who has spoken appears to have made a study of the qualities of various kinds of timber, and the purposes for which they can be used. There is a desire to give an impetus to a trade which will ultimately do a great deal of good to Australia. But we have to concern ourselves with the present as well as with the future; and, on consulting the Tariff, I find that the Government have actually proposed heavy increases upon the very high Tariff that was introduced several years ago. They have proposed a 200 per cent. increase on one line, 300 per cent. on another, and further increases of 25, 50, and 150 per cent. So that the Government are proposing to increase these duties up to the enormous extent of 300 per cent. upon the former duties charged, and this for the purpose of bringing into use timbers that cannot be grown in Australia to take the place of

the imported timbers for at least twenty years. The honorable member for Cowper made a most excellent speech. After he had finished, I had a conversation with him on the subject, and he told me that he knew a tree that took twenty-eight years to grow to a condition when it would be fit for cutting. If we are going to charge these excessive duties, in addition to the high duties charged under the old Tariff, we shall be doing what is not justified. But when timber of our own, suitable for the purposes which have been mentioned during the course of the debate, is fit for cutting, those interested in having certain duties imposed for the benefit of the industry are not likely to have anything to fear at the hands of such a Parliament as this. The country, however, has much to fear if we are to increase existing duties by 200 and 300 per cent. Who will pay those duties? We have been informed that they will necessitate the mines of Broken Hill increasing their payments in duties to the extent of £12,000 a year. Here is a native industry that has done a great deal to benefit Australia. Broken Hill came to the assistance of South Australia when she badly required a fillip. The mines have benefited every State in the Union. These duties will mean that the smaller mines, which are not so remunerative as are the others, will probably have to close down. Surely that will injure rather than benefit Australia. Furthermore, we shall lose a considerable amount of revenue. We are told that there is good timber in Tasmania. My good friend the honorable member for Denison has put in a word for the blue gum of his State. It is not necessary for us to run down our own timbers. My honorable friend tells me that Tasmanian blue gum is as good a timber as any that is used in our mines. But, unfortunately, it is open to the objection of being three times the weight of oregon.

Mr. STORRER.—No; barely twice the weight.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—Even if it is twice the weight of oregon, it means twice the freight upon a given quantity of timber going to Broken Hill. That is a severe handicap. Are we going to place a handicap upon our industries because, unfortunately, we have not a light native timber to take the place of oregon? It is one of the disabilities under which we labour. I have no doubt that in time

lighter timbers will be grown in Australia to take the place of those now imported. But, in the meantime, do not let us penalize small mining companies that are living, so to speak, from hand to mouth. While the honorable member for Barrier was making his able speech, I myself thought of those who have taken their millions out of the best mines in Broken Hill, and asked the question, "Why should they not be required to pay something for what they have obtained?" But the best point which the honorable member made in his speech was in meeting that objection. He had been speaking of the great mines. He then referred to the small mines, which employ thousands of men. We shall throw those thousands of men out of employment if we impose heavy taxation with the idea of conserving an industry for supplying timber that is not yet planted.

Mr. FISHER.—That would be a wonderfully sound argument if the mines could not get their timber in free. But they can get oregon in free now.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—Yes, they can get their oregon in free in the log. But there is so much waste in a log of timber that it is more economical to import it cut. It is not business to bring to Australia at enormous expense an immense amount of lumber, much of which has to be thrown away. The honorable member for Wide Bay has reminded us that New Zealand has imposed restrictive legislation regarding the export of her timber. We are penalized because of that legislation. Well, these chickens will come home to roost. They will come home in our case in the future, and they will come home to New Zealand. New Zealand grows a kind of timber—white pine—which is better than any other wood for the making of butter boxes. Are we going to injure the great dairying industry that has done so much for New South Wales, Victoria, and, in fact, every State in the Union, and that in the future will do ten times as much as it has done in the past? We shall penalize that industry if we carry these duties, not only by putting a tax upon the wood from which the butter boxes are made, but also, possibly, by encouraging the use of another timber that is inferior—a timber that will give an objectionable flavour to the butter. As soon as we give people abroad the idea that we cannot make butter

equal in quality to that which they get from the Continent of Europe, our product will suffer in price.

Mr. FISHER.—Does the honorable member suggest that in that respect Queensland timber is defective?

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—Recently a butter box made of Tasmanian hardwood was placed on view in this building, and when my attention was drawn to it by the honorable member for Franklin I communicated with butter factory managers in my electorate with the view of ascertaining whether this timber was suitable for the purpose. The replies I received were to the effect that it tainted the butter and could not be used. If we have a suitable timber for this purpose in Australia, by all means let us use it, but I am not prepared to penalize an industry by declaring that it shall use unsuitable timber.

Mr. GROOM.—Did the men of whom the honorable member sought this information speak from practical experience?

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—The honorable member suggests that I did not fully investigate the question. I would remind him that when the first Federal Tariff was under consideration it was thoroughly investigated and discussed in this House, and I think we were then all agreed that Australian timber was inferior to New Zealand white pine for butter boxes.

Mr. FISHER.—Decidedly not. I shall have to repeat the facts adduced on that occasion. It is simply a matter of prejudice against Australian timber.

Mr. PAGE.—Is the honorable member aware that butter sent to the Old Country this year in a Queensland pine box took first prize in competition against the world?

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—I am very glad to hear it. I remember that when the first Federal Tariff was before us the honorable member for Wide Bay and other representatives of Queensland brought under the notice of the Committee the hoop pine grown in that State, which they said was eminently suitable for butter boxes. I forget for the moment what were the grounds of the objection to its use for that purpose, but I think that the question of cost as well as the flavour that it was said to impart to the butter had something to do with it.

Mr. GROOM.—Certificates from London show clearly that Queensland pine is excellent for butter-box making.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—As an Australian I always give first place to that

which is Australian, but the representatives of Queensland have not yet satisfied the trade that Queensland pine is the most acceptable for butter boxes.

Mr. GROOM.—In Queensland butter boxes are made almost exclusively of it.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—But it has not been shown that its use is more profitable than is the use of New Zealand white pine.

Mr. GROOM.—That is another matter.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—It has just been hinted to me by an honorable member that my statement that Queensland pine boxes taint the butter packed in them is correct, and he has gone in search of data to support that statement.

Mr. PAGE.—How is it, then, that butter packed in a box made of Queensland pine took the first prize in England?

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—I do not wish to deal further with that phase of the question.

Mr. PAGE.—The honorable member is libelling the Queensland timber.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—The timber getters of Queensland are having a rosy time. Some of them pay a mere bagatelle for the right to cut timber in the forests of that State, and I have yet to learn that they cannot compete against the world in the matter of hardwood. They have the market to themselves, and need no duty. In some cases the Government propose an increase of between 200 per cent. and 300 per cent. on the old timber duties. Such excessive imposts will penalize the staple industries of Australia. They will retard progress and injure the country, and it is also proposed to impose them on timber, a substitute for which for certain purposes we cannot produce in Australia. I hope that the Government will not press their proposals, and that if they do the Committee will insist upon material reductions.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [5.11].—It is not a matter for surprise that the timber duties should have so long absorbed the attention of the Committee, because I can bear testimony that no branch of the Tariff gave me and my colleagues so much difficulty as did the task of investigating this question and arriving at a conclusion as to what duties should be proposed. In the report of the protectionist section of the Commission attention is drawn to the difficulty that we experienced, owing to the conflict of interests, in endeavouring to do justice all round. In the first place, we had to consider the timber getters in the forest, and the saw-millers and the

saw-mill employes there. Then we had to consider the timber merchants in the cities and the towns, as well as their employes, who are anxious that the sawing should be done there instead of in the forests. Finally, we had to take into account the interests of the users of the timber, and particularly those of two or three groups of consumers comprising users of butter boxes and fruit boxes. On the whole, therefore, we had a very complex problem to solve, and its complexity has been reflected during this debate. I subscribed formally, with considerable doubt, to the recommendation that a duty of 1s. 6d. per 100 superficial feet should be imposed on timber undressed in sizes of 12 inches by 6 inches and over. In doing so, I yielded to the opinion of my colleagues who joined with me in signing the recommendation. In framing a report, one has sometimes to subordinate one's views to those of others, and I did so in this case with the reservation that I should have a free hand in the House in regard to, not only the rate of duty, but the mode of measurement. I am not bound absolutely to all our recommendations; they are merely suggestions which the Committee may accept or modify. I take leave, therefore, to differ in matters of detail in respect to which I have grave doubts. I say frankly that so far as paragraph A is concerned, I had at the outset grave doubts as to the amount of the duty, and those doubts have been confirmed by this debate. As to New Zealand white pine, I think there should be no exemption, and the only doubt I have in that regard is as to the amount of the duty. It is unfair to Australian timber to give a preference to any outside timber.

Mr. SAMPSON.—New Zealand is a part of Australasia.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—It is no part of the Commonwealth.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—Are we to increase the cost of butter boxes?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—That point has been discussed over and over again. It is not desirable to allow New Zealand white pine to be imported free, because, as is shown by the scientific evidence placed before the Tariff Commission in Brisbane, Queensland pine is equally good for making butter boxes. Mr. J. C. Brunnich, Agricultural Chemist of the Queensland Department of Agriculture and Stock, made analyses of butter box timbers, the results of which are given at page 549 of volume

V. of the Tariff Commission's evidence on Wood, Wicker, and Cane. Reporting on these analyses, he said—

The watery extracts of the two Queensland pines and the New Zealand white pine, which were obtained by letting sawdust of these timbers soak for twenty-four hours in water, were almost tasteless, meaning that the extracts had only the very slightest woody taste, and there was no difference between the three samples. The extracts of the Queensland timbers were quite colourless, and that of the New Zealand pine of a light-yellow colour.

The amounts of extractive matters taken up by the water, of special importance in the use of these timbers for butter boxes, are the lowest in the Queensland timber, particularly in the second well-seasoned sample, which is to be considered in their favour.

Another point of importance is the amount of water absorbed by the timbers, and, again, the manner in which such water is given off when the timbers are exposed to the air, as a criterion of the porosity and capillarity of such timbers. The experiments show that no difference exists in regard to these properties between our Queensland and the New Zealand pine.

I have read that report in justice to the Queensland timber, because it has been suggested in the course of the debate that it gives forth a certain aroma which injuriously affects the butter placed in it. As to the price of the Queensland pine, let me quote the evidence of Mr. George Brown, the managing director for Brown and Brown, Brisbane—question 90994—

Can you say what would be the increased cost of butter-boxes if the duty of 1s. 6d. per 100 superficial feet, which you suggest, were imposed, and assuming that the whole duty were passed on to the users of timber for this purpose?—The increased cost would be from 1½d. to 1½d. per box.

That is not much. He went on to say—

We do not anticipate that if the duty were imposed the price of butter-boxes in the south would be increased at the outside by more than 1½d. each.

In view of the possibly slight increase in cost to which he refers, I think that it would be well to reduce the duty from 1s. 6d. per 100 superficial feet to, say, 1s. or 9d. That would put the two timbers comparatively on a level. I am altogether against placing New Zealand white pine on the free list, and by singling it out from amongst the timbers of the world, giving it a statutory preference. It would be a great injustice to the Queensland industry to do that, and if I were a representative of Queensland I would strongly object to any such treatment. Whilst I am prepared to treat alike all importations of timber in sizes 12 x 6 or over—

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—Why in those sizes?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—Because they are the sizes in which timber is generally imported, to be cut up into smaller sizes.

Mr. ATKINSON.—Does the importation of New Zealand white pine reduce the sale of Queensland timber?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—Unquestionably it is now difficult to obtain Queensland timber. I have complaints to that effect from makers of butter boxes, case-makers, and moulding-makers, all of whom acknowledge the high quality and great value of the Queensland pine. It cannot be denied that the timber industry in Queensland has not yet been properly developed, and that it may take some years to develop it; but we should do our best to give prominence to the merits of the timber, and to assist the industry. Let me read a letter, dated 5th August, addressed to a Melbourne firm by Messrs. Lahey Brothers, Townsville branch. The Melbourne firm had written to the Brisbane representative of Messrs. Lahey Brothers, offering a big order for ballygum, caloon, and pine—

Ballygum and Caloon.—We would only be too pleased to enter a contract with you for your supplies for 1908 for both these timbers, but owing to the uncertainty of log supplies could not undertake to do so, in fairness to you and ourselves.

Pine.—We may point out that the agency for this timber has been passed on to Messrs. Davies and Fehon, and orders placed with them are distributed among the Brisbane or Maryborough millers, as they find the millers here and at Maryborough capable of filling such orders, and owing to the unprecedented demand for pine, every saw-miller here is, with difficulty, able to keep pace with the orders.

The fact that there is delay in filling orders is not a reason for admitting New Zealand pine free; but it is a reason for reducing the duty on it to 1s. or 9d. I advise the representatives of Queensland not to ask for too large a duty, for fear of creating a prejudice against their timber. A lower duty than that proposed should place the two timbers on an equality of competition, so that it could not be said that butter-boxes made of Queensland timber cost 1½d. or 1¾d. more than butter-boxes made of New Zealand pine. This will tend to popularize Queensland timber.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—Does the honorable member consider 15 per cent. a high rate?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—We have discriminated between raw materials and the finished product. The duty on timber in the rough should not be as great as that upon dressed timber.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—The honorable member's idea is that timber should be imported in the rough, to be cut up here?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—I should like it to be cut up here, if that can be done without injury to any local industry. I shall oppose the amendment of the honorable member for Barrier to make oregon and white pine free, and shall vote for a duty of 1s. or 9d. per 100 superficial feet on sizes 12 x 6 and over. A duty of 1s. 6d. would be too high.

Mr. WYNNE (Balaclava) [5.30].—It must be admitted that timber is becoming much scarcer in Victoria than it used to be. The cost of timber for mining purposes at Ballarat and Bendigo has been greatly increased during the last few years. We had some splendid forests in this State, which have been destroyed by the burning off of the timber on the land being thrown open to selection. The timber on the land in the Cape Otway forest is worth from £20 to £30 per acre, but in order to promote settlement the State Government have been selling the land at £1 an acre, and allowing the timber to be rung and burnt, when they might just as well have cut the timber first and promoted the settlement afterwards. Every one admits that the Australian hardwoods are as good as any timber in the world for certain purposes; but when we consider the special method of timbering adopted in the Broken Hill mines I believe it must be admitted that there is no timber equal to oregon for the purposes to which it is applied there. Throughout this session we have been piling up the duties on the mining industry, and just as it is the last chop that falls the tree it may happen that the timber duty will prove to be the last tax required to bring about the closing down of some of our mines.

Mr. STORRER.—What about the timber getter?

Mr. WYNNE.—The timber getter receives better wages now than he ever did before in Australia, because the price of timber has increased. Owing to the increased price of lead, wages in the Broken Hill mines have been increased 12½ per cent. Do honorable members desire that that rate of wages should be decreased? I do not think that they do; but a drop of £2 per ton in the price of lead might mean a decrease in wages, or the closing down of some of the mines. The mining community can stand no more taxation than we have so far put upon them, and I am sure

honorable members do not wish to break the back of the mining industry by imposing upon it this last straw in the shape of an increase in the duty on timber. It would be, in my opinion, a great mistake to refuse to allow oregon timber to be admitted free, or to impose upon it any increase in the duty levied under the old Tariff. One honorable member has said that 5,000,000 superficial feet of New Zealand pine imported for the manufacture of butter boxes was used for other purposes. I find that last year 16,871,000 tons of butter were exported from Victoria, and any one who takes the trouble to make the calculation will find that it would take exactly 5,000,000 superficial feet of pine to make the boxes required for the export of that quantity of butter. It is therefore clear that the whole of the pine imported into Victoria must have been used in the manufacture of butter boxes, and that being so there has been no fraud upon the Customs in this State. The honorable member for Cowper made some reference to the time within which a tree might be cut after planting, and I can inform the Committee that I know of a property upon which a great deal of tree planting has been done, and that blue and red gums planted on that property from thirty-three to thirty-five years ago, and growing on good soil, are not yet fit to cut.

Mr. JOHN THOMSON.—If the honorable member will come with me to the north coast of New South Wales I can show him trees 7 feet 6 inches in girth which are only three years old.

Mr. WYNNE.—That would, no doubt, be a different kind of timber, and I am talking of blue and red gum.

Mr. JOHN THOMSON.—That country cannot be like the New South Wales country.

Mr. WYNNE.—I think that the Western District of Victoria is as good as any other district in Australia. It is looked upon as the cream of this State; and in the Cape Otway forest there are as fine trees as any I have ever seen. Red gum trees must be nearly fifty years of age before they are fit to cut for sleepers. When we consider the length of time it will take to re-afforest this country, it is useless for honorable members to suggest that we can soon grow timber for our own use. Mines cannot be carried on unless they are properly timbered, and after many experiments it has been found that oregon is the

best timber for mining purposes. I agree with the honorable member for Barrier in saying that this timber should be admitted free, or at least that there should be no increase in the duty imposed under the old Tariff. I have here particulars of a cargo of soft woods that arrived since this Tariff was introduced by a vessel called the *Harpsjord*. The quantity amounted to 1,583,000 superficial feet, according to the actual measurement on the ship, but according to the Customs measurement under the present Tariff, it amounted to 2,691,000 superficial feet. At 3s. per 100 superficial foot, the duty on that one cargo comes to over £4,000, or an increase on one cargo of timber of £1,660 upon the duty payable under the old Tariff. That seems to me to be too great an increase in the duty imposed on an article required for our natural industries. The Government claim to be a protectionist Government, and yet they propose to tax our natural industries. It should be remembered that in the production of butter, lead, and copper we have to depend on an export trade, and must compete with the world. The honorable member for Darling, in the interests of mining at Cobar, was influenced by the reasons which appealed to the honorable member for Barrier when applied to the conditions existing at Broken Hill. I do not call it protection to tax the raw materials required by the natural industries of this country. I consider that I am as good a protectionist as is any member of the Ministry, but I do not favour taxing the raw materials required in the development of our natural industries, and for the export of our natural productions. If we are to tax the mining industry out of existence, and so turn hundreds of thousands of miners out of work, the sooner we close up this Parliament the better it will be for the country.

Mr. SAMPSON (Wimmera) [5.36].—Notwithstanding the time which has been taken up in this debate, I think it will be generally admitted that the importance of the subject justifies the attention which has been given to it. Timber is required in almost every industry in the Commonwealth, and the imposition of duties which might render it more difficult to obtain it should not be decided upon without full discussion. It seems to me that, up to the present, a plea has been put forward for the consideration of every industry in the Commonwealth, with the exception of the dairying industry. Very little has, so

far, been said on behalf of that industry. From my investigations of the timber resources of Australia, I am proud that Queensland is one of the States of the Commonwealth. Still, from the information recently received, it is clear that the supplies of Queensland timbers for the various uses to which they are put within the Commonwealth are deficient. I have seen correspondence which shows that people who required Queensland timber have been unable to obtain it in sufficient quantities, and that is borne out by my personal investigations. I do not propose to enter upon a discussion of the uses to which various kinds of timber can be applied in the Commonwealth. The question we are discussing is one which affects every man who has to build a house, and the whole of our manufacturing industries. It is of importance, indeed, to the whole of our industrial and social progress. It seems to me that it is very unwise at this early stage in the history of the Commonwealth to restrict our people to the use of particular kinds of timber, in view of the fact that the use of a variety of timbers is necessary to our industrial progress if the Commonwealth is to keep pace with other parts of the world. The honorable member for Barrier has dealt effectively with the question as it affects the mining industry, whilst the honorable member for Cower has ably submitted all the claims that might be put forward on behalf of the duties as proposed in the Tariff. The dairying industry is one of the most important industries in Victoria, and must depend solely on an export trade for its existence. Whilst I am always prepared to impose duties to increase local production, more particularly when it is for the supply of the local market, I contend that the export of butter requires that that industry should be placed in a different category. Every penny of increase added to the cost of production becomes a most serious handicap to the dairying industry, since the product of the industry must find a sale in the markets of the world. An honorable member asks me how much per lb. these duties would add to the price of butter? If they would add only 1d. to the cost of a butter box that would be a serious matter in disposing of the product of an industry which has to compete against the world, in view of the more economical style of living adopted by people engaged in the production of butter in places like Denmark. The evidence taken by

the Tariff Commission shows that the use of Queensland pine would mean an increase of 1½d. per box as against the cost involved in the use of New Zealand pine; and the increase in the price of New Zealand timber which has taken place recently means a very substantial increase on the figures supplied to the Tariff Commission with respect to Queensland pine. The raw material for the manufacture of butter boxes is to be restricted apparently to Queensland and New Zealand pine. Considering the difficulty there is in getting a sufficient supply of timber from Queensland, the use of Queensland pine will involve an increase in the cost of butter boxes; and on the other hand, if New Zealand pine is used, the cost of the boxes must be increased to the amount of the increase proposed in the duty. In this matter we can scarcely regard New Zealand in the light in which we are justified in regarding foreign countries. The timber industry is carried on in New Zealand under conditions similar to those which prevail in Australia. The Dominion is a part of the Australasian group, and if there is to be any special consideration given to outsiders it might well be given to New Zealand. The great butter industry of the Commonwealth, which, I understand, is worth from £8,000,000 to £9,000,000 per annum, is one which should receive consideration in this connexion, having regard to the extent to which it is dependent on the export trade. In the circumstances, I think that New Zealand pine should be admitted to the Commonwealth free. I admit the tremendous possibilities of the timber industry of Queensland, and that they have not been availed of to a greater extent is due to the fact that the State Government have not carried railways into the interior to make it possible to bring the timber to market. If the State Government had adopted a sufficiently progressive policy, and had run railways into the at present inaccessible forests, so that Queensland might be able to supply all the requirements of the Commonwealth in respect of timber at a reasonable price, there would be some justification for the imposition of a reasonable duty upon importations of over-sea timber in the interests of the industry in the northern State. If the amendment proposed by the honorable member for Barrier be pressed to a division, I shall support it.

Mr. FULLER (Illawarra) [5.43].—I desire to congratulate the honorable member for Wimmera on the splendid free-trade speech which he has just delivered. It was practically the same speech as that which I have delivered here on different occasions in support of the interests of those engaged in the dairying industry, which is one of our primary industries, and has done so much for the welfare of Australia. I have been delighted to find that one of the strongest protectionists in the House has come to believe in what I have put before this Committee time after time. The honorable member has acknowledged openly and honestly that the effect of the imposition of this duty on white New Zealand pine is to increase the cost of butter boxes to the dairy farmers who have to compete in the world's market. We have had representations from those engaged in the dairying industry which go to show that the result of the duty has already been to raise the price of butter boxes by 3d. This is a very serious addition to the duties which the dairy farmer already has to pay. Now that the honorable member for Wimmera recognises that imposts of this sort handicap the dairying industry as against its competitors in the world's markets, he ought to endeavour to remove the other duties under which it is suffering.

Mr. CHANTER.—What about the rebate on butter boxes?

Mr. FULLER.—The Minister of Trade and Customs has attempted four or five times to explain that, but has not been able to find a way by which the rebate will reach the proper pockets. When the Minister can give the Committee definite information, we may discuss it. If the honorable member for Wimmera, in connexion with the other duties under which our great primary industries are labouring, had taken the same sensible view as he has taken in this instance, and if other protectionists in this House had done the same, our producers, who have to compete in the world's markets would be getting a much better deal. All those concerned in the great primary industries depend for the price of their produce on the price ruling in the world's markets. Every increase of expense, whether on butter boxes, salt, or other materials which they use in their industries or in building their houses, tends to handicap them, seeing that they have to ship their produce across many thousand miles of ocean

to compete with other producers who are within a few days' sail of the world's markets. I congratulate the honorable member for Wimmera on the stand he has taken, and am sorry that he did not see the same reason for conversion from his fiscal faith when dealing with other duties that affect our great primary industries. A good deal has been said regarding the values of New Zealand white pine and Queensland pine for the making of boxes for the exportation of butter. The quotation made by the Chairman of the Tariff Commission practically bore out the evidence given before us that, when Queensland pine is properly seasoned—it requires a great deal more seasoning than does the New Zealand pine—its effect on the butter is practically the same as that of the New Zealand pine. But we had very strong evidence that the Queensland pine is a much more difficult wood to handle, and very much heavier, and therefore the freight would be higher on butter boxes made from it. But even supposing that it was equal in all respects to the New Zealand white pine, there is the evidence given by witness after witness representing the timber industry in New South Wales and Victoria, that the Queensland timber millers are absolutely unable to fulfil the orders sent to them. The question is whether we are going to handicap our dairy farmers by keeping out the New Zealand pine, which is absolutely necessary for the manufacture of the boxes, when a sufficient supply of Queensland pine is utterly unavailable for the purpose. Not only in Queensland, but in northern New South Wales a large quantity of this excellent pine is grown, but in many instances it is in most inaccessible places, and neither the New South Wales nor Queensland State Governments have done anything to develop those forests.

Mr. FISHER.—Some of the Governments have humbugged the growers.

Mr. FULLER.—It was stated that the men engaged in that industry had been humbugged a great deal by the Governments of New South Wales and Queensland. On page 573 of the *Minutes of Evidence* appears the following statement from Mr. John Leigh Jones, the well-known sawmiller connected with the Austral Box and Timber Company Limited, of Sydney—

95013. Has your company ever sought quotations from the mills of Queensland and the Northern rivers of New South Wales for butter-box timber in large quantities?—Yes. They

cannot give us the quantities we require. If we needed 1,000,000 feet of timber, dry, we could not get it from them, but we could get 1,000,000 feet of white pine stripped and seasoned from New Zealand.

That evidence was given in 1906. But, to show that Queensland is absolutely not in a position to supply its own local requirements, I may quote a statement from a letter written by Mr. Jones in Sydney only last month. It proves that time after time, and even this season, when there is a bigger development in connexion with the production of pine in Queensland, the Queensland people have given large orders in Sydney for butter boxes to be taken to Brisbane for packing their produce for exportation to the world's markets. In that letter it is stated that—

Queensland last season drew from this State about 100,000 white pine boxes. One firm supplied about 50,000 boxes, and we supplied a considerable quantity ourselves. The Secretary of the Queensland Millers' Association admits they only exported in all about 2,030,000 super. feet of hoop pine, of which only a very small proportion was for butter boxes. (We, ourselves, used five million super. feet last year.) If they could supply their own factories, why did they call on us to supply them? We were informed by the factories buying from us in Queensland that they would not get supplies from their local box makers in time.

The simple position, therefore, is that by imposing duties on New Zealand pine we shall, according to the admissions even of protectionist members, raise the price of the butter boxes to the dairy farmers. Already by reason of the duty the price of butter boxes has been raised by 3d. A sufficient quantity of timber is not available in Queensland and northern New South Wales to meet the demands of the Queensland market alone, much less the great markets of New South Wales and Victoria. I hope that the Government, in the interests of the great dairying industry, which has done so much for Australia, and particularly for Victoria, will agree to the proposition of the honorable member for Barrier, and allow oregon to come in free in the interests of the miners, and New Zealand pine to come in free in the interests of the dairy farmers.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN (Indi) [5.55].—I echo the sentiments uttered by the honorable member for Illawarra. I am also delighted to find that the honorable members for Balaclava and Wimmera, who are strong protectionists, have thrown their influence into the movement for admitting this timber free. The great industries of min-

ing and dairying are interested in this question. There can be no doubt that this timber is really the raw material of those great industries to which the Commonwealth owes so much. The honorable member for Bendigo appealed on party lines to the Queensland members to vote with him in imposing a heavier duty than those industries deserve or demand. My namesake, the honorable member for Calare, has supplied me with the following statement, which proves that Queensland does not supply even an appreciable proportion of the enormous quantity of softwood used in the Commonwealth—

The imports to Australia of soft woods are 115,000,000 ft. per annum. Queensland can only supply 4,000,000 ft. at their own price, which has been advanced 50 per cent. within the last two years.

I have also a document from Mr. John Ramsay, the chairman of the Australasian Marbut Carving Company, who states—

Since the new Tariff came into operation timber merchants have increased the price of ballygum and caloon from 16s. 8d. to 24s. per 100; hoop pine from 19s. 3d. to 21s. 6d.; silky oak from 20s. to 40s., and other woods in proportion, and even at these figures they cannot execute orders.

When such an enormous quantity of timber is being imported, of such vital necessity to almost every industry in the community, surely the Treasurer will not have any objection to allowing it to come in free. If any other documentary evidence were wanted to convince the Committee of the advisability of adopting the proposal of the honorable member for Barrier, it is supplied in a circular, emanating from Broken Hill Chambers, and signed by Mr. W. G. Sharp, chairman of the Melbourne and Suburban Timber Merchants' Association, and by Mr. James Sutch, secretary of the Federated Saw-mill and Timber-yard and General Woodworkers' Employés' Association of Australasia. When two great interests are working together in that way—and we should all be glad to see it—

Mr. FISHER.—Does the honorable member agree with all the statements in the schedule attached to that circular?

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—I have not read the whole of the schedule, nor do I intend to. I am dealing with oregon and New Zealand pine. When those people who represent the section of which the honorable member is leader, and the other people with whom I have the honour of being associated have come to

agreement—when the two great contracting parties have arrived at a decision—the Committee might well abide by it.

Mr. FISHER (Wide Bay) [5.59].—It would be worth the while of the Committee to get back to facts. The whole of the argument to-day has been that this particular timber should be admitted free. It is free in this Tariff, and has been from the first. It is free now. The raw material is free, as the log timber is free.

Mr. FULLER.—It does not pay to import it in the log form.

Mr. FISHER.—What principle did the honorable member for Bendigo lay down regarding these proposals? We have been told that there is a symmetry about the Tariff—that raw materials are charged a small duty, the partly-finished article a higher duty, the finished article a still higher duty, and articles of luxury and adornment the highest duty of all.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—Big logs are very hard to ship.

Mr. FISHER.—Log timber is shipped from Queensland every day, and surely it can be just as easily shipped from New Zealand. Let us be fair and honest—

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Let the honorable member be fair in his argument.

Mr. FISHER.—Let us be fair and honest, and tell the people of Australia that, while the log may be admitted free of duty, we do not desire it to be admitted free after being partly dressed in New Zealand and other countries. If the opponents of this duty are logical, they ought to advocate that completely finished and polished butter-boxes should be brought from outside the Commonwealth. The intention undoubtedly, in opposing this duty, is to hit at the industry in Queensland. What are the grounds on which this duty is opposed? If the Committee determine to abolish this duty, I, of course, am helpless; but I wish honorable members to know exactly what they are doing. The honorable member for Bendigo, the honorable member for Wimmera, the honorable member for Robertson, and others, have stated that, even if the industry were established, Queensland could not supply all the requirements of Australia; and I admitted that fact in my opening remarks. But that is no justification for refusing the industry a small modicum of protection. What would become of the wool industry if the same argument were applied to it? Can the woollen manufacturers

supply all the requirements of Australia? Where now are the men who stood in this Committee and declared that the woollen industry would be destroyed in the absence of a higher duty? What political hypocrisy!

Mr. SAMPSON.—There is a reasonable prospect of the woollen industry overtaking the demand.

Mr. FISHER.—And there is a reasonable prospect of those engaged in the timber industry in Queensland supplying the demand.

Mr. SAMPSON.—That has not been shown.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—They have the opportunity to supply the demand now.

Mr. FISHER.—Is there any denial of the facts stated in the document which has been distributed to us?

Mr. THOMAS.—I have not read it.

Mr. FISHER.—The agnostic argument is very convenient sometimes. The estimate of the forest areas, as shown in that document, has not been denied.

Mr. THOMAS.—Are those areas all pine?

Mr. FISHER.—There are large areas of pine forests. However, log timber is now free.

Mr. THOMAS.—But butter-box timber is not free.

Mr. FISHER.—Butter-box log timber is free.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—New Zealand pine wood is not free.

Mr. FISHER.—I maintain that if butter-box timber were imported in the log there would be cheaper timber for fruit-cases.

Mr. WILSON.—It is dearer to buy in the log than when it is sawn.

Mr. FISHER.—Why?

Mr. WILSON.—Because of the export duty in New Zealand.

Mr. FISHER.—Undoubtedly, an export duty has been imposed in New Zealand in order to protect the workmen in that State. The honorable member for Indi has told us that those more particularly interested in this trade have come to an agreement which we ought to adopt.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—What nonsense! They are two interested parties!

Sir JOHN FORREST.—How would it help Queensland to have the logs cut here?

Mr. FISHER.—Such a course would be in accordance with the protectionist principle of imposing the smallest duty on the raw material, and higher duties according

to the degree of manufacture. In any case, the proposal represents a duty of only 15 per cent., and that could not affect prices very materially.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—It means an increase of 2½d. in the price of the box.

Mr. FISHER.—I am credibly informed that the price has been raised by 6d. per box.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The price of fruit cases has been raised by 2d.

Mr. FISHER.—Who believes for a moment that the increased duty amounts to 2d. per box?

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—It does.

Mr. WILSON.—And that is proved by the fact that the Customs authorities are willing to give a rebate of 2½d.

Mr. FISHER.—The Customs authorities have not been able to give that attention to this matter that it ought to have received.

Mr. WILSON.—Then why have they offered the rebate?

Mr. FISHER.—I am only expressing my opinion. I think, however, that there is some excuse for the Customs authorities, seeing that the Comptroller and others, in conjunction with the Treasurer, have been engaged in this Chamber for fifteen and sixteen hours a day.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I am glad to hear the honorable member at last protesting against this sweating!

Mr. FISHER.—Nearly all citizens are more or less sweated in the earning of their daily bread; and it is not too much to ask us, who are well paid, to devote a little extra time to our duties.

Mr. WILSON.—Does the honorable member consider that we are well paid?

Mr. FISHER.—I have never denied that we are well paid, though I do not think that we are overpaid. All this, however, is by the way; and I desire to discuss the question of the protection of the Queensland pine wood industry. There has been an attempt made to belittle the quality of Queensland pine; but it is too late in the day to take that attitude. The honorable member for Robertson practically made that charge against the Queensland timber.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—I shall say something directly!

Mr. FISHER.—The honorable member may repeat as often as he likes the charge which was made five years ago, but which has been disproved by the fact that Queensland butter, exported in Queensland pine

boxes, has not once, but twenty times, got to the top of the London market.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—We do not question the quality of the Queensland timber.

Mr. FISHER.—The honorable member for Robertson has just signified his intention of again addressing himself to that point.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—I meant that I would put myself right with the Committee.

Mr. FISHER.—I cannot allow any reflections of the kind to be made on the quality of the timber of Queensland; and honorable members ought to be more reasonably careful in what they say.

Mr. MCWILLIAMS.—It has been said that in all Australia there is no timber suitable for use in the Broken Hill mine.

Mr. FISHER.—When I knew Mount Morgan, the only wood used there was hardwood, and I suppose that such is the case now; at any rate, there has never been a single accident in consequence of the timber breaking at Mount Morgan.

Mr. THOMAS.—There is practically very little timber used at Mount Morgan.

Mr. FISHER.—The honorable member is mistaken, though, of course, Mount Morgan is a small mine as compared with the mines of Broken Hill.

Mr. THOMAS.—At Broken Hill as much as 72,000 feet of timber is used in one day, and that is just about as much as would be used at Mount Morgan in twelve months.

Mr. FISHER.—The timber is used in a different way at Broken Hill. Hardwood is much stronger than any other timber in the world.

Mr. SPENCE.—That is the objection to it at Broken Hill—it is dangerous because it is hard and strong.

Mr. FISHER.—No doubt oregon makes a loud squeaking noise before it actually breaks; and, as I said before, I am not attempting to in any way dictate how the mines shall be managed at Broken Hill. What I contend is that, if miners suffer from the Tariff, so do the timber getters whose tools of trade are subject to a heavy duty. These men who are really doing pioneering work, and doing as much as, for instance, dairymen to open the country, ought not to suffer from any disadvantage in this connexion. There are far more dairymen than timber getters in my electorate, and most of the sawmillers are entirely opposed to me politically;

but that does not influence me one iota. There is a principle involved in the establishment of native industry.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—This industry is well established, but it cannot supply the demand.

Mr. FISHER.—We desire to have it better established. I have heard the honorable member for Corangamite grow quite enthusiastic about the expansion of some trumpery industry in Victoria.

Mr. THOMAS.—Are the employes paid better in Queensland than in New Zealand?

Mr. FISHER.—I am unable to answer that question.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The employes are under the Arbitration Court in New Zealand.

Mr. FISHER.—My desire is that all employes should be paid fair and reasonable wages, as prescribed by the Court. What class of men is it proposed to attack? A class whose members were the very first to be called upon to assist the Mother Country in her hour of need. When we required soldiers to fight the battles of the Empire, to whom did we appeal? To the bushmen of the Commonwealth. The amendment of the honorable member for Barrier is unnecessary, and he himself must know it. It is merely a kite-flying proposal, which has been submitted with the object, later on, of getting these articles put upon the free list. It is a mere placard—a redundancy. The paragraph reads—

Timber, undressed, n.e.i., in sizes of 12 in. x 6 in. (or its equivalent) and over, per 100 super. feet, 1s. 6d.

Nowhere in the Tariff are oregon and New Zealand pine specifically mentioned.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Therefore, they are dutiable.

Mr. FISHER.—If the amendment be carried, we shall not have altered the position one iota except in regard to oregon and New Zealand white pine—oregon being used by the mining companies and New Zealand white pine by the dairymen.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—And the fruit-growers.

Mr. FISHER.—The fruit-growers can do better by importing the logs. This question is of some importance, at least to one State of the Commonwealth.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—It is not of the least importance.

Mr. FISHER.—The allegations that the effect of the duty will be to increase the price of butter boxes and fruit cases cannot be substantiated. How often have similar statements been made with regard to other articles since this Tariff was introduced? Do we not know that over and over again the Treasurer has pointed out that there was no duty upon articles the prices of which had been raised owing, it was alleged, to the introduction of the new Tariff? If prices have been increased from other than fiscal reasons, that is no reason why the pioneers in the timber-cutting trade should be penalized by the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS (Robertson) [6.20].—The leader of the Labour Party has charged me with having attempted to belittle the pine timber industry of Queensland. In that he did me an injustice. I merely stated that during the discussion of the first Commonwealth Tariff it was contended that the use of Queensland timber in butter boxes imparted a disagreeable flavour to the butter. I wish now to read a few lines in proof of my statement that such an assertion was made. It was made by Mr. Manifold. Speaking in this chamber that gentleman said—

There has been a lot of correspondence in the local papers on the subject of butter boxes at Byron Bay, and the Victorian dairy expert, Mr. Crowe, condemns the Queensland timber, which he considers to be unsuitable. The New Zealand white pine is very useful for the purpose, but the Queensland pine is said to make the butter smell somewhat.

I make this quotation merely with a view to substantiate my statement. I should be the last to attempt to belittle any industry in Australia, or to cast a reflection upon any timber which can be grown in Queensland.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [6.23].—The statement of the honorable member for Wide Bay, that timber for butter-box purposes is admitted free, is incorrect. It is true that logs are upon the free list, but it costs more in the way of freight to import them than it does to import timber in its dressed state. Fully one-third of the logs represent waste, and consequently it is considerably dearer to import timber in that form. With regard to the timber that is used for fruit-boxes, I would point out that fitches are sent to London from New Zealand because they bring higher prices there, and it is those higher prices which enable us to obtain the other portions of the timber

cheaper than we should otherwise be able to get them. If the consumer had to pay a duty upon that timber it would necessarily add to its price, and certainly no saving could be effected by its importation in the form of logs. Earlier in the debate I stated that there was no competition between the hardwood timbers of Australia and the imported softwood timbers. That fact is clearly shown by the great difference between the prices of the two articles. I stated, and my statement was questioned, that hardwood timber was sold at from 9s. to 10s. per 100 superficial feet, whereas oregon realised from 14s. 6d. to 17s. per 100 superficial feet.

Mr. CHANTER.—That may be so at the mills.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—No; those are the prices in the metropolitan market. Of course, I am speaking of stock sizes. I hold in my hand the December price-list of a Melbourne timber merchant—

Mr. GROOM.—Which December?

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—December of the present year. Surely the Attorney-General does not imagine that I am endeavouring to mislead the Committee. That price-list quotes oregon cut to size up to 36 feet at 17s. per 100 superficial feet, and oregon of stock sizes at 10s. per 100 superficial feet. These figures show that there is even a greater difference between the prices than I have previously stated.

Mr. POYNTON (Grey) [6.26].—I intend to support the amendment of the honorable member for Barrier. But I rise chiefly for the purpose of refuting the statement which has been repeatedly made that the hardwood timbers of Australia are suitable for use in the Broken Hill mines. I have had a number of years' experience in both quartz and alluvial mines in Victoria, and I say that anybody with practical knowledge will admit that the class of timber required in the Barrier mines is not hardwood timber. No comparison can be instituted between those mines and the mines of any other portion of the Commonwealth. As a matter of fact, if we were to impose a duty of 5s. per 100 superficial feet upon oregon, it would still be imported for those mines, but in less quantity. There would be a disposition to economize in the matter of timber, and accidents would probably result. I do not think that the imposition of the duty proposed would benefit the timber industry of Queensland one iota. But my first consideration is the safety of the

miners. Something has been said about the hard lot of the timber cutters. There is no doubt that timber cutting is hard work, and that there is a certain amount of risk associated with it. But if the timber cutter were required to work for only one shift in a Broken Hill mine, he would be very glad to return to his ordinary avocation. I have been down the mines there, and I can only compare the creaking and the roaring of the timber sets to the noise which is made by a terrific bush fire. In the Central Mine this creaking may be heard continuously.

Sitting suspended from 6.30 to 7.45 p.m.

Mr. POYNTON.—When the Committee adjourned for dinner, I was pointing out the kind of timber which is essential to the safe working of the Broken Hill mines. There are no mines in Australia similar to those mines. For instance, in some places an immense cavity is worked to a width of 400 feet, and it is essential to have a class of timber which will resist the pressure by degrees, and will not snap as hardwood usually does. I have no doubt in my own mind that, whether a duty be imposed or not, oregon timber will be imported for those mines. What I fear is that if the price of timber be increased by the imposition of a duty there may be a tendency to scrimp the timbering, and so place the unfortunate miner in greater danger. I do not know what the intention of the Government on this matter is. It will be remembered that this morning the honorable member for Flinders asked a question about a rebate of the duty paid on the timber used in butter boxes. I understood the Minister of Trade and Customs to reply that it was the intention of the Treasurer to put that kind of timber on the free list. Several honorable members to whom I have spoken formed the same impression. But other honorable members have told me that they did not think that that was intended. In its report, the Melbourne *Herald* confirms my impression of the reply. Since this morning, I have gathered that the Treasurer does not intend to take that step.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I am not prepared to make a statement at this moment, but if that were done, the timber for the boxes would have to be cut in lengths in bond.

Mr. POYNTON.—We must not lose sight of the fact that timber is used for other purposes than the production of butter boxes and the timbering of mines.

It is required in nearly every industry, and is also used by private persons to a large extent. I hope that the Committee will not distinguish between the users of timber. I see no reason why it should be made free in the case of one particular line and subjected to heavy duties in the case of other lines.

Mr. SINCLAIR.—The other people have a larger range of choice.

Mr. POYNTON.—I remember that the immediate effect of the imposition of the duties under the old Tariff was an increase in the price of timber. The builders found the duties a very serious tax indeed, and, of course, it had to be passed on to other persons. Since that time there have been other increases. There seems to be a combine in the timber business.

Mr. TUDOR.—I think that the saw-millers and the merchants are in the combine.

Mr. POYNTON.—In my opinion, the easiest way to break down the combine will be to put timber on the free list.

Mr. TUDOR.—I do not think that that would affect the position at all.

Mr. POYNTON.—If that were done, a man would not require so much money in order to secure his timber. To a small man who wants to start in business a duty is a very great item. It is to be regretted that the Government have not dealt with the Timber Combine under the Anti-Trust Act, because in any part of the Commonwealth they can get evidence of an increased price having been charged under the old Tariff, and of advantage having been taken of the new duties. No doubt we shall have further results if those duties are increased. I want to deal with the joint recommendations of the Melbourne Timber Merchants' Association and the Federal Saw-millers' Employés Association. They want certain classes of timber to be put on the free list, and recommend an increase in the duties on other sizes of timber. It is as fine a specimen of brazen cheek and glaring selfishness as has ever been brought under our notice. Here are these persons, who want protection on every article they make, clamouring to get their own raw material put on the free list. But they have no consideration for the man who wants to erect a house, or to use that material in other ways. In the case of other persons, the timber merchants are not satisfied with the proposed duties which represent a fairly stiff increase on the old duties, but deliberately suggest an

increase of nearly 100 per cent. on some lines of timber. It is only another exhibition of the inherent selfishness which characterizes all manufacturers. They want their machinery, tools of trade, and everything else put on the free list, but demand a high duty on the raw material of the primary industries. If this circular letter is to be taken as a sample of the kind of barter to which they are prepared to resort, the sooner the Committee is made acquainted with their actual intentions, the better it will be for the users of these articles. I, in common with a large number of honorable members, have been under the impression that in the matter of the timber duties we had to consider not only the manufacturer and his employés, but also a very important factor in the production of wealth, and that is the user of the article. But these two interested parties sit down, and the employés practically say to the sawmillers, "Now, we will agree with you to go for the increased duties, and to plunder the other fellow, provided that we are to get a bit of this protection in the form of increased wages. It is immaterial to us what you intend to charge the user." If that is their idea of the new protection—

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—We have something to say about the charges, too.

Mr. POYNTON.—We are always talking about going to have a say about the charges, but in the meantime they are being made.

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—We cannot do everything at once.

Mr. POYNTON.—The Government have already had opportunities to take action, but they have not yet given effect to the system of new protection. For instance, they could have dealt with the Timber Combine if they had taken the trouble to obtain the evidence which is available. If two parties are to be allowed to fix the duties on articles, and to arrange for parcelling out the plunder, it is about time that the user got some consideration. If anything we may do here should tend to cripple the primary producers, its effects will very soon be felt in the metropolitan areas of the States. I intend to vote for the amendment of the honorable member for Barrier, and I trust that when we come to fix the duties on other lines the Committee will see that the users get a fair, square deal, and that no special exemptions are made for a particular class of persons.

Mr. FISHER (Wide Bay) [7.56].—I am as desirous as is any one of getting on with the consideration of the Tariff. I suggest to the Committee that it would be a fair compromise to fix the duty on the timber required for butter boxes at 9d. per 100 feet, with the right, if the Minister so desires, to manufacture them in bond.

Mr. THOMAS.—What about the timber for the mines?

Mr. FISHER.—The proposal of the honorable member is in no way affected by my suggestion. Beyond that I cannot go.

Mr. JOHN THOMSON (Cowper) [7.57].—The suggestion of the honorable member for Wide Bay would have helped us very considerably if it had been made at an earlier hour. This item has given rise to a considerable amount of feeling. Some honorable members have doubted whether Colonial timbers are suitable for the purpose of making butter boxes, and other honorable members have declared that Queensland pine, if suitable for the purpose, is not available, and that consequently persons would have to look elsewhere for their supplies of pine. The suggestion which has been made by the honorable member for Wide Bay occurred to my mind in the early part of the debate. I shall be prepared to agree to a compromise of 9d. per 100 feet on the timber if the butter boxes are allowed to be made free in bond. I know that since the duties have been imposed the Department of Trade and Customs have made an arrangement by which a drawback of the duty paid on such timber is allowed when the butter boxes are exported. But I suppose that most honorable members are aware that when butter is sent to Melbourne or Sydney for sale it is bought very often by speculators, and that when it is exported the rebate is paid to them, and not to the factories which really paid the duty on the timber. The consequence of this system is that co-operative factories which, in most cases are owned by the farmers, have had to pay the duty without getting the full advantage of the drawback. If such an arrangement were made as has been suggested, the original purchasers of the butter boxes would get a remission of the duty paid on the timber.

Mr. CROUCH.—Will the honorable member say how country factories would be

affected by the manufacture of butter boxes in bond?

Mr. JOHN THOMSON.—They could get their timber free of duty in any thickness they liked.

Mr. SPENCE (Darling) [8.1].—I wish to call attention to the coolness of the proposal to put a tax upon the mining industry by way of what is called a compromise. Oregon timber is not produced in Australia at all. No substitute for it is produced here. Yet it is calmly proposed to impose a duty of 9d. per 100 feet, instead of 6d. as under the old Tariff, and that is called a compromise. Some honorable members who profess to be strong protectionists are willing to make a concession in the case of butter boxes, but no concession to the mining industry. Surely that is most unfair. The idea that oregon can be imported in logs has been exploded. I have shown that kauri pine from New Zealand has been sold recently at from 20s. to 24s. per 100 feet in logs, whilst first-class boards were sold at from 20s. to 30s. per 100 feet.

Mr. FISHER.—Because there is an export duty in New Zealand.

Mr. SPENCE.—We are dealing with facts, not explanations. Not a 220th part of the timber that is imported comes in log form, because it costs less to import the sawn timber and pay the duty. The Broken Hill mines would long ago have imported logs had it been cheaper to import them than sawn timber. I enter my protest against this way of dealing with the matter. I can see no reason why we should not consider one industry as well as another. Queensland is not able to supply the timber that is required, even if Queensland timber were suitable. No one wishes to injure the Queensland industry, but trade is so brisk already that they cannot supply the market. I object to putting a tax unnecessarily upon one of our most important industries. If we imposed a duty of 5s. per 100 feet super., not one log more would be imported, nor would it conduce to any other kind of timber being used. This tax does not affect all mines, but it does touch those which have to work under the square-set system, and cannot use any other timber than oregon. I have been in mines where hardwood was used, and where a collapse came so suddenly from the wood snapping that it put out every light in the mine. Mine-owners are not going to take such risks, and we do not want them to. It is

of no use to compare mines worked on the square-set system with mines where there is simply an open cut. When they get down deep the square-set system is a necessity, and then there is no substitute for oregon timber in Queensland or in any other part of Australia. What is more, we do not want to put the beautiful pine of Queensland into our mines. We are told that it is even too good for making butter boxes, and it costs three or four times as much as some mines can afford to pay.

Mr. FISHER (Wide Bay) [8.8].—I wish to point out to the honorable member for Darling that the practice of the Department of Trade and Customs is that if any imported article is afterwards re-exported a drawback of duty is allowed. That practice is in accordance with the policy that this Parliament has authorized.

Mr. TUDOR (Yarra) [8.9].—I compliment the honorable member for Barrier on the tricky way in which he has moved his amendment. If that term is objected to I will say the discreet way in which he has moved it, so as to "rope in" all those honorable members who are interested in butter boxes, as well as those who are interested in mining. If oregon stood by itself, I believe that a good case could be made out for putting it on the free list; certainly a better case than could be made out for so dealing with New Zealand white pine. I shall vote against either being made free under present circumstances, just as I voted a few nights ago against coloured marble being put on the free list, and for Carrara marble being free. But, at the same time, I believe that if we were to put an import duty of 5s. per 100 feet on oregon it would not lessen the imports by 5 per cent., because that class of timber must be used for certain purposes. If I had an opportunity of voting that the duty on oregon should remain as it was under the old Tariff, at 6d. per 100 feet super., I should do so. But New Zealand white pine is in another category. There are several kinds of timber in Australia that can be used for making fruit cases, and the honorable member for Moreton has proved that the butter boxes used in Queensland and made from wood grown in that State are as good as any others. I believe that a suggestion is to be made that we should allow butter boxes to be made in bond. I think that that would be a mistake, and I shall vote against it if it is proposed. It is in the

interest of every honorable member representing a country constituency to vote against such a proposal, because the timber merchants who would go to the expense of turning their places into bonds, and employing a Custom House officer at a salary of about £300 a year are not numerous; and it would mean that one or two firms would have an absolute monopoly of the trade. It would be the worst thing we could do in the interests of the butter industry. If the amendment of the honorable member for Barrier is put to the vote I shall oppose it. But if I have an opportunity, I shall vote for a duty of 6d. per 100 feet, or, if that is negatived, and the Committee votes on the question, whether the duty shall be 9d. per 100 feet, I shall vote for that.

Mr. THOMAS (Barrier) [8.12].—I am rather sorry that the honorable member for Yarra should have said that I have moved my amendment in rather a "tricky" way. I do not think that that is fair. In the last Parliament I voted for New Zealand white pine to be free, as well as oregon. I do not see why oregon should be free if white pine is to be dutiable. I wish to do the best I can for the mining industry, because I represent a mining electorate. But at the same time, I do not want to penalize the dairying industry in order that the mining industry may secure an advantage at its expense. I should like to explain what it is that I wish to have carried just now. I fancy that one or two honorable members are under a misapprehension as to what the outcome of the division would be. It does not follow that if the Committee agrees to my first proposal, to put oregon and white pine in paragraph A, those timbers will necessarily be free. In the first division we shall not be voting to make them free.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I cannot understand the necessity for putting those words in.

Mr. THOMAS.—If the Treasurer will accept a proposal to make the timbers in paragraph A free, I will retire at once. But there are some honorable members who are prepared to make oregon and New Zealand pine free, or to impose a very low duty on them, whilst they are not prepared to extend that treatment to other timbers. The honorable member for Yarra says that he is prepared to vote for oregon being placed on the free list, or being subjected to only a very low duty, but that he is not ready to deal with New Zealand white

pine in the same way. If the honorable member is prepared to vote against the amendment because it covers both oregon and white pine, then it is obvious that he would do so if it also included other timbers. The same remark will apply to other honorable members who are prepared to vote for a low duty on oregon and white pine, whilst they think that certain other timbers should be subjected to a heavier duty. For these reasons, I think that we should deal separately with oregon and white pine. My first amendment is simply designed to confine paragraph A to oregon and white pine, and once that question has been decided, it will be open to honorable members to determine whether those timbers shall be free or subjected to a duty.

Mr. WATSON (South Sydney) [8.17].—I would ask you, Mr. Chairman, to put the amendment before the Committee in two sections, as you have power to do under the Standing Orders. Any complicated question may be so treated, and if my suggestion were adopted, it would enable a clear vote to be taken. Mr. Speaker has frequently split up amendments in that way.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—By consent.

Mr. WATSON.—The Standing Orders provide that it may be done, and I hope that you, Mr Chairman, will adopt this course.

The CHAIRMAN.—I presume that the honorable member for South Sydney desires that I shall put the question in two sections—the one relating to oregon and the other to New Zealand pine.

Mr. WATSON.—Yes.

The CHAIRMAN.—Standing order 122 provides that the House may order a complicated question to be divided, and if it be the desire of the Committee, I shall put the question in separate paragraphs.

Mr. HANS IRVINE.—I shall object.

Mr. KING O'MALLEY (Darwin) [8.20].—The honorable member for Yarra has said that if butter-box timber were dealt with in bond, it would involve an annual expenditure of £300.

Mr. TUDOR.—That would be the cost of the Lond.

Mr. KING O'MALLEY.—The cost of keeping a Customs Officer in attendance. The honorable member is under a misapprehension. The cost would not exceed £50 per annum. Shiploads of timber

would be sent in and would be immediately cut up into the required sizes and taken away.

Mr. FISHER.—At the outside, the cost would be only £25 per annum.

Mr. KING O'MALLEY.—I am well above the mark in saying that it would be £50 per annum. I hope that no honorable member will vote, on the score of cost, against the imposition of a duty.

Mr. HUTCHISON (Hindmarsh) [8.22].—Judging by the remarks made by the honorable member for Wide Bay and others, there is every likelihood that a duty, which will not be protective in its incidence, will be carried.

Mr. FISHER.—I say that the duty, whatever it is, will be protective.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—I disagree with the honorable member. I am not going to vote for a duty of 6d. or 9d. per 100 superficial feet on this timber, and thus penalize a big industry for the sake of raising revenue. We should either protect our timber industry or allow timber to come in free. I shall vote, first of all, for the item being placed on the free list, and, if that proposition be rejected, I shall vote for the highest duty that I can obtain.

Mr. WEBSTER (Gwydir) [8.24].—There is good reason for adopting the course suggested by the honorable member for South Sydney, since, underlying the amendment moved by the honorable member for Barrier, there is a serious danger to the interests of those who are called upon to use New Zealand pine. My experience teaches me that the making of butter-boxes does not represent one-twentieth of the uses to which this pine is put in Australia. Listening to this debate, one would imagine that New Zealand white pine is used only for making butter-boxes. As a matter of fact, it is put to many other uses, and this question has a much broader aspect than some imagine.

Mr. ATKINSON.—Does the honorable member think that New Zealand white pine should be free?

Mr. WEBSTER.—Undoubtedly; because in Australia we cannot obtain in sufficient quantities a suitable substitute to meet the demand.

Mr. THOMAS.—The honorable member speaks as a builder?

Mr. WEBSTER.—I speak as a man who has had to buy this timber. We have not in Australia a supply of white pine adequate to meet the demand, and, that

being so, I fail to see why we should penalize those who have to use this timber. The honorable member for Wide Bay has made a strong appeal to the Committee to adopt the Government proposal, and a good deal has been said as to the suitability of Queensland hoop pine for butter-boxes. To use it for such a purpose is to be guilty of almost a crime. It is a very valuable timber, and if it were obtainable in sufficient quantities I should be prepared to impose a duty on New Zealand white pine. It is most suitable for building purposes and for the making of furniture, and ought not to be used for butter-boxes. It is too scarce, and, to my mind, is not the most suitable timber to be put to such a use. I am prepared to vote for a duty on that which can be produced in Australia or for the encouragement of an Australian industry, but I should be false to my principles as a protectionist if I voted for a duty on that which we cannot produce.

Mr. PALMER (Echuca) [8.27].—The all-important question is whether or not the imposition of a duty will increase the cost of this timber to the great producing and mining interests of Australia. It is admitted that we have splendid timber in the Commonwealth. Those who visited the last Australian Natives' Association Exhibition in Melbourne, or have any idea of the extent and resources of the forests of Western Australia and Queensland, must recognise that we have great possibilities in that direction; but the time is not yet ripe for their development, and the opening up of our timber supplies is not far enough advanced to enable the local demand to be met. That being so, if we impose a duty in this case we shall simply increase the cost to those who are entitled to look to the Legislature for assistance. It has been shown, by quotations from letters from more than one trade organization, that Queensland cannot supply our needs. I have here a statement by the Master Coachbuilders and Wheelwrights' Association, signed by a number of reputable and worthy firms in Melbourne, Bendigo, and Sydney, setting forth that—

Queensland cannot supply our wants. The imports to Australia of soft woods is 115,000,000 feet per annum. Queensland can only supply 4,000,000 ft. at their own price, which has been advanced 50 per cent. within the last two years.

Mr. KING O'MALLEY.—They are polished pagans.

Mr. PALMER.—If I called the honorable member a Christian he would not be offended, and I am sure that those who

have signed this circular care not what name the honorable member applies to them. The honorable member for Darwin has said that he claims my vote. I do not know why he should claim my vote. I am here in the interests of my constituents. The honorable member for Wide Bay, too, claimed my vote. I should like to know on what ground?

Mr. FISHER.—On the ground that the honorable member declared himself to be a protectionist.

Mr. PALMER.—I suppose that the Fisher of Wide Bay thought that he had caught a very big fish, by using that phrase. He has not succeeded. I am not prepared to vote for a duty on this timber until there is a reasonable prospect of Queensland and the other States being able to supply the demand for it. When that time arrives, we may well impose a duty in the furtherance of the policy of protection; but until then such an imposition would merely penalize industries which we should do our best to assist. I object strenuously to the division of the question. We have been discussing the amendment all day long as raising one question, and now, at the eleventh hour, it is proposed to divide it.

Mr. BRUCE SMITH.—And to double the debate.

Mr. PALMER.—Yes. The whole subject will be re-opened. This is being done in order that one party in the Committee may be played off against another.

Mr. HANS IRVINE.—That is exactly what it is being done for.

Mr. PALMER.—We are too "fly" to allow that to be done, if we can help it.

Mr. WATSON.—Honorable members cannot help it.

Mr. WILKS.—The honorable member can argue that the amendment is not a complicated one.

Mr. PALMER.—It is certainly not a complicated one.

The CHAIRMAN.—The Committee has consented to the question being divided.

Mr. WILKS.—No; the Committee has not been asked yet.

Mr. PALMER.—The question has not been put to the Committee.

Mr. WATSON.—There was no objection.

Mr. LIDDELL.—I heard it objected to.

Mr. PALMER.—I did not understand that the Committee had consented to the division of the question. If it had been put to the Committee, I, for one, would

have objected, because I consider that such a procedure would allow the whole matter to be re-opened. We must, of necessity, view it from another standpoint, if it is divided, and vote for both propositions.

Mr. WATSON.—Honorable members can vote for both separately.

Mr. PALMER.—If we were anywhere else than in a Parliamentary Committee that would be perfectly safe, but under the circumstances I do not know that it is safe. In the interests of the butter producers, of the individual who wants to build himself a small cottage, of the great mining industry, and of the development of the country generally, there must be no paltering with this question. We must show a firm front, and make a determined effort not to sacrifice the great interests of the Commonwealth to the minor interests.

Mr. HEDGES (Fremantle) [8.35].—The honorable member for Gwydir clinched the argument when he showed that timber for butter boxes cannot be obtained in Australia in a sufficient quantity to meet the demand. There is a demand for Australian timber, but the supply is not large enough to meet it. The Committee has already voted to make wheat sacks free, so that the cost of exporting our grain to England shall not be increased. Wool packs, too, are free. Having made free the coverings and bags in which our wool and grain are exported, why should we put a tax on the boxes in which our butter is exported? I shall support the amendment to make oregon and white pine free.

Mr. WILKS.—The honorable member will not separate the two?

Mr. HEDGES.—No. I should not have spoken on this subject had I seen that things were going the right way. As a trick has been suggested, I say that the trick is in trying to separate the two proposals contained in the amendment.

Mr. WATSON.—The division of the question will not prevent the honorable member from voting for each of the proposals separately.

Mr. HEDGES.—Every word that was said by the honorable member for Barrier about the safety attained by the use of oregon timber in the Broken Hill mines was absolutely true. I know something about the subject, because for two years I handled every bit of timber used by the Broken Hill Proprietary Company. The

big creep occurred during that period, when we used as much as 72,000 feet a day—more than the saw-mills of Queensland could cut in a week, or in a month. The average quantity of oregon used in the Broken Hill mines for the two years during which I had the contract was 300,000 feet a week. Tasmanian stringy bark was during that time given an exhaustive trial by the directors, but it was not a success, because it is not safe. Oregon is the only timber that invariably gives warning that the strain on it is too heavy, and thus enables those who are watching it to take precautions against disaster. Our first object should be to secure the safety of those who are working in the bowels of the earth. We should do in this matter what I suggested should be done in regard to mining machinery—leave it to those who are running these propositions to decide what is the best material to use. The Committee is not composed of experts in mining, and it should therefore listen to those who are. I hope that honorable members will allow oregon to be imported free for use in the mines and for other purposes, and that it will also allow the white pine which is used in making butter boxes to be imported free.

Mr. LIDDELL (Hunter) [8.38].—Before the Committee divides, I wish to be set right on one point. As honorable members are aware, the Commonwealth has undertaken the administration of New Guinea, and the development of its resources, and I believe that the Government wish to advance the Territory in every way possible. I am informed that large sums of money have recently been invested there in the establishment of saw-mills to open up an export trade in timber, and I wish to know whether the proposed duty will not militate against that trade. I was under the impression that a rebate would be given in connexion with timber imported from New Guinea; but I now understand that that is not so, and that that timber will be treated like any coming from other countries.

Mr. McDougall.—Does the honorable member suggest a preference to Germany by a rebate on timber imported from German New Guinea?

Mr. LIDDELL.—Of course not. Why does the honorable member waste the time of the Committee by making such an interjection? I am alluding to Papua or British New Guinea. If the duty will militate against the development of that Territory.

I urge the Government to introduce, at an early date, legislation which will remove the disability.

Mr. FISHER.—I understand that the matter will be dealt with at the end of the tariff.

Mr. LIDDELL.—No doubt we shall hear from the Minister exactly what is proposed.

Mr. STORRER (Bass) [8.41].—I have listened for several hours to special pleading on behalf of the mining and butter exporting industries, but I have not heard a word on behalf of the furniture industry. English oak, walnut, and other woods are imported to be made into furniture, but it has not been proposed that those timbers shall be made free of duty. I am not going to ask for such a concession, because this is a protectionist community, and every industry should reap the benefits of our policy of protection.

Mr. FULLER.—The farmers will benefit mightily by a duty on butter boxes.

Mr. STORRER.—We should protect the men who labour in our forests. If it is right to allow to be imported free white pine and oregon, it is right to allow to be imported free walnut, oak, and other furniture timbers. I am glad that the butter industry and the mining industry are doing so well, and making so much money that they can afford to pay a little more for the timber they use. I am prepared to give every industry in Australia, in whatever State it may be, some amount of protection. It has been extraordinary to hear to-day free-traders making protectionist speeches, and protectionists making free-trade speeches.

Mr. THOMAS.—The honorable member made a good free-trade speech on chairs.

Mr. WILKS.—And on paraffine wax.

Mr. STORRER.—I voted for a duty of 35 per cent. on chairs. That is a very fair protective duty. The honorable member for Barrier would call it prohibition. I am not a prohibitionist, but a protectionist. I am surprised that honorable members in dealing with these duties do not take the serious view of their possible effects upon the future welfare of this country which we have a right to expect from the members of a Parliament representing the great Commonwealth of Australia.

Mr. ATKINSON (Wilmot) [8.45].—I have no intention of making a speech. I have been listening all day to arguments which I should myself have submitted in support of the proposal to permit oregon

and white pine timber to come in free, and I am satisfied that they are correct. I have risen to ask what is the present position. Have you, sir, decided that oregon timber shall be dealt with separately, or is the amendment moved by the honorable member for Barrier to be put as moved, and the vote taken with respect to both oregon and New Zealand pine at the same time?

The CHAIRMAN.—The honorable member for Wilmot asks me to state the present position. The amendment moved by the honorable member for Barrier would have been put in the ordinary course as the honorable member moved it, but the honorable member for South Sydney asked me whether the question might not be divided. I pointed out that according to standing order 122 I had no power to divide the question, but that the Committee has power to request that a question be divided.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—Besides, there is no complication.

The CHAIRMAN.—The point is that it is not for me to say whether the question as submitted is complicated or not. It is for the Committee to say that, and if the Committee says that the question is complicated, I then have power to divide it.

Mr. CROUCH.—Did you not put it to the Committee to say whether the question should be divided?

The CHAIRMAN.—I asked the Committee whether I should divide the question, and I certainly understood that I had the consent of the Committee to do so. If honorable members continue their conversations it is difficult for me to give a ruling or to hear what is said. I repeat that so far as I could understand when I put it to the Committee deliberately to say whether the question should be divided, no objection was taken to the adoption of that course.

Mr. HANS IRVINE.—I said that I objected.

Mr. FULLER.—When you said you had no power to divide the question, of what use was it to raise any objection?

The CHAIRMAN.—I pointed out that I had no such power unless with the consent of the Committee, and when I put the question, and there was no dissent, I took it for granted that the Committee gave me power to divide the question. As it appears that some honorable members did object, though I certainly did not hear them, I accept their statement, and in the circumstances the amendment will have to be put as it was moved.

Mr. WATSON (South Sydney) [8.47].—There is an easy way of getting over the difficulty. I must, however, express my surprise that any honorable member should raise any objection to putting separately two questions so radically distinct as are proposals to impose duties on oregon and on New Zealand pine. Right through the discussion on the Tariff I have advocated and urged that the utmost facility should be given on every occasion to have the lowest duty put first and all technical difficulties swept aside, so that honorable members might have a fair vote upon each question separately and in rotation; and I say it is a paltry thing of honorable members to now object to having these questions divided.

Mr. HANS IRVINE.—I think it is a very proper thing.

Mr. WATSON.—I think very little of honorable members who insist on tricks of this description.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I rise to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN.—Order. I ask the honorable member to withdraw that remark.

Mr. WATSON.—I wish to say that I acquit—

The CHAIRMAN.—The honorable member will please withdraw the remark.

Mr. WATSON.—Perhaps I will be allowed to explain what my remark was intended to convey. I want to say that I acquit at once the honorable member who moved the motion of any desire to trick the Committee, but I say that when the difficulty was pointed out, and it was shown that the motion, as moved, puts the Committee in an awkward position, the matter assumes a very different complexion. If any one objects to that statement of the case, I am prepared to withdraw it. I have said that there is an easy way out of the difficulty, and I now move, as an amendment of the amendment—

That the amendment be amended by leaving out the words "and New Zealand pine."

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [8.51].—I have refrained all day from taking part in the very long discussion on this item—which has assumed a most complex and difficult character—because I have found that to take part in a debate until it has reached a certain stage, has sometimes had the effect of provoking further argument. My great object is to get a fair vote after discussion.

and I am quite prepared then to submit to the decision of the Committee. Surely there has been a sufficiently lengthy discussion on this question during the whole of this long day? I wish to say but a very few words. The honorable member for Barrier has put his case strongly, and was quite within his rights in moving the amendment he has submitted. The honorable member for Wide Bay has put his case more strongly than I have ever heard him put a case before, and he displays a tenacity of purpose which reflects the greatest credit upon him. I do not propose to enter into the details of the matter under discussion. Every honorable member present is aware that I desire to carry out a protective policy. I have been surprised at the speeches made to-day by one or two honorable members of this House who were returned as strong protectionists. It is all nonsense to say that we cannot produce the timber we require here. I need not dilate upon that. I can assure honorable members that the leading harvester, agricultural implement, and buggy maker in my electorate does not use a single stick of imported timber. He uses only Australian timber, but he sees that it is properly seasoned.

Mr. WYNNE.—We do the same. We burn Colonial firewood.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—There is something in what the honorable member for Bass has said. I see that certain honorable members are laughing over this very serious subject. I do not think that is quite proper. I wish the matter to be dealt with seriously, and in no spirit of levity. If honorable members decide that both these classes of timber shall be admitted duty free, they will be going lower than the old Tariff.

Mr. HANS IRVINE.—They are getting common-sense.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The honorable member for Grampians will never get that if he lives to be as old as Methuselah. He has lost his opportunity.

Mr. HANS IRVINE.—The honorable gentleman never had any common-sense, and never will have any.

Mr. BOWDEN.—The statement of the Treasurer is not argument.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I know that, but the honorable member for Grampians has been very insulting two or three times.

Mr. HANS IRVINE.—The Treasurer is offensive at all times.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I wish to remind honorable members of the responsibility they are taking upon themselves in proposing to abolish the duty which has been in force for the last five years.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—On New Zealand pine?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—On New Zealand pine. Honorable members laugh, but the honorable member for Boothby made a stupid interjection only fitted for a school boy. The honorable member knows, and is aware that I know, that the duty of 6d. per 100 superficial feet was imposed on oregon timber. I know also that a special arrangement was made with respect to New Zealand pine.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—I asked the honorable gentleman about New Zealand pine.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I expected that the honorable member would not be guilty of a trick of that kind.

Mr. MALONEY.—It was only a joke.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—It was a very childish joke, and was not fitted for a member of Parliament.

Mr. HANS IRVINE.—There the Treasurer is again.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not wish to hear anything from the ridiculous honorable member opposite, who has proved himself to be the greatest spotted protectionist in the community, and the most unreliable member.

Mr. MALONEY.—The honorable member for Grampians was never a protectionist, and never will be.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—And he never will be trustworthy.

Mr. WILKS.—He has used wooden arguments out of his own head.

The CHAIRMAN.—I again appeal to honorable members to keep order. It is impossible for the Treasurer to proceed with these continual interjections.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—You might keep the Minister in order, too, with his insulting remarks.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I think the deputy leader of the Opposition is scarcely fair, in view of the fact that I have had insulting remarks addressed to me from all round the chamber, and I am not one whose temper is such as to dispose him to submit to that sort of thing from men of the character of those who have been guilty of it. The duty on oregon under the last Tariff was 6d. per 100 superficial feet, and New Zealand white pine was free.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—No, pine.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The honorable member is right; the duty on other timbers was 1s. per 100 superficial feet. Honorable members who support the amendment really propose, so far as oregon timber is concerned, to abolish the duty which existed during the operation of the old Tariff.

Mr. THOMAS.—Does the honorable gentleman contend that the duty of 6d. per 100 superficial feet on oregon was a protective duty?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I shall not answer the catch questions of the honorable member. No doubt it afforded some measure of protection. The decision in dealing with pine under the old Tariff was arrived at, not by a substantial majority, but by one vote.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—By the vote of an honorable member, who admitted that he voted on the wrong side.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—That is so; the honorable member for Mernda admitted at once that he voted unintentionally on the wrong side, but the result was to make pine free under the old Tariff.

Mr. WATSON.—But this is supposed to be a protectionist Parliament.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—This is supposed to be a different Parliament in a protectionist sense, and if this Parliament is going to abolish the very low duty that was imposed under the old Tariff on oregon timber, its action will not be in keeping with the name it has received. I wish now to say that if the amendment moved by the honorable member is rejected, I shall be quite prepared to make a proposal which I think will be accepted by all reasonable minds.

Mr. THOMAS.—What is it?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—It will involve a reduction of the duty at present proposed by the Government, and probably some arrangement by which certain classes of timber might be admitted in a manner satisfactory to those who require to use them.

Mr. THOMAS.—What is the proposition, apart from these vague generalities?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I will tell the honorable member after the vote is taken on the amendment exactly what it will be. As I have said, it will involve a reduction of the duty now proposed, and a nearer approach to conditions existing under the old Tariff.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE (Flinders) [8.59].—I hope that the Treasurer's speech will not lead to a renewal of the discussion of the whole matter on the merits. I do not wish to say anything on the merits of the question, but I do wish, if possible, to remove some misapprehension which may exist in the minds of some honorable members in regard to the vote which we are about to take. As I understand it, the amendment moved by the honorable member for Barrier is to insert after the word "undressed," the words "oregon and New Zealand pine," with the object subsequently of inserting in the first column the word "free." The honorable member for South Sydney, with a desire in which I entirely concur, has proposed an amendment on the amendment. When I say that I concur in that desire, I mean that if any honorable members wish to record a separate and distinct vote on the two items they ought to have the opportunity to do so. It is with that object that the honorable member for South Sydney has moved his amendment. I do not mean to say that they ought to be treated on a different basis. That is another matter. The form in which you, Mr. Chairman, will put the amendment is that the words "New Zealand pine," proposed to be omitted, stand part of the question. Therefore, those who desire to express their opinion that both New Zealand pine and oregon ought to be treated on the same basis will vote with the "Ayes," while those who desire oregon, but not New Zealand pine, to be made free, will vote with the "Noes."

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [9.2].—I had intended to say nothing in this preliminary debate, until I found that an entirely new aspect had come over it. I think I heard the honorable member for South Sydney use the word "trickery."

The CHAIRMAN.—I ask the honorable member not to refer to that matter.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The honorable member's perfervid oration came fittingly after his very industrious career throughout this afternoon. There has been a most industrious whip going on all the afternoon to get a uniform duty on the different timbers, but it seems that that has not succeeded, and now they are to be separated, so that an effort may be made to make one of them free and have the other taxed. That is the plain English of this move. I am not complaining, but I want the Committee to understand what has been

going on, and what is proposed to be done. I wish to say a few words against the deletion of "New Zealand pine" from the amendment of the honorable member for Barrier. The honorable member for South Sydney wants to exclude the New Zealand white pine, which is now used largely for the making of butter boxes and fruit cases. Does the honorable member deny that?

Mr. WATSON.—Other kinds of New Zealand pine are included.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The argument put forward in favour of that proposal is that this is a protectionist House, but, protectionist as it is, it has already decided that the interests of the great primary producers of Australia must have precedence. That has been an outstanding feature of the whole consideration of this Tariff. The question now is whether we are to depart from the sound rule which the Committee has laid down for itself, that when it has to make its choice it will make it in favour of the great primary producer. Pursuing that line of policy, the Committee has already moved down to a nominal figure, if not entirely removed, the duties on galvanized iron, wire-netting, kerosene, and some other items of large consumption by the primary industries. We have had wire-netting factories in Australia for some years; we have a huge capital sunk in the development of our shale deposits for the purpose of producing oil, and we have large galvanized-iron works dotted over Australia, but, notwithstanding the existence of those industries, the Committee either removed or reduced those duties because of the great tax which would otherwise have been imposed upon the users of the articles throughout Australia. Those industries have been put in a secondary position when they have conflicted with the requirements of the primary industries. This is a similar case. The only question the Committee has to ask itself is whether we should fine the great producers of Australia, who depend upon this pine for their boxes to send their produce away, in order to try and benefit the timber industry in one corner of Australia, which is now finding a market for all it can supply, or whether we shall let that industry go along and flourish, as it has been doing for years, and leave the great primary producers untouched. That is the issue in a nutshell. Whatever may be said about the quantity of pine available in Australia, here are the figures, which show the effect which the duties already imposed by the Tariff are having.

Mr. FISHER.—The timber industry is a primary production.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—It is one of them. How many men are engaged in it?

Mr. FISHER.—About 20,000.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Probably nothing like it. There are 60,000 persons engaged in the dairying industry alone, and many thousands more in fruit cultivation, in Australia. Whose interests are we to put first, if one must be put first—that of the timber industry, or that of the dairying and fruit industries? I do not think there will be so much trouble about the mining industry, as the idea of the proposal which has now been put forward is to let the mines get their timber free, while the dairymen have theirs taxed.

Mr. SAMPSON.—There will be no penalization of the timber industry by lowering the duty, as it cannot supply the orders in Queensland now.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—That is the whole point, but there will be a penalization of the dairying industry if the duties are passed. I wired to-day to Sydney to one of the leading fruit-growers of Australia, who is also a member of the Legislative Assembly of New South Wales, for the latest prices for fruit boxes. He replies that gin cases are 14d. each since the duties were imposed, whereas they used to be 10d. each; bushel cases are now 10d. that used to be 7d. each; and half cases are now 7d. each where they used to be 5d.

Mr. CHANTER.—Who is the honorable member's authority?

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Mr. J. C. Hunt.

Mr. CHANTER.—One of the most rabid free-traders in New South Wales.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The honorable member for Franklin said that the Tasmanian boxes had been supplied in Sydney at 6½d. each.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—He has said the same to me, but, in spite of that, here is what they are paying. Mr. J. C. Hunt is not one of the greatest free-traders in New South Wales. The Committee has to make up its mind whether, for the sake of putting a duty on this timber, it is going to continue those prices indefinitely.

Mr. THOMAS.—I think it is only fair to say that there is a timber combination that keeps up prices.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Are we likely to break that combination down by any such proposal as this?

Mr. THOMAS.—I do not think so. I think it will tend to intensify the trouble.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I should think so, too. It is not the timber combination but the duty that has put up the prices. They will come down when the duty is removed. During the discussion of the former Tariff, I had the honour and privilege of moving this item on to the free list. I hope we shall see a similar result achieved to-day—a result which accords with the dictates of elemental justice towards a large proportion of the community, without which Australia would be a desert.

Mr. GLYNN (Angas) [9.13].—On the point as to how the question should be put, I wish to mention that in 1901, when this matter came up, the honorable member for Barrier moved that the whole line be free, moving that on and after 28th February, 1902, timber undressed should be free. That amendment was the most far-reaching that was proposed, because it would have put on the free list everything included in that particular item. It was defeated, and the honorable member then moved that oregon alone should be put on the free list. That was carried, and then another honorable member followed with something else, such as baltic timber. Supposing the amendment were put on this occasion, as the honorable member for Barrier has moved it, including only two articles and not the whole item, and were lost, would it not be competent for another honorable member then to move that oregon be free, and subsequently that New Zealand pine be free? If that can be done, the Committee does not lose the smallest right which it has of taking them separately afterwards.

The CHAIRMAN.—The Committee has power to divide a complicated question. As the Committee refused the ordinary consent to have the question divided in this case, the honorable member for South Sydney moved an amendment—which of course I had to accept, and which came to exactly the same thing—that the words "New Zealand pine" be omitted from the amendment of the honorable member for Barrier, which was to insert after the word "undressed" in the item the words "oregon and New Zealand pine." The honorable member for South Sydney has moved to omit the words "New Zealand pine," and that amendment, if carried, will leave oregon timber under discussion. The question

will be put, "That the words proposed to be omitted stand part of the amendment," and the Committee must understand, as the honorable member for Flinders has already pointed out, that if that question be carried, the amendment of the honorable member for Barrier will be put as originally proposed.

Mr. WATSON (South Sydney) [9.16].—I may say, in reply to the honorable member for Parramatta, that there was no "move" concealed under my proposal to have these articles voted on separately. The honorable member will do me the justice to acknowledge that in this, as in other Parliaments, I have consistently advocated that, whenever complex questions arise, members should be given the utmost facility to exercise a discriminating vote.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—All I pointed out was that this proposal to separate the articles has recently been made.

Mr. WATSON.—Early in the day, soon after the original amendment was moved, I spoke to a number of honorable members as to the unfairness of having these two matters mixed up in one question, and I took the earliest opportunity of consulting the Chairman as to the possibility of having them separated. The honorable member for Parramatta seems to have misunderstood the scope of the amendment of the honorable member for Barrier. The honorable member referred to the amendment as though it included only the white pine of New Zealand. As a matter of fact, the amendment also affects kauri, and any other form of pine from the Dominion.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I know.

Mr. WATSON.—If the honorable member knows, then his argument seems to be largely beside the question, because he spoke as though only butter boxes and fruit cases were affected.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Fruit cases are made of kauri.

Mr. WATSON.—Does the honorable member seriously contend that we can get fruit cases only from New Zealand? In Sydney, at the present time, the greater proportion of the fruit and other cases used come from the north coast of New South Wales.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—They do not.

Mr. WATSON.—I say they do; I have seen them coming in by the ship-load all sawn and machine planed, ready to be put together.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I do not dispute that some fruit cases come from that part of New South Wales.

Mr. WATSON.—I say that the greater proportion comes from there.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—No.

Mr. WATSON.—Then, in the case of butter boxes, we are not in such a position as to have to rely solely on New Zealand, because, in the Queensland pine, we have an excellent wood for the purpose. That this wood cannot be obtained in the quantities desired, has not been absolutely proved. While New Zealand pine is free, and, therefore, cheap, the people of the southern States naturally use it.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Large orders from the southern States have been sent to Queensland, but cannot be executed.

Mr. WATSON.—At any rate, that is an admission that the Queensland pine is suitable for butter boxes.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Nobody has denied that.

Mr. WATSON.—From all the records and statistics, it would seem that there is plenty of pine wood in Queensland.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—What we say is that the requisite supplies are not available.

Mr. WATSON.—I doubt that. The honorable member for Boothby, who on most questions is a protectionist, seems to assume that, no matter what encouragement we give, it is not possible to get timber from Queensland suitable for this purpose. Every other industry, if it has made a start, and seems to be getting along fairly well, can, in his opinion, be improved by a little more encouragement.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—Quite so; but we cannot make timber.

Mr. WATSON.—The timber is there already made; it is only a question of transport. It is the recourse of the free-trader to lay everything at the door of Providence, while it is the business of the protectionist to supplement the deficiencies of Providence. The honorable member for Parramatta spoke of the great primary industry of butter-making; but I do not know that butter-making is any more a primary industry than is timber getting, and in the latter there is an enormous number of people employed. Timber getters very often perform efficient pioneer work, and I do not think they are asking too much when they suggest a duty of 15 per cent. Though I do not bind myself to vote for the full duty

proposed by the Government, it would be very improper from a protectionist standpoint to admit all kinds of timber free to compete with Australian timbers, which are well suited for the purposes intended.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [9.25].—I desire to say just one sentence. The Queensland saw-millers, working at full speed, supply annually 4,500,000 feet of timber, whereas the requirements of Australia are 70,000,000 feet.

Mr. CHANTER (Riverina) [9.26].—I desire to remove a misapprehension by stating the facts of the case, so that honorable members may take the full responsibility for the votes they give. Constantly throughout the debate honorable members opposite have "harped on one string," declaring that orders which have been sent to Queensland cannot be executed. Apparently they have departed from the position that the Queensland timber is not of sufficient quality. Why is it that timber cannot be obtained from Queensland when it is wanted? It is because there is a combination of merchants and ship-owners in Sydney, who prevent timber being taken from Queensland into other parts of the Commonwealth. I am not speaking from hearsay, but stating facts which were laid before the Tariff Commission on oath, and I am surprised that they have not been mentioned before. That evidence is to the effect that there is a combination of merchants and ship-owners in Sydney who control the distribution of timber. One unfortunate individual, who tried to break away from the ring, was immediately boycotted, and thereupon he invested his money in a mill in Queensland and cut his own timber. However, when he endeavoured to have the timber conveyed to New South Wales, the combination refused to carry it.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—There are orders for millions of feet waiting execution.

Mr. CHANTER.—I am now speaking of evidence which was given on oath before the Commission. This gentleman determined that he would get the Queensland timber into the other States, and bought two schooners in order to ship it himself. What do honorable members think happened? The combination in Sydney took steps to prevent a single ton of cargo being given him as freight back to Queensland, using as their weapon the secret commission known as rebate. They went to store after

store, and yard after yard, and threatened their customers that if one cwt. of cargo was given to this gentleman the whole of the usual rebate would be forfeited. That is how the timber industry of Queensland has been strangled. This man had the pluck of a Briton; but he was blocked in the way I have described.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—This was a Queensland saw-millers' combination, according to the honorable member.

Mr. CHANTER.—The honorable member for North Sydney is absolutely wrong. This man was at first a merchant, but he was patriotic enough to invest his money and give employment in this industry in Queensland. In Sydney, when he could not get any return freight, he bought goods himself in the open market; but when he endeavoured to dispose of them in Queensland, representatives of the combination entered the auction room and threatened those there that if they dared buy one pound's worth they would forfeit any rebate that was usually given.

Mr. FISHER.—And in one instance that step was taken.

Mr. CHANTER.—Personally I have no interest in this matter beyond feeling it to be my duty to place these facts before the Committee.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Sacred, solemn duty!

Mr. CHANTER.—A duty just as sacred as any performed by the honorable member, though I may not have the halo around my head that he has. In declaring that the Queensland timber industry cannot supply the orders which it receives, he has only one object in view.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—That fact has been admitted by one of the Queensland representatives.

Mr. CHANTER.—It would make no difference to me if it were admitted by the whole of the Queensland representatives. I am not speaking of what has been told to me, but of what I have seen with my own eyes. Surely there is sufficient patriotism amongst us to affirm that if we can make butter equal to that produced in any part of the world, we can also supply the timber necessary for the manufacture of butter boxes. Provision is made in the Tariff for the granting of a rebate upon every butter box exported.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Upon boxes not made of Australian timber.

Mr. CHANTER.—The rebate can be claimed upon all butter boxes exported, even if the timber of which they are composed comes from New Zealand.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—How does that provision benefit Queensland?

Mr. CHANTER.—I am not discussing the question from that point of view. I merely wish to show that the exporters of butter have practically to pay no duty. An honorable member says give us a chance. I am giving honorable members a chance to be honest, to stand by the industries of Australia, and to keep their pledges to their constituents. I believe that a number of honorable members will vote upon this question in ignorance of the fact that the necessary timber for butter boxes can be supplied in Australia.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—It cannot.

Mr. CHANTER.—I know from personal knowledge that it can. Time after time it has been demonstrated that we have the requisite supplies of timber. This fact was abundantly proved by the exhibits at the Australian Natives' Association's exhibitions, both in Sydney and Melbourne. The statement of the honorable member for Wide Bay—which has not been denied—that the butter exported from Queensland in boxes made from Queensland timber has realized the highest price in the London market, effectually disposes of the argument that the use of that timber imparts a disagreeable flavour to the butter.

Mr. BATCHELOR (Boothby) [9.37].—The honorable member for Riverina has raised some new points which have an important bearing upon this matter. I scarcely expected him to put it to the Committee that because the supply of timber is controlled by a combine, we ought to impose an additional duty upon that article. It seems to me that it is rather a reason why we should remit the duty. If the combine is so powerful that it can prevent the use of Queensland timber, surely by the imposition of a duty we shall be giving the whole industry of which timber is the base into the hands of that combine. If ever there was a strong argument against levying a duty upon this commodity, it is that which has been advanced by the honorable member. He has made it perfectly clear that our first duty is to break down that combine in order to enable the Queensland people

to get their timber used in Australia. The imposition of the proposed duty will not accomplish that, inasmuch as it will be pocketed by the combine.

Question—That the words "and New Zealand pine" proposed to be left out stand part of the amendment (Mr. WATSON's amendment of Mr. THOMAS' amendment)—put. The Committee divided.

Ayes	30
Noes	32
Majority				2

AYES.

Archer, E. W.
Atkinson, L.
Batchelor, E. L.
Brown, Thomas
Brown, Tilley
Catts, J. H.
Cook, Joseph
Crouch, R. A.
Frazer, C. E.
Fuller, G. W.
Glynn, P. McM.
Hedges, W. N.
Hughes, W. M.
Irvine, Hans
Irvine, W. H.
Liddell, F.

Mahon, H.
Palmer, A. C.
Poynton, A.
Sampson, S.
Smith, Bruce
Spence, W. G.
Thomas, J.
Thomson, Dugald
Wilks, W. H.
Willis, Henry
Wilson, J. G.
Wynne, A.

Tellers:

Bowden, E. K.
Johnson, W. E.

NOES.

Carr, E. S.
Chanter, J. M.
Chapman, Austin
Coon, J.
Deakin, A.
Edwards, R.
Ewing, T. T.
Fairbairn, G.
Fisher, A.
Foster, F. J.
Groom, L. E.
Hall, D. R.
Knox, W.
Lyne, Sir William
Maloney, W. R. N.
Mauger, S.
McDougall, J. K.

McWilliams, W. J.
O'Malley, King
Page, J.
Quick, Sir John
Salmon, C. C.
Sinclair, H.
Storrer, D.
Thomson, John
Tudor, F. G.
Watkins, D.
Watson, J. C.
Webster, W.
Wise, G. H.

Tellers:

Cook, Hume
Hutchison, J.

PAIRS.

Kelly, W. H.
Fowler, J. M.
Reid, G. H.
Livingston, J.
Bamford, F. W.

Kingston, C. C.
Mathews, J.
Harper, R.
Fysh, Sir Philip
Forrest, Sir John

In Division:

Mr. HANS IRVINE.—I wish to ask you, sir, whether honorable members will be able to vote separately upon both amendments after this question has been decided?

The CHAIRMAN.—The question is "That the words proposed to be omitted stand part of the amendment." The honorable member for Barrier has moved to insert after the word "undressed" the

words "oregon and New Zealand pine," upon which the honorable member for South Sydney has moved to strike out the words "and New Zealand pine." If the words proposed to be omitted by the honorable member for South Sydney are eliminated from the amendment of the honorable member for Barrier, they cannot be again put into it.

Question so resolved in the negative.

Amendment of the amendment agreed to.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE (Flinders) [9.50].—I desire to ascertain from you, sir, whether it will be in order, after the amendment of the honorable member for Barrier has been dealt with, for an honorable member to move the insertion of the words "New Zealand pine" in paragraph A? If not, the only course open to those who desire to place New Zealand pine either on the free list or on the same level as oregon will be, I take it, to support the insertion of a separate paragraph dealing with New Zealand pine.

The CHAIRMAN.—The question before the Committee is that the amendment of the honorable member for Barrier, as amended—that is, to insert the word "Oregon" after the word "undressed"—be inserted in paragraph A. It will not be in order for an honorable member to move the insertion of the words "New Zealand pine" in that paragraph.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—Chair!

The CHAIRMAN.—It is most disrespectful to the Chair for honorable members generally to be conversing in loud tones. It has not been altogether my fault that the Committee have got into the present difficulty, because originally honorable members refused to have the amendment of the honorable member for Barrier divided, so that oregon and New Zealand pine could be dealt with separately. The insertion of the words "New Zealand pine," in paragraph A, cannot again be moved.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—Will it be in order, sir, for an honorable member to move the insertion of a separate paragraph, say, AA, relating to New Zealand pine?

The CHAIRMAN.—It will all depend upon what the amendment is. If an amendment is submitted, I shall be in a better position to judge.

Mr. GLYNN (Angas) [9.53].—I think that when the last vote was taken honorable members were under the misappre-

hension that the question was, as the honorable member for Barrier proposed, to take the two items together. They thought that had that question been put and lost, it would not be competent for the Committee to take them separately.

Mr. WATSON.—A number of honorable members blocked the items from being taken separately.

Mr. GLYNN.—All that we have decided is that New Zealand pine shall not be subject to a duty of 1s. 6d. per 100 feet, and, therefore, it is open to any honorable member to deal with that pine in a separate paragraph, and to propose that it shall be duty free.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question, as you express a desire to know what the amendment was going to be?

The CHAIRMAN.—Order! I must again appeal to honorable members to cease these loud conversations. If any individual member were making a deliberate noise, I would be in a position to deal with him; but when practically all the members of the Committee are talking, it is impossible for me to maintain order.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I shall not raise the question now, sir. I shall allow the amendment, as amended, to be put, and raise the question after it has been dealt with.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [9.56].—I think that we should have a direction from the Chair before a vote is taken on the amendment as amended. Unless we know what we can do afterwards, it may affect materially the votes which we are about to give. I hold that immediately after this paragraph has been dealt with it will be in order for an honorable member to move for the insertion of a new paragraph, say AA, to make New Zealand pine free.

Mr. THOMAS (Barrier) [9.57].—Do I understand, sir, that my amendment to make oregon free is going to be put to the Committee?

The CHAIRMAN.—Yes.

Mr. THOMAS.—I gave notice of my intention to move that oregon and New Zealand pine be made free. The proposal to make the latter free has been defeated. But since then I have learnt that the honorable member for Kooyong was not prepared to have the two items put to the Committee at the one time. I understand now that he is not in favour of oregon

being made free. If he, who happens to be one of the directors of the Broken Hill mine, has an idea that oregon ought to be subject to a duty, I for one am not going to move that it be made free, so that he can please himself as to what he will do.

Mr. KNOX (Kooyong) [9.58].—At an early stage I indicated to the Committee that in my opinion a fair compromise would be to fix the duty on oregon at 6d. per 100 superficial feet. I intend to adhere to that position right through.

Mr. THOMAS.—The honorable member told me that he would support me to make it free.

Mr. KNOX.—I did nothing of the kind.

Mr. THOMAS.—The honorable member did.

Mr. CROUCH.—But that was said two hours ago.

Mr. THOMAS.—I do not mind what the honorable member does now. It does not make any difference to me.

Mr. KNOX.—I took up that position more than two hours ago. I was prepared last night to vote in favour of restoring the old duty. We have protested against an increase in the old duty. I do not understand the quibbling with regard to the votes, but I want my position to be clearly defined. I believe that, in view of local interests, we shall be justified in imposing a duty of 6d. per 100 superficial feet on this timber. The change in the manner of measuring the timber has altered the situation very materially.

Question.—That the word "Oregon" in paragraph A be inserted (Mr. THOMAS' amendment, as amended)—put.

The Committee divided.

Ayes	30
Noes	32
Majority	2

AYES.

Atkinson, L.
Batchelor, E. L.
Brown, Tilley
Brown, Thomas
Catts, J. H.
Cook, Joseph
Crouch, R. A.
Fuller, G. W.
Glynn, P. McM.
Hedges, W. N.
Hughes, W. M.
Hutchison, J.
Irvine, Hans
Irvine, W. H.
Johnson, W. E.
Liddell, F.

Mahon, H.
Palmer, A. C.
Poynton, A.
Sampson, S.
Smith, Bruce
Spence, W. G.
Thomas, J.
Thomson, Dugald
Wilks, W. H.
Willis, Henry
Wilson, J. G.
Wynne, A.

Tellers:

Bowden, E. K.
Frazer, C. E.

NOES.

McWilliams, W. J.
O'Malley, King
Page, J.
Quick, Sir John
Salmon, C. C.
Sinclair, H.
Storror, D.
Thomson, John
Tudor, F. G.
Watkins, D.
Watson, J. C.
Webster, W.
Wise, G. H.

Tellers:

Cook, Hume
Maloney, W. R. N.

PAIRS.

Kelly, W. H.
Fowler, J. M.
Reid, G. H.
Livingston, J.
Bamford, F. W.

Kingston, C. C.
Mathews, J.
Harper, R.
Fysh, Sir Philip
Forrest, Sir John

Question so resolved in the negative.

Amendment negatived.

Amendment (by Mr. JOHN THOMSON) proposed—

That after the word "over" the words "other than New Zealand white pine, cut to size for butter boxes, in bond," be inserted.

Mr. KNOX.—I should like to know from the Chairman exactly where we are. I understood that after the last division was taken, I should be in a position to move for the omission of the figures "1s. 6d.," with a view of inserting in lieu thereof the figure "6d."

Mr. FULLER.—I desire to move the omission of the figures "1s. 6d.," with a view to insert the word "free." I think my amendment should come before that of the honorable member for Cowper.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [10.10].—I point out that there is no occasion to move an amendment like that of the honorable member for Cowper. The Customs have power under the Customs Act to enable timber to be cut up in bond for export.

Mr. GROOM.—But only for export.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—It seems to me to be absolutely illegal to allow timber to be cut in bond, and then to come in free, after we have declared that a duty shall be imposed. If the honorable member for Cowper means that it is to be cut for export, the Customs have power, without this amendment. But if he means that butter boxes are to be made in bond and then admitted free, I think that his proposal is absolutely illegal.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [10.11].—In my opinion, there would be nothing contrary to the Customs Act or to the Constitution in inserting a special line in the Tariff providing that white pine or any other timber used for butter boxes shall be free. I am speaking purely on the question of constitutionality.

The CHAIRMAN.—There is no question of order. The honorable member for Cowper has moved an amendment, which I shall put in the ordinary way. Whether what he desires should be provided for in some other Act, or in this Tariff, is not for me to say. His amendment is in order, and I must accept it.

Mr. FRAZER.—I desire to obtain your ruling as to whether the amendment of the honorable member for Cowper is in order, on the ground of its legality.

The CHAIRMAN.—I have already ruled that it is in order.

Mr. CROUCH (Corio) [10.12].—I submit that the amendment of the honorable member for Illawarra should come first. He desires to move that the timber dealt with in this paragraph be free. His amendment applies to the whole paragraph. If it is not carried, some other amendment—as, for instance, that the duty be 6d. per 100 feet—can be moved.

Mr. GLYNN (Angas) [10.13].—I do not think that we can provide for things being done in bond, except in the case of dutiable goods. Section 78 of the Customs Act provides that—

Dutiable goods may be housed in warehouses licensed by the Minister.

But it would be impossible to put free goods in bonded warehouses under the authority of an Act of Parliament.

Mr. WILKS (Dalley) [10.14].—The honorable member for Corio has suggested that the amendment of the honorable member for Illawarra should receive prior treatment. What the honorable member for Cowper proposes to do is to amend the language of the item. I take it that an amendment of that kind must have priority over an amendment affecting the duty only.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE (Flinders) [10.15].—The amendment of the honorable member for Cowper assumes that a substantial duty will be placed upon the goods included in paragraph A. On that assumption, the honorable member desires to exempt in some way timber imported for the particular purpose of making butter

boxes. It seems to me that the proposal is not a very workable one in the form in which it is introduced. The only way in which we can test the opinion of the Committee—which has not been tested yet—is on the main question whether white pine or oregon are to be admitted free. The Committee has not yet voted on that question, and in order that it may do so, it seems to me that we should first of all go to a vote upon the amendment of the honorable member for Illawarra. If that amendment be carried, it will settle the question as to New Zealand pine, oregon, and other timber. If, on the other hand, a specific duty of 6d., 1s., or 1s. 6d. per 100 superficial feet be carried for the general item, it will still be competent to take the opinion of the Committee on the question of whether or not one class of timber or another should be at a lower duty or be made free. Therefore, in order to get rid of this troublesome matter, I propose that we should follow the suggestion made by the honorable member for Kalgoorlie, and proceed at once to a division on the amendment moved by the honorable member for Illawarra.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—No; let us deal first of all with the amendment moved by the honorable member for Cowper.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—If we do, the result will be absolute confusion.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I was going to move it if the honorable member for Cowper had not done so.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—That does not make it right. We should be in a ridiculous position if we were asked before we knew whether any duty was going to be imposed on paragraph A to except from it one particular class of timber, for a particular purpose.

Mr. SALMON.—Why did not the honorable member take that objection when the original amendment was moved?

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—That was a totally different kind of amendment, designed to confine paragraph A to two classes of timber, and leaving the Committee open to deal with those two classes on their merits. The desire is, I am sure, to settle this question in an intelligent way, and we can certainly do so if the honorable member for Cowper will temporarily withdraw his amendment, in order that that proposed by the honorable member for Illawarra may first be dealt with. We shall then be able to deal, not

only with the further question as to whether or not Oregon and New Zealand pine shall be free, but if they are not to be admitted duty free, whether the honorable member for Cowper's amendment can be taken as an exception to any duty being imposed. Unless we adopt that course, we shall find ourselves in a state of interminable confusion, and the misapprehension which undoubtedly took place in connexion with the last division will be repeated.

Mr. BATCHELOR (Boothby) [10.19].—I agree with the honorable member for Flinders, but I desire first of all to test the feeling of the Committee on another question. If the honorable member for Cowper intends to press his amendment, I shall ask the Committee to determine whether or not we should not provide for fruit cases, as well as butter boxes, being manufactured in bond. All the arguments used in favour of the making of butter boxes in bond apply with equal force to the manufacture of fruit cases and rabbit crates under the same condition.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—Could we not deal with that question after we had decided the question of duty?

Mr. BATCHELOR.—Yes; it would probably be better first of all to determine the question of duty on the general item, and then to make any exception that we may desire. But I am assuming that the honorable member for Cowper is going to press his amendment now.

Mr. JOHN THOMSON.—I intend to do so.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—Then I shall have to test the feeling of the Committee on the question of whether or not fruit cases and rabbit and poultry crates should be included in it by moving an amendment of his amendment. Perhaps I had better not overload my proposal, and I shall therefore simply move—

That the amendment be amended by inserting after the word "boxes" the words "and fruit cases."

Mr. MCWILLIAMS (Franklin) [10.22].—A claim has been made for the exemption of timber for butter boxes, on the ground that there is not sufficient timber in Australia to supply our wants in that respect.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—No.

Mr. MCWILLIAMS.—The chief argument in favour of the free admission of timber for butter boxes has been that the Queensland timber mills are unable to supply the local demands. Does the hon-

orable member for Boothby mean to say that the forests of Australia cannot produce sufficient timber to make all the fruit cases that we want? As a matter of fact, one small mill in Tasmania can supply ten times the quantity of timber required for casing all the fruit grown in Australia.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—But that is hardwood.

Mr. MCWILLIAMS.—Tasmania's fruit export trade with London is five times as great as is that of the rest of Australia, and during the last twenty years, all the fruit exported from that State to London has been packed in cases made of local timber. I should like to point out the extraordinary fact that whilst we export to New Zealand timber for making rabbit crates for her export trade, the mainland of Australia uses wholly imported timber for that purpose. Men in Australia who appeal to this House to pass heavy duties for the protection of their manufactures, almost invariably pack their goods in boxes made of imported timber. It has been said that we will reduce the duty on Oregon to 6d. per 100 superficial feet. It is, to say the least, strange that pronounced protectionists who, throughout the consideration of the Tariff have been voting for duties of 25 per cent., 30 per cent., and 40 per cent., are ready to impose a so-called protective duty of less than 5 per cent. to assist one of the staple industries of Australia. I am satisfied that if the timber industry were within the boundaries of some of our cities, we should have a different tale to tell. Let us clearly understand the position as to the amendment of the amendment moved by the honorable member for Boothby. There can be no question as to the capacity of our mills to supply the whole of the timber required for fruit cases in Australia. I guarantee that Tasmania can supply all Australia at the rate of 4½d. per case f.o.b. Hobart, or for about half the price that is now being paid for imported timber.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—But Tasmania cannot supply the cases that are wanted.

Mr. MCWILLIAMS.—The very cases that we are using in connexion with the fruit export trade between Tasmania and London, can be obtained under contract for 4½d. each f.o.b. at Hobart, or 6d. per case in Melbourne, and 6½d. per case in Sydney.

Mr. STORRER.—The honorable member for Parramatta said that the cases in Sydney cost 10d. each.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—Those cases are made of imported timber.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—If hardwood were suitable for the fruit cases, our orchardists could obtain it close to their own gardens.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—For fifteen years before the export of apples from the mainland was a business proposition, Tasmania was shipping them to London in cases made of local timber, and she is still doing so. It is idle to say that the timber is unsuitable, or that we have not the necessary supplies. The heavy duties that have been imposed for the protection of other industries, will fall upon the timber getter. Even his saw and other requirements are liable to heavy protective duties, and yet those who have supported their imposition, consider that a duty of $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. is sufficient protection for the men engaged in one of our staple industries. I have never asked for a high duty. Had the Government in this case proposed a heavy duty, I should have been found voting to bring it down to the level for which I have been consistently fighting throughout our consideration of the Tariff. It would seem that many protectionists are prepared to swamp the Australian market with oregon, in order that a wealthy company may secure larger dividends. To say that Australian timber is unsuitable for fruit cases, is to slander it. Eighty per cent. of the mines of Australia are using Australian timber. In the great coal mines of the Newcastle district, it is almost invariably used. Not a mine in Tasmania uses imported timber. Surely the men who are managing these concerns know their business as well as do the mine managers at Broken Hill, who use oregon? Oregon is used at Broken Hill simply because the freights on it are less.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—At Broken Hill they pay more for oregon than for Tasmanian timber.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—The question of railway freight decides the matter. Moreover, because they use a 10 x 10 piece of oregon, they think it necessary to use a 10 x 10 piece of hardwood, although a 6 x 6 piece of hardwood would have a greater bearing capacity than the oregon.

Mr. SPENCE.—It is not a question of bearing capacity.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—It is a question of breaking point. I challenge the honorable member to say that he has known

a miner to lose his life through the breaking of Tasmanian timber. Honorable members say that oregon must be imported free in the interests of the poor miner.

Mr. McDOUGALL.—In the interests of the dividend hunter.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—Yes. I challenge those who say that Tasmanian timber is dangerous for use in mines to bring forward one authenticated case of serious accident through the breaking of such timber. I make this statement notwithstanding the fact that 80 per cent. of the mines of Australia use this timber.

Mr. SPENCE.—What has this to do with the duty on timber used in making fruit cases?

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—We are dealing with the duty on oregon. So far as fruit-case timber is concerned, I wish honorable members to understand that if they pass the amendment they do so to allow foreign timber to oust local timber in the markets of Australia.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—No; New Zealand white pine was free under the old Tariff.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—I do not understand the consistency of the man who claims to be a protectionist, so far as city industries are concerned, but will not vote protection for the primary industries. The timber industry should be treated by protectionists as they have treated other industries; those connected with it should be given a fair and square deal. If any body of men have a claim for consideration it is the timber-getters. If these men were employed in a Melbourne industry, they would receive, not a protection of 10 or 15 per cent., but one of 25 or 30 per cent. The people of Australia are beginning to realize that many honorable members draw a wide distinction between city and country industries. They are ready enough to tax the man in the country, but when he asks for protection they will not consider his application. Let there be some consistency. The Government proposal of 15 per cent. is the lowest protective rate in the Tariff, and it concerns an industry which, though not a city industry, deserves some encouragement.

Mr. WISE (Gippsland) [10.35].—I wish to give notice of my intention to move an amendment on the amendment of the honorable member for Cowper, which will make it read—

other than New Zealand white pine, cut to sizes for butter-boxes, in bond, which shall be delivered free.

Mr. JOHNSON (Lang) [10.36].—I shall not make another speech, but I wish to remark upon the peculiar attitude of a number of honorable members who were returned pledged to vote against any increase of duties. Some representatives of Tasmania and Queensland who were so pledged seem prepared to vote for higher duties for the further protection of industries in which their States are concerned. If I were not so strong a free-trader, I should be greatly tempted to vote in a spirit of retaliation for other duties which would operate disadvantageously to them. Of course, I shall not do so. I stick to my principles, whether a proposed duty affects an industry in my State or in any other. But I take this opportunity of protesting against what seems to be a breach of faith.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—The honorable member has consented to duties of 15 per cent. all through.

Mr. JOHNSON.—I have consented to such duties as against proposed higher duties, in some cases running to 150 per cent., and then only because I knew that I had no chance of getting them further reduced. What I take exception to is the action of honorable members who accepted the platform of the leader of the Opposition, and pledged themselves not to vote for duties higher than the old rates, yet supporting higher duties for the benefit of particular industries in which their States happen to be chiefly concerned.

Mr. BATCHELOR (Boothby) [10.38].—The honorable member for Franklin says that my proposal to allow fruit boxes as well as butter boxes to be manufactured in bond is a blow aimed at a Tasmanian industry; but as a matter of fact New Zealand pine was, under the old Tariff, admitted free. What he wishes is to force the fruit-growers of South Australia and other States who use imported timber to confine themselves to Tasmanian timber. Does he call dairying and fruit-growing city industries?

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—Of course not; but if the timber industry were being carried on in the Boothby district the honorable member would support the duty.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—Possibly; though in the district of Boothby there is timber as suitable for fruit cases as the Tasmanian hardwood. But what is wanted for the export trade is a light softwood. As the local hardwood is, in Tasmania, much cheaper than imported timber, it is largely

used there, while the position in South Australia is different. In order to obtain good prices for our fruit, we must pack it in cases having a good appearance, and a good appearance cannot be given to a hardwood case. Then hardwood are much heavier than softwood cases, and the additional weight increases the cost of transport. The honorable member for Franklin, as a member of the Tasmanian Fruit-growers' Association, must know how small the margin of profit is, and how carefully expenditure must be watched to prevent it reaching the vanishing point. The secretary to the South Australian Fruit-growers' Association has written to me on this subject, as follows—

We have to use imported wood for our export cases, and, with the passing of a Standard Fruit Case Act, for local cases also. This means quite 300,000 a year. The new duties will materially increase the cost of these cases. We have been fighting for years to secure reduced freights, and have succeeded to the extent of a few pence per case, but the new duties will take this out of our pockets again. It may be said, "Use hardwood cases like the Tasmanians," but these are not suitable. For one thing, they do not look well, and looks undoubtedly count for much in selling the fruit; they are too heavy, which means increased weights to cart and to pay freights on; they are not so good for the purpose.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—Fruit shipments are charged for by weight, not by measurement.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—At all events, any increase in weight is a serious matter where cartage is concerned. In reply to a communication from me suggesting that it might be possible to use Tasmanian timber, the same correspondent wrote—

It is quite true Tasmania can supply hardwood cases, but if these were suitable we can cut them in our hills from our own stringy bark. We have tried these cases, but, with hardly an exception, our shippers will pay 3d. extra for the softwood.

We do not wish to prevent the Tasmanians from using their local hardwood. Let them continue to do so. The timber industry in Tasmania is a flourishing industry, and why should the fruit-growers of South Australia be asked to stand a loss to make that industry still more flourishing? The result on the whole to the Commonwealth would be disadvantageous. The honorable member for Franklin knows something of the difficulties with which the people engaged in the fruit-growing industry have to contend, and I am at a loss to understand why he should suggest that the Tasmanian hardwood industry should be

benefited at the expense of the fruit-growing industry of South Australia.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS (Robertson) [10.46].—I wish to give honorable members notice that I intend to move the insertion of a new paragraph after paragraph A to the following effect—

Timber, New Zealand pine, free.

Mr. WILSON (Corangamite) [10.47].—It would be a great mistake for the Committee to agree to the amendment submitted by the honorable member for Cowper. It would, of course, be possible to manufacture butter boxes in bond, but it would be very expensive and undesirable.

Mr. WISE.—It is only the cutting of the timber to sizes that would require to be done in bond.

Mr. WILSON.—That would mean that every place at which timber is cut to sizes for the manufacture of butter boxes must be a bond. The honorable member for Boothby has suggested that timber required for the manufacture of fruit cases should be treated in the same way. These amendments would lead to all sorts of complications. One result of the amendment proposed by the honorable member for Cowper would be that, in order to save expense in bonding, the work of cutting the timber to sizes would get into the hands of one or two firms.

Mr. WISE.—What would be the expense of bonding?

Mr. WILSON.—First of all an Excise officer would have to be provided for to take charge of the bond.

Mr. WISE.—The expense involved would be £25.

Mr. WILSON.—In addition, the owner would have to enter into a bond for a large sum of money, and if he was caught defrauding the Customs that bond would be estreated.

Mr. STORRER.—These bonds would differ from ordinary bonds, as the Excise officer would only require to be present when the timber was taken out.

Mr. WILSON.—We could not allow distillation in bond to be treated in one way and the cutting of timber to sizes for butter boxes in a different way. The work would have to be done in the bond under the supervision of an Excise officer. In the interests of the butter industry it is not desirable that this work should have to be done in bond.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The expense might amount to more than a duty of 6d. per 100 superficial feet.

Mr. WILSON.—The proposal made would not only involve great expense, but it would actually play into the hands of trust, and the people most concerned would probably prefer to pay the duty on the timber. If the Minister of Trade and Customs believes that I am wrong I would like him to say exactly what the amendment proposed by the honorable member for Cowper would involve.

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN (Eden-Monaro—Minister of Trade and Customs) [10.53].—What the honorable member has said as to the cost involved is very wide of the mark. What would happen under the amendment would be that a man would obtain the right to a bond on payment of the sum of £25. Then he would give a paper bond as security for the amount of the duty which would be payable on anything which he kept in the bond. Business men give these securities every day, and they do not cost much. A man would pay £25 for the right to a bond in which the timber would be stored, and he would have to pay 1s. 6d. an hour to an officer for supervising the work while the timber was being cut.

Mr. WILSON (Corangamite) [10.54].—After the Minister's explanation it is clear that it would be better for people to pay the duty than to have this work done in bond.

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—The estimate of the Comptroller-General of Customs is that the cost, including £25 for the right to the bond, would not in any case exceed more than about £50 a year.

Mr. WILSON.—There are factories for the manufacture of butter boxes in a number of centres in Australia. There is a very large factory at Warrnambool, where only timber imported direct from New Zealand is used. There are several large factories in Melbourne and Sydney, and in Adelaide there are factories for the manufacture of fruit-cases. The expense involved in the proposal made by the honorable member for Cowper would be so great that people would be better off in paying a duty on the timber.

Mr. SALMON.—And in that case they would pay the duty and dispense with the bond.

Mr. WILSON.—The honorable member is right. They would pay the duty

because that would be cheaper than to cut the timber to sizes in bond.

Mr. FRAZER.—At 6d. per 100 superficial feet he would have to import 100,000 superficial feet in order to get his bond money back.

Mr. WILSON.—In the interests of the butter industry, which the honorable member for Cowper is trying to serve, it would be better if he did not press his amendment. I ask all honorable members interested in the butter industry to vote against it if it is pressed to a division.

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—And leave the duty on the boxes?

Mr. WILSON.—No. We will deal with that later on.

Mr. JOHN THOMSON.—We know how the honorable member would deal with it.

Mr. WILSON.—We would deal with it in a very liberal spirit in the interest of the two great producing industries of Australia. I agree with the honorable member for Boothby, that if butter boxes are to be treated in this way fruit cases should be included.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN (Calare) [10.57].—The honorable member for Lang has administered a castigation to some of his confreres in connexion with some of these duties. I would remind him that the only party in this House pledged on the fiscal question is the Protectionist Party. Free-traders lost their identity in anti-Socialism at the last election, and I do not see that the honorable member can have any special grievance against those who are not voting with him to-night. If any honorable members are pledged to free-trade, they are pledged individually to their electors; but as parties they are either protectionists, anti-Socialists, or labourites.

Mr. JOHN THOMSON (Cowper) [10.59].—There seems to be some confusion about the wording of my amendment. The honorable member for Gippsland has, with a good deal of justification, outlined an amendment upon it, pointing out that if my amendment is carried there is a probability that this timber might be included under "n.e.i.," which would bring the article with which I am dealing under another duty. If the Committee will allow me to amend my amendment by adding the words, "which shall be delivered free,"

suggested by the honorable member for Gippsland, I shall be prepared to do so.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The honorable member objected to withdraw his amendment to allow anything else to be done.

Mr. HEDGES (Fremantle) [11.0].—I understand that the maker of butter boxes would have to pay £25 first of all to be allowed to manufacture in bond. That means ½d. per box on 12,000 boxes. He had better pay a small duty on the timber.

Question.—That the words "and fruit cases," be inserted after the word "boxes" (Mr. BATCHELOR's amendment of Mr. JOHN THOMSON's amendment)—put. The Committee divided.

Ayes	45
Noes	14
Majority	31

AYES.

Archer, E. W.	Knox, W.
Atkinson, L.	Liddell, F.
Batchelor, E. L.	Mahon, H.
Brown, Tilley	McWilliams, W. J.
Brown, Thomas	Palmer, A. C.
Carr, E. S.	Poynton, A.
Catts, J. H.	Quick, Sir John
Chanter, J. M.	Salmon, C. C.
Chapman, Austin	Sampson, S.
Cook, Joseph	Sinclair, H.
Crouch, R. A.	Smith, Bruce
Deakin, A.	Storrer, D.
Fairbairn, G.	Thomas, J.
Fisher, A.	Thomson, Dugald
Forrest, Sir John	Watkins, D.
Foster, F. J.	Watson, J. C.
Fuller, G. W.	Webster, W.
Glynn, P. McM.	Wilks, W. H.
Hall, D. R.	Willis, Henry
Hedges, W. N.	Wilson, J. G.
Hutchison, J.	<i>Tellers:</i>
Irvine, Hans	Bowden, E. K.
Irvine, W. H.	Johnson, W. E.

NOES.

Coon, J.	Thomson, John
Frazer, C. E.	Tudor, F. G.
Groom, L. E.	Wise, G. H.
Lyne, Sir William	Wynne, A.
Maloney, W. R. N.	<i>Tellers:</i>
Mauger, S.	Cook, Hume
O'Malley, King	McDougall, J. K.
Page, J.	

In Division:

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—I desire to withdraw the call for a division.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I object.

Mr. MAUGER.—Let us all cross over to the other side.

The CHAIRMAN.—Will the Treasurer be seated? He must return to the other side of the chamber. He crossed the floor after the tellers were appointed. The honorable member for Bourke, the honorable member for Balaclava, and the honorable member for Gippsland must also return. I also saw the honorable member for Flinders cross over.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—I was on the side of the "Ayes," and crossed to the other side when I understood that the call for the division had been withdrawn. I then returned to this side.

Mr. WYNNE.—I also was on the side of the "Ayes," and crossed over in the same way as did the honorable member for Flinders.

The CHAIRMAN.—The honorable member for Calare also crossed over. He must return to the other side. I would point out to the Committee, although I do not like to lecture honorable members, nor is it my place to do so, that honorable members apparently will not take notice of what they should do. A custom is growing up in the Committee of calling divisions off. If that sort of thing is going to occur again, then the moment that a division is called for I shall insist on its being taken, because what is now happening only reduces the whole proceedings of Parliament to a farce, and places me in a position which no honorable member would desire to occupy.

Mr. CROUCH.—On a point of order, only one teller is acting for the "Ayes."

Mr. WISE.—I was appointed teller for the "Ayes," but I was told to come over to the side of the "Noes," and sit down.

The CHAIRMAN.—The honorable member for Nepean and the honorable member for Lang were appointed tellers for the "Ayes." I did not appoint the honorable member for Gippsland. The honorable member for Bourke and the honorable member for Wannon were appointed tellers for the "Noes." With regard to the honorable member for Calare, I understand that he was on the side of the "Ayes" before the tellers were appointed.

Question so resolved in the affirmative.

Amendment of the amendment agreed to.

Mr. CROUCH (Corio) [11.10].—I desire that the words "and oregon timber" be added. I feel that it is not consistent with the self respect of the Committee—

Mr. WATSON.—I rise to a point of order. I desire to know whether the honorable member for Corio is in order in proposing to add the words "and oregon timber," in view of the division just taken?

The CHAIRMAN.—I do not yet know what the proposed amendment is.

Mr. CROUCH.—I desire to add the words "and oregon timber." I do not think it is consistent with the self respect of the Committee, when a majority plainly desire to have a straight vote in regard to oregon timber, fruit cases, and butter boxes, that, by a shuffling of amendments, we should not be able to realize our desire.

Mr. WATSON.—We have had a vote.

Mr. CROUCH.—I submit that we have not. If we have the three amendments put before the Committee, from what I know of the opinion of honorable members—

Mr. WATSON.—I desire to know whether the suggested amendment is in order?

The CHAIRMAN.—The honorable member for Corio would be out of order in submitting that amendment. The Committee have definitely decided that oregon timber shall not be omitted from the item.

Mr. CROUCH.—I rise to a point of order. I desire to explain what my amendment is.

The CHAIRMAN.—That is not a point of order. The honorable member must either obey my ruling or move that my ruling be disagreed with.

Mr. CROUCH.—Then, I move to be disagreed with.

That the ruling of the Chairman be disagreed with.

I do not like to disagree with the ruling of the Chairman, but I think we have arrived at the stage when such a step is necessary. To a very large extent, we have been submitting to a number of Chair-
man. In the past we have, I think, accepted rulings by the Chairman simply because we did not want to waste time. This is a question of whether or not the rights of honorable members are to be respected. I submit that my amendment ought to be received by the Chairman, so long as it does not transgress the Standing Orders. The position is that the honorable member for Barrier submitted a proposal to insert after the word "undressed" the words "Oregon and New Zealand pine." Since then the honorable

member for Cowper has moved, and the Chairman permitted him to move, that New Zealand pine should be exempted. If the proposal to insert "Oregon" is out of order, I submit that the amendment to insert "New Zealand white pine" was also out of order, inasmuch as the Committee had previously decided that both the word "Oregon" and the words "New Zealand pine" should be left out.

Mr. CHANTER.—I ask the honorable member for Corio to withdraw his motion dissenting from the Chairman's ruling. It is well known that the Standing Orders provide that when the Committee has once determined any question—as it has done in this case—its decision must stand. We have already taken one vote in regard to the inclusion in the item of the very words which the honorable member now desires to insert. To my mind, the Chairman is quite within the Standing Orders in ruling as he has done.

Mr. WILKS.—It is with deep regret that I support the motion of the honorable member for Corio. If ever a Chairman has experienced a trying time, you, sir, have. Further, you have remained in the chair from day to day with very little relief. At the same time, I think that your ruling in the present instance is incorrect. The position is that the honorable member for Barrier moved an amendment upon the item by proposing to insert after the word "undressed," the words "Oregon and New Zealand pine." Then the honorable member for South Sydney submitted an amendment upon the amendment to leave out the words "and New Zealand pine," and the amendment of the honorable member for Barrier was negatived. We were thus brought back to the item in its original form, which I take it covers all kinds of timber. The honorable member for Cowper moved to insert after the word "over" the words "other than New Zealand white pine, cut to size for butter boxes in bond," and the honorable member for Boothby then proposed to insert after the word "boxes" the words "and fruit cases." The latter amendment has been carried, and the honorable member for Corio now desires to cure the addition of the words "and Oregon timber." If we regard the proposal of the Government as we would an ordinary motion, I submit that the amendment now proposed is in order in that it has been brought forward at a later stage than the other amendments.

Mr. WATSON.—We all agree that we have subjected you, sir, to a very trying time, and I suppose that I have contributed, with others, to make it a little worse than it might have been. But it seems to me that we ought to recollect that the principle governing the submission of amendments is that, if an amendment has been negatived, no amendment substantially the same can be proposed in respect of the same item.

Mr. FRAZER.—The amendment of the honorable member for Cowper ought to have been ruled out of order.

Mr. WATSON.—I am inclined to think that the proper place for that amendment to be moved was in paragraph R, which reads, "Timber for making boxes or drawers." The object of the amendment of the honorable member for Corio is to exempt Oregon timber from duty. We have already negatived an amendment to that effect—

Mr. CROUCH.—No. That amendment had reference to the insertion of the word "Oregon," and to making it dutiable at 1s. 6d. per 100 superficial feet, whereas under my proposal it may be admitted free, or may be subjected to a duty of 5 per cent.

Mr. WATSON.—The rate has not yet been fixed. The question which we have to consider is whether the two amendments are substantially the same—whether an amendment to insert the word "Oregon" having been negatived, a proposal to insert it at a later stage is in order. If there were any substantial difference between the two amendments, the position would be different.

Mr. WILKS.—What does the honorable member understand "timber, n.e.i." to mean?

Mr. WATSON.—It means timber which is not included in the following paragraphs of this item, or in any other portion of the Tariff.

Mr. WILKS.—Would not that exclude Oregon?

Mr. WATSON.—Quite so; but that does not touch the question of whether we have or have not negatived substantially the amendment which the honorable member for Corio wants to propose.

Mr. FRAZER.—I do not think that the position adopted by the honorable member for Corio is the correct one. This evening we have had two divisions on proposals to take Oregon and New Zealand pine out of the general item of timber

undressed, and to deal with them either individually or together. The Committee negatively both proposals, and as a consequence oregon and New Zealand pine fell back into the division to be dealt with in conjunction with other items. In view of those decisions, I think that the honorable member for Cowper was out of order in moving that in certain cases white pine be exempted from duty; but you, sir, ruled otherwise, and I bow to your decision. The honorable member for Corio is now endeavouring to take the same course with oregon, and the only difference between his proposal and the other proposal is that the honorable member for Cowper stipulated that white pine was to be used for a certain purpose. The proposal of the honorable member for Corio is the same as that which was negatived, and, consequently, is out of order. In the circumstances, I think that the only way in which he can bring himself in order will be by stipulating in his amendment the conditions under which the oregon shall be used.

Mr. GLYNN.—I hope the honorable member will withdraw his motion. I believe that, technically, he is right; but if I may make use of a paradox, sir, I think that you also are right. The whole trouble has arisen from honorable members moving their amendments wrongly. The honorable member for Barrier moved his amendment not to make oregon subject to a duty of rs. 6d. for 100 superficial feet, but to exclude it from the operation of that duty. The honorable member for Corio has submitted a different proposition, and I suggest to him that as the Chairman is trying to help him, he should ask leave to withdraw his motion.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. CHANTER (Riverina) [11.30].—I desire to make a brief personal explanation. In the last division, I, in common with, I believe, other honorable members, voted in a way in which I had no intention of recording my vote. When I heard the question put from the Chair, I was under the impression that the amendment before the Committee was that of the honorable member for Cowper, to make provision for the exclusion of timber for butter boxes. I was in favour of that proposal, and so I crossed to the right of the Chair, thinking that I was going to vote in that way; but afterwards I found that I was voting in favour of the exclusion of timber for the purpose of making fruit

cases. Had I clearly understood the question, I would have voted with the noes, instead of with the ayes.

Amendment (by Mr. WISE) agreed to—

That the amendment be amended by adding the words "which shall be delivered free."

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [11.32].—I understand that we are about to vote on the original amendment of the honorable member for Cowper, that is, to permit of butter boxes being made in bond.

Mr. WILKS.—And fruit boxes.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I hope that honorable members will vote against the amendment, because the manufacture of the boxes in bond would be more expensive to the butter packers than would be a small duty on the timber.

Question—That the words "other than New Zealand white pine cut to size for butter boxes and fruit cases in bond, which shall be delivered free" (Mr. JOHN THOMSON's amendment, as amended), be inserted in paragraph A—put. The Committee divided.

Ayes	26
Noes	34
Majority				8

AYES.

Brown, Thomas	McDougall, J. K.
Chanter, J. M.	O'Malley, King
Chapman, Austin	Quick, Sir John
Coon, J.	Salmon, C. C.
Crouch, R. A.	Storrer, D.
Edwards, R.	Thomson, John
Ewing, T. T.	Watkins, D.
Fisher, A.	Watson, J. C.
Foster, F. J.	Webster, W.
Groom, L. E.	Wise, G. H.
Hutchison, J.	
Lyne, Sir William	<i>Tellers:</i>
Maloney, W. R. N.	Cook, Hume
Mauger, S.	Page, J.

NOES.

Atkinson, L.	McWilliams, W. J.
Batchelor, E. L.	Palmer, A. C.
Bowden, E. K.	Poynton, A.
Brown, Tilley	Sampson, S.
Carr, E. S.	Sinclair, H.
Catts, J. H.	Smith, Bruce
Cook, Joseph	Spence, W. G.
Fairbairn, G.	Thomas, J.
Forrest, Sir John	Thomson, Dugald
Frazer, C. E.	Tudor, F. G.
Hall, D. R.	Wilks, W. H.
Hedges, W. N.	Willis, Henry
Irvine, Hans	Wilson, J. G.
Irvine, W. H.	Wynne, A.
Johnson, W. E.	
Knox, W.	<i>Tellers:</i>
Liddell, F.	Archer, E. W.
Mathews, J.	Fuller, G. W.

Question so resolved in the negative.
Amendment negatived.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—After the last division I think I had better say that the Government are prepared to take a duty of 6d. all round.

Amendment (by Mr. FULLER) proposed—

That after the figures "1s. 6d.," paragraph A, the words "and on and after 6th December, 1907, free," be added.

Mr. WYNNE (Balaclava) [11.40].—I am advised that if we vote for paragraph A in its present form, the effect will be to throw New Zealand pine under the next two paragraphs, the timber in which is dutiable at 2s. and 2s. 6d., because white pine is not imported in the sizes mentioned in paragraph A. It seems to me that we require a separate paragraph, which might be called paragraph A1, dealing with white pine only.

Mr. JOHNSON.—The honorable member for Robertson has given notice of such an amendment.

Mr. KNOX.—I desire to move that the figures "1s. 6d." be left out, with a view to insert in lieu thereof "6d."

Mr. HUTCHISON (Hindmarsh) [11.41].—Some of us are placed in a very awkward position. I am not in favour of all timbers being admitted free. I want to have oregon admitted free, but, as I cannot have that, I want to be careful not to vote so as to allow other timbers to be admitted free. The reason why I was in favour of free oregon was that we cannot protect any branch of the timber industry in Australia by imposing a duty on oregon, because there is no timber grown in Australia that enters into competition with it. The duty proposed by the honorable member for Wide Bay—9d. per 100 feet superficial—would not cause a single foot less of oregon to be imported. But, though I am in favour of oregon being admitted free, I am not in favour of the free importation of New Zealand pine, because it competes with New South Wales and Queensland timbers. I object even to a duty of 6d. per 100 feet upon oregon, because I am opposed to revenue duties. Timber, in my opinion, should either be admitted duty free, or it should bear a protective duty.

Question.—That after the figures "1s. 6d.," paragraph A, the words "and on and after 6th December, 1907, free" (Mr. FULLER'S amendment) be inserted—put. The Committee divided.

Ayes	23
Noes	35
Majority	12

AYES.

Atkinson, L.	Sampson, S.
Batchelor, E. L.	Smith, Bruce
Bowden, E. K.	Spence, W. G.
Brown, Tilley	Thomas, J.
Brown, Thomas	Thomson, Dugald
Catts, J. H.	Wilks, W. H.
Cook, Joseph	Willis, Henry
Irvine, Hans	Wilson, J. G.
Irvine, W. H.	Wynne, A.
Johnson, W. E.	<i>Tellers:</i>
Palmer, A. C.	Fuller, G. W.
Poynton, A.	Liddell, F.

NOES.

Archer, E. W.	Mathews, J.
Carr, E. S.	Mauger, S.
Chanter, J. M.	McDougall, J. K.
Chapman, Austin	McWilliams, W. J.
Coon, J.	Page, J.
Edwards, R.	Quick, Sir John
Ewing, T. T.	Salmon, C. C.
Fairbairn, G.	Sinclair, H.
Fisher, A.	Storrer, D.
Forrest, Sir John	Thomson, John
Frazer, C. E.	Tudor, F. G.
Groom, L. E.	Watkins, D.
Hall, D. R.	Watson, J. C.
Hedges, W. N.	Webster, W.
Hutchison, J.	Wise, G. H.
Knox, W.	<i>Tellers:</i>
Lyne, Sir William	Cook, Hume
Maloney, W. R. N.	Foster, F. J.

PAIRS.

Kelly, W. H.	Kingston, C. C.
Bamford, F. W.	Mahon, H.
Livingston, J.	Fysh, Sir Philip
Glynn, P. McM.	Deakin, A.
Reid, G. H.	Harper, R.
Crouch, R. A.	O'Malley, King
Hughes, W. M.	Foxton, Colonel

Question so resolved in the negative.

Amendment negatived.

Amendment (by Mr. KNOX) agreed to—

That after the figures "1s. 6d.," paragraph A, the words "and on and after 6th December, 1907, per 100 super. ft., 6d.," be added.

Amendment (by Mr. HENRY WILLIS) proposed—

That the following new paragraph be inserted—"A1. New Zealand Pine, on and after 6th December, 1907, free."

Mr. FISHER.—I should like to ask, Mr. Chairman, whether the amendment is in order, seeing that a proposal to insert the words "New Zealand pine" in paragraph A has already been negatived.

The CHAIRMAN.—When it was sought to insert these words, the duty provided for in paragraph A was 1s. 6d. per 100 superficial feet, but the honorable member now proposes that the timber in question shall be free.

Mr. FRAZER.—If I understand the position correctly, the proposal was to take New Zealand white pine out of the original item—

The CHAIRMAN.—Does the honorable member question my ruling?

Mr. FRAZER.—I think it ought to be questioned.

The CHAIRMAN.—If I were to allow the honorable member to challenge my ruling without moving that it be disagreed with, I should open the door to every honorable member doing so. We must have some finality, and if the honorable member objects to my ruling, he must, therefore, move that it be disagreed with.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [11.53].—Under the old Tariff, New Zealand pine was free, whilst oregon 12 x 6 and over was dutiable at 6d. per 100 superficial feet. The Minister has agreed to oregon being dutiable at 6d. per 100 superficial feet, and whilst I should like New Zealand pine to be free, I think that if the Minister would agree to its being made dutiable at 6d. per 100 superficial feet we might save a long debate.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [11.54].—The position has become slightly complicated. What I agreed to was a duty of 6d. per 100 superficial feet on oregon and New Zealand pine, but I have since been asked to apply that rate to paragraph B as well as to paragraph A.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The timber to which it relates was free under the old Tariff.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—No. It was dutiable at 1s. 6d. per 100 superficial feet. The paragraph in the old Tariff read—

Timber, undressed, n.e.i., in sizes of 7 in. x 2½ in. (or its equivalent) and upwards, and less than 12 in. x 6 in. (or its equivalent), per 100 super. feet, 1s. 6d.

I am prepared to move the insertion of a new paragraph to read—

A1. New Zealand Pine, Undressed, of all sizes, per 100 super. feet, 6d.

Mr. KNOX.—That is what the Minister agreed to this morning.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I promised to make the rate on New Zealand pine, undressed, which under the old Tariff was admitted duty free, the same as the rate on oregon, which was formerly dutiable at 6d. The amendment I suggest will carry out that promise.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS (Robertson) [11.59].—I do not know of any arrangement, and intend to press my amendment.

Mr. SALMON (Laanecoorie) [12.0].—I would point out to the Committee that, if it wishes to carry out the arrangement, it will be necessary for some one to move to amend the amendment by omitting the word "free" with a view to inserting the figure "6d."

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Let the Minister move to amend it.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That the amendment be amended by inserting after the word "pine" the words "undressed, of all sizes, per 100 super. feet."

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) proposed—

That the amendment be further amended by leaving out the word "free," with a view to insert in lieu thereof the figure "6d."

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [12.2 a.m.].—Whilst I should like to have New Zealand pine admitted free, I am ready, in order to bring the debate to a conclusion, to come to an arrangement with the Minister to secure as low a duty as we are likely to get, and therefore I shall vote to make the duty 6d.

Mr. ATKINSON (Wilmot) [12.3 a.m.].—I know of no arrangement with the Minister, and intend to support the amendment of the honorable member for Robertson, because I think we shall do more injury to the great butter-making industry by imposing a duty on New Zealand pine than we can do to the timber industry by making it free.

Mr. WILKS (Dalley) [12.4 a.m.].—I have not heard of any arrangement. Whilst I am a member, the only arrangements which will have my sanction will be those made in the public eye, on the floor of the House. I am sick and tired of arrangements made either with the Comptroller-General or with the Treasurer behind the scenes. As a representative of the people I shall vote in accordance with the opinions which I have formed after hearing the speeches of other representatives. The honorable member for Robertson can claim the votes of all who during this debate have advocated the importation of New Zealand pine free. Any waste of time that may hereafter be complained of will be on their shoulders. They asked that this timber should be admitted free in the interests of the butter industry. Now we are told

that an arrangement has been made. I am about tired of these arrangements. If the honorable member for Robertson presses his amendment to a division, it should receive the support of honorable members who to-day have expressed themselves as anxious that this timber should be admitted free, as it was under the old Tariff.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN (Indi) [12.6 a.m.].—I wish only to say that I am not a party to any arrangement. I have protested against duties being heaped on to the primary industries, and I feel it my duty to vote for the amendment of the honorable member for Robertson.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [12.7 a.m.].—The honorable member for Dalley seems to be under some misapprehension. There was no party arrangement made. Knowing that we could not secure the free admission of this timber, I asked the Treasurer, on my own behalf, whether he would agree to a duty of 6d. per 100 superficial feet. The Treasurer agreed to the suggestion, and that binds me only.

Mr. WILKS.—The honorable member for Kooyong was at the same game just now, and said he had made an arrangement.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—That does not matter. Surely any member of the Committee has a right to ask the Minister whether he is prepared to accept a certain duty.

Mr. WILKS.—But he has no right to suppose that that will bind other honorable members.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Certainly not. The honorable member for Dalley and other honorable members are free to do as they please. I tried to end the debate so far as I was concerned, and entered into an arrangement with the Treasurer, which I considered the best that could be made in the circumstances. I stand to that arrangement so far as I am personally concerned.

Mr. HANS IRVINE (Grampians) [12.8 a.m.].—I have not addressed the Chair on this question during the whole of the discussion that has taken place upon it. I wish to say now that I have just heard, for the first time, that any arrangement has been come to between the Treasurer and the honorable member for North Sydney, which, if it had been mentioned yesterday morning, would probably have led to a vote being taken on the item at 11 or 12 o'clock yesterday, and we might

since that time have passed a dozen of the other items. I shall vote for the free admission of this timber, because I believe that the primary industries of the Commonwealth should be protected.

Mr. WILSON (Corangamite) [12.9 a.m.].—It appears that an arrangement was come to between the Minister and the honorable member for Kooyong some time yesterday morning, and we have had to wait until this morning to hear of it. I do not see why honorable members should be considered bound by any hole-or-corner arrangement. Is this the way the legislation of the Federal Parliament is to be conducted? Are we to be known as the "hole-and-corner Parliament of Australia"? This kind of business has been going on too long here. It has been attempted not only in this Parliament but in the last Parliament. If the Treasurer desires to make arrangements of this kind, in view of the responsible position he holds, he should make them from the chair he occupies at the table, and at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—No honorable member is bound by any arrangement.

Mr. WILSON.—I know that.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—Then why protest?

Mr. WILSON.—The honorable member for Flinders must know quite well that if honorable members had been made acquainted with this arrangement at noon yesterday, we should not be here at midnight.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—It would not have made any difference.

Mr. WILSON.—It would have made all the difference in the world. I record my most emphatic protest against so much hole-and-corner work in this Parliament.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [12.10 a.m.].—I am sorry to hear the honorable member make such a violent speech. What happened was simply this. I received a memorandum from the honorable member for North Sydney only a few minutes ago. I certainly thought the honorable gentleman was acting for most if not for the whole of his party. I think the position which the honorable gentleman holds justified me in that impression.

Mr. HANS IRVINE.—What position does the honorable member hold?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The honorable member for North Sydney holds a very high position in this House. I knew he would stand by what he asked me to agree to. Certain other honorable members told

me that they would agree to what the honorable member proposed, because although they preferred a lower duty, they considered that a duty of 6d. per 100 superficial feet was the lowest they could get. I agreed in all good faith to what was suggested, and said that the Government would accept a duty of 6d.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—The honorable gentleman did not say so.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I did. I proposed to move in that direction, and the honorable member for Kooyong, who has taken a great interest in the matter—

The CHAIRMAN.—The honorable member for Kooyong had already given me notice of his intention to move a similar amendment.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—All I wish to say is that there is nothing "hole-and-corner" about the matter. If leaders in this House were not able to make some arrangements on behalf of a certain proportion of their following, it would be very difficult to carry on our work.

Mr. WILKS.—The honorable member for Kooyong is not my leader.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—If the business of Parliament is to be carried on, its arrangement must be largely left to the leaders of the different parties represented, especially in a House consisting of so many parties as we have here. I did not know when the arrangement was first suggested that it would be necessary to move the insertion of a new paragraph, but when the first paragraph of the item was carried, I saw that in order to keep my promise it would be necessary to insert a new paragraph dealing with the importation of New Zealand pine. Though I desired a higher duty than was suggested by honorable members opposite, I took the course which I considered necessary to carry out the agreement I had made in good faith, and I hope the Committee will agree to a duty of 6d. per 100 superficial feet on this timber.

Mr. TUDOR (Yarra) [12.13 a.m.].—I candidly admit that I knew that some move was being made to secure a duty of 6d. per 100 superficial feet on New Zealand pine.

Mr. HANS IRVINE.—At what time?

Mr. TUDOR.—At about mid-day yesterday. But if I had known that it was to cover New Zealand timber of all sizes, I should have protested, because the timber-card employés will not receive any protec-

tion under this proposal. Why was not the duty applied to oregon timber of all sizes?

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Because under the old Tariff all pine was free, and oregon in sizes of 12 x 6 was dutiable at 6d.

Mr. TUDOR.—In the circumstances, I consider that honorable members on this side have been thrown over by the proposal of the Government.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS (Robertson) [12.14 a.m.].—A great deal of feeling is being displayed in connexion with this matter. I gave honorable members notice of my intention to move the insertion of a new paragraph to admit New Zealand pine free, and in the circumstances I think that, as a mere matter of courtesy, I should have been approached and told that some arrangement of this kind was on the tapis. I was ignored, however, and at the last moment we are told that an understanding has been in existence since mid-day yesterday.

Mr. HUME COOK.—That has just been contradicted by the Treasurer.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—Certain honorable members have talked themselves hoarse in favour of making butter boxes free of duty, and are now at the last moment going back upon themselves. Have they forgotten their position as representatives of the people in a deliberative Assembly? For hours on end they declared themselves to be in favour of a principle, and at the last moment they ignored the honorable member whose amendment is before the Committee. As between man and man, that is not a fair thing to do. I am a fairly faithful member of a party. I have fought for a principle, and have stuck to it from beginning to end. I have refrained from moving for high duties, because I felt that it was the duty of those who were in favour of them to move for them. An opportunity comes once in a way, when a member is free, as I am, to move that an item be placed on the free list, but when I move it I find that the leaders of my party go behind me, and make an arrangement without consulting me. That shows at least a lack of courtesy towards myself. Those honorable members have wasted my time as well as their own, and if they do not know what they are in favour of, why do not they go home? I am faithful to my party, but on this occasion they have shown me no courtesy.

Mr. KNOX (Kooyong) [12.17 a.m.].—If any honorable member imagines that a compact binding him was made, he is mistaken. At an early stage of the proceedings yesterday, I addressed myself to the question, and said that I should have liked to see this item made free, but that I believed that a duty of 6d. could be secured. That was after speaking to the Minister. I said so publicly. It is utterly wrong for any one to insinuate, as the honorable member for Dalley does, that I spoke on behalf of any party or number of members. There was no compact of that kind, but there was an expression of opinion which the Minister gave quite straightforwardly, and the whole of this business could, therefore, have been settled before lunch-time yesterday.

Mr. SPENCE (Darling) [12.19 a.m.].—After this new development, it is time the Treasurer informed us whether the rest of the Tariff has been fixed up. The Treasurer spoke of the honorable member for Kooyong as a leader, but that honorable member does not appear to assume that position, and claims to speak for himself only. It is time we understood how many leaders there are. I feel that I have been made rather a fool of by somebody. I was putting up a good fight to-day, when I learnt from his own utterance that the honorable member for Kooyong, whom we expected to support our views, had thrown us over because a little while beforehand an arrangement had been made with the Minister, when his vote and those of one or two other honorable members could have secured the placing of the item on the free list.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The honorable member for Darling has no right to say that an arrangement was made with me. The honorable member for Kooyong made a statement, but I did not agree to anything at the time.

Mr. KNOX.—The Minister is quite right.

Mr. SPENCE.—We are told now that the arrangement was made about twelve hours ago. The efforts which we were making to assist the honorable member for Barrier have been wasted, and so has the time of the Committee. Where does the honorable member for Parramatta come in? Has he been deposed as acting leader of the Opposition?

The CHAIRMAN. — The honorable member must not follow that line of argument.

Mr. SPENCE.—If the whole item has been fixed up, has all the rest of the Tariff been fixed up? It would be as well for us to know, so that we might have a sleep, and leave the honorable member for Kooyong and the Treasurer to arrange matters between them.

Mr. WEBSTER (Gwydir) [12.22 a.m.].—Have any further arrangements been made with regard to the other items?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—None whatever: and the arrangement referred to was only made two minutes before I spoke just now.

Mr. WEBSTER.—My sympathy goes out to the honorable member for Robertson. A prominent member of a party, such as the honorable member is, should at least be considered in important matters of principle involved in the policy of the party to which he belongs. That party claim to be the representatives of free-trade pure and simple. I disagree altogether with these arrangements being made by prominent members of a party to the exclusion of any information to even more prominent members. The debate to-day has been more or less a waste of time. The honorable member for Barrier started the ball rolling last night with an amendment for free oregon. After the debate had gone on for eight or ten hours, he abandoned his intention, and that started the whole controversy. He alleged that the honorable member for Kooyong had given him some encouragement in the course he was taking, but that later on, when the honorable member for Barrier persisted in the amendment, the honorable member for Kooyong suddenly told him that he had arrived at another decision altogether, and believed that a duty of 6d. was a fair thing.

Mr. KNOX.—That is not correct.

Mr. WEBSTER.—It is exactly what the honorable member said. He stated, when the honorable member for Barrier was about to speak in reply, that he was in favour of a 6d. duty.

Mr. KNOX.—Yes, I was.

Mr. WEBSTER.—That seemed to upset the honorable member for Barrier very much, for he immediately abandoned the amendment which had caused that long debate. I say to the Treasurer: Let us into your confidence and tell us what arrangements have been made, so that we may get on with the Tariff and know what is to be done. If the arrangement made had been announced earlier, the matter might have been settled in an hour or two, and we could have gone home.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [12.25 a.m.].—I really do not see what all the trouble is about.

Mr. FRAZER.—There has been an understanding about nearly every item on the Tariff.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I fancy that if the honorable member interrogated a prominent member of his own caucus, he would get to know the secret of it.

Mr. FRAZER.—I am not objecting; because it is a reasonable way of meeting the different views of honorable members, and arriving at a decision with reasonable despatch.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—This arrangement does not appear to have resulted in reasonable despatch. I have heard nothing of it until it was too late, because I had already promised to support the proposal of the honorable member for Robertson. At the same time, the arrangement is a good one and represents a great concession. I have always been in favour of making butter-box and fruit-case timber free. I may say that as soon as I heard from the honorable member for North Sydney of the arrangement, I said I thought it was a good one; but I was bound to vote for making this commodity free.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I had not time to inform the honorable member for Robertson before the Minister spoke.

Mr. WILKS (Dalley) [12.28 a.m.].—I think this is the time to make a stand, seeing that arrangements of this kind have already been made in respect of several important items. In my opinion, it is not right for honorable members to part with their representative privileges. Who commissioned honorable members to make an arrangement?

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Themselves for themselves.

Mr. WILKS.—I do not wish to be personal or get heated over this matter; but I should like to know what power the Treasurer has to make any arrangement. I will not surrender my position as a representative.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The honorable member himself has tried to make arrangements of the kind with the Treasurer.

Mr. WILKS.—I have never tried to make an arrangement to bind any one else but myself.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Nor did I bind any one else.

Mr. WILKS.—I contend that other honorable members ought to have been consulted. I object to be kept here nearly the clock round, debating this item, and then be told that an arrangement was made at 10 o'clock or 12 o'clock this morning.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The arrangement was not made until I got up to speak to-night.

Mr. WILKS.—The honorable member for Kooyong stated that the arrangement was made this morning.

Mr. KNOX.—I desire to make a personal explanation. I know that the honorable member for Dalley does not wish to misrepresent me; but I did not say that which he attributes to me, as *Hansard* will show. What I stated was that it was purely a matter for belief that the Treasurer would give way on this question.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—And I did not give way at that time.

Mr. WILKS.—If arrangements are made, we ought to know of them in time. I think that the honorable member for Robertson ought to be supported in his proposal, seeing that he gave notice of it hours ago. This morning, the honorable member for North Sydney made a strong speech, in which he advocated that this commodity should be free.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—No arrangement had been made then.

Mr. WILKS.—I spoke of the honorable member this morning as one who never overstated his case, and said that I should be prepared to follow him; but now, at 12 o'clock at night, I am told that "an arrangement has been made."

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I made no arrangement, but I told the deputy leader of the Opposition about the Minister's intention the moment a division was called for.

Mr. WILKS.—Well, all I can say is that those who believe that these articles should be made free ought to support the honorable member for Robertson.

Question.—That the word "free" proposed to be left out stand part of the amendment (Sir WILLIAM LYNE's amendment of Mr. HENRY WILLIS' amendment)—put. The Committee divided.

Ayes	19
Noes	36

Majority ... 17

AYES.

Atkinson, L.
Brown, Tilley
Brown, Thomas
Carr, E. S.
Catts, J. H.
Cook, Joseph
Irvine, Hans
Johnson, W. E.
Liddell, F.
Palmer, A. C.

Poynton, A.
Sampson, S.
Smith, Bruce
Spence, W. G.
Thomas, J.
Willis, Henry
Wilson, J. G.
Tellers:
Bowden, E. K.
Wilks, W. H.

NOES.

Archer, E. W.
Bamford, F. W.
Batchelor, E. L.
Chanter, J. M.
Chapman, Austin
Coon, J.
Edwards, R.
Ewing, T. T.
Fairbairn, G.
Fisher, A.
Forrest, Sir John
Foster, F. J.
Frazer, C. E.
Groom, L. E.
Hall, D. R.
Hedges, W. N.
Hutchison, J.
Irvine, W. H.
Knox, W.

Lyne, Sir William
Maloney, W. R. N.
Mathews, J.
Mauger, S.
McWilliams, W. J.
Page, J.
Quick, Sir John
Salmon, C. C.
Sinclair, H.
Storror, D.
Thomson, Dugald
Thomson, John
Tudor, F. G.
Webster, W.
Wise, G. H.

Tellers:

Cook, Hume
Watkins, D.

Question so resolved in the negative.

Amendment of the amendment agreed to.

Question—That the figure “6d.” be inserted—resolved in the affirmative.

Paragraph, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraph B. Timber, undressed, n.e.i., in sizes of 7 in. x 2½ in. (or its equivalent) and upwards, and less than 12 in. x 6 in. (or its equivalent), per 100 super. feet*, 2s.

Amendment (by Mr. BOWDEN) negatived—

That the words “and on and after 6th December, 1907, per 100 super. feet, 1s. 6d.,” be added.

Paragraph agreed to.

Paragraph C. Timber, undressed, n.e.i., in sizes less than 7 in. x 2½ in. (or its equivalent); including door stocks, per 100 super. feet*, 2s. 6d.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [12.48 a.m.].—I wish to point out to the Committee that, as regards the remaining paragraphs in this item, the Government proposals are the same as those recommended by the protectionist section of the Tariff Commission. I suggest that if there are no objections to be offered, a test vote might be taken on this paragraph.

Mr. WILKS (Dalley) [12.49 a.m.].—I understand that the suggestion of the honorable member for Bendigo is practically to take the remaining paragraphs of this item *in globo*. I am thoroughly opposed

to that course being taken. I suggest to the Chairman that each paragraph be put in the ordinary manner.

The CHAIRMAN.—That will be done.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [12.50 a.m.].—I suggest to the Treasurer that he should agree to reduce this duty to the rate recommended by the Tariff Commission.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—It is fixed at that rate now. I have accepted all their recommendations.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [12.51 a.m.].—I have been asked to support an increase of duty in some cases, but I do not propose to do so. I ask the Committee to pass the remaining paragraphs of this item *in globo*, or, if honorable members like, to take a test division on this paragraph. I do not see the use of taking a division on every paragraph.

Amendment (by Mr. BOWDEN) negatived—

That the words “and on and after 6th December, 1907, per 100 super. ft., 1s. 6d.,” be added.

Paragraph agreed to.

Paragraph D (Timber, dressed, n.e.i.) agreed to.

Paragraph E. Architraves, Mouldings, and Skirtings, of any material, per 100 lineal feet, 5s.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That the letters “n.e.i.” be inserted after the word “mouldings.”

Paragraph, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraph F (Shingles) agreed to.

Paragraph G. Pickets, undressed, per 100, 2s. 6d.

Mr. BOWDEN (Nepean) [12.53 a.m.].—I move—

That the words “and on and after 6th December, 1907, per 100, 1s.,” be added.

I do not know why the duty on undressed pickets has been raised to this figure.

Mr. POYNTON.—Because it is the poor man's material.

Mr. BOWDEN.—It is equal to an increase of 150 per cent. on the old duty.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—Surely Australia can produce its own pickets.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [12.54 a.m.].—I ask the Minister to agree to this amendment, because 2s. 6d. per 100 seems to be an enormous duty to impose on undressed pickets. It is nearly as much as the wood is worth.

Amendment negatived.

Paragraph agreed to.

Paragraph H. Pickets, dressed, per 100, 6s.

Amendment (by Mr. BOWDEN) negatived—

That the words “and on and after 6th December, 1907, per 100, 4s.” be added.

Paragraph agreed to.

Paragraph I. Laths, per 1,000, 7s. 6d.

Mr. WILSON (Corangamite) [12.58 a.m.].—A large number of laths are, I believe, made of softwood.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—They can be, and are, made of our own pine.

Mr. WILSON.—Not to a considerable extent, I think. It will be observed from the statistics that we imported in 1906 25,368,000 laths, and that the duty paid was £5,356.

Mr. SALMON.—They included laths for Venetian blinds.

Mr. WILSON.—Yes. The Minister might very well agree to a slight increase over the old duty, which was 5s. per 1,000.

Mr. TUDOR.—The figures quoted by the honorable member show that the old duty was not operative.

Mr. MAUGER.—Surely we can make a lath in this country?

Mr. WILSON.—In the large centres like Melbourne and Sydney, there is no great difficulty about getting laths; but in the country districts the imported lath is indispensable. An increase of 1s. over the old duty would be ample. I move—

That the words “and on and after 6th December, 1907, per 1,000, 6s.” be added.

Mr. WEBSTER (Gwydir) [12.59 a.m.].—If the Treasurer had a fair idea of the way this duty operates, he would not insist upon maintaining it. The figures quoted by the honorable member for Corangamite show that, no matter what the duty may be, oregon laths must be imported.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—We make any quantity in Western Australia.

Mr. WEBSTER.—None made there is as good as the oregon lath.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—We want the cutting to be done here.

Mr. WEBSTER.—The cutting is a very small matter indeed. We get no laths in New South Wales that are fit for any but very common work, except oregon laths, and they are used for building purposes throughout Australia. They are easily fixed, regular in size, and do not shrink.

Any ceiling that is put up with these laths is calculated to stand. The Minister might seriously consider the advisableness of adopting the amendment.

Amendment negatived.

Paragraph agreed to.

Paragraph J. Laths for Blinds, ad val., 25 per cent.

Amendment (by Mr. BOWDEN) negatived—

That the words “and on and after 6th December, 1907, ad val., 20 per cent.” be added.

Paragraph agreed to.

Paragraph K. Spokes, Dressed or Prepared (not being of Hickory), 2 inch or under in diameter, per 100, 10s.

Mr. WILKS (Dalley) [1.4 a.m.].—Why has the Treasurer resorted to a fixed duty on spokes, instead of an *ad valorem* duty, as under the old Tariff?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Because a fixed duty is recommended by the Tariff Commission.

Mr. WILKS.—That is no reason why it should be accepted. Under a fixed duty, the poorer quality of spokes will pay the same rate as the better kind; the costly vehicle, whose wheels have expensive spokes, will pay no more than the cheapest waggon. I do not feel inclined to move an amendment. I should like some information from the Treasurer as to the object of imposing a fixed duty instead of an *ad valorem* one.

Mr. TUDOR (Yarra) [1.6 a.m.].—Before the Treasurer replies I should like to ask him to strike out the words “not being of hickory.” No distinction should be made; certainly there ought not to be any differentiation in favour of the finest spokes that are imported.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—We have no hickory here.

Mr. TUDOR.—Under paragraph x “hickory, undressed” is free, and when it is so admitted an opportunity is afforded for its being worked up into spokes in Australia. I move—

That the words “not being of hickory” be left out.

Mr. HEDGES (Fremantle) [1.8 a.m.].—I hope that the amendment will be rejected, for it is very difficult to obtain first-class buggy spokes.

Mr. POYNTON.—On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I wish to know whether it is competent for the honorable member to move such an amendment, since, if carried, its effect would be to increase taxation?

The CHAIRMAN.—The duty under the paragraph as it stands is 10s. per 100. I do not think that I am called upon to find out under what paragraph hickory spokes would fall if the amendment were made.

Mr. POYNTON.—They would come under this paragraph, "Spokes dressed or prepared."

The CHAIRMAN.—That is so. I rule that it is not competent for the honorable member to move such an amendment.

Mr. TUDOR (Yarra) [1.9 a.m.].—I appeal to the Minister to move the amendment I have suggested. It is useless to make other spokes dutiable, whilst hickory spokes are allowed to come in free. The same remark will apply to the paragraph, "Prepared hubs (not of elm), each, 1s.," for most of the hubs imported are made of elm.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I think we had better allow the item to remain as it is. It has stood too long to be altered.

Mr. STORRER (Bass) [1.10 a.m.].—We wish to provide increased employment in Australia, and I feel satisfied that if the Treasurer were to give this matter a few moments' consideration, he would recognise the desirableness of making the amendment suggested by the honorable member for Yarra. I am in favour of hickory undressed coming in free.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [1.11 a.m.].—I understand that this fixed duty is equivalent to 30 per cent. It therefore means an increase of at least 10 per cent.

Mr. HUME COOK.—Except in the case of hickory spokes.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—This is a very high duty, and it is certainly not sought by the coachbuilders. The Coachbuilders and Wheelwrights' Association, of both Sydney and Melbourne, petitioned the Minister to retain the old duties on these articles.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—They want protection for their vehicles, but no duties on their parts.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—They want no increase of duties in respect of either vehicles or parts.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Individual coachbuilders have asked for increased duties on vehicles, and I have had communications in favour of parts being admitted free.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—But the associations do not ask for these duties.

Mr. MAUGER.—The associations are not representative of the trade.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—If the honorable member for Parramatta turns to the report of the protectionist section of the Tariff Commission, he will see that an application for an increased duty was made.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I have not the report at hand, and should be glad if the honorable member would read the paragraph to which he refers.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [1.14 a.m.].—At page 22 of the report of the protectionist section of the Tariff Commission it is shown that the representative of the New South Wales Coachbuilders and Railway Car and Waggonmakers, and Wheelwrights' Society of Journeymen, consisting of 350 members, asked for increased duties. Our recommendations in favour of fixed duties were based on voluminous representations, although not on the part of Victorians.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [1.16 a.m.].—I draw the attention of the honorable member for Bendigo to the fact that, although Australia uses £3,000,000 worth of vehicles annually, we imported last year only £9,000 worth. Our coachbuilders admit that, under the old duty, they have been able to drive the importers out of the market.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—Requests for fixed duties came from New South Wales, Queensland, and Western Australia.

Mr. MAUGER.—If very few vehicles are imported, the duty will not hurt any one.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—This is a duty on spokes, and must, therefore, make vehicles dearer. The coachbuilders object to a duty on their raw material, though they do not ask for any increase in the duty on vehicles. With a view to reducing the rate to 20 per cent. *ad valorem*, I move—

That the words "per 100" be left out.

Amendment negatived.

Paragraph agreed to.

Paragraph L (Palings) and paragraph M (Prepared Hubs) agreed to.

Paragraph N. Rims n.e.i., each 1s. 3d.

Mr. BOWDEN (Nepean) [1.20 a.m.].—Can the Treasurer tell us how this fixed rate compares with the old *ad valorem* rate?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—It is an increase on the 20 per cent. *ad valorem* rate.

Mr. BOWDEN.—In that case, I move, with a view to restoring the old rate—

That the word “each” be left out.

Amendment negatived.

Paragraph agreed to.

Paragraph O. Staves, dressed or partly dressed, but not shaped, per 100, 2s. 6d.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [1.22 a.m.].—I do not know why the raw material of the cooper should be charged duty.

Mr. HUME COOK.—Undressed staves are admitted free under paragraph DD.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—In any case, in the present temper of the Committee, it would be useless to move a reduction.

Paragraph agreed to.

Paragraph P. Three-ply Veneer, per 100 super. feet*, 3s.

Mr. WILKS.—Does the Treasurer propose to strike out the asterisk attached to this paragraph?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [1.24 a.m.].—I intend to move to strike out both notes at the bottom of the page.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—And the striking out of the asterisks and dagger will be consequential?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Yes. In proposing a duty of 3s. in this case, I followed the recommendation of the Tariff Commission; but there must have been a misunderstanding of the position. It is nonsense to suppose that we cannot produce here veneers as good as any in the world, and perhaps better. I therefore move—

That the words “and on and after 6th December, 1907, per 100 super. feet, 5s.” be added.

Mr. WILKS (Dalley) [1.25 a.m.].—The proposal of the Treasurer is to increase the duty by 2s. more than the rate recommended by the Tariff Commission. We will not be warranted in doing so on the sanction which he has given.

Mr. STORRER (Bass) [1.25 a.m.].—If three-ply veneer is to be made dutiable at 5s. per 100 superficial feet, there should be some alteration made in the next paragraph, and some duty should be imposed on veneers n.e.i.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I intend to propose a duty of 3s. per 100 superficial feet on veneers n.e.i.

Amendment agreed to.

Paragraph, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraph Q. Veneers, n.e.i., free.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) proposed—

That the words “and on and after 6th December, 1907, per 100 super. ft., 3s.,” be added.

Mr. POYNTON (Grey) [1.27 a.m.].—I think the Treasurer might condescend to tell the Committee why he moves this amendment. The honorable gentleman has submitted a Tariff in which he has proposed that these veneers should be admitted duty free, and I think we should know what influence has been brought to bear upon him to induce him now to propose a duty of 3s. per 100 superficial feet.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [1.28 a.m.].—None whatever. I followed the recommendation of the Tariff Commission in the first instance, but without going into minute details I knew that we had in Australia the best veneering woods in the world.

Mr. POYNTON.—I suppose the alteration is proposed because the Minister knows that a veneering machine has been imported?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not know it.

Mr. POYNTON.—Oh, the honorable gentleman knows all about it.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The honorable member has no right to say that. It is a very improper thing to say. The honorable member is measuring my corn with his own bushel.

Mr. POYNTON.—It is a very improper thing for the Treasurer to propose an increase of duty without notice.

Mr. PAGE (Maranoa) [1.29 a.m.].—I should like to say that when we have such valuable and beautiful timbers that we have in Australia, I see no reason why veneers should be admitted duty free.

Mr. BOWDEN (Nepean) [1.30 a.m.].—I should like to ask the Chairman of the Tariff Commission to say why the Commission recommended that veneers, n.e.i., should be free.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [1.30 a.m.].—May I say that the protectionist section of the Tariff Commission made no recommendation with respect to paragraph Q. Veneers, n.e.i. Our recommendation referred only to three-ply veneer, and we recommended that the duty should be 3s. per 100 superficial feet. There is no reference to veneers, n.e.i., in our report, and I can only suppose that this paragraph has been introduced on the advice of the Customs authorities.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The B section of the Tariff Commission recommended a duty of 15 per cent.

Mr. BOWDEN.—For revenue purposes.

Mr. STORRER (Bass) [1.32 a.m.].—I think the Treasurer is doing the right thing in proposing a duty on veneers, n.e.i. For many years I have been getting veneers cut from the best of our Tasmanian blackwoods, and they are better than anything that can be imported. We have too long delayed the imposition of a duty on veneers.

Mr. WILSON.—Suppose I desire to use a rosewood veneer?

Mr. STORRER.—The honorable member would only have to pay the duty, and he could import what he wanted.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN (Calare) [1.33 a.m.].—I confess that I do not know very much about veneers, but I protest against this method of doing business. This Tariff has been in actual operation for some months. We see that under it veneers, n.e.i., may be admitted free, and that they were free under the old Tariff, and we have also been informed that the A section of the Tariff Commission recommended that they should be free.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—That is a mistake.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—After we have been given all this information, the Treasurer, at the last minute, in the early hours of the morning, and after a long and tedious debate, moves that veneers, n.e.i., should be dutiable at 3s. per 100 superficial feet. That is certainly not a reasonable way in which to deal with the business, and I enter my protest against it.

Question—That the words “and on and after 6th December, 1907, per 100 super. feet, 3s.” be added to paragraph Q (Sir WILLIAM LYNE’s amendment)—put. The Committee divided.

Ayes	31
Noes	16
Majority	15

AYES.

Bamford, F. W.	McWilliams, W. J.
Batchelor, E. L.	Page, J.
Carr, E. S.	Quick, Sir John
Chanter, J. M.	Salmon, C. C.
Chapman, Austin	Sampson, S.
Coon, J.	Spence, W. G.
Fisher, A.	Storrer, D.
Forrest, Sir John	Thomson, John
Foster, F. J.	Tudor, F. G.
Frazer, C. E.	Watkins, D.
Groom, L. E.	Watson, J. C.
Hutchison, J.	Webster, W.
Lyne, Sir William	Wise, G. H.
Maloney, W. R. N.	<i>Tellers:</i>
Mathews, J.	Cook, Hume
Mauger, S.	Hall, D. R.

NOES.

Archer, E. W.	Poynton, A.
Atkinson, L.	Sinclair, H.
Brown, Thomas	Thomson, Dugald
Cook, Joseph	Wilks, W. H.
Fuller, G. W.	Wilson, J. G.
Hedges, W. N.	<i>Tellers:</i>
Irvine, Hans	Bowden, E. K.
Liddell, F.	Thomas, J.
Palmer, A. C.	

PAIRS.

Kingston, C. C.	Kelly, W. H.
Deakin, A.	Glynn, P. McM.
Fairbairn, G.	Smith, Bruce
Ewing, T. T.	Johnson, W. E.
Harper, R.	Reid, G. H.
Catts, J. H.	Wilfis, Henry
Crouch, R. A.	Fysh, Sir Philip
O'Malley, King	Livingston, J.

Question so resolved in the affirmative.

Amendment agreed to.

Paragraph, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraph R. Timber, for making boxes or doors, being cut into shape, and dressed or partly dressed, per 100 feet super. face†, 2s. 6d.

†Definition of Super. Face.—The term “super. face” means the lineal measurement of that part of the timber actually planed.

Mr. BOWDEN (Nepean) [1.38 a.m.].—Does the Treasurer intend to strike out the footnote? I notice that this is a specific duty. I move—

That after the figures “2s. 6d.” the words “and on and after 6th December, 1907, ad val., 20 per cent.,” be added.

Mr. BAMFORD (Herbert) [1.39 a.m.].—What is meant by timber dressed or partly dressed for doors? Does it mean that they are to be mortised, tenoned, or ploughed for panels?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [1.40 a.m.].—The wording of the paragraph speaks for itself. Whether the doors are dressed, partly dressed, or completely dressed and finished, the duty goes on.

Mr. TUDOR (Yarra) [1.41 a.m.].—Does this paragraph refer to the material which was classified in the last Tariff as door stock?

Mr. WILSON.—That is included in paragraph c.

Amendment negatived.

Paragraph agreed to.

Paragraph s. Picture and Room Mouldings, ad val., 20 per cent.

Mr. WILSON (Corangamite) [1.41 a.m.].—This is a case where the Minister might slightly increase the duty, say, to 30 per cent.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [1.42 a.m.].—I was about to move for duties of 30 and 20 per cent.

Mr. WILSON.—Make them 30 and 25 per cent.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Very well. I move—

That the words “and on and after 6th December, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 30 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 25 per cent.,” be added.

Mr. BOWDEN (Nepean) [1.43 a.m.].—This is the second time at this hour of the night that new duties have been sprung upon the Committee without the slightest warning. That is a very undesirable practice, when honorable members are physically exhausted and unable to grasp the bearing of alterations. There ought to be some difference made between picture and room mouldings, as in the last Tariff. I shall content myself with making a protest against the constant insertion of new duties without notice.

Amendment agreed to.

Paragraph, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraph r (Broom stocks) agreed to.

Paragraph u. Timber, bent or cut into shape, dressed or partly dressed, n.e.i., ad val., 30 per cent.

Mr. WILSON (Corangamite) [1.44 a.m.].—This is one of the duties which the coachbuilders suggest should be reduced. One coachbuilder tells me that whilst the Colonial bent timber is very suitable for some classes of work, there are other classes for which it is not at all suitable. Where they can use Australian woods they do so, and, in some instances, prefer it; but there are finer branches of the work where imported wood is required, and, whatever the duty, it must be obtained. Under the circumstances, I think the Treasurer might accept the proposal to reduce the duty to 20 per cent. This would assist the industry very materially.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I am willing to agree to a duty of 25 per cent.

Mr. WILSON.—Then, I move—

That the words “and on and after 6th December, 1907, ad val., 25 per cent.,” be added.

Mr. STORRER (Bass) [1.51 a.m.].—The honorable member for Corangamite has stated that Australian wood is not suitable for this class of work; but the honorable member for Boothby told us yesterday that Tasmanian blackwood had been tested in Adelaide for the making of bent wood chairs, and found to be suitable; and, if that be so, it can be used for any kind of bentwork. I suppose that if this blackwood were grown somewhere about Warrnambool, the honorable member for Corangamite would take a different view. I intend to support the duty of 30 per cent.

Amendment agreed to.

Paragraph, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraph v. Hickory spokes, dressed, 2 inches and under in diameter, free.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [1.53 a.m.].—At an earlier stage, the honorable member for Parramatta asked me on what authority the Tariff Commission made their recommendation in reference to these spokes; and, in reply, I beg to quote the following from the report of the Commission—

By another Melbourne carriage-builder: A duty on finished spokes and rims (Q. 80309), but hickory spokes should be free, unless they could be manufactured locally, in which case the rough hickory should be exempted.—(Craine, Q. 80308.)

By a further Melbourne witness: The Victorian Tariff—a fixed duty on finished vehicles and parts.—(Q. 80605). Hickory spokes under

1½ inches free, above that size dutiable, as blue-gum could then be used. Hubs also should be exempted, as well as hickory rims up to 2 inches; in sizes above that there should be a heavy duty.—(Hoth, Q.80611-2.)

Mr. MATHEWS (Melbourne Ports) [1.54 a.m.].—Hickory undressed might be permitted to come in free, but I fail to see why the Australian makers of wheels should be robbed of their right to some protection.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—These spokes are dressed by machinery.

Mr. MATHEWS.—I am assured by both employers and employed that hickory spokes can be dressed in Australia, and therefore I move—

That paragraph v be left out.

Mr. BOWDEN.—I ask your ruling as to whether the honorable member is in order in submitting an amendment which will have the effect of increasing the duty.

The CHAIRMAN.—The honorable member for Melbourne Ports is not in order in submitting such an amendment.

Paragraph agreed to.

Paragraph x (Hickory, undressed) agreed to.

Footnotes :—

*NOTE.—Definition of a Superficial Foot.—A superficial foot of timber shall mean an area of one square foot on one surface, and being one inch or less in thickness.

†Definition of Superficial Face.—The term "super. face" means the lineal measurement of that part of the timber actually planed.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) proposed—

That the footnotes be left out.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN (Calare) [1.55 a.m.].—When the question of these notes was brought up yesterday we were promised some explanation by the Treasurer. Before we eliminate them, we ought to have that explanation.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I supplied it at an early stage of the sitting.

Mr. MALONEY (Melbourne) [1.56 a.m.].—At the present moment I understand that the Customs authorities are adopting a false system in regard to the measurement of timber. If the Government intend that the true system of measurement shall be followed, I have nothing to urge by way of objection.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The method proposed is to measure only one surface.

Mr. MALONEY.—The piece of wood which I hold in my hand is a sample of the timber used by the makers of cigar boxes. The outside surface has been prepared, but the inside is in a rough state. If it were planed upon both sides, I contend that both sides should be included in its superficial measurement, but not the edges.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [1.59 a.m.].—The two footnotes, which I desire to strike out, are responsible for the trouble to which the honorable member has referred. When they have been eliminated we shall revert to the old system—the ordinary system of surface measurement.

Mr. MALONEY (Melbourne) [2.0 a.m.]. I desire to point out to the Treasurer that wood which has been planed upon both sides is in a greater state of preparedness than is wood which has been planed upon only one side. I wish to know if, in regard to 1-inch boards, twelve will be counted to the foot?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—No.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [2.1 a.m.].—Here is a piece of timber which, by some extraordinary method of reasoning, was calculated to contain 4 superficial feet. I understand, however, that it is now proposed to charge upon the measurement of only one face of such timber—upon its running length. Is that so?

Mr. HUME COOK.—In every case, the trade method of measurement will be followed.

Amendment agreed to; footnotes left out.

Paragraph y (Elm Hubs, with or without metal bands) and paragraph z (Engravers' Boxwood and Engravers' Maple Wood) agreed to.

Paragraph AA. Logs, not sawn, free.

Mr. FISHER (Wide Bay) [2.4 a.m.].—Yesterday it was repeatedly stated that these logs would not be imported by merchants on account of the increased freight charges upon them. As I do not desire to see the Tariff burdened with provisions of a useless character, I intend to move—

That the paragraph be left out.

Mr. BOWDEN (Nepean) [2.5 a.m.].—I would point out that if logs not sawn are removed from the free list, they may fall under another item under which they

will be dutiable. In that case, the proposal of the honorable member for Wide Bay would have the effect of increasing taxation, and I submit, therefore, that it is out of order.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. BATCHELOR).—That is so. The effect of the amendment suggested by the honorable member for Wide Bay would be to increase taxation, and therefore it cannot be received.

Mr. MATHEWS (Melbourne Ports) [2.5 a.m.].—Yesterday we were repeatedly assured by members of the Opposition that logs not sawn could not be imported. If that be so, where is the utility of retaining this paragraph?

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [2.6 a.m.].—If the honorable member for Wide Bay will tax his memory a little; he will find that his statement is not quite correct. He informed the Committee that over 1,000,000 feet of log timber had been imported, and I admitted that. I understood the honorable member for Melbourne Ports to declare that I had said that no logs had been imported. I agreed with the honorable member for Wide Bay that over 1,000,000 feet of log timber had been imported, and I said that it had been imported for a special purpose.

Mr. WEBSTER.—Not to be sawn up or to give employment.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I said that the timber had been imported in the log, where large sizes were required, and that it did not pay to import the logs for making butter boxes and fruit cases. I proved my statement by showing that out of 225,000,000 feet of timber imported, only the small quantity of 1,000,000 feet had been imported in the log, and for special purposes. If we impose a duty on the logs, we shall penalize those persons who require the timber for special purposes.

Mr. WEBSTER (Gwydir) [2.8 a.m.].—The remarks of the honorable member for North Sydney only substantiate the position taken up by the honorable member for Wide Bay. Because the logs to which the former has referred are imported for special purposes where large sizes are required, and not to give employment to people. We are not warranted in levying a duty upon the logs.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—They are sawn planed in many cases.

Mr. WEBSTER.—In the majority of cases, the logs are not imported for the purpose of being planed or worked, but are put into a building almost in their rough state, and boxed or veneered. The Opposition are really swallowing their principles. All day long they have been declaring that these logs cannot be imported.

Mr. FISHER (Wide Bay) [2.9 a.m.].—Although I think that the ruling of the Chair is correct, still, it will not prevent me from voting against the paragraph; but seeing that the Opposition have recanted, I do not think it would be right to call for a division.

Paragraph agreed to.

Paragraph BB (Spars in the rough); paragraph CC (Spokes, Rims and Felloes of Hickory); and paragraph DD (Staves, undressed) agreed to.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 304. Wicker, Bamboo and Cane, all articles n.e.i. made of, whether partly or wholly finished, ad val. (General Tariff), 45 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 40 per cent.

Mr. ARCHER (Capricornia) [2.12 a.m.].—In the tropical parts of Queensland and Western Australia, especially in the bush, where many persons live in small cottages, a great quantity of wicker, bamboo, and cane articles is used, especially bamboo blinds to keep out the sun. The proposed duties of 45 and 40 per cent. represent an increase of over 100 per cent. on the old duty. It is a heavy tax on what is really a necessary of life to a great many persons, especially poor persons. I ask the Treasurer to accept duties of 25 and 20 per cent. An enormous quantity of this material is used in towns like Rockhampton by persons who cannot afford to pay a great deal for their furniture. In my opinion it is an unjustifiable tax to impose on light, cool furniture which is essential to any one who lives in tropical country. These articles are used pretty well all over Australia, but especially in towns in Queensland where a great number of persons live in small cottages.

Mr. MATHEWS.—The majority of the people of Queensland do not want black labour.

Mr. ARCHER.—This light, cool furniture is used not only in Queensland, but also in Western Australia and South Australia.

Mr. MATHEWS.—It is made by Chinese.

Mr. ARCHER.—The honorable member is not acquainted with anything outside Bourke-street and Port Melbourne. Queensland and Western Australia seem to stink in his nostrils. I submit to the Treasurer that it is not fair to impose this very heavy burden upon the users of these articles. I hope that the Committee will reduce the duties as I suggest. I move—

That after the words “45 per cent.” the words “and on and after 6th December, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 25 per cent.,” be inserted.

Mr. STORRER (Bass) [2.15 a.m.].—I think that the duties ought to be reduced to 35 and 30 per cent., and shall be prepared to move accordingly. This item will stand a little higher duty than furniture.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [2.15 a.m.].—I do not agree with the honorable member for Bass that the duty on this item should be a little higher than on ordinary furniture. In my judgment, it should be a little less. Indeed, there is no necessity for any duty at all.

Mr. MATHEWS.—The honorable member knows that all these goods are made in China.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—How much is imported? Only £4,896 worth, divided amongst 4,000,000 people! And all of it, the honorable member says, is made in China! Upon my word, honorable members opposite must be almost mad. Where is the sense in a duty like this? The figures show that our own furniture-makers have driven the importers out of the market.

Mr. MATHEWS.—Is the honorable member sorry for that?

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Not at all; I am glad of it.

Mr. WEBSTER.—Are goods of this class made by our furniture-makers?

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Yes; if the honorable member goes to Anthony Hordern's shop in Sydney, he will find some of the finest work of this class in the world, and it is all made there. I bought a beautiful little table there ten years ago, and the work in it is as fine as could be found anywhere. Let me tell honorable members opposite that they are the people who are always crying stinking fish, by saying that we cannot make anything in Australia, because of the competition of the Chinese and the Japanese.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I will agree to make the duty the same as on ordinary furniture.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—It seems to me that we are going mad about the Chinaman and the Japanese. Anything more ridiculous has never been stated. If there is one thing more than another that stands out clearly with regard to the furniture-makers in Australia, it is that under present conditions they have fairly captured the market, and beaten the importer out of it. Why therefore should we increase the duty? This class of furniture is necessary in the tropical parts of Australia. Cheap wooden furniture cannot be used up there. It falls to pieces from the heat. Honorable members should be reasonable in this matter. They should not strain at a gnat.

Mr. ARCHER (Capricornia) [2.24 a.m.].—The most important part of the item affects blinds. They are very expensive, and are most necessary in Northern Queensland. I am battling for people whose comfort is dependent upon the use of these articles. The furniture is not so important. If the Treasurer will agree to make the duty on the blinds 20 per cent., I shall not object to the other articles coming under the general item of furniture, the duties for which have already been agreed upon.

Amendment negatived.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That the words “and on and after 6th December, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 35 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 25 per cent.,” be added.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 305. Basketware, n.e.i., per cubic foot outside measurement, or ad val., whichever rate returns the higher duty, (General Tariff), 1s. 1½d., 45 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 1s., 40 per cent.

Amendments (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That the words “per cubic foot outside measurement or,” and “whichever rate returns the higher duty,” be left out.

That the figures “1s. 1½d.” and “1s.” be left out.

That after the words “40 per cent.,” the words “and on and after 6th December, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 35 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 25 per cent.,” be added.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 306. Wood, all articles made of, n.e.i., whether partly or wholly finished; including Bellows; Sashes, and Frames; Wire Doors; Window Screens; Walking Sticks; Hods; Mallets; Rakes; Grain Shovels; Saw Frames; Mitre Boxes; Wood Bungs; Wood Type; Wood Rules; Washboards; and Knifeboards, ad val. (General Tariff), 40 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 30 per cent.

Mr. WILSON (Corangamite) [2.29 a.m.].—Does the Minister propose to reduce these duties to 35 per cent. and 25 per cent.?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—No; I am prepared to reduce them to 35 per cent. and 30 per cent.

Mr. WILSON.—I would point out that saddletrees of wood which come under this item were previously on the free list. Then again, whilst we make walking-sticks in Australia, there are some varieties that we cannot produce here and which many people favour.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—Those who are not satisfied with Australian walking-sticks ought to be prepared to pay for imported ones.

Mr. WILSON.—But surely we should not expect them to pay upon them such a high duty as this. Then, again, why should hods and mallets be subject to these duties? They are made of a special kind of wood.

Mr. STORRER.—And a better variety is obtainable in Australia.

Mr. WILSON.—We cannot produce *lignum vitae* mallets in Australia. If the Treasurer would agree to reduce these duties to 35 per cent. and 25 per cent. the item would be passed without further debate.

Mr. PAGE (Maranoa) [2.32 a.m.].—Saddletrees come under this item, and it was my intention to move as I did when the first Federal Tariff was under consideration, that they should be placed on the free list. I have found, however, that we can make in Australia saddletrees that are superior to the imported article, and that they are sold at a reasonable price.

Amendment (by Mr. WILSON) proposed—

That after the words "40 per cent." the words "and on and after 6th December, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 35 per cent.," be inserted.

Mr. LIDDELL (Hunter) [2.35 a.m.].—I would remind the Committee that malacca canes are not made in Australia, and yet under this item they are subject to very high duties.

Amendment negatived.

Amendment (by Mr. BOWDEN) put—

That after the words "30 per cent.," the words "and on and after 6th December, 1907, ad val. (United Kingdom), 25 per cent.," be added.

Question put. The Committee divided.

Ayes 12

Noes 26

Majority 14

AYES.

Bowden, E. K.	Sinclair, H.
Cook, Joseph	Thomson, Dugald
Forrest, Sir John	Wilks, W. H.
Irvine, Hans	
McWilliams, W. J.	<i>Tellers:</i>
Palmer, A. C.	Archer, E. W.
Poynton, A.	Liddell, F.

NOES.

Carr, E. S.	Page, J.
Chanter, J. M.	Quick, Sir John
Chapman, Austin	Salmon, C. C.
Coon, J.	Sampson, S.
Fisher, A.	Storrer, D.
Foster, F. J.	Tudor, F. G.
Groom, L. E.	Watkins, D.
Hedges, W. N.	Webster, W.
Hutchison, J.	Wilson, J. G.
Lyne, Sir William	Wise, G. H.
Maloney, W. R. N.	
Mathews, J.	<i>Tellers:</i>
Mauger, S.	Cook, Hume
McDonald, C.	Hall, D. R.

PAIRS.

Kelly, W. H.	Kingston, C. C.
Glynn, P. McM.	Deakin, A.
Smith, Bruce	Fairbairn, G.
Johnson, W. E.	Ewing, T. T.
Reid, G. H.	Harper, R.
Willis, Henry	Catts, J. H.
Fysh, Sir Philip	Crouch, R. A.
Livingston, J.	O'Malley, King

Question so resolved in the negative.

Amendment negatived.

SPECIAL ADJOURNMENT.

Motion (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That the House at its rising adjourn until 2 p.m. this day.

PAPER.

The CLERK laid upon the table the following paper—

Northern Territory—Particulars as to Lands, Revenue, Railways, &c.—Return to an Order of the House, dated 11th July, 1907.

House adjourned at 2.44 a.m. (Friday).

House of Representatives.

Friday, 6 December, 1907.

Mr. SPEAKER took the chair at 2 p.m., and read prayers.

FEDERAL CAPITAL SITE.

Mr. JOHNSON.—As the promise given by Ministers at the beginning of this session, that an opportunity would be afforded, before its close, to consider the question of the Federal Capital site, does not seem possible of fulfilment before the Christmas adjournment, might I ask the Prime Minister if, in arranging the course of business to be done on the re-assembling of the House after that adjournment, the question will be given an early place in the list of matters which we will be asked to consider?

Mr. DEAKIN.—At the present time it would be premature to attempt to indicate the precise date when we shall be able to deal with this question. But the first opportunity affording any guarantee that Parliament is able to come to a decision upon the question will be seized. There will certainly be no avoidable delay. The honorable member will realize, as we do, that the whole of the difficulty in the settlement of the question arises from the fact that all except the supporters of the particular site most in favour, unite to prevent progress, in order that other sites which they prefer may have a chance of consideration. If we can overcome that obstacle, the Government may be relied upon to afford every facility for an early settlement of the question.

Mr. BOWDEN.—I wish to ask the Minister, whose Department is concerned in the matter in reference to the report of Mr. De Burgh, on the water supply of Canberra, which has been circulated, and which refers to certain maps, whether the maps will be made available to honorable members?

Mr. DEAKIN.—I will inquire from the Home Affairs Department, which, I assume, will be in possession of maps that can be placed on the Library table.

DUTIES OF CAPTAIN COLLINS.

Mr. CROUCH.—I wish to ask the Prime Minister if his attention has been directed to some recent utterances by Captain Collins in London, referred to in

cables which appeared in the newspapers last week and to-day? Last week's cables credited Captain Collins with having said that the preference now being given to Great Britain is only an earnest of future concessions in the same direction. I wish to ask what really is the position which Captain Collins occupies in London. Is he a financial expert, an examiner of Defence stores, or a political agent generally? Does the Prime Minister think it right that Australian public servants in London should take it upon themselves to represent his views on Australian policy at political gatherings?

Mr. DEAKIN.—The position that Captain Collins occupies is that of an officer charged with certain definite duties in regard to purchases for the Defence Department, the conduct of other ordinary business, and also special duties which he is, from time to time, authorized to undertake. I have noticed the semi-political remarks made by Captain Collins on one or two public occasions, but they have been such as I think no exception could be taken to, because in each case he has simply repeated, generally in the same words, statements which have been made on behalf of the Government, and chiefly by myself, either here or in England. I have not noticed that he has ever done more than repeat statements of that kind, or has made any statements of his own opinions.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Is it wise to make Captain Collins the mouth-piece of the honorable gentleman's political views?

Mr. CROUCH.—I understand that the Prime Minister does not disapprove of a permanent public servant, in the person of Captain Collins, expressing political opinions at public meetings, on the ground that that gentleman has previously made statements which are an echo or repetition of the views of the Government or of the Prime Minister himself. Does the Prime Minister not see that such a course of action will mean that in the event of an undesired change of Ministry Captain Collins' usefulness will at once be terminated?

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—No; Captain Collins could do the same for another Ministry.

Mr. CROUCH.—I desire to know if the Prime Minister does not think it desirable that Captain Collins should be seen to make public political statements?

Mr. DEAKIN.—I think there is every objection to a public servant making statements which can have the slightest party bearing or which contain a political reference to any question then in contention. But while this officer is in London, and speaking at a gathering of a Colonial Club, where the members or audience consist almost wholly of Australians, it is not at all out of order, in acknowledging the toast of the Commonwealth, to make statements of a general character when they are in harmony with the current opinion of the Commonwealth. Captain Collins does not speak with any personal accent; and while I should be the first to jealously resist any attempt on the part of an officer to express opinions on political questions, a general statement of the development of the country or the movement of public affairs in the Commonwealth ought not to be too captiously criticised.

Mr. CROUCH.—Captain Collins has expressed political opinions of which I and other honorable members disapprove.

Mr. DEAKIN.—Exactly; but there is no opinion which can be expressed on any subject that some one will not disapprove; consequently, either there must be absolute silence or some general permission of the sort so long as it is not abused.

NORTHERN TERRITORY— TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

Mr. GLYNN.—I wish to ask the Prime Minister a question without notice. A telegram appears in this morning's newspapers to the effect that the motion affirming the conditions on which the proposed surrender of the Northern Territory to the Commonwealth has been passed by both Houses of the Parliament of South Australia. As the terms of the agreement involve the consent of South Australia to the survey and construction of a line to Western Australia, I wish to ask the Prime Minister whether he can say what route is likely to be chosen for the construction of the railway, and whether in determining the route the Government will consider the advisableness of taking the line through country in South Australia that is susceptible of development?

Mr. DEAKIN.—I have observed with great satisfaction the passage of the motion referred to in both Houses of the South Australian Parliament. In regard to the honorable gentleman's second question, so far as I am aware, there are but

two alternative routes from Port Augusta which have been proposed as those which the future line should follow; one to the north of Lake Gardiner and the other to the south, skirting the coast. The only advantages, so far as I am aware, claimed for the southern route, are that it would be somewhat shorter, and be more inexpensive to construct. But there are grave strategic dangers which must be taken into account when carrying an important connexion such as this would be so close to the sea, and therefore open at any time to possible severance from the sea.

Mr. GLYNN.—There is also the objection that that route would take the line through the poorest country.

Mr. DEAKIN.—Of that I am not able personally to speak. The other route which would pass to the northward of Lake Gardiner, would take the line in the neighbourhood of what are believed to be very large mineral deposits.

Mr. GLYNN.—And through hundreds of square miles of pastoral country.

Mr. DEAKIN.—It would involve, I think, no very material increase in the length of the line. Although the purpose of such a railway would be to connect the western State with the eastern States, from which it is at present severed, the necessity for making the line self-supporting cannot be overlooked. Whichever route afforded the greatest possibilities of local earnings would naturally be selected. I am sure that any Federal Parliament would lend an attentive ear to representations from either of the States through which it will pass, offered by those most competent to offer a valuable opinion.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—Before asking the Prime Minister a question without notice, I should like to refer to the very satisfactory news of this morning, as to the passing of the Northern Territory resolution in the Legislative Council of South Australia. I desire to ask the Prime Minister whether he will take steps to urge the South Australian Government to give their consent to the Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta railway survey, which was recently authorized by the Commonwealth Parliament, subject to the proviso that before any money is expended the assent of the Parliament of South Australia must be obtained to the survey being made in that State. I make this request because it may be thought that the South Australian Parliament, having assented to

the Northern Territory transfer Bill, which contains a provision authorizing the survey and construction of the railway through South Australia, from Port Augusta to Kalgoorlie, there is no necessity for its assent to the survey to which I have referred. I point out to the Prime Minister, however, that if that view were taken much undesirable delay would result, as some months may elapse before the Northern Territory Transfer Bill comes before the Federal Parliament. I think it only requires the question to be brought prominently under the notice of the South Australian Parliament, that the assent of the Parliament of that State is necessary before the Commonwealth Government can spend any funds on the survey, to insure immediate attention to the matter. It is most probable that the South Australian Government will attend to the matter without any special request; but still I should be glad if the Prime Minister will make a representation on the subject, as the matter is urgent.

Mr. DEAKIN.—I shall have pleasure in doing so.

TARIFF.

IMPORTATION OF PIANOS.

Mr. MAHON.—I wish to ask the Minister of Trade and Customs a question without notice. Can he say whether a communication was addressed to Mr. Beale, the piano manufacturer, by the Customs authorities, supplying him with particulars as to the number and value of the pianos imported into the Commonwealth from 1902 to 1907? Is the Minister aware that the Customs authorities, in furnishing the information, made serious errors? Has the fact that such errors have been made been communicated to Mr. Beale, and, if so, has the correction been communicated also to the importers? If not, can he say why?

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—I ask the honorable member to give notice of his questions to enable me to obtain the information for which he asks. If he does so, I shall be glad to look into the matter and let him have the information he desires later.

EXCISE TARIFF (AGRICULTURAL MACHINERY) ACT.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—It is reported in the newspapers to-day that some days must still elapse before the fortnight's

notice, given to the manufacturers of agricultural implements, to pay Excise or comply with certain conditions will expire. As we shall reach the Christmas adjournment in a few days, I wish to ask the Minister of Trade and Customs whether he will take an early opportunity to definitely state what the intentions of the Government are in this matter?

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN. — Certainly, every information will be afforded to honorable members, probably on Tuesday next. There has been a little delay in connexion with some of the notices, owing to a blunder on the part of one of the officials. That will not materially interfere with the steps the Government propose to take, and I hope that, on Tuesday next, at the latest, and possibly on Monday, honorable members will be placed in possession of full information on this subject.

SPANISH IMMIGRANTS.

Mr. BAMFORD. — I wish to ask whether the attention of the Prime Minister has been directed to an article appearing in this morning's *Argus*, headed "Strike of Spaniards": For the information of honorable members I propose to read the paragraph, which is not a very long one. It is as follows—

BRISBANE, *Thursday*.—A Geraldton telegram states that all the Spaniards in the district went out on strike on Monday. Seven were summoned to-day, a test case from each of the seven farms. The police magistrate fined them each £10 and costs, in default four months' imprisonment, the sentence to be suspended if the prisoners would go back and finish their agreement.

All instantly refused, and when the police went to remove them to the cells, the other Spaniards in court instantly rushed to their mates, crying, "All together, all together." They took possession of the Court-house, and a disgraceful scene followed.

Eventually the police put the prisoners in the clerk of petty sessions' office, the others outside continuing yelling and gesticulating for a quarter of an hour. Finally the police locked up the prisoners and all their mates, to the number of 28. The Spaniards state that they will not work while they are under the present agreements.

I ask the Prime Minister, as the Government are to a great extent responsible for bringing those men here, if he will cause inquiries to be made to ascertain whether they have been treated properly or otherwise, or if the agreements have not been carried out by the employers, or what really

is the cause of the trouble at Geraldton, and inform the House as soon as possible of the result of those inquiries?

Mr. DEAKIN.—I had not observed the paragraph in the paper this morning. There can be no objection to inquiring into the statements made. The responsibility of this Government for the introduction of those men is, as the honorable member is aware, indirect. We gave permission that, provided suitable labour could not be obtained from the Mother Country, it might be obtained from Europe. Certain Spaniards some weeks ago occasioned trouble in the neighbourhood of Geraldton. I had inquiry made into that circumstance, and found that apparently not one of those who could be tested had been found to be familiar with country employment. They came from Spanish towns, unacquainted with any form of agriculture, and familiar only with some employment—I forget the particulars—of a light and casual character. They appeared to be quite unsuited for the work to which they had been put.

Mr. FISHER.—Was there any suspicion that they had been brought out under false pretences?

Mr. DEAKIN.—No. When I was in North Queensland a short time ago, I endeavoured to ascertain in what way the foreign element generally, which consists chiefly of Spaniards, was behaving. At that time there had been no disturbance, but there was already a good deal of doubt, on the part of those who had seen the men, as to whether the bulk of them were of appropriate character to make good agricultural settlers.

PARLIAMENT HOUSE: EXHIBIT OF PIANO.

Mr. GLYNN.—I desire to ask the Treasurer a question without notice. There is a piano, which is "fetching," at least in appearance, in one of the ante-rooms, and covering a good deal of floor space with its geographical area. I desire to ask the Treasurer, whose skill as a manipulator of the strings we know is exceptional, and who, with an enviable delicacy of touch, is capable, without notice, of improvising variations that would almost beggar the genius of a Liszt, whether he will, before the item of pianos is reached, either himself taking his place at the keyboard or otherwise, give us an opportunity of testing the resonance of the instrument?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I wish I could play. I have no doubt that in that case the honorable member could sing very nicely to my accompaniment. I know nothing as to who gave permission for the piano to be placed where it is. I presume that Mr. Speaker did so. Certainly I did not apply to him. I have had nothing to do with the matter.

Mr. POYNTON.—Seeing that the maker of one class of pianos has been granted the privilege of exhibiting one of his instruments within the precincts of this building, I desire to ask the Prime Minister whether he will extend similar privileges to those interested in other makes of instruments?

Mr. DEAKIN.—Honorable members will recollect that I have no power to either admit or exclude the smallest piece of furniture from the Parliamentary Buildings. Every honorable member possesses the same right as I do. The whole and sole direct control of this part of the building is vested in Mr. Speaker and the Committee of which he is the head.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I should like to say that when the question of showing within this building a sheep-shearing machine was brought up, I think by the honorable member for Lang, I was asked whether I would give similar permission in the case of any other exhibit in the north lobby, and I said that I would. I took it that the House assented to the course I suggested, and when permission was sought later on for a piano to be placed in the lobby, I gave the desired consent, and hence the piano is there.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—May I ask the Treasurer whether he will endeavour to make arrangements to have the very best foreign-made piano obtainable placed against the Beale piano in the north lobby for purposes of comparison?

Mr. JOHNSON.—There are several other makers.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Why not have a piano from each agent?

Mr. BATCHELOR.—I suggest that the best foreign piano obtainable be placed on exhibition for the purpose of comparison, and following up the suggestion made by the honorable member for Angas, that the Treasurer and the acting leader of the Opposition play a duet.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not know why the honorable member for Boothby has asked me this question. After my experience in connexion with the exhibition

of a sheep-shearing machine, it is not likely that I would take any part in the introduction of any other exhibit. I have had nothing whatever to do with the exhibition of this piano in the north lobby. I refer the honorable member for Boothby to Mr. Speaker as to the suggestion to have another piano introduced.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—I wish to ask you, Mr. Speaker, whether you have given permission for the corridors to be used by the general public in connexion with the various wares that are now being exhibited?

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have given no permission except in cases where there have been specific applications. When specific application is made to me, I shall deal with it in a way which I deem to be fitting.

Mr. JOHNSON.—I believe that applications have been already made by several importers representing European firms for leave to exhibit their pianos within the precincts of the House, and I presume that no objection will be offered to their doing so.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The objection which it seems necessary to raise in such cases is contained in the fact that the room will not hold an indefinite number of pianos. If any more pianos are introduced, I am afraid that honorable members will be incommoded.

EXCISE TARIFF (AGRICULTURAL MACHINERY) ACT.

Mr. TUDOR.—Is the Minister of Trade and Customs aware that it is reported that the Massey-Harris Company are employing skilled labourers at 6s. a day in putting together agricultural implements? Does not the Minister think that that is an evasion of the award of Mr. Justice Higgins?

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—I was not aware of what the honorable member states, although the honorable member for Wide Bay brought the matter under my notice a few minutes ago. I intend to make every inquiry in order to find out exactly what is being done and what steps should be taken.

ABORIGINES: WESTERN AUSTRALIA.

ALLEGATIONS OF CRUELTY.

Mr. MAHON.—I desire to ask the Prime Minister, without notice, whether his

attention has been drawn to a statement in the *Age* newspaper of to-day concerning the treatment of aborigines in Western Australia? As these reports generally filter through to Great Britain, and reflect very seriously upon the character of the people of Australia—and possibly this paragraph has already got there—will the honorable gentleman take measures to counteract any false impression conveyed? The *Age* in a leading article this morning says—

Only the other day Mr. E. J. Blake related a tale at Perth of what he had personally witnessed as a member of a recent exploring expedition in the Wiluna district. He declares that the explorers caught the blacks they encountered on their way, and with the most inhuman cruelty chained them by the necks and forced them to act as guides.

These serious accusations against the character of the exploring party are virtually contradicted in another part of the same paper, although it is apparently assumed in the leading article that Blake's statement is absolutely true. In another column that statement is challenged by the members of the exploring party, as appears from the following—

In the Assembly, Mr. Troy called attention to statements made by Mr. E. J. Blake, cook of the Canning stock route exploring party, with regard to the treatment of natives, as published in the press. The Premier replied that Mr. Canning's attention had been called to Mr. Blake's statements, which were absolutely at variance with Mr. Canning's own statements. Full particulars would be given to Parliament when Mr. Canning had had an opportunity to reply. Mr. Canning this evening gave the press a detailed denial of the allegation of ill-treatment.

Can the Prime Minister see his way to send a cablegram to the representative of the Commonwealth in London for publication, to the effect that Blake's statement has been challenged and denied absolutely by the members of the exploring party?

Mr. DEAKIN.—I think the course suggested would be judicious, and shall certainly take it, although it may be desirable to wait until we see the denial in full. I had already noted both the paragraphs quoted by the honorable member, for the purpose of giving a contradiction, should the statement made by the head of the expedition disprove the allegation, as I feel confident that it will. Quite recently, when in England, I was met on a number of occasions by statements of this kind, which it was very difficult to refute at the moment.

Mr. FISHER.—*Petitioner.*

Mr. DEAKIN.—Not that particular fable, but statements as to the cruelty with which the aboriginal inhabitants of Australia were being treated. One had to reply as best one could on the spot. I quite recognise that action is necessary on behalf of Australia as a whole, not only because of the assumption in the *Age* leading article, which was, evidently, written without a knowledge of the telegram appearing in another column, but also because information of the kind is cabled Home, and, what is more, is at once assumed by readers there to apply indiscriminately to the whole continent, and to the treatment of a vast number of aborigines. After all, so far as these deplorable abuses are even alleged to occur, they include only individual cases. Less prominence is sometimes given abroad to famines in India, and catastrophes elsewhere, which destroy thousands, than to isolated injuries to particular aborigines in Australia.

NAVAL FORCES: RETIRING AGE.

Mr. MATHEWS.—I desire to ask the Minister of Defence, without notice, whether in view of the fact that it is the intention of the Government to extend our naval system, and that we require experienced men, he will consider the advisability of increasing the age of retirement of men in the Naval Forces to sixty years as is the case in the Military Forces?

Mr. EWING.—Under present conditions there is a good deal to justify the action suggested by the honorable member. I cannot say more at present, however, than that I will carefully consider the matter.

NEW PROTECTION: APPRENTICES.

Mr. TUDOR.—I desire to ask the Minister of Trade and Customs whether in the proposed new protection legislation he will provide that the number of apprentices shall be limited as has been done in the distillery trade?

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—The details of the legislation now being prepared will have every consideration. The honorable member will see that at present I could not possibly give the information he asks; but I repeat that his suggestion will have all the consideration to which it is entitled.

PAPER.

Mr. MAUGER laid upon the table the following paper—

Census and Statistics Act—Commonwealth Statistics—Trade, Shipping, Oversea Migration, and Finance—Bulletin No. 9, September, 1907.

CONTRACT FOR MILITARY STORES.

Mr. CROUCH asked the Minister of Defence, *upon notice*—

1. To what firm was the contract for the supply to the Department, of waist belts, cartridge pockets, bandoliers, shoulder straps, &c., let early in 1907?

2. Did this contract apply to the supplies for all the States?

3. Have any of the articles submitted to the Department by the contractors been rejected in any State?

4. How many of such articles have been rejected, and in what States, and for what reasons?

5. Are different standards required from contractors in different States?

Mr. EWING.—The answers to the honorable member's questions are as follow—

1. Messrs. Holder and Frost, of Adelaide.

2. Yes.

3. Yes.

4. Of the 1,600 sets ordered for Victoria a number of waist belts, bandoliers, pockets, cartridge 15 rounds, pockets, cartridge 10 rounds, waterbottle straps, mess tin straps, and waterbottle carriers were found to be defective, some on account of flaws and bad leather, and others for minor defects.

In fairness to the contractors it may be added that when the matter was brought under their notice they explained that, in some unaccountable way, a number of defective articles which they had themselves condemned were included in the Victorian shipment, and the correct articles left out. They immediately replaced the defective articles where required, and rectified the defects in others.

5. No.

I notice that only Victoria is referred to in the answers supplied, and, therefore, I infer that defective stores were not furnished in any other State. If they were, I shall give the honorable member information in reference to the matter at a later stage.

DEFECTIVE AMMUNITION.

Mr. BOWDEN asked the Minister of Defence, *upon notice*—

1. Whether any steps had been taken to have the defective cadet ammunition recalled and replaced by a fresh supply, as promised on the 25th September last?

2. Whether the defective supply is still in use and is being supplied to cadets and sold to them at the price of 5s. per 100?

3. Whether it is a fact that, though the proprietor of the Colonial Ammunition Company has undertaken to replace the ammunition complained of, so far he has not been called upon to do so?

4. Will the Minister have the ammunition immediately withdrawn absolutely from use and so allay the dissatisfaction and discontent amongst the cadets?

Mr. EWING.—The answers to the honorable member's questions are as follow—

1. I propose to place all the papers relating to this question on the table of the Library, and the honorable member will then see how thoroughly the whole matter has been investigated. Since April last, when the specification was amended to a $4\frac{1}{2}$ grain charge instead of a $5\frac{1}{2}$ grain charge, the ammunition has proved entirely satisfactory.

2. Not that I am aware of. Inquiries will be made, and if such is found to be the case it will be stopped immediately.

3 and 4. Major Sandford, the Inspector of Ammunition, whose duty it is to report on such matters, has only just made his final report. Instructions have been given for the defective ammunition to be recovered and returned to the manufacturer, who will replace it. When the trouble was first reported, instructions were given that no doubtful ammunition should be issued, and every endeavour has been made to recover that of the earlier make; but as the distribution was somewhat extensive, great difficulty has been experienced in obtaining its return.

TELEGRAPHIC DELAYS.

Mr. CHANTER (for Mr. THOMAS BROWN) asked the Postmaster-General, *upon notice*—

1. Whether any representations have been made by the Chamber of Commerce, of Sydney, as to the serious inconveniences caused to the commercial community of New South Wales by the frequent delays in the despatch and receipt of telegrams, said to be due to "interruption of lines"?

2. What steps are being taken to remedy these defects, and when may the public expect to have a reasonably reliable and efficient service?

Mr. MAUGER.—In reply to the honorable member's questions, I may state that no communication has been received by me from the Chamber of Commerce, Sydney, on the subject, but inquiries are being made of the Deputy Postmaster-General there, and a reply will be furnished in due course.

AUSTRALASIAN PRESS ASSOCIATION.

Mr. CHANTER (for Mr. THOMAS BROWN) asked the Prime Minister, *upon notice*—

1. Have representations been made to him, on behalf of the Australasian Press Association,

as to the result of a Conference recently held in Sydney to the effect that it would be an advantage to the Commonwealth to arrange and provide for the visit of some 25 press delegates from Great Britain?

2. Has this matter received consideration; and, if so, what action has been determined upon with respect to the proposal?

Mr. MAUGER.—The answers to the honorable member's questions are as follow—

1. Yes.

2. A similar proposal was inquired into some 18 months since. The Associated Chambers of Commerce of the Empire propose to visit Australia in 1909, when 200 representative men from the Mother Country and the Sister Dominions will arrive, accompanied by a number of leading journalists, incidentally making a tour of the States. In this manner the press of the greater part of the English-speaking world will have its attention directed to the Commonwealth in the most effective way.

ALLEGED OVERWORK. SYDNEY POST OFFICE.

Mr. MAUGER.—On 29th November, the honorable member for Cook asked me the following questions—

1. Why are not telegraphists appointed, considering the alleged inadequate and overworked staff of the G.P.O., Sydney, and the numerous complaints by the public appearing in the columns of the daily press in New South Wales?

2. Is it a fact that officers of the General Division who qualified for positions of telegraphists over eighteen months ago are still kept at their present grade and salaries, notwithstanding the fact that they are, and have been, performing telegraphists' work. If so, why are these officers not appointed, and their rightful increases allowed them?

I have now been furnished with the following replies—

1. Positions for telegraphists have been provided to the full extent of the provision made on the Estimates for 1907-8.

2. Thirty-five officers passed the examination referred to, and of this number eighteen have been promoted as telegraphists or to the Professional Division. The remaining successful candidates will receive promotion as vacancies occur for telegraphists.

TELEGRAPHISTS, SYDNEY.

Mr. MAUGER.—Upon 22nd November, the honorable member for Calare asked the following questions—

1. Is the Postmaster-General aware that telegraphists employed in the Sydney Head Office on the afternoon staff are frequently called upon to work extra long hours at night?

2. Is it a fact that a large proportion of the extra work thus entailed upon the staff originates after their regular working hours?

3. Is it a fact that officers commencing duties at 10.30 a.m. are frequently detained until 8 p.m.?

4. Have representations been made by representatives of the staff as to the disabilities thus entailed, and what steps, if any, is it proposed to take to redress these overtime grievances?

The Acting Deputy Postmaster-General, Sydney, has now supplied me with the following information—

1. Telegraphists employed in the G.P.O., Sydney, on the afternoon staff are frequently called upon to perform extra hours at night when business is much congested in consequence of interruptions or bad working of the circuits through adverse weather conditions during the day. No case has, however, ever been brought under the notice of the Manager where any of the Telegraphists' total hours of duty during any one fortnight have been in excess of eighty-four hours, which would entitle him to a claim for overtime.

As, with the exception of a few stations which are open till 10 p.m., offices throughout the country are closed by 8 p.m., when conditions are normal, the majority of the afternoon staff Telegraphists, who commence duty at 3 p.m., are released at 8.15 p.m., or very shortly afterwards. They are required to take it in turn to clear all business for the 10 o'clock stations.

2. It is not a fact that a large proportion of the extra work performed by the staff originates after they have been on duty six hours. Telegraphists while on duty are called upon to assist in any emergency which may arise after their regular hours.

3. It is not a fact that officers commencing duty at 10.30 a.m. are frequently detained until 8 p.m. During the month ended 10th November they were kept on on eight different dates after 6 p.m., and of these on five dates till 8 p.m. or later, the latest hour being 8.30 p.m., on the 12th of that month.

4. The only representations made to the Manager, Telegraph Branch, were by members of the intermediate staff, who on the 16th November, drew his attention to the extra demands that had been made on their services during the past month.

He had already given instructions to the Assistant Manager that arrangements must be made to prevent the intermediate staff being kept on so late. The latest hour subsequent to the 15th November that any member of this staff has been required to remain on is 5.40 p.m.

They may, under exceptional circumstances, be required on occasions to perform extra duty, the same as Telegraphists on other staffs are required to do. The Manager has, however, given instructions that they must not at any time be kept later than 6.15 p.m. without his special sanction.

Overtime work resulting from conditions referred to in answer to question 1 cannot be avoided. Including all overtime, Head Office Telegraphists' hours, taken throughout the year, average less than 6½ per working day, except those on the intermediate staff (5), who average less than seven.

Application has been made for six additional Telegraphists to be put on at once to cope with the increasing business.

Mr. Mauger.

TARIFF.

In Committee of Ways and Means (Consideration resumed from 6th December, *vide* page 7110):

Item 307 (Wicker, bamboo, cane or wood) agreed to.

Item 308. Brushmakers' woodware and turnery, including brush handles, ad val., 30 per cent.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [2.35].—I move—

That the words "including brush handles" be left out.

These handles will then automatically fall under item 309, under which they will be dutiable at 20 per cent. The reason underlying my proposal is that they are really tool handles, and it is thought only fair that they should be included in the next item, under which all tool handles will be dutiable.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [2.36].—I should like to know why a distinction is made between the duty proposed upon this item and that levied upon the succeeding item? Both items are really in the same category, and why one should be dutiable at 30 per cent. and the other at only 20 per cent. I cannot understand. I hope that the Treasurer will consent to a reduction of the rate proposed, because brushmakers' woodware and turnery are a very simple form of manufacture.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [2.37].—The reason why a higher duty is levied upon this item than upon the succeeding one is that all the articles enumerated under it are being made in the Commonwealth, whereas some of those covered by the next item are not being made in Australia to the same extent. Hence the distinction which has been drawn. In this matter, the Government have adopted the recommendations of the A section of the Tariff Commission.

Amendment (by Mr. JOSEPH COOK) proposed—

That the words "and on and after 7th December, 1907 (United Kingdom), 25 per cent.," be added.

Sir JOHN FORREST (Swan) [2.39].—I am in receipt of a letter from a brushware company in Western Australia, in which the writer complains of this proposed increase of duty from 20 to 30 per cent. He says that the woodware specified in this item forms an important

part of the raw material of his company, and that the bulk of the same is imported from the United Kingdom.

In many lines of brushware, such as scrubs, dandies, distempers, &c., we have now great difficulty in meeting the English and foreign competition. It would suit our purpose if the rate against the United Kingdom was reduced to 20 per cent.

Mr. SALMON.—At the instance of the Treasurer brush handles have been taken out of this item, so that they fall under the next item, and are dutiable at 20 per cent.

Amendment agreed to.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 309. Tool Handles, unattached, ad val. 20 per cent.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [2.41].—I hope that the Treasurer will consent to give a preference to British tool handles.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I cannot do that.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Surely tool handles are a very proper subject for a preference.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Under the old Tariff they were dutiable at 15 per cent.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I move—

That the words "and on and after 7th December, 1907, ad val. (United Kingdom), 15 per cent.," be added.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [2.43].—I hope that the honorable member for Parramatta will not press the amendment. It is a unique circumstance that the two sections of the Tariff Commission have recommended the imposition of a duty of 20 per cent. on these articles.

Mr. STORRER (Bass) [2.43].—I do not see why this amendment should be made. Yesterday we had a long discussion about the qualities of Australian woods. Surely there is in Australia wood suitable for the making of tool handles, and certainly there are persons who can do the work.

Mr. WILSON (Corangamite) [2.44].—This item deals with the tools of trade of workers in the country districts. It covers, for instance, fork handles.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Many of them are free.

Mr. WILSON.—They ought to be free. Take for instance axe handles. We have not suitable timber for making them.

Mr. BAMFORD.—Dozens of them are being made at Cairns.

Mr. WILSON.—No doubt axe handles of a sort can be made at Cairns, but timber-getters mostly use an American handle.

Mr. BAMFORD.—At Cairns handles are being made equally as good as, and in some instances better than, American handles.

Mr. WILSON.—I think that the honorable member is wrong.

Mr. BAMFORD.—I have seen them.

Mr. WILSON.—Axe handles are specially made out of a certain description of American wood. We have no wood similar to that wood. This item covers innumerable handles of tools of trade. The old duty of 15 per cent. was quite high enough, and the honorable member for Herbert has informed us that with that protection handles are made here. No doubt they are making some handles and making them profitably too with that protection. Therefore his argument is really in favour of restoring the old duty.

Mr. BAMFORD.—The honorable member wants the handles made free?

Mr. WILSON.—No; I shall be quite satisfied if we can reduce the duty to 15 per cent.

Mr. SALMON.—Why should we reduce the duty to less than that which the free-trade section of the Tariff Commission has recommended?

Mr. WILSON.—As a general rule, the honorable member does not believe that the free-trade section of the Tariff Commission was right in making a particular recommendation. I ask him to be consistent on this occasion, and say that it was wrong in recommending a duty of 20 per cent. He must know that throughout his electorate a large number of tool handles are used. Surely he is aware that the greater number of tool handles used in mining and agriculture are imported handles. I shall support the amendment, because I think that a duty of 15 per cent. is a perfectly fair one to impose.

Mr. WATKINS (Newcastle) [2.47].—I hope that the Committee will not reduce the duty. If we can compete with the world in making anything, it is in making the handle for any tool of trade.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—Not a handle for an axe, because we have not suitable wood.

Mr. WATKINS.—For three years I have used Colonial handles in the bush just as well as any other handle.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—The honorable member broke a handle every day, I expect?

Mr. WATKINS.—I broke more American than Colonial handles.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—Of what wood were they made?

Mr. WATKINS.—We made them out of spotted gum and blue gum.

Mr. HEDGES.—Those handles are no good.

Mr. WATKINS.—Spotted gum is the finest timber for making handles.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—To start with, it is too heavy.

Mr. WATKINS.—A miner, who has to lie on his side when he is at work, wants the smoothest possible handle for his pick. Every handle for a miner's pick is made out of spotted gum, and, generally, by an old miner, who earns a few shillings in that way. If ever there was an industry which could be said to be a poor man's industry it is the industry of making pick handles.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—They cannot make axe handles.

Mr. WATKINS.—I get my axe handles made by the man who used to make my pick handles. I hope that the duty on tool handles will not be reduced.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I am afraid that the honorable member has only a very few tools in his mind.

Mr. WATKINS.—I think the honorable member will admit that the handle that is required in a miner's pick needs to be as smooth as any handle that can be made.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—It is the simplest form of handle of all.

Mr. WATKINS.—It may be, but it has to be very smooth, or the hands of the miner will not stand. Honorable members can take any timber in the world and have handles made from it, but I will back a piece of spotted gum against any of them. It can resist a greater breaking strain than any timber that can be imported.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS (Robertson) [2.51].—This is a duty which will fall exclusively upon the working man.

Mr. SALMON.—Handles are made exclusively by working men.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—What is more, tool handles are not made to shape in Australian wood as they are when imported, and, consequently, men who use them will be able to do so much less work. Work in the bush is almost entirely done by the

piece. If a bushman has an axe handle of the right shape, he will be able to do more work with less fatigue than if he has a badly-shaped handle. I believe that the only handle that can be made satisfactorily in this country in competition with imported handles is the handle for the pick of the miner, or something of that kind. Such a handle is almost straight, or tapers away to the end. I believe that Australian wood is as good as imported timber for that particular purpose. But a handle for almost every other tool has a turn in it somewhere; and it is putting in that turn that involves labour. The output of Australian handles must necessarily be small. It cannot be expected that we can compete against a country like the United States, with 80,000,000 people, or against Great Britain with her enormous population. Therefore, this would be exclusively a tax upon the wage-earner. It would mean increasing the revenue from this source from £4,280 probably to £5,000 more, and that money would have to be paid by the wage-earners. I hope that the Treasurer will give some consideration to the question from that point of view.

Mr. SALMON (Laanecoorie) [2.54].—The honorable member for Robertson has entered a plea for the working man who uses tool handles. But the handles which are made in Australia are made by men who are working "on their own," and not in factories. I have in my mind a number of men in my own electorate who have brought up their families by making handles for tools. They have been able to do this work owing to the protection they had under the old Victorian Tariff. The wood they have used for making handles has been ironbark, which wears down to a very smooth surface, and complies with the conditions correctly mentioned by the honorable member for Newcastle.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—We are speaking about axe handles.

Mr. SALMON.—What are they made of?

Sir JOHN FORREST.—Hickory.

Mr. SALMON.—I understand that they are made of ash.

Mr. WATKINS.—Ninety per cent. of them are made of ash.

Mr. SALMON.—The Tariff Commission report says that they are made of imported ash.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—Do the men in the honorable member's electorate make bent wood handles?

Mr. SALMON.—They make splendid handles, which are preferred to the imported article. It is only because of the duty that they have been able to do it. They also make handles with curves in them.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—All that I am asking for is 5 per cent. preference.

Mr. SALMON.—The honorable member is asking for more than both sections of the Tariff Commission recommended.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The Tariff Commission were willing to grant a preference.

Mr. SALMON.—The Chairman of the Tariff Commission is, I am sure, too good a protectionist to say that right through the Tariff he is prepared to grant 5 per cent. as a preference. Honorable members opposite are not treating fairly those of us who believe in preference when they come along with these demands for a reduction of duty on such an article.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Is it always to be preference up, and never preference down? That is absolutely sham preference.

Mr. SALMON.—I want to assure honorable members that this is an industry that is not carried on by big capitalists. It is a means of livelihood to a large number of men who are living in the bush.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—What wood do they use for axe handles?

Mr. SALMON.—They use principally imported wood for making axe handles; but not for making pick handles.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—What does the honorable member for Newcastle say to that?

Mr. SALMON.—I was asked a question as to what wood is used in my electorate, where spotted gum is not grown. I am pleading for men who are making these goods, and making them well.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—How many of them are there?

Mr. SALMON.—They are hardly worth considering, I suppose, in the right honorable member's opinion. His ideas are too large to consider the interests of such men as these, who have brought up their families by means of this industry and are good citizens.

Mr. FULLER.—Where do they sell their handles?

Mr. SALMON.—They sell them locally. It is all very well for those who are interested in large tracts of forest country, which they have taken up for purposes of exploitation, to endeavour to get these special concessions. But I notice that they are not so anxious for reductions of duty when we are dealing with timber. I do plead with honorable members to recollect that this is not a large capitalistic industry, but one carried on by individuals who work hard for their living. Those who vote to take away from these men the only means of subsistence which they have, are taking upon themselves a very grave responsibility.

Mr. HEDGES (Fremantle) [2.59].—We have been supplied with a lot of useless knowledge about axe handles, and the honorable member for Newcastle has told us that pick handles for miners can be made out of spotted gum. They can be made out of deal, so far as that goes, and can be worn down very smooth. But when a man has to get his living by swinging an axe he must have a handle so cut as to make the blade fall with the greatest possible weight where it is wanted, and as true as can be. An axe handle is quite different from a pick handle. I have no desire to interfere with the Newcastle miners. If they choose to encourage their old men to make pick handles and scrape them smooth with a bit of glass paper, let them do it. But we have in Western Australia 4,000 or 5,000 men engaged in the timber industry.

Mr. SALMON.—Who supplies them with axe handles?

Mr. HEDGES.—We purchase the best that can be obtained in the world. They are made from hickory.

Mr. WATKINS.—Supplied to the men on the truck system.

Mr. HEDGES.—I am connected with two companies who employ 500 axemen. We use from 25 to 30 cases of axes per month, with the necessary number of extra handles. If that experience is not worth more to the Committee than that of a doctor or a coal miner I am very much surprised. We do not object to old men in the bush making a few handles out of whatever wood they can obtain. They can make them out of broomsticks if they like. But the Committee should not interfere with a big industry such as we are running in Western Australia. We have imposed a duty of 15 per cent. on some tools of trade.

I do not object to a reasonable duty—say 15 per cent.—on these handles, which are also tools of trade. But those honorable members who ask for a higher duty than that are going too far. They must recollect that the men who use them pay for their own axes and handles.

Mr. STORRER.—What do the companies charge the men for their handles?

Mr. HEDGES.—We supply them at cost price.

Mr. SALMON.—This duty will not fall on the men who use the axes.

Mr. HEDGES.—I say that it will.

Mr. SALMON.—Does the honorable member supply his men with British axe handles?

Mr. HEDGES.—How could I do so? Hickory is not produced in Great Britain.

Mr. SALMON.—Then why propose a preference?

Mr. HEDGES.—I am asking that the duty be reduced. Axemen and others have to purchase from the companies by which they are employed the handles that they require. If they were given the full run of the store the employer would not be able to get enough for them. It is necessary that they should purchase them from their employers in order that some control may be kept over their use. I have no objection to the honorable member for Newcastle having pick handles made out of deal.

Mr. WATKINS.—I am not specially concerned.

Mr. HEDGES.—I would ask the Committee to place a reasonably low duty on axe handles, and to allow the men who have to use them to select those which they find most suitable.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [3.2].—In order that honorable members may realize how great a concession this will be to Great Britain, I would point out that last year our imports from the United Kingdom were valued at £948, whilst those coming from the United States were of the value of £27,505.

Mr. EDWARDS (Oxley) [3.3].—I was surprised to hear the statement made a few moments ago that tool handles could not be made in Australia, since I know that they can be produced in all parts of the Commonwealth. I have a small farm near Brisbane where, when Parliament is not in session, I spend a good deal of time and make from timber on the ground all tool handles that I need. I find them

nearly as good as any that are imported from America. I think that we ought to encourage an industry of this kind, and shall therefore vote for a duty.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The duty under the general Tariff has already been dealt with, and my amendment relates only to a British preference.

Mr. EDWARDS.—I regret very much that, although the Prime Minister and the Treasurer, when in London, talked largely of preferential trade, they have not kept faith with Great Britain. The principle of preference so far as this Parliament is concerned has been nothing but a sham. We ought to be prepared to make some little sacrifice to the Motherland. This Parliament has not dealt fairly with Great Britain, and I repeat that the promises made by the Prime Minister and the Treasurer when in the Old Country have not been fulfilled.

Mr. DEAKIN.—The honorable member is utterly wrong. I have done a good deal more than I undertook to do.

Mr. EDWARDS.—I know that the Prime Minister has done a great deal, but I have seen him in this House voting again and again against preferential duties in favour of Great Britain.

Mr. BAMFORD (Herbert) [3.7].—For the information of the Committee I should like to say that when I was in the north last year, I visited at Cairns a timber mill where I saw tool handles being freely produced. A shaping machine is used, and the timber is rapidly converted into pick or axe handles. First-class timber is available in the district, and a bushman whom I met there told me that he was taking back with him a dozen locally-produced axe handles, which had cost from 1s. 6d. to 1s. 9d. per dozen less than the imported article, and which, he said, were not only cheaper, but better, than the imported handles.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—There has been so much humbug in connexion with this matter, that I ask leave to withdraw my amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. WILSON (Corangamite) [3.9].—I move—

That the words "and on and after 7th December, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 15 per cent.," be added.

The honorable member for Herbert has just shown that under the old Tariff certain tool handles could be made here and

supplied at a cheaper rate than the imported handles.

Mr. BAMFORD.—That is under the present duty.

Mr. WILSON.—The duty under the old Tariff was 15 per cent. Whilst we may be able to produce some excellent tool handles, I would point out that there is a special class of axe handle, as well as adze, pick, and scythe handles, which should come in at a lower rate. The statement made by the honorable member for Fremantle, that it is the custom for bush-workers to purchase their handles from their employers, is correct, and as in some cases an imported handle is absolutely necessary this duty will fall directly upon the men who use them. I, therefore, hope that, in the interests of these men, the Committee will agree to my amendment.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Moreton) [3.11].—This is a paragraph that might very well be subdivided. It seems to me that we ought not to allow ordinary straight tool handles to come in at a low duty, but the position is different with regard to bent handles, which cannot be made here.

Mr. STORRER.—They can be made here.

Mr. SINCLAIR.—We may be making them on a very small scale.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—Cannot the honorable member put in a word for Queensland timbers?

Mr. SINCLAIR.—The Queensland timbers are as good as any to be found in Australia, but I do not say that we are making there all classes of bent handles. I therefore propose at the right time to move that a new paragraph be inserted under which axe, adze, and scythe handles shall be dutiable at 15 per cent.

Mr. EDWARDS (Oxley) [3.13].—When I was speaking a few moments ago I was informed that we had already dealt with the duty of 20 per cent. under the general Tariff, and I was led to lecture two members of the Government who, I said, had failed to carry out the promises made by them when in Great Britain. I wish to know, Mr. Chairman, whether I was misinformed.

The CHAIRMAN.—The honorable member's informant made a mistake. The honorable member for Parramatta at the time had simply moved to insert an amendment providing that imports from the United Kingdom should be dutiable at 15 per cent.

Sir JOHN FORREST (Swan) [3.14].—In my constituency there are 5,000 timber-getters, and every one of them uses an imported hickory axe handle for the reason that it is found to be the most suitable that can be obtained. If Queensland can supply axe handles that are equally good, why does she not give us some evidence of it? I hope that the Government will revert to the duty which prevailed under the old Tariff. This item relates to tools of trade and will be a tax upon the working man.

Mr. FRAZER (Kalgoorlie) [3.16].—The Treasurer might well consent to insert a new paragraph relating to bent handles. I feel disposed to support the Government proposal in regard to straight handles, which can be satisfactorily manufactured in Australia from locally-grown timbers; but as the evidence submitted to us this afternoon is that scythe, adze, and axe handles of the most suitable kind are not at present being made here, it would be well to subject them to a lower duty.

Mr. STORRER (Bass) [3.18].—The special pleading to which I have listened in connexion with this paragraph has occasioned me some surprise. I was brought up in the bush and have often seen youths make from locally-grown timbers axe handles equal to those imported from America. The honorable member for Herbert has spoken of the machinery in Queensland timber mills for making tool handles, and we all know that we have in Australia timber suitable for such a purpose. We have skilled men capable of turning out the very best handles, and they should receive some encouragement. We have been told that so far as these articles are concerned Australia cannot compete with America, but we should not forget that the United States owes her position to-day to the way in which she has built up her industries. If we wish to succeed we must encourage every industry, and perhaps the day will come when we shall be able to export tool handles of all descriptions.

Question.—That the words "and on and after 7th December, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 15 per cent.," be added (Mr. WILSON's amendment) — put. The Committee divided.

Aves	24
Noes	34
Majority	10

AYES.

Archer, E. W.
Brown, Thomas
Cook, Joseph
Fairbairn, G.
Forrest, Sir John
Fowler, J. M.
Frazer, C. E.
Fuller, G. W.
Glynn, P. McM.
Hedges, W. N.
Irvine, Hans
Irvine, W. H.
Johnston, W. E.

Knox, W.
Mahon, H.
Palmer, A. C.
Poynton, A.
Smith, Bruce
Thomson, Dugald
Willis, Henry
Wilson, J. G.
Wynne, A.

Tellers:

Bowden, E. K.
Wilks, W. H.

NOES.

Atkinson, L.
Bamford, F. W.
Batchelor, E. L.
Catts, J. H.
Chanter, J. M.
Chapman, Austin
Coon, J.
Crouch, R. A.
Deakin, A.
Edwards, R.
Fisher, A.
Groom, L. E.
Hughes, W. M.
Lyne, Sir William
Maloney, W. R. N.
Mathews, J.
Mauger, S.
McDougall, J. K.

O'Malley, King
Page, J.
Quick, Sir John
Salmon, C. C.
Sinclair, H.
Spence, W. G.
Storrer, D.
Thomas, J.
Thomson, John
Tudor, F. G.
Watkins, D.
Watson, J. C.
Webster, W.
Wise, G. H.

Tellers:

Cook, Hume
Hall, D. R.

PAIRS.

Brown, Tilley
Reid, G. H.
Liddell, F.
Fysh, Sir Philip
McWilliams, W. J.
Livingston, J.

Carr, E. S.
Ewing, T. T.
Foster, F. J.
Harper, R.
Hutchison, J.
Foxton, Colonel

Question so resolved in the negative.

Amendment negatived.

Amendment (by Mr. JOSEPH COOK)
put—

That the words "and on and after 7th December, 1907, ad val. (United Kingdom), 15 per cent.," be added—put.

The Committee divided.

Ayes	29
Noes	29

AYES.

Archer, E. W.
Brown, Thomas
Cook, Joseph
Edwards, R.
Fairbairn, G.
Forrest, Sir J.
Fowler, J. M.
Frazer, C. E.
Fuller, G. W.
Glynn, P. McM.
Hedges, W. N.
Hume, W. M.
Hans
Irvine, W. H.
John, W. E.

Knox, W.
Mahon, H.
Palmer, A. C.
Poynton, A.
Sinclair, H.
Smith, Bruce
Thomson, Dugald
Wilks, W. H.
Willis, Henry
Wilson, J. G.
Wynne, A.

Tellers:

Atkinson, L.
Bowden, E. K.

NOES.

Bamford, F. W.
Batchelor, E. L.
Catts, J. H.
Chanter, J. M.
Chapman, Austin
Coon, J.
Deakin, A.
Fisher, A.
Groom, L. E.
Hall, D. R.
Lyne, Sir William
Maloney, W. R. N.
Mathews, J.
Mauger, S.
McDougall, J. K.

O'Malley, King
Page, J.
Quick, Sir John
Salmon, C. C.
Spence, W. G.
Storrer, D.
Thomson, John
Tudor, F. G.
Watkins, D.
Watson, J. C.
Webster, W.
Wise, G. H.
Tellers:
Cook, Hume
Crouch, R. A.

PAIRS.

Brown, Tilley
Reid, G. H.
Liddell, F.
Fysh, Sir Philip
McWilliams, W. J.
Livingston, J.

Carr, E. S.
Ewing, T. T.
Foster, F. J.
Harper, R.
Hutchison, J.
Foxton, Colonel

The CHAIRMAN.—The numbers being equal, I give my casting vote with the Ayes.

Question so resolved in the affirmative.

Amendment agreed to.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Moreton) [3.30].—I move—

That the following new item be inserted—
399A. "Adze, axe, scythe, and bent wood handles, on and after 7th December, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 15 per cent."

I do not make this motion with the object of singling out any particular industry or to specially benefit the users of these handles, but because they are not made here. The amendment, if agreed to, will overcome a great deal of the difficulty experienced here in trying to afford as much protection as we possibly can to our artisans, while making such tools of trade as cannot be made here dutiable at as low a rate as possible.

• Mr. HEDGES (Fremantle) [3.32].—I think I rose before the honorable member for Moreton, and I intended to move a similar amendment, but I should have included all handles used by mechanics. I would ask the honorable member if he can see his way to include mechanics' tool handles in his amendment.

Mr. SINCLAIR.—I am afraid that that would be too big an order.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [3.33].—I hope the amendment will not be agreed to. Honorable members might just as well strike out the whole item.

Proposed new item agreed to.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [3.36].—Will the Minister agree to a preferential rate in the new paragraph, to bring it into line with similar items? I move—

That the words “(United Kingdom), 10 per cent.,” be added to the new item just inserted.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [3.37].—If the Committee intend to go on as they have begun, the sooner we stop the better, because the rate proposed by the Government is the old duty, and is recommended by the Tariff Commission.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—If the Treasurer is going to debate the amendment, I will withdraw it.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Item 310 (Doors of wood) agreed to.

Item 311. Photograph Frames and Stands for Pictures, Picture Frames (on pictures or otherwise), ad val., 35 per cent.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [3.38].—Why this extraordinary and unjustifiable increase from 20 to 35 per cent.? I wish that the Chairman of the Tariff Commission, whose example the Minister is evidently following in connexion with this item, would explain why it is necessary to propose a 75 per cent. increase of duty. I could understand some of these huge duties, from a protectionist point of view, being placed upon articles which require rare and special skill, but this is an article whose manufacture calls for only the most rudimentary skill.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [3.40].—A mass of evidence was given with reference to the picture frame making industry and moulding industry. The honorable member for Parramatta will find it summarized on page 479 of the report of the protectionist section of the Tariff Commission. The manufacturers complained that they were being inundated with cheap picture frames from America, lightly constructed and attractive in appearance, and that they had to face fierce and intense competition. They also pointed out that in Australia they had to pay duty on the moulding, which was their raw material. In this matter two industries have to be considered—the making of mouldings and the making of picture frames. Of course the picture frame maker would like his mouldings free, but on the other hand a number of manufacturers are engaged in making splendid mouldings of Australian

timber. Samples of them were exhibited in this building yesterday. Some made from Queensland timbers would defy the world for brilliancy of finish and excellence of workmanship.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—We have given an extra protection to the makers of mouldings.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—The Committee last night unanimously increased the duty on mouldings from 20 to 30 per cent. It was felt that we ought to promote the moulding industry, which is the basis and foundation of the picture frame making industry. Having increased the duty on the raw material, we should raise rather than reduce the duty on picture frames, as the interests of the Australian manufacturers should be considered. In fact, I understand that the honorable member for Kooyong has received this morning a letter, in which the picture frame makers complain of the altered incidence of the duties, and ask for the addition of an alternative duty of 4d. per foot. I can assure the honorable member for Parramatta that the duty on this item ought to be increased, rather than reduced.

Mr. KNOX (Kooyong) [3.43].—I received to-day the letter which I hold in my hand, from a well-known firm of picture frame makers. They ask, in consequence of the changes made last night in the timber duties, that there should be added to this item the words “or 4d. per foot, whichever is the higher rate.”

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—We do not want those double-barrelled duties.

Mr. KNOX.—I do not believe in them myself; but practically the whole of the trade makes this request.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—They have got their timber reduced, and an extra duty on imported mouldings. They should be satisfied.

Mr. KNOX.—Those who write to me are responsible people, who speak, not only on behalf of themselves as manufacturers, but for the whole of the trade. They point out that there is a big industry in Melbourne, Sydney, and Brisbane, and that, in consequence of the cheap picture frames which are introduced from various parts of Germany, it would be hopeless for them to expect to make any profit out of the business. I have no personal knowledge as to whether their representations are correct, but they are a most reputable firm, and their statements may safely be

taken as fair and reasonable. They say that, owing to the importation of the 3-ply veneer to Australia, the importation of manufactured frames had been almost knocked out under the old Tariff, with the exception of a few of very inferior quality, but if the duties were to remain as they now stand, all those who are now making picture frames in Australia must close up. There must be thirty firms manufacturing these frames in Australia at present, and it would be a most serious matter to the whole industry to reduce the proposed duty.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [3.47].—I wish I had not spoken. It seems to me that I am in danger of causing the proposed duty to be doubled. Perhaps I had better say no more about it, except to move—

That the words "and on and after 7th December, 1907, ad val. (United Kingdom), 30 per cent.," be added.

Amendment negatived.

Item agreed to.

Item 312. Lasts and Trees, wooden, ad val. (General Tariff), 35 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 25 per cent.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Moreton) [3.48].—I see no justification for this high duty on lasts. How does the Minister arrive at the conclusion that it is necessary? The protectionist section of the Tariff Commission recommended only 25 per cent. In order to obtain an explanation from the Minister, I move—

That after the words "35 per cent." the words "and on and after 7th December, 1907 (General Tariff), free," be inserted.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [3.49].—I hope the honorable member will not press the amendment. The duty proposed, as against the United Kingdom, is recommended by the protectionist section of the Tariff Commission, while the free-trade section recommend 20 per cent., which is nearly as high. I took the recommendation of the former for the United Kingdom column, and proposed a duty of 25 per cent. in the General Tariff column, in order to give a preference of 10 per cent. When both sections of the Tariff Commission so nearly agree, there must be some very strong reason in the evidence why a substantial duty should be imposed.

Mr. JOHNSON (Lang) [3.50].—I desire to remind honorable members of a fact which has very often been explained, namely, that the recommendations of the

free-trade section of the Tariff Commission were intended to be taken only in conjunction with a general Tariff scheme, and that they hold good only so long as the whole scheme is accepted. When that scheme is departed from, these recommendations simply go by the board; and the Treasurer appears to have quite overlooked this governing factor. I shall support the proposal to make the item free.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [3.51].—I hope that this duty will not be rejected. Honorable members may be surprised to learn the immensity of this trade in lasts. One witness said that he was already making 250 a day, and yet the imports were much in excess of the local production. The Tariff Commission was also informed that it is very desirable to have lasts manufactured here, in order to meet the constantly changing requirements of the boot-making trade.

Mr. COON (Batman) [3.53].—Under the old Tariff the raw material of these lasts was admitted free, whereas now a duty of 10 per cent. is proposed. The last which I hold in my hand is made in a factory where forty hands are employed, and where, if the duty on the finished article be imposed, the number of employes will be increased to 120.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Of what wood is the last produced made?

Mr. COON.—I am not so sure; but lasts of the kind are made throughout Australia.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Under what item is the wood of that last made dutiable?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—The wood is n.e.i.

Mr. COON.—The average wage in this trade is £2 per week, counting men and boys; and I trust that the duty will be imposed.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [3.55].—Since this item proposes to give preference to the United Kingdom I think I shall be in order in calling the attention of the Minister of Trade and Customs to an announcement which appears in the newspapers of this morning. It would appear that the Department or the Minister—I do not know which—is now legislating by regulation in a different way from that intended by Parliament; and the seriousness of the position leads me to call attention to the matter at the earliest possible moment. The will of Parliament ought to be carried out by the

Minister and the Department; and I call attention to the following announcement in this morning's Melbourne Age.

The CHAIRMAN.—I ask the honorable member not to go into this matter fully, or he will open up a general discussion on the question of preference.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I have no desire to cause a general debate on the question, but merely to inquire whether regulations have been made as stated by the newspaper. The announcement is as follows—

The "A" certificate makes the manufacturer or supplier of goods in Great Britain certify that all the goods set out in a given invoice are "*bond fide* the produce or manufacture of the United Kingdom, and that a substantial portion of the labour of that country has entered into the production of every manufactured article included in the said invoice to the extent in each article of not less than one-fourth of the value of every such article in its present condition ready for export to the Commonwealth of Australia."

If I were debating the matter, I should point to the enormous difficulty which must be created by such a regulation. We here decided that certain articles from Great Britain should receive preference, whatever proportion of labour might be involved; but the Department or the Minister now requires that the labour must be equal to 25 per cent. Our decision had no reference to the labour employed, but merely required that the article should be produced or manufactured in Great Britain.

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—Many of the goods sent from Great Britain to Australia are manufactured in other countries.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Let me point out that although sugar does not grow in the United Kingdom, a preference is given in the case of British confectionery. Is that preference to be withheld in every instance in which 25 per cent. of British labour has not been employed? If this regulation be enforced, there will be not only enormous difficulty caused to the exporter and to the Department, but also an absolute departure from the decision at which we arrived, knowing that in the case of many articles 25 per cent. of British or any labour was not employed. In fact, the labour in some articles might not be 5 per cent. of their value.

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN (Eden-Monaro — Minister of Trade and Customs) [4.3]. — I shall be very glad to give consideration to the repre-

sentations of the honorable member for North Sydney. In dealing with this matter, our aim has been to attain as far as possible uniformity throughout the Empire. This preferential idea is spreading, and if there be uniformity it will make the administration much smoother. The regulations, as a matter of fact, are identical with the preferential regulations in other parts of the Empire; and we must be very careful to give preference to goods that are really British, and not to goods which just flit through Great Britain on their way to Australia. If preference be given to goods of the latter class, we shall place Great Britain at a disadvantage, and, in fact, defeat the very object we have in view. I am pleased that the honorable member has raised the question, and I shall look further into it.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—All that is required is to see that goods are the legitimate manufacture of Great Britain without any reference to the percentage of labour.

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—Quite so; but there must be some clear lines laid down—some definition of the goods entitled to preference.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Surely that is for honorable members to determine?

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—Certainly; and, as I say, I shall be glad to give the representations of the honorable member for North Sydney every consideration. This question must be discussed when the Tariff Bill is introduced. It is the desire of every one of us to place preference on a fair and equitable basis; and in what we have done we have, to a great extent, been guided by the experience in other parts of the Empire.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [4.4].—I confess that the point raised by the honorable member for North Sydney had escaped my observation.

The CHAIRMAN.—I allowed the honorable member for North Sydney to call attention to this matter, and the Minister to reply. It is true that that was slightly irregular; but I regarded the question as important enough to justify the latitude given. I must ask honorable members, however, not to debate further the general question of preference.

Item agreed to.

Item 313. Buggy shafts, bent, but not dressed, per pair, 2s. 6d.

Mr. WILKS (Dalley) [4.6].—This item is the first of a group relating to parts used in the manufacture of buggies. I should like to know the reason for substituting specific duties for *ad valorem* rates in respect of these items.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—All these specific duties are merely devices for concealing inordinately high rates.

Mr. WILKS.—I am inclined to agree with the honorable member. If we wish to levy high imposts, do not let us disguise them by substituting specific duties for *ad valorem* rates. The Treasurer asks that a fixed duty shall be imposed upon buggy shafts, bent, but not dressed, notwithstanding that under the old Tariff they were admitted free. I would further point out that these shafts are a portion of the raw material of the coachbuilder. They are made mainly from hickory and American ash.

Mr. CHANTER.—The question is not worth arguing.

Mr. WILKS.—The coachbuilders think that it is. The fixed duty now proposed would work most inequitably, in that it would fall equally upon the lowest and the highest grade of buggy shafts. In other words, the same charge would be levied upon the cheapest and the most expensive shafts. The duty proposed would also be a tax upon all those in the country districts who use buggies. I suggest that buggy shafts in the rough should be admitted free, and that shafts bent and dressed should be dutiable at 1s. 6d. per pair, or at an *ad valorem* rate of 20 per cent.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Fixed duties have been agreed to in respect of a good many other items.

Mr. WILKS.—My objection is based upon the enormous increase that is proposed.

Mr. CHANTER.—Twenty per cent. would work out at about 2s. per pair.

Mr. WILKS.—In any case I would prefer an *ad valorem* rate. I move—

That the words "and on and after 7th December, 1907, free," be added.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN (Calare) [4.13].—This item is important, in that it governs a group of items relating to a particular industry. I should like to know whether I shall be in order in referring generally to that group?

The CHAIRMAN.—The honorable member may make incidental reference to

other items, but he will not be in order in debating them.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—In discussing this item we must bear in mind the extent to which our decision will affect the industry which is particularly concerned.

Mr. WILKS.—The small coachbuilders will be chiefly affected.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—The duty proposed will fall heaviest upon the small coachbuilders who are carrying on operations in country districts. We must recollect that they have to place their manufactures upon the market at a price approximating that at which the large manufacturers are able to sell. There is scarcely a country town in New South Wales in which there is not to be found a blacksmith who is also a coachbuilder and buggy maker. He usually devotes the "slack" period of the year to the manufacture of sulkies and buggies, which vehicles are commonly used in rural areas. He is unable to procure his raw material locally. As a matter of fact the greater portion of it—especially for the lighter class of vehicles—must be imported. The general consensus of opinion among buggy manufacturers is that hickory and other woods will continue to be imported irrespective of the duty which may be imposed upon them. A high duty will only operate in the direction of limiting the output of vehicles made of these materials. The contention of the buggy manufacturers is that the proposals of the Government in respect of the group of items to which I have referred will operate distinctly to their detriment. I should like the Committee to understand that this industry is a very considerable one, that it is not concentrated in the big cities, but that it is distributed throughout our small centres. The proposals of the Government, if agreed to, will have the effect of concentrating the industry in the large manufacturing shops of the cities. Is that a wise result to bring about? If the Committee is prepared to look beyond the interests of the timber-getters some modification of the proposal immediately under consideration must be adopted.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Does the honorable member know that this proposal is equivalent to an *ad valorem* rate of only 10 per cent.?

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—The Coachbuilders' and Wheelwrights' Association have considered this matter, and have

placed their position before the members of this Committee. They declare that under the old Tariff they were enabled to build up their industry to such an extent that their annual output was valued at, approximately, £2,000,000. As against that large sum, our total importations were valued at only £10,000. The members of the Coachbuilders' and Wheelwrights' Association hold that they have so completely got the control of the industry, that they do not fear importations.

Mr. WATSON.—They only assemble the imported parts.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—They say that they are prepared to face competition, and, in order to meet the position raised by the honorable member, they are willing to accept the duty on the made vehicle or the completed parts. They object to the duty on the parts which they use in their industry, and which must be imported.

Mr. WATSON.—In Queensland and New South Wales, there is an abundant supply of spotted gum suitable for the production of shafts.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—Do I understand the honorable member to imply that spotted gum is suitable for all this work?

Mr. WATSON.—No; but it is for shafts.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—I have no doubt that Australian timber will be used where it can be done profitably. But the men who are engaged in the trade assert that for the lighter vehicle and the lighter work in vehicles, they are compelled to make these importations or to cease the manufacture of vehicles. They say that for the heavier work in their trade they can secure Australian timber, and that they use it wherever it can be done with advantage. But they contend that the smaller parts for the lighter conveyances, such as buggies and sulkies, and the parts of those conveyances which require durability and strength must be imported. The association I mentioned state in their circular that the imports of softwoods amount to about 115,000,000 feet per annum, and that out of the large quantity required only 4,500,000 feet can be obtained from Queensland. That indicates to what a small extent, even in those particular lines which are not the main lines for which an exemption is required, the Commonwealth is able to meet the great demand for these kinds of wood. The association also state that within the last two years the prices

of such woods in the Commonwealth have advanced fully 50 per cent., and that the manufacturers have to pay 50 per cent. more to-day than they did a few years ago. That is only in accord with the general rise in the prices of all the timbers that are used. I am not an expert in this matter, and, therefore, I have to rely for my information upon those who are engaged in the trade. Perhaps I may be permitted to read a few extracts from a letter I have received from a manufacturer in a country town with whom I am acquainted. I know that his opinion is worthy of every consideration, and that his statements can be relied upon. He is managing a company that has gradually grown from a small beginning to fairly large dimensions. He writes—

We have been negotiating to put machinery into our works, but in view of the duties being imposed, we have abandoned the idea.

He cancelled temporarily the work which was being taken in hand to instal the new machinery. He continues—

We have been in business for eighteen years, and we have made a success of it. At the present time we employ about twenty-five hands, and I must say that had we to contend in the earlier stages with these excessive duties we would never have built our business up to what it is to-day. We have mechanics who have been in our employ for years, and if these duties are imposed it will mean, in place of increasing our plant, we must reduce the number of hands employed by us, and our business will be one more of repairing than of manufacturing, for when the prices are increased the demand is always lessened. It would suit us to have the additional duties taken off, which I consider is a fair thing, knowing that there is a specific duty on vehicles, &c. Spring carts, drays, and waggon wheels are all made from Colonial timber, and that shows clearly that if hickory was procurable here we would not mind the imposition of the additional duties.

Mr. STORRER.—Does he want the duty taken off the finished article, as well as the parts?

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—No; he wants a duty on the finished article.

Mr. TUDOR.—He wants the duty taken off the parts which he uses.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—He is a good protectionist, like my honorable friends who interject. It is only the very necessity of the position that compels him to ask for the reduction of the duties on the American timbers which must be used. He says that the position has reached this acute stage: that those who give orders to America for such timbers have to wait for

a period extending to eighteen months until they can be executed. So that there are difficulties even in getting the timbers from America, and that in itself would be sufficient to induce the manufacturers to use colonial timbers wherever it was possible to do so. If honorable members will refer to the Tariff of Canada, they will see that an exception is made in favour of hickory and the other timbers which are required for the manufacture of coaches and buggies, and which are being imported to Australia. The same thing obtains in New Zealand; in fact, in every protectionist country in which those special timbers are not grown. In such countries these timbers are regarded as the raw materials of the coachbuilders and wheelwrights, and because they cannot be locally produced they are placed on the free list. We are asked by the Coachbuilders' and Wheelwrights' Association to follow the examples of those countries. They ask that the specific duties generally be eliminated, and replaced with *ad valorem* duties. They hold that a specific duty falls as heavily on the lighter and less expensive vehicle as on the heavier and more expensive vehicle. The less expensive vehicles are used by the poorer classes, and if these duties are retained the burden of this taxation will fall upon them in a measure out of proportion to their more wealthy countrymen. As regards their raw material, this association have expressed their readiness to accept the old duties. They recommend that the more complete the manufactured article is the higher *ad valorem* duty it should bear, until the completed article is reached, when, of course, they are prepared to accept any duty which the Committee may impose, so far as its maximum is concerned. They ask that in the interests of their industry their representations may receive the favorable consideration of the Committee. Whether they be free-traders or protectionists, they are unanimously of the opinion that this schedule, if it is passed, will do a very grave injury to their industry; and that a number of the articles which are heavily taxed in the interest of Australian timbers must be imported because they cannot be produced here. I am prepared to support the amendment of the honorable member for Dalley, because under the old Tariff this industry was able to so completely outstrip the consumption in the Commonwealth that less than £10,000 covered the exportations.

r. Thomas Brown.

Mr. HEDGES (Fremantle) [4.34].—There is evidently some mistake with regard to this item, because the Treasurer has just stated that the duty is equal to only 10 per cent. He must have taken the price to refer to a dozen instead of a gross.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—No; I said that that had been reported to me.

Mr. HEDGES.—I think that the honorable gentleman will acknowledge that there is something wrong about the item. I find that the duty is equal to over 100 per cent. From the most reliable people in Melbourne, Messrs. Ewing and Company, I have just learned by telephone that they can easily land hickory shafts at 3s. per pair, and hickory poles at 5s. each. I ask the Minister to reconsider the item, or to procure further information.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I am waiting for some information which I expect to receive in a few minutes.

Mr. HEDGES.—It appears to me that all the items from 313 to 320 are affected. If the Minister's information is wrong in one case, it is wrong in all the others. I would suggest that the words, "including poles, swingle-bars and shaft bars made of hickory in the rough—free," be added to the item. If the Minister will not consent to that, it appears to me that we shall have to take the whole of these items separately.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [4.36].—There seems to have been a mistake in this instance. The calculation has been made per dozen instead of per gross. The officers now tell me that the percentage is much higher than was at first stated. I think that it would be better to have an *ad valorem* duty.

Mr. TUDOR.—The free-trade section of the Tariff Commission recommended 20 per cent.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I am not going to take as low a duty as 20 per cent. Perhaps duties of 25 per cent. and 35 per cent. would meet the case.

Mr. WILKS (Dalley) [4.40].—I am glad that the Treasurer has dropped the idea of having a fixed duty in preference to an *ad valorem*. I should like to meet him, provided he does not propose too high a duty. I ask leave to withdraw my amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That the words "and on and after 7th December, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 30 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 25 per cent.," be added.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 314. Buggy shafts, bent and dressed, per pair, 3s. 6d.

Item 315. Shafts, n.e.i., in the rough, per pair, 3s.

Item 316. Shafts, n.e.i., dressed, per pair, 4s.

Item 317. Bent poles, rough, each, 2s. 6d.

Item 318. Bent poles, dressed, each, 3s. 6d.

Item 319. Whiffle tree bars, per dozen, 3s.

Item 320. Shaft bars, per dozen, 4s. 6d.

Amendments (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That the words "and on and after 7th December, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 30 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 25 per cent.," be added to items 314 to 320.

Item 321. Casks, barrels, and vats, n.e.i., full or empty, ad val., 35 per cent.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [4.45].—I move—

That the words "and on and after 7th December, 1907—Item 321. Casks, barrels, and vats, n.e.i. (intended to contain liquids), empty or containing goods not subject to ad val. duty, ad val. (General Tariff), 35 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 30 per cent.," be added.

The reasons for this amendment are that experience of the new item has shown that in practically every instance in which casks containing dry goods or goods other than fluids are imported, the casks are to all intents and purposes of no value when emptied of their imported contents. Such casks as those containing pickled cabbage, olives, sheep dip, &c., have been brought under the notice of the Department as being casks which are valueless after being emptied of their imported contents. Hitherto, the practice of the Department has been to deal with each case on its merits, and allow the casks to be entered as of no value for duty in those cases in which they were of no value as casks when emptied. Whilst a strict reading of the present wording of this item would require that the value of the casks containing goods subject to *ad valorem* duty should be included in the value of those goods for duty, and, in addition, that the special duty placed on casks under this item should be charged, the practice of the Department is to charge only the special duty under this item, and to exclude the value of the casks from the value of their *ad valorem* contents for duty. The proposed amendment will give legislative effect to this

practice, and will afford relief both to the Department and to the public without injuring the local coopering trade. The substance of the explanation which I have given is that when casks are imported containing such goods as printers' ink or olives they are of no further use. Therefore, it is not considered fair to charge duty on them. But when wine casks or whisky casks, which can be used again, are brought in, duty is charged on them. It is most unfair to charge duty on casks which simply have to be broken up for firewood.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [4.50].—The Minister under this item is proposing to charge a special duty on packages which are necessary to the safe conveyance of goods to their place of destination, although we have already decided that when iron tanks are used for this purpose—and they are saleable at prices nearer their cost than are any other packages—they shall be admitted duty free.

Mr. MAUGER.—Casks are in a different category from tanks.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I do not think so. The casks in which goods are brought here cannot be made in the country, and if a duty of 35 per cent. is charged on them, it will in many cases greatly increase the gross duty on their contents, which may be dutiable nominally at much lower rates. Sometimes casks have to be used for the importation of comparatively cheap goods, or of goods upon which the duty is very small. Although the proposal has been put forward with a view to assisting the coopering industry, it may really have the effect of taking some work from the coopers. Most of the tallow casks and many other casks used in Australia are made from local timbers, but there are casks for which only imported timbers can be used, and if they are not re-made from imported casks the timber for them will have to be imported in staves, or in the rough, ready to be cut up into staves. By keeping out the casks we shall take from the coopers a good deal of the business in re-making which now goes on. No one would import casks if he could get here casks made of suitable material; but for some purposes special timber is requisite. It may be necessary to use an absolutely tasteless timber, or a non-porous timber, or a timber possessing some other special quality which can be obtained only in imported wood.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Mountain ash, blackbutt and Tasmanian blackwood make better wine casks than any that are imported.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Perhaps so; but such casks will never be exported to bring back wine, spirits, or other contents.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—May not some of the casks which are imported be filled with wine and exported?

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The casks which are imported filled with liquid or goods are, after being emptied, sold for less than their cost, and some of them may be exported; but I maintain that it is not a proper thing, after it has been determined that a certain commodity shall bear a certain duty, to increase that duty by imposing a heavy rate on the package in which it is brought out.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—What does the honorable member suggest?

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I would strike out the words "or full."

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—And allow casks to come in free?

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Yes, full ones; just as tanks are allowed to come in free.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—Tanks are allowed to come in free because the plea was made that they are necessary to the existence of the poor farmer.

Mr. TUDOR.—Besides, we do not make iron tanks here, while we do make casks.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—We do not and cannot make the casks which are imported full of liquid or other goods; because they must be provided at the place of origin. It would never pay to send empty casks Home to be filled.

Mr. TUDOR.—If no duty is imposed, casks may be imported filled with goods much less valuable than they are.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—That could be prevented by inserting the words "casks full, in which goods are ordinarily imported, free." There is a similar provision in the Tariff regarding outside packages. I do not desire that the Tariff shall be evaded, but we ought not to place on outside packages a duty which materially adds to the gross duty payable on the contents.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—A cask is not an outside package.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—When it contains liquid it certainly is.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—An "outside package" implies an inner package.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I think it merely implies contents. Would the honorable member say that where goods are imported in small packages within an outside package the outside package should be admitted free, but that when they are packed in it in bulk it should not be regarded as an outside package? I do not think that that would be a fair rule to make. In my opinion the present practice should continue. The importers are accustomed to it, and the proposed change will create considerable confusion, without giving effective protection to coopers. I wish to amend the original item by moving—

That the words "full or" be left out.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [5.4].—The importation of casks was brought before the Tariff Commission by a witness who represented the Coopers' Association. He strongly objected to the practice of allowing full casks to be imported free of duty, because, when emptied, they have a marketable value.

Mr. MAHON.—As a rule, a very small one.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—The importers sometimes dispose of them at good prices, and occasionally dump them on the market at very low prices. Sometimes these casks are well and strongly built, and are very valuable; but they are sacrificed or sold at a very low price indeed, and thus come into competition with the locally-made casks and barrels. The coopers say that if a duty were placed upon these casks, the importers would be induced to add the duty to the price they demanded for these discarded casks, and that that would lessen the extent of their competition with the locally-made article by bringing up their price more nearly to that demanded for locally-made casks.

Mr. MCWILLIAMS.—As a rule, they are sold for whatever they will bring.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—Very often they are almost given away, and it is on that account the local coopers complain that they come into competition with the casks locally made.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The imposition of a duty would not prevent the importation of these casks.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—I admit that they will continue to be imported, but they are a valuable commodity. A cask imported

full of brandy or whisky has, when empty, a certain market value, nearly equal to the value of a new cask, and in some cases possibly these casks are of greater value, because they have been matured, than are new casks. The coopers say that these second-hand casks have a life of from ten to twenty years.

Mr. FRAZER.—Does the honorable member think that the imposition of a duty would lead to a diminution in the number of casks imported?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—No; the coopers admit that they will still come in, but they say that if a duty be imposed they will have an added value, and so will not compete on such advantageous terms with locally-made casks.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—These casks will still sell at exactly the same price here.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—No; they would sell at present prices, plus the duty.

Mr. MCWILLIAMS.—What addition to the price would the duty involve?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—I believe that brandy and whisky casks are sold at from £1 to 25s. each.

Mr. HANS IRVINE.—They are worth about £1 each.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—The duty would therefore amount to 5s. or 6s. on each cask, and the local coopers say that it would cause these discarded casks to be sold at a higher rate, and that they would not then come into such severe competition with new casks locally made.

Mr. FRAZER.—Are not the importers more likely to charge the increased duty on the liquid which the casks contain?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—I do not think they would increase the price of the contents to the consumer by the amount of the duty imposed on the casks. I think they would try to recover the duty by charging more for the empty casks, and that would to some extent prevent them being dumped on the market as they are at the present time in competition with the new casks locally made. That is the coopers' case, and I think there is a great deal in it. If these casks were sold at their legitimate value there would not be the same competition with locally-made casks.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The honorable member will not find importers selling casks at a penny less than they can get for them.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—One witness who appeared before the Tariff Commission said that, in Victoria alone, upwards of 15,000 second-hand casks are placed on the market every year in competition with new casks locally made. I think that the proposal submitted by the Treasurer is better, because more discriminating, than that recommended by the Tariff Commission. It will not impose a duty on ink casks, pitch casks, or other casks that have no marketable value when emptied of their contents, but only on casks which have a legitimate and considerable market value. I think that is a fair thing.

Mr. FRAZER (Kalgoorlie) [5.11].—I feel disposed to vote in favour of a substantial duty in order that the work of making casks shall be retained for our local coopers. I am prepared to be guided by the advice of the authorities on the question whether the duty should be a fixed or an *ad valorem* duty. But I must say that on the question now before the Committee the argument to which we have listened from the honorable member for Bendigo is quite beside the mark. I could understand the honorable member pleading for a special duty on full casks if that would have the effect of reducing the number imported, because that would give a wider market to the Australian industry.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—We have put a duty on full bottles.

Mr. FRAZER.—The honorable member admits that the imposition of a duty on full casks would not reduce by a single cask the number imported. Therefore, the only possible result of the imposition of such a duty would be to add to the cost of the contents imported in these casks, and the argument that it would lessen the competition with the locally-made article is immediately exploded. I remind honorable members of the course adopted by the Committee in dealing with tanks imported as packages for goods, and which also come into competition with a local industry.

Mr. MATHEWS.—That was done in the interests of the "poor farmer."

Mr. FRAZER.—It would be very much easier to find other means for importing the goods which are imported in tanks than it would be to find other means of importing the liquids which are now imported in casks. The appeal for the poor farmer, as the honorable member for Melbourne Ports says, might have led the Committee

to take the course it did in dealing with full tanks, but that does not alter the position in this case. Casks will continue to be imported whether a duty is imposed upon them or not, and they must continue to come into competition with the local article.

Mr. MATHEWS.—Yes; but by placing a duty on full casks the importers would be induced to charge a higher price for them when their contents have been discharged.

Mr. FRAZER.—I ask the honorable member to say whether he thinks the importers would give these casks away, or would sell them for 2s., if they could get 4s. for them? Does the honorable member really believe that the imposition of the duty would give these casks an increased value?

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—They are waste products after the importers have done with them, but they get what they can for them.

Mr. FRAZER.—These casks may be waste products, but they have a certain value, and I am at a loss to understand how the imposition of a duty upon them will increase their value, which must be determined by their fitness for any use to which it might be desired to put them. I think the best thing we can do is to maintain the conditions which prevailed under the old Tariff, and impose a duty upon the next item, which would secure to the coopers of Australia the making of the casks required in this country.

Mr. HANS IRVINE (Grampians) [5.17].—I did not desire to say anything at this stage. Casks, barrels, and vats are valued for Customs purposes at 22s. 6d. for hogsheads and 14s. 6d. for quarter casks. In the case of hogsheads, containing about 60 gallons, the duty proposed would amount to an added tax of about 2½d. per gallon for the casings alone. That seems to me to be an extraordinary amount of duty to charge on casings. As the honorable member for Kalgoorlie has pointed out, liquid contents must be brought here in something. I wish to see Australian woods used wherever possible in connexion with all our manufactures, but I suppose it will be admitted that it would be impracticable, at present, to send Australian woods to Great Britain for the manufacture of the casks to be shipped back to Australia with goods. I am quite willing that an effective protective duty should be placed upon empty casks. The people who use casks do not

desire to import empty casks, but as primary producers they do expect to be able to obtain as cheaply as possible casks imported with contents, on which duty has already been paid. I wish the Treasurer to think that over. I suppose I can claim to have tried as much to advance Australian industries as the Treasurer has done. I have had some thousands of Australian casks made, but seven years ago my advices were that if I shipped wines in casks made of Australian woods they would be refused. I can tell honorable members why. I heard the Treasurer mention mountain ash and also blackwood as suitable timbers for casks.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I said blackbutt, too.

Mr. HANS IRVINE.—I have not tried blackbutt, but I have tried blackwood, and I am prepared to sell the Treasurer some thousands of blackwood staves today at a twentieth of what they cost me. I cannot use them, and I should like the honorable gentleman to take them off my hands, because they are becoming worm-eaten, and are an eyesore to me. I shipped a few hundred hogsheads, and there were complaints that the casks, though they had been treated with caustic soda to purify them, tainted the wine. The wood is too bitter. It is splendid for cabinet purposes, but it is not good for shipping wines or liquids that must maintain a special flavour.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I know that some people at Albury have used Australian casks.

Mr. HANS IRVINE.—If they did they lost their shipping business. I remember Albury thirty years ago, as the Treasurer does. I have had large quantities of mountain ash casks made in Melbourne. They are of no commercial value after they reach London. Merchants will not buy them. At Home they get a fixed price of 5s. for secondhand hogsheads. The great majority of the Australian woods, besides tainting the contents, are too brittle. I desire to encourage the use of Australian casks, and would place an order to-morrow if I were told where I could get Australian wood fit to make casks suitable for wine for the British trade. I could give the names of men who have made casks in Melbourne. There is little or no demand for them for shipping wine, though they are used for holding tallow and other things. The goods contained in full casks imported

have already paid a high duty, and surely it is not desired to charge a second duty on the casks. As the honorable member for Kalgoorlie pointed out, those casks are practically a by-product, and are sold for whatever they will bring in the open market. When empty, they only bring 5s. each at Home. I imported a large number of casks from Sydney last year because I was shipping a fair quantity at the time. I got them put on board at 10s., while similar casks, if made here, would have cost me £1 apiece. That is a consideration to me, because I can charge nothing for the casks in selling my produce. It is only fair and right, in the interest of the primary producer, that full casks should be admitted free, as they were under the old Tariff. A duty on them will be a tax on the primary producer. If the Treasurer wishes to encourage the making of casks here, I do not object to his imposing a higher duty on empties than is proposed in the Tariff; but I strongly object to any tax on casks that come here full.

Mr. MAHON (Coolgardie) [5.24].—I rise to get a little information from the honorable and learned member for Bendigo. I understood him to say that if an extra duty were put on full casks, they would sell at a higher price when cast off by the importer, and that, therefore, he wants a duty imposed so that the competition with the local article may be lessened.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—So that there should be greater equality in competition.

Mr. MAHON.—The honorable and learned member contends then that the duty would increase the price?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—That is the contention of the coopers.

Mr. MAHON.—But we have listened here for six years to the contention of protectionists that a duty always lowers the price of the article on which it is imposed. Which side of that argument are we to accept? At one time, we are told that a protective duty will lower the cost of the commodity to the consumer; but now the honorable and learned member for Bendigo tells us that the imposition of a duty will increase the price.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—I did not say that. I said it would increase the price of the second-hand casks, not of the locally-made cask.

Mr. MAHON.—By-and-by the honorable and learned member will argue that to impose a higher duty on an article will lower the cost.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—So it will in many cases.

Mr. MAHON.—It is certain that the two contentions cannot be right. A duty cannot lower the price in one case and raise it in another. The difficulty I am in about this item is that, if the duty on full casks is increased, the importer will simply put the increased cost on to the price of the liquid, and get his profit out of that. He will still sell the casks as he does now at the highest price he can get. Being unable to get any explanation from the honorable and learned member for Bendigo of the enigma of a duty in one case lowering, and in another case raising the price to the consumer—each side of the case being advocated by protectionists—I shall resume my seat.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [5.28].—Will the Minister withdraw his amendment, in order to allow me to move the omission of the words "full or"?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [5.29].—I have decided to resort to the old practice of allowing full casks to come in free, but I shall ask the Committee to impose a high duty on the empty casks.

Mr. WYNNE.—Hear, hear. Thirty-five and 30 per cent.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I propose to ask for duties of 35 and 30 per cent. I desire to withdraw my amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendments (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That the words "full or" be left out.

That after the words "35 per cent." the words "and on and after 7th December, 1907 (United Kingdom), 30 per cent.," be added.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 322. Hogsheads, secondhand, full or empty, each 12s.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [5.31].—I propose to omit the words "full or" in this item also.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [5.32].—The coopers complain more bitterly of the second-hand hogsheads than of the new ones. It is suggested that the second-hand ones should be dealt with separately. It would be very unfair to impose the same *ad valorem* rate of duty on a second-hand as on a new cask, because, where the new might be worth £1 or 25s., the second-hand, although nearly as good, would be valued at only from 6s. to 10s. Therefore an *ad valorem* rate would hardly be a fair basis, especially as the second-hand article

might have a long life and come into competition with the locally-made article. I am told that many second-hand hogsheads are imported and sold at low prices. I therefore submit that an *ad valorem* duty would not be a fair, reasonable, or effective way of dealing with second-hand hogsheads, and that a fixed duty should be imposed upon them.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [5.34].—In order to bring this item into unison with the last, I move—

That the words "and on and after 7th December, 1907—Item 322A. Hogsheads, second-hand, empty, ad val. (General Tariff), 35 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 30 per cent.," be added.

Mr. HANS IRVINE (Grampians) [5.35].—Do I understand that all full casks are to be free of duty, while empty casks, hogsheads, quarters, or whatever they are called, are to be dutiable at rates of 35 and 30 per cent.?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Yes.

Mr. HANS IRVINE.—I am perfectly satisfied, and I am sure the trade will be. The desire is to encourage the use of Australian wood; but I am afraid that in the case of wines and spirits, a little taste is imparted by the wood.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Moreton) [5.36].—It is quite patent that second-hand hogsheads will be invoiced at half the value of new hogsheads; and, therefore, I think there is much in the contention of the honorable member for Bendigo that there should be a fixed duty in the case of the former.

Amendment agreed to.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 323. Shooks—

Hogshead, new, each, 6s. 6d.

Barrel, new, each, 5s.

Half-hogshead, new, each, 4s. 6d.

Kilderkin, new, each, 3s. 6d.

Puncheon, new, each, 11s.

Hogshead, second-hand, each, 10s.

N.E.I., ad val., 35 per cent.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [5.37].—I desire to strike out the word "each" wherever it occurs, with a view to proposing *ad valorem* duties.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [5.38].—An *ad valorem* duty in the case of shooks will be altogether ineffective—they are the greatest curse of the coopering trade. If the Treasurer desires to give any assistance to coopers, there ought to be a fixed duty imposed on shooks. These are imported in bundles from Calcutta and other places in India, the staves having been separated and numbered in order that they

may be put together on their arrival in Australia. Packed in this way, they take up small space, and are carried at low rates. A hogshead, originally worth 25s. in Calcutta, is broken up into a shook and sold at 6s. This is the last appeal I shall make on behalf of the coopers, and I urge strongly that an *ad valorem* duty will be entirely ineffective.

Mr. MAHON.—Fixed duties are proposed in the Tariff.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—But I understand that the Treasurer proposes to strike out the word "each" wherever it occurs, with a view to imposing *ad valorem* duties.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [5.39].—I have not yet submitted any amendment, though my intention was as stated. However, considering the great experience and knowledge possessed by the honorable member for Bendigo, I am prepared to allow the fixed duties to remain.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [5.40].—On behalf of the coopers, I feel even more interested in the duty on shooks than I am in the duty on barrels. I should not object to the duty on the complete barrel being reduced, but, as I have already indicated, the importation of these shooks are really destroying the coopers' trade, which, as such, is dying out. So long as this importation goes on, it is found impossible to train apprentices to the coopering trade, because all they are required to do is to fit the staves together. The coopers will be greatly disappointed unless there are fixed duties or a substantial equivalent.

Mr. TUDOR (Yarra) [5.41].—I trust the Minister will agree to a fixed duty on shooks. As the honorable member for Bendigo has explained, shooks are imported principally from India, put together here under the circumstances he described, and sold at about one-fourth of their value in India or London. They are sent here because there is a better chance of getting cheap loading from India to Australia than from India to England, and they have been sold f.o.b. in Calcutta and Bombay as low as 6s. 6d. f.o.b., whereas the actual value in London is about 30s.

Mr. MAHON.—The proposed duty is about 100 per cent.

Mr. TUDOR.—But it is not 100 per cent. on the actual value of the article. The barrel having been used only once for the transit of beer, whisky or other liquor, is as valuable, or even more valuable, as a seasoned cask than when it was new. Not

a single employer has spoken to me on this matter, but the representatives of the men's unions have seen me, and, as there is a fixed duty on dressed staves, they suggest that there should also be a fixed duty on shooks. If we desire to retain the coopering industry, a fixed duty should certainly be imposed.

Mr. HANS IRVINE (Grampians) [5.43].—I do not think that it would be fair to impose an excessive duty, seeing that these casks are mostly used by smaller manufacturers. I should like to know how many shooks come to this country, because it is years since I saw them.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—Shiploads come here.

Mr. TUDOR.—About 95 per cent. of Carlton Brewery casks are imported as shooks.

Mr. HANS IRVINE.—If so, I did not know the fact. Any person who knows anything of the subject can detect a shook cask at once, and, when empty, the highest price is 3s. to 5s. in England.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—Beer barrels?

Mr. HANS IRVINE.—Yes, for second-hand hogsheads; the very utmost price is 5s., and it costs about 9d. or 1s. to make the barrels into shooks.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—I am relying on the sworn evidence given before the Commission.

Mr. HANS IRVINE.—I am now giving my own evidence of what I know.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—But the honorable member is not subject to cross-examination.

Mr. HANS IRVINE.—Cross-examination would in no way alter my statement. Years ago I used to import shooks, and, calculating the cost of 2s. 6d. for putting the shooks together, with 1s. for freight and other charges, the actual value is not above 12s. Further, it is impossible to get more than three good casks out of five sets of shooks. They are used mostly by the manufacturers of dry goods in the various capitals.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—Are they not used as rejuvenated beer barrels?

Mr. HANS IRVINE.—They may be, but I know nothing of the beer industry. We have been told that the life of a cask is twenty years, and that may be so; but if the cask is in transit constantly two or three years is about the limit. Beer casks are generally made of strong wood, frequently Australian wood, and are very good. It is absurd to impose a duty of 10s. on a second-hand cask which at the

very outside is not worth more than 6s. to 8s., and, in my opinion, duties of 35 per cent. and 30 per cent. are quite ample.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [5.46].—I am altogether puzzled about the recommendations of the Tariff Commission. Those recommendations are based on statements made to them by a conference of delegates of the Victorian Association of Coopers and the Master Coopers' Association, who, according to the Tariff Commission's report, declare that a new hogshead is worth 25s., whereas a shook hogshead is worth 25s. 6d. Can that be right?

Mr. HANS IRVINE. — It is absolutely wrong.

Mr. BAMFORD.—I suppose that is on account of the hoops.

Mr. HANS IRVINE.—But the cost of a shook, hoops and all, cannot exceed 14s. or 15s.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The honorable member for Grampians, who has bought shooks, says that the value is only 14s. or 15s.; but, of course, the Tariff Commission accepted the statement of those who make the shooks, and declare them to be worth 25s. 6d.

Sir JOHN QUICK. — We had no other evidence.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—That is the whole trouble; it seems to me that the Commission did not get complete evidence.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—We had no time; we were told to hurry up. I had had quite enough of it.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I can quite believe that the honorable member had had "quite enough of it." I am making no complaint against the honorable member personally, because we all know with what rare industry he applied himself to the work. What I am pointing out is the one-sided character of the evidence, and its little value. I think the Minister would be quite justified in making these duties uniform at an *ad valorem* rate. If the coopering trade cannot stand with a duty of 35 per cent., it is a business which ought to be left to look after itself. Why coopers should be exempt from the ordinary competition of trade, I do not know. The honorable member for Bendigo says that there is a danger of the industry dying out; but there is a price to be paid for everything, and, if the industry dies with protection to the extent of 35 per cent., it will merely prove that there are coopers

somewhere else in the world who can do very much better with less protection. The great difficulty presented in all the evidence of the Tariff Commission is that it is grossly one-sided; none of it is corroborated, and, although sworn to, is *ex parte* right through. I intend to move that these duties be omitted, and that a uniform *ad valorem* rate be substituted for them.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [5.52].—I propose to adhere to the specific duties, with the exception of the rate levied upon second-hand hogsheads.

Mr. TUDOR.—That is absolutely the worst article included in this item, in so far as it comes into competition with the locally-made article.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—I am quite prepared to agree to a duty of 5s. upon second-hand hogsheads.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—My difficulty is to ascertain the value of these hogsheads. The honorable member for Grampians has stated that second-class hogsheads are worth about 14s. each.

Mr. HANS IRVINE.—I said that shooks were worth about 6s. or 7s. each, and that the cost of a new hogshead, unmade, was 14s. or 15s. The making would cost an additional 5s. or 6s.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—If the shook is valued at 6s. or 7s.—

Mr. HANS IRVINE.—The duty proposed is equivalent to more than 100 per cent. As a rule, these shooks are cut up and used by the small manufacturers in large centres. A second-hand shook does not find its way to the farmer, because he requires good casks.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [5.54].—Upon page 603 of volume 5 of the *Minutes of Evidence of the Tariff Commission* will be found a letter written by Messrs. Robertson, Morrison, and Company, for the purpose of showing the value of second-hand shooks. It reads—

Re empty beer hogsheads. Confirming ours of the 24th ultimo, in order to give you some idea of the cost of hogsheads in shooks, c.i.f., your port, we beg to inform you that at the present rate of freight this would be 10s. per hogshead landed in Melbourne.

That document shows that a shook which is worth only 5s. or 6s. in Calcutta has a landed value in Melbourne of 10s.

Amendments (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That after the figures "10s." the words "and on and after 7th December, 1907, each (General Tariff), 5s.," be inserted; that after the words

"35 per cent." the words "and on and after 7th December, 1907, ad val. (United Kingdom), 30 per cent.," be added.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 324. Buckets and Tubs, wooden, ad val. (General Tariff), 45 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 35 per cent.

Mr. JOHNSON (Lang) [5.59].—Perhaps the Treasurer would explain why he proposes to increase the duty upon tubs from 20 per cent. to 45 per cent., and to make buckets which were formerly free dutiable at the same extravagantly high rate? The increase proposed upon this item is 10 per cent. in excess of the recommendation of the protectionist section of the Tariff Commission. The Treasurer has inserted the duty recommended by that portion of the Commission in the preference column, and has increased the rate against the outside world by 10 per cent. I should like some explanation as to the reasons underlying his action.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [6.0].—The A section of the Tariff Commission recommended the imposition of a duty of 35 per cent. upon this item, and we have proposed a duty of 45 per cent. under the general Tariff, in order that we may be able to charge the imports from Great Britain the rate recommended by the Commission.

Mr. JOHNSON (Lang) [6.1].—The Treasurer has explained that it is owing to the recommendation of the protectionist section of the Tariff Commission that a duty of 35 per cent. has been levied upon buckets and tubs imported from the United Kingdom. But the Chairman of the Commission has stated that in recommending such high rates of duty, the A section of that body had in mind the maximum amount of duty. He conveyed the impression to my mind that its members did not intend that the rates which they recommended should prevail against Great Britain, and that a still higher rate should be charged against the outside world.

Mr. WISE.—That is not so.

Mr. JOHNSON.—It is. I spoke to the honorable member for Bendigo about the matter, and I understood him to mean that his idea was that the duties recommended by the protectionist section of the Commission were to be the maximum rates against the outside world.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—No.

Mr. JOHNSON.—I am speaking of what the honorable member for Bendigo himself told me.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—And I am speaking of what he said in this chamber.

Mr. JOHNSON.—I did not hear him say it. In any case, I move—

That the words "Buckets and" be left out.

Mr. WISE (Gippsland) [6.5].—I am rather surprised that we should once more be confronted with a statement as to what were the intentions of the A section of the Tariff Commission in making their recommendations. The Chairman of that body distinctly pointed out in this chamber what was the idea underlying his recommendations, and I have quoted his utterances in this connexion upon more than one occasion. They clearly show that the honorable member for Lang, in making the statement which he did just now, is in error.

Mr. JOHNSON.—What does the honorable member propose to quote from?

Mr. WISE.—From a speech which the honorable and learned member for Bendigo made in this House, and from which I quoted in my speech on the Tariff and Budget proposals of the Government. On that occasion I said—

With reference to the report of the protectionist section of the Tariff Commission he said their recommendations were of a substantially protective character designed to protect our industries against the whole world, including Great Britain.

Mr. JOHNSON.—I submit that the honorable member is out of order in quoting an extract from a speech made in the House during the current session.

The CHAIRMAN.—The Tariff and Budget proposals of the Government were discussed at the one time, and the honorable member for Gippsland is entitled to quote a passage from any speech which has relation to the item now before the Committee.

Mr. WISE.—It is an extraordinary thing that the honorable member for Lang should think that he has the right to misrepresent the honorable member for Bendigo, and to object to me representing the views of that honorable member correctly. At a later stage of his remarks, the Chairman of the Tariff Commission said—

I am not prepared to agree to a reduction of duty upon any class of goods—even in favour of Great Britain—which would be prejudicial to manufactures.

Mr. HANS IRVINE.—But he is not infallible. The honorable member heard him say to-day that he was wrong.

Mr. WISE.—I know that. I only rose to correct the statement made by the honorable member for Lang, that the duties recommended by the A section of the Tariff Commission were the maximum duties, and that they were to be reduced for preferential purposes.

Mr. JOHNSON.—I said that in answer to a question I put he gave me to understand that.

Mr. WISE.—I have quoted what he said.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Then he has made two different statements.

Mr. WISE.—He said that on some articles, such as cutlery, which are not made here, he might be prepared to recommend a reduction in the duty, but that as regards any articles which would interfere with local products, he was not prepared to recommend a reduction in the duty, even as against Great Britain.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [6.10].—I desire to ascertain from the Treasurer whether wooden buckets are made in Australia.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I should think so.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Where are they made?

Mr. MAUGER.—They are made under the shadow of the fire brigade station.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I thought that a Melbourne atmosphere must be surrounding this item. Otherwise we would not have been asked to impose a duty of 45 per cent. on the old wooden bucket.

Mr. CHANTER.—They are made all over the Commonwealth.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—If the housewives do not hunt my honorable friends with brooms, they ought to do so.

Amendment negatived.

Amendment (by Mr. JOSEPH COOK) proposed—

That after the words "45 per cent." the words "and on and after 7th December, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 30 per cent.," be inserted.

Mr. McWILLIAMS (Franklin) [6.13].—I ask the Treasurer to accept the amendment, which, if carried, will mean that wooden buckets will be dutiable at 30 and 25 per cent. respectively. Some of these buckets are exceedingly cheap and are used very largely in fruit-picking. The fruit-pickers constitute the poorest class in the community, and as they have to provide their own buckets, a duty of 45 per cent. is a heavy tax upon them.

Mr. FOSTER.—Give the timber industry a fair show.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—It is rather amusing to hear that honorable members who refused to give a protection of 15 per cent. to the men who cut the timber are willing to give a protection of 35 per cent. to the men in the city who make buckets out of the timber. Out of every two bucketsfull which the fruit-pickers pick in Tasmania they get one bucket, and the orchard gets the other.

Mr. CHANTER.—Do they use imported buckets?

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—Yes.

Mr. CHANTER.—More shame to them, then.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—The bucket is exceedingly cheap, being sold readily at about 1s.

Mr. CHANTER.—All the buckets required in Riverina are made of Australian wood.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—In Tasmania a very much higher price is paid for the fruit which is picked in buckets, because it does not pulp the same as it does when picked in tubs. The zinc bucket is unsuitable, because it stains and destroys the fruit in a short time. Wooden buckets are exceedingly cheap, and last about one season. Sometimes a family will have to obtain four or five buckets at a time. The fruit-pickers are the very poorest class in the community. Generally a widow with four or five children will go into the fruit-growing districts, and when the fruit-picking is done they go hop-picking.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Very well; if the honorable member will stop, I will agree to the amendment.

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment (by Mr. JOSEPH COOK) agreed to—

That after the words "35 per cent." the words "and on and after 7th December, 1907, ad val. (United Kingdom), 25 per cent.," be added.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Division XI.—Jewellery and Fancy Goods.

Item 325. Fancy Goods; including Card Cases; Snuff and Match Boxes; Purses n.e.i.; Wallets; Thimbles; Serviette Rings; Button Hooks; Shoe-horns and Lifts; Glove Stretchers; Toys; Ivory and other ornamental figures; Feather Dusters; Paper Parasols; Articles used for outdoor and indoor games; Fishing Appliances, n.e.i.; and Articles, n.e.i., used for ornamental purposes, or partly for use and partly for ornament, ad val. (General Tariff), 35 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 25 per cent.

Mr. TUDOR (Yarra) [6.16].—I notice that this item includes toys. I believe that toys such as dolls have never been made

here. It costs over 70 per cent. to land them, and I certainly think that they should not be required to bear such a heavy impost as is proposed.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Is that the reason why the doll was brought into the Chamber just now?

Mr. TUDOR.—I did not bring the doll, but whoever did so did the right thing. I am in favour of a reduction of the duty on dolls, as they are not made here. I think that the Minister might agree to an alteration of the duty on toys generally. This item also includes articles used for outdoor and indoor games. I believe that those articles include boxing gloves and cricketing gloves and material. As boxing gloves are made here, I think that all articles used for outdoor and indoor games should be put in a separate line, and made subject to a heavy duty.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Thirty-five per cent. is a fair duty.

Mr. TUDOR.—I think it would have been better to put boxing gloves and cricketing gloves and leg guards, which are all made here, in a separate line, so that we could ascertain the extent of the importations. I have received a letter from a firm engaged in the manufacture of boxing and cricketing gloves. The writer says—

For your information, I called at a prominent Sports Depot to-day re cricket goods. They replied, "We never buy Colonial stuff unless we run out of imported, and we will have enough to see us through this season." This is consoling, especially as we can sell to them goods equally as well finished (if not of stronger make) at about 100 per cent. less than their selling prices marked in the windows.

I trust that if there is any proposal to reduce the duty the Treasurer will pick out sporting goods and put them in a separate line, so that they will bear a heavier duty.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [6.20].—In this item, the words "fishing appliances n.e.i." appear. In item 396, appear the words "fishing nets and netting." If, as I understand and hope, fishermen's nets and netting are to be struck out of the item in which they appear, they would, unless provision were otherwise made, be dutiable as fishing appliances. So long as care is taken that they are not taxed under this item, I shall be satisfied.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I shall take care of that.

Mr. CROUCH (Corio) [6.22].—I hope that when we reach item 396, fishing nets

and netting, we shall make those goods free, and shall also exclude from the payment of duty the appliances used by fishermen who earn their living at sea.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—How can we distinguish between nets that are used by professional fishermen and those used by amateurs?

Mr. CROUCH. — The professional fisherman does not use fancy articles such as floats and reels. He uses lines and nets, but does not lother himself about the tackle which amateurs use. I understand that the Treasurer intends to make it clear that the appliances used by those who get their living by fishing shall be free. If that be so, the honorable member for North Sydney can safely leave this item as it stands.

Mr. PAGE (Maranoa) [6.23].—What is the Treasurer going to do in regard to children's toys? They are made dutiable under this item. Do I understand that dolls, children's toy balls and rubber balls are all included under it.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—At present, yes.

Mr. PAGE.—Children's dolls now cost to import 73 per cent. of their value. Surely the Minister does not want to make toys dearer?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I want to strike out the word "toys" from the item.

Mr. TUDOR.—I think we should have a separate item for toys, and that they should be free.

Mr. FOSTER.—Why cannot they be made in Australia?

Mr. MALONEY.—Rag dolls are made here.

Mr. PAGE.—I move—

That the word "toys," line 6, be left out.

Mr. FOSTER (New England) [6.27].—There seems to be a good deal of sentiment about this subject, and I am surprised that honorable members should introduce sentiment into the consideration of a Tariff. One would think that toys were of such a scientific and complicated construction, and so affected by patents, that it was impossible to manufacture them in Australia. I do not see why the toys used by our children should not be made here. Furthermore, I think we are justified in endeavouring to find avenues of employment for women. Toy-making is really women's work. A reasonable duty would not penalize the children by any means. On the cheaper lines a duty would make very little difference. It might fall heavier

upon the dearer kinds of toys, but those who could afford to buy expensive toys are well able to pay the extra duty. There is every reason why we should encourage the manufacture of dolls and toys in Australia instead of importing them from Germany.

Mr. JOHNSON (Lang) [6.28].—I trust that the Treasurer will agree to strike out the word "toys" in the item with a view to making them duty free. It is bad enough to tax children's clothes and food, without imposing a duty on their playthings. Our little ones will not be children very long. Let us make their youthful lives as pleasant and happy as possible, and let them have as many toys as their parents and friends can buy for them. Let them be as cheap as possible so that the children of the poorer classes may have as generous a share of them as their parents' circumstances will allow. I hope that the Treasurer will yield to the appeal that has been made to him, and will agree to strike out the word "toys."

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I have already said that I would do so.

Sitting suspended from 6.30 to 7.45 p.m.

Amendment negatived.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) proposed—

That after the word "Toys" the words "other than Dolls, undressed," be inserted.

Mr. PAGE.—What would be the effect of that amendment?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—It will make undressed dolls free.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. EDWARDS (Oxley) [7.48].—There are a number of small articles in this item which might well be left out. Take, for instance, thimbles.

The CHAIRMAN.—We have already inserted an amendment in a later line, so that the honorable member could not now move to omit the word "thimbles."

Mr. EDWARDS.—I understand that tailors' thimbles are free, and I should like to know why seamstresses' thimbles except in silver or gold are not also free? It seems unjust that the one line should be free while the other is subject to a duty of 35 per cent. and 25 per cent.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I can do nothing now.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That after the word "ornament" the words "including Fancy Ground and Cut Glass Bottles of over 5 drams of fluid capacity containing

goods not subject to ad valorem duty and Stoppers for such bottles" be inserted.

Mr. JOHNSON (Lang) [7.50].—Since it has been decided that toys shall be subject to taxation I shall endeavour to make the tax as light as possible. I move—

That after the words "35 per cent." the words "and on and after 7th December, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 20 per cent." be inserted.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I am prepared to agree to duties of 30 per cent. and 25 per cent.

Question put. The Committee divided.

Ayes	6
Noes	27

Majority	21
----------	-----	-----	----

AYES.

Archer, E. W.
Cook, Joseph
Fuller, G. W.
Johnson, W. E.

Tellers:
Bowden, E. K.
McWilliams, W. J.

NOES.

Bamford, F. W.
Chanter, J. M.
Chapman, Austin
Coon, J.
Crouch, R. A.
Deakin, A.
Edwards, R.
Ewing, T. T.
Foster, F. J.
Frazer, C. E.
Groom, L. E.
Harper, R.
Hedges, W. N.
Irvine, Hans

Irvine, W. H.
Knox, W.
Lyne, Sir William
Mahon, H.
Mathews, J.
Page, J.
Quick, Sir John
Storrer, D.
Thomson, John
Tudor, F. G.
Watkins, D.

Tellers:
Cook, Hume
Wise, G. H.

Question so resolved in the negative.

Amendment negatived.

Amendment (by Mr. JOHNSON) negatived—

That after the words "35 per cent." the words "and on and after 7th December, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 25 per cent.," be inserted.

Amendment (by Mr. EDWARDS) proposed—

That after the words "35 per cent." the words "and on and after 7th December, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 30 per cent.," be inserted.

Mr. TUDOR (Yarra) [8.0]. — I expressed a hope before dinner that if the Minister accepted a reduction in these duties he would agree to take out of this item "Articles used for outdoor and indoor games." My reason is that the makers of boxing gloves and cricketing gloves and pads have, under a later item, pay duties on the raw material they use

in the shape of leather. They should be given some protection to cover the duties they will be called upon to pay on their raw materials.

Amendment agreed to.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That the following new item be inserted :—
"325A. On and after 7th December, 1907, Dolls, undressed, free."

Item 326. Combs (toilet) and Shaving Sets, ad val., 25 per cent.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That after the word "Sets" the words "not included under item 384" be inserted.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) proposed—

That the words "and on and after 7th December, 1907 (United Kingdom), 20 per cent.," be added.

Mr. JOHNSON (Lang) [8.5].—This is an outrage. If this item is passed as proposed, I shall be compelled to grow a beard. The people who manufacture shaving pots and soap will suffer, but I will have to suffer also. I should like to impress honorable members with the importance of this question. I recently read an article, I think, in last Saturday's *Age*, in which reference was made to the great danger of wearing beards. I was going to say that the article was cribbed; it was an article by a scientific authority that was reproduced in the *Age*. It was stated by the writer that a beard is the most dangerous thing a man can wear, and is dangerous especially to the other sex, since beards gather up and accumulate all kinds of malignant microbes, such as the microbes of diphtheria, influenza, and other undesirable ailments.

Mr. SALMON.—Where did the scientist get his information? Was it gathered from the lips of a lady?

Mr. JOHNSON.—I believe that is how he made the discovery. Personally I have too great a regard for the other sex to be content to see them exposed to these terrible risks. I cannot support the proposal.

Mr. MAHON (Coolgardie) [8.7]. — I should like to point out that the incidence of taxation under this item would be unfair if not unjust. For instance, the honorable member for Parramatta would not require to pay any duty under this item. Even at this stage the Treasurer might

reconsider his proposal in view of the fact that its operation would be inequitable.

Amendment agreed to.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 327. Pencils and Penholders of wood, free.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) proposed—

That the following words be added:—"and on and after 7th December, 1907, Pencils of wood, but not including pencils with metal or other clamps or attachments, also penhandles of wood (including metal attachments for nibs), free."

Mr. PAGE (Maranoa) [8.9].—I object to the amendment. Why did not the officers of the Customs Department think of this when they were framing the Tariff? I have here a pencil with a metal cover for the point, and the Treasurer now proposes to make it dutiable because it has a metal attachment.

Mr. HUME COOK.—No; the Treasurer is proposing to make those pencils free.

Mr. PAGE.—Then I am satisfied.

Amendment agreed to.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 328. School Pen and Pencil Sets, including boxes, free.

Mr. STORRER (Bass) [8.10].—The word "and" should be substituted for the word "including" in this item. I have one of these pen and pencil boxes here, and, while it would be admitted free if it contained pens or pencils, if the box were introduced by itself, it would be dutiable at 25 per cent. as furniture. I think that whether they contain pencils or not, these boxes should be admitted free. I move—

That the word "including" be left out, with a view to insert in lieu thereof the word "and."

Amendment agreed to.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 329—(Paint boxes), and item 330 (Shells, Weapons and Curios, and Old Coins)—agreed to.

Item 331. Jewellery, unfinished, being settings and mounts for, with or without imitation stones, ad val. (General Tariff), 40 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 35 per cent.

Mr. TUDOR (Yarra) [8.12].—I have a few samples here of this unfinished jewellery. You, sir, are probably the best judge we have in the chamber of the value of these goods, and if you were not in the chair you would no doubt have something to say about them. The point I wish to make is that they are practically finished articles. I have 15-carat rings here, which I am informed by experts in the trade, employers as well as

employés, are worth about ros. each. All that is required to finish them is to put the stones in them, for which they have been prepared, and these stones are sent out in a separate parcel and admitted free. When the stones are set in the ring, its value is increased to about £2, and this increase in value is brought about with very small expense for labour. We have allowed precious stones to come in free, and under this arrangement of the Tariff a lot of work in the jewellery trade which might be done here will be done elsewhere. I admit that I do not know how the difficulty is to be overcome. I have here also a 15-carat brooch practically finished, and requiring only the stones to be set. I have samples also of bracelet fronts in the same stage of manufacture. Goods of this kind, which would be valued at the Custom House at £1 or a little more, are worth when the stones have been set in them perhaps £10. The Minister might consult with the officers to see whether some means might not be discovered to prevent this evasion of the duties on jewellery which every honorable member will admit is a luxury.

Mr. MAHON.—The unfinished article is dutiable under the Tariff at 40 per cent.

Mr. TUDOR.—Precious stones are admitted duty free, so that when a ring setting and its stone are imported separately, duty is paid only on the setting, and, of course, comes to very much less than if the two were brought in together as a finished article. I trust that if there is any way of preventing this evasion of duty it will be taken. If the Minister cannot suggest an amendment now, will he look into the matter, and subsequently issue a regulation which will get over the difficulty?

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [8.17.].—The case is stated on page 396 of the report of the A section of the Tariff Commission in this way—

Unfinished jewellery generally consists of settings and mounts for bracelets, brooches, necklets, and rings, which are made up and imported apart from their precious stones. The manufacturing jewellers, as well as the workers in Victoria, suggested that there should be a higher duty on such jewellery than on complete jewellery. They believe that such a higher duty would tend to reduce the importations of these unfinished settings and mounts, and that it would encourage their manufacture in Australia.

It is a grievance with manufacturing jewellers and jewellers' workers that practically finished articles can be imported on the

payment of an extremely small duty by placing the fittings or mounts in one parcel and the gems in another. This is really a fraud on the revenue which the Customs authorities have found themselves unable to prevent. I have consulted the highest Customs authorities in Australia with reference to the matter, and they can suggest no better way of dealing with it than that proposed.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [8.19].—Notwithstanding what has been said by the honorable member for Yarra, I think that the proposed rates are too high.

Mr. PAGE.—They should be higher. What takes place now is a fraud on the revenue.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—How can it be a fraud on the revenue, seeing that the Tariff provides for it being done? The duty is on "unfinished jewellery."

Mr. CHANTER.—But practically finished jewellery is imported as unfinished.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The settings and mounts for jewellery, with or without imitation stones, are dutiable as unfinished jewellery, and there is no fraud in importing them as such. If honorable members wish to prevent the importation of unfinished jewellery, let them strike out the item altogether. In my opinion, the proposed rates are altogether too high, and I therefore move—

That after the words "40 per cent." the words "and on and after 7th December, 1907 (General Tariff), 30 per cent.," be inserted. If the amendment is carried, I shall move to make the duty against the United Kingdom 25 per cent.

Mr. PAGE (Maranoa) [8.22].—It seems to me that the higher the rates of duty in this item, the less the likelihood of the fraud to which reference has been made being practised. The honorable member for Parramatta cannot cloud the issue. The fact is that practically finished jewellery is brought in at a low rate by separating the settings and the stones to make it dutiable as unfinished jewellery. As a matter of fact, it is so much finished that any one could put it together, could set it and finish it, with a penknife, making it a marketable commodity at once. I hope that the Treasurer will make the duty 50 per cent.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [8.23].—Does the honorable member for Maranoa believe in taxing jewellery at the rate of 50 per cent.?

Mr. PAGE.—Yes; jewellery brought in in this way. The honorable member should be the last to defend a fraud on the revenue.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The honorable member is barking up the wrong tree. The jewellery which is brought in as unfinished rightly pays only the duty leviable on unfinished jewellery. The honorable member has been a staunch free-trader until of late, when the Melbourne atmosphere seems to have affected him. Surely rates of 30 and 25 per cent. are sufficiently high even for finished jewellery.

Mr. SALMON (Laanecoorie) [8.25].—I wish to read to the Committee the reason which actuated the trade in asking for a duty of 100 per cent. It is this—

As a consequence of these articles being admitted at a comparatively small expense as compared with the value of them when the stones are set in, the manufacture of high-class jewellery is only carried on at a limited extent, and although there are many workmen here capable of executing the work, there is very little encouragement for employers to teach, and for apprentices to devote their time to learning, the manufacture of high-class jewellery, owing to the small demand for the locally-made article, and a duty such as is recommended above will undoubtedly have a beneficial effect on the future of the trade in cultivating the artistic branches of it.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE (Flinders) [8.27].—At first the proposed duty seemed to me very high, but there is a great deal in the contention of the honorable member for Yarra. Jewellery is dutiable under item 334 at 30 and 25 per cent., but if a setting and its stones are brought in separately, and 40 per cent. is charged on the setting, while the stones are admitted free, the amount actually paid is very much smaller than would be paid on the finished article, though what is imported is virtually a finished article. For instance, a setting might be worth 10s., and the stones belonging to it might be worth 30s. If the article were imported as finished jewellery, it would be dutiable at 30 per cent., whereas if the setting and the stones were imported separately, duty would be levied only on the setting, at the rate of 40 per cent., making the amount actually paid on the complete article only a fraction of that. A duty which permits an importation of this kind does not give valid and effective protection. Something must be done to prevent all but the least valuable part of an article coming in duty free. It seems to me that

unless a very high duty is placed on settings, it will be necessary to impose a duty on precious stones.

Mr. TUDOR.—That would penalize our working jewellers, to whom precious stones are a raw material.

Mr. FOSTER.—We might put a duty on diamonds.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—I do not know why we should differentiate between diamonds and rubies and other stones. Perhaps the best thing would be for the Treasurer to consult his officers, and subsequently propose some amendment which would make the duty effective.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [8.29].—I am afraid that the honorable member has fallen into a trap which has been skilfully laid by the honorable member for Yarra. There are other kinds of jewellery besides rings.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—Most of the jewellery coming under item 334 consists of precious stones and their settings.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—There are over a hundred other articles of jewellery besides rings.

Mr. CHANTER.—The honorable member for Yarra showed brooches and bangles which have been imported as settings, without the precious stones.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Does the honorable member mean to say that that practice can be followed in the case of difficult and complicated brooches?

Mr. TUDOR.—Yes; I have some of them here.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—That kind of brooch cannot be treated in that way. How many stones are in the brooch that the honorable member has?

Mr. TUDOR.—Over twenty.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Was it imported with the stones in it?

Mr. TUDOR.—It was imported with the stones out of it.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—It may have been that another part of that jewellery, apart altogether from the stones, had to be prepared elsewhere, and that it was necessary for it to be brought in in that way.

Mr. PAGE.—That is too thin.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Honorable members, apparently, are getting hold of what is perhaps an abuse of a legitimate trade and a legitimate importation.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—It is not only an abuse. The practice to which the honorable member for Yarra has drawn atten-

tion will practically render the duty ineffective regarding all that jewellery which consists of settings and stones, as specified in item 334.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—That might be so if they all came in in that way, but in the making up of the jewellery, certain manipulations, apart altogether from the putting in of the stones, may have to be done elsewhere. Does this item specially provide for bringing in jewellery and stones in that way?

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—The item is to meet the particular cases in which the settings and stones are brought in separately.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Surely they are brought in separately for some other reason than the "sticking of the stones in with a bit of wax"? If that is the only reason for the item, ought it not to go out of the schedule altogether?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—The reason they are imported in that way is to escape the duty.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Are we to put the item in so as to tempt people to escape the duty?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—No; we propose to penalize them, and to prevent the device.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Will the Minister say that the item is included for the purpose of catching these people at their frauds?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—It is to stop them and penalize them.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Does the honorable member suggest that that is the only reason why the item is proposed?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—The higher the duty, the higher the penalty.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Surely the provision has some useful function to perform? I cannot illustrate my point, as I have not the requisite knowledge of the subject.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—Read the evidence, and the honorable member will understand it.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I dare say I should arrive at some such result as I have already done in reading some of the evidence. I did not appreciate a lot of the honorable member's evidence.

Mr. PAGE.—It is not his evidence, but the evidence of witnesses.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The evidence in nearly every case runs somewhat thus: A certain individual says, "I want a higher duty, or I will collapse." Therefore he gets the higher duty.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—The honorable member had better let the item pass as it is, "lest a worse thing befall."

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Would the honorable member like me to move 50 per cent.?

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The honorable gentleman ought to make the duty absolutely prohibitive, if the only intention of the item is to stop the fraud alleged.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—I have already suggested that one way out of the difficulty might be to prohibit these things coming in separately.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—A prohibition might stop some useful function which is served by the articles coming in separately. Apparently the object of the Treasurer is only to stop the abuse, without regard to the usefulness of the practice. Will the Treasurer explain why the item is in the schedule?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [8.35].—The item is included in the schedule because a great deal of difficulty has been experienced for years past, and the Department has been trying to devise some means of preventing the practice to which the honorable member for Yarra has called attention. It has come to the conclusion that the only way is to put a high duty on this partially-finished imported jewellery.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The item appeared in the last Tariff at 25 per cent. Why is it included at all?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—It has to do its work in preventing the importation of this half-made jewellery.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—But for this item, that jewellery would come in free.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—One of its essential functions is to protect other parts of the Tariff. I am surprised that some honorable members ask for a duty of 50 per cent. I do not feel disposed to move for higher rates than 40 per cent. and 35 per cent. at present. That is the recommendation of the A section of the Tariff Commission. Previously the duty was 25 per cent. If the honorable member for Parramatta will withdraw his amendment, I desire to alter the wording of the item to read as follows—"Jewellery, unfinished, being settings and mounts for bracelets, brooches, necklets and rings, unset, or set with imitation stones." Setting with imitation stones is another method adopted of avoiding the higher duty. The jewellery is imported in that way at the lower

rate, the imitation stones are taken out, and more valuable stones are put in afterwards.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I will withdraw my amendment, as the alteration outlined by the Treasurer makes sense of the item.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) proposed—

That the words "and on and after 7th December, 1907—Item 331. Jewellery, unfinished, being settings and mounts for bracelets, brooches, necklets, and rings, unset, or set with imitation stones; ad val. (General Tariff), 40 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 35 per cent.," be added.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [8.39].—The new wording will limit the application of the term "unfinished jewellery" to the particular articles specified. As previously worded it apparently included many other articles.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—The new words are words of limitation. I do not think they are wide enough.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—They make sense of the item. Its general application will now be entirely done away with, and it will be clearly a clause for the abolition of fraud of the kind mentioned. No one can grumble at that.

Mr. JOHNSON (Lang) [8.40].—Those protectionists who did not hesitate about imposing taxes of from 25 per cent. to 150 per cent. on food and clothing might be pardoned for regarding even 40 per cent. or 50 per cent. as a very moderate duty on jewellery, but I shall be very glad to see the duties on these items reduced. I do not believe in taxes of any kind on either the necessities or luxuries of life. As I have tried to get all taxes reduced on food and clothing and other necessities, I shall be quite consistent in seeking to have them reduced also on what are called luxuries, but what I regard as part of the necessities of life. I am sorry the honorable member for Parramatta has withdrawn his amendment, as I should have liked an opportunity of voting for it.

Amendment agreed to.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 332. Jewellery, commonly known as imitation gold or rolled gold; and jewellery under 9-carat, ad val. (General Tariff), 40 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 35 per cent.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [8.42].—I move—

That the words "imitation gold or" be left out.

That will then come under item 334.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [8.43].—Is it the intention of the amendment to compel people to buy expensive jewellery? Why is imitation gold to be eliminated from this item?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—To bring it under "imitation jewellery n.e.i."

Mr. CROUCH (Corio) [8.44]. — One feature of this item must be considered by the Committee. I do not ask that it should be fully considered until we reach the item "spectacle frames." I understand that spectacle frames of rolled gold have been largely increased in price. I want the Committee to bear that in mind when passing this item, because I intend to ask for an exemption later on when we reach item 341.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [8.45].—As showing the reason for the proposed differentiation, I quote the following from the report of the Tariff Commission—

Rolled gold jewellery consists of a sheet of metal in the centre, with a thin plate of gold in front and a similar plate of gold at the back, pressed together and rolled and consolidated, finished with a show of gold outside. A witness in Adelaide, interested in the import trade, admitted that rolled gold jewellery, like imitation jewellery, tended to interfere with the manufacture of the legitimate article.—(Keoppen-Wendt, Q. 57655.)

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment (by Mr. PAGE) proposed—

That the figure "9" be left out, with a view to insert in lieu thereof the figures "15."

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [8.47].—The object we have in view is as far as possible to differentiate between what may be called spurious jewellery and real jewellery; and 9-carat gold is everywhere acknowledged to be gold; all below being regarded as spurious. I am advised that the amendment of the honorable member, if carried into effect, would cause complication at the Customs House by throwing all the gold jewellery below 15 carat into the spurious class.

Mr. EDWARDS (Oxley) [8.48].—There is a great resemblance between the item under consideration and item 334, which deals with jewellery and imitation jewellery; and I suggest that a similar duty should apply to both. I should like to read a few words which have reached my hands from some jewellers' association in Melbourne or Sydney, to the following effect—

The proposed Tariff, under item 332, establishes a conflict between that number and item 334, for reasons that we endeavour herein to set out.

The duty on gold filled jewellery is stated—Foreign, 40 per cent.; English, 35 per cent.; under No. 332, and yet item 334 states—"Imitation jewellery—Foreign, 30 per cent.; English, 25 per cent."

We respectfully submit to your notice that in making the difference between "rolled gold jewellery" and "imitation jewellery" such a conflict will exist in respect to decisions as will cause an element of injustice and unrest in regard to the whole of the two lines referred to.

Perhaps the Minister would consent to reduce the duties on the item under consideration to 30 per cent. and 25 per cent., which would place it on the same level as item 334. In the old Tariff the item before us was 25 per cent., and the Tariff Commission recommended a duty of 35 per cent.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I think we may raise the duty on item 334 when we reach it.

Mr. EDWARDS.—I may point out that in the old Tariff the duty on item 324 was 25 per cent., and a similar duty was recommended by the Tariff Commission.

Mr. PAGE (Maranoa) [8.51].—I think the Treasurer is a bit at sea in regard to 9-carat jewellery. He must remember that when he was Minister of Trade and Customs he instituted a prosecution against a Melbourne firm for importing rings which were stamped 9-carat, but which were wrongly described, and were neither more nor less than a fraud. Any day rings may be bought which are stamped "9-carat," but which in reality are not even 6-carat gold.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—That is no reason for altering the standard in the Tariff; it would only make fraud more frequent.

Mr. PAGE.—The higher we make the standard, the more chance there will be of the purchaser getting what he paid for.

Mr. HUGHES.—What guarantee will there be if the standard be made 15-carat that the jewellery will be any nearer that standard than it is at present?

Mr. PAGE.—Experts in the trade tell me that with a 15-carat standard there is a better chance of stopping fraud. I suggest that the Treasurer ascertain the opinion of his officers on the point.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I have done so, and I am told that the amendment of the honorable member would cause confusion and trouble at the Customs House.

Mr. PAGE.—Is it so terrible to cause more work to the Customs Department, when the object is to stop fraud?

However, the Government seem to be against me, and I shall not press the amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 333. Jewellery, being machine made Chain in the rough (known as Brunswick pattern Foxtail, or Lace Chain); Gallerie; Beads; Catches and Joints for Pins; Clasps, n.e.i.; Points; and Brooch Pins, ad val. (General Tariff), 20 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 15 per cent.

Mr. TUDOR (Yarra) [8.55].—This "machine made chain in the rough" is practically finished jewellery. It is imported in one long chain, and cut into the required lengths here; and I think that, in order to protect the revenue, it ought to be placed in the next item. On the other hand, gallerie and beads are among the raw materials of jewellery, and ought to be made free. I suggest that the words "machine made chain in the rough" be omitted.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—Those are the words suggested by the trade.

Item agreed to.

Item 334. Jewellery and Imitation Jewellery, n.e.i., including Bolt and Split Rings; Swivels; Ear Wires; Bars and Stampings used in manufacture of jewellery; Medals and Medallions of Gold and Silver; Links and Studs of all kinds; Buckles, Badges, Clasps, Slides, Buttons, and other Ornaments of Gold or Silver for Attire; Combined Bracelets and Watches; Gold, Silver, or Plated Safety Pins; Gold or Silver Bags and Purses; Imitation Precious Stones; Alberts of all materials, ad val. (General Tariff), 30 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 25 per cent.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) proposed—

That after the word "materials" the words "and all articles, n.e.i., partly or wholly made of gold or silver, including gold and silver lace."

Mr. JOHNSON (Lang) [8.58].—I suppose there is no hope of carrying a reduction of this duty?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I am inclined to increase it.

Mr. JOHNSON.—The Treasurer seems itching to move an increase. I suggest, however, that he ought to make a separate item, so as to admit of wedding rings being admitted free. We are much concerned about the decline of marriage; and some encouragement ought to be given to our young people to undertake the responsibilities of matrimony.

Mr. PAGE (Maranoa) [8.59].—I see that imitation precious stones are included in this item; and the Treasurer a few minutes ago promised the honorable mem-

ber for Oxley that he would increase the duty. In many parts of Australia, and particularly Queensland and New South Wales, there are opal fields and sapphire mines; and I do not see why the duties should be only 30 per cent. and 25 per cent. when men have to work night and day in order to make a living in the mining of these precious stones.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—What difference will a duty of 25 per cent. on glass make to the miners of precious stones?

Mr. PAGE.—If I had my way I would make the duty 50 per cent. I ask the Treasurer to consent to make the duties upon this item uniform with those which have been levied upon the previous item.

Mr. HUGHES (West Sydney) [9.0].—It seems to me that it would be very absurd to impose a duty of 35 per cent. upon imitation precious stones, the invoiced value of which would be very small indeed. In this country we produce rubies in such quantity that we have been obliged to call them garnets to prevent the price of rubies being reduced to a non-payable level. Yet it is now proposed to admit coloured glass at 30 and 25 per cent. We should either prohibit its importation entirely, or levy a specific duty upon this class of jewellery of so much per carat. The Treasurer knows perfectly well that the Commonwealth produces a large variety of precious stones, and that the industry is one upon which a man may embark without the possession of either capital or skill. Opals, rubies, and garnets can be obtained here by the veriest new chum, who ought to be protected just as much as anybody else.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [9.3].—The Tariff Commission is in no way responsible for the inclusion of imitation precious stones in this item. As a matter of fact, this group of items was intended to cover only *bona fide* jewellery. For that reason, rolled gold jewellery and jewellery under 9 carat were taken out of it, and the Commission recommended that they should be made dutiable at 35 per cent. My own idea is that imitation stones should be removed from this item and charged a special rate.

Mr. FOSTER (New England) [9.4].—I hope that the Treasurer will agree to eliminate imitation precious stones from this item. I am rather disappointed that the Tariff schedule makes no attempt to protect Australian diamonds. In my own elec-

torate, we have fields which are producing thousands of pounds worth of diamonds annually. For many years these precious stones were sold as Brazilian diamonds, but now they are being sold as Australian diamonds, and even the smallest of them—if they are usable—are worth 22s. 6d. per carat. These fields have produced diamonds worth as much as £60 each in the rough. I think that we should eliminate imitation precious stones from the item under consideration with a view to prevent glass jewellery from being imported to compete with the genuine article. The only way in which we can attain our object is by the imposition of a heavy duty per carat upon precious stones. The industry is one in which tens of thousands of pounds have been invested, and there are miles and miles of country now awaiting development. Under these circumstances, I think that the industry ought to be protected.

Mr. TUDOR (Yarra) [9.7].—In the previous item, we have taxed rolled gold jewellery at 40 per cent. under the General Tariff and at 35 per cent. under the Tariff for the United Kingdom. Yet it is now proposed to make jewellery and imitation jewellery *n.e.i.* dutiable at only 30 per cent. under the General Tariff and at 25 per cent. under that for Great Britain. I agree with the honorable member for Oxley that the duties upon the two items should be made uniform.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—Then the honorable member would not distinguish between rolled gold jewellery, imitation jewellery, and jewellery of a high standard?

Mr. TUDOR.—If the honorable member presses his suggestion to strike out the words “imitation jewellery, *n.e.i.*,” I shall be prepared to consider it, but I think we should make all these lines dutiable at 40 per cent.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—That would penalize good jewellery.

Mr. TUDOR.—It would not. In any case, jewellery is a luxury. I would further point out that £300,000 worth of jewellery is annually imported into the Commonwealth, the bulk of which could be made here. Unless our jewellers receive a greater measure of protection for their finished article, they will be denied the opportunity of competing successfully that they should be afforded.

Mr. HUGHES (West Sydney) [9.10].—I wish to direct the Treasurer's attention to the question of imitation precious stones. The honorable gentleman has told me that

a working jeweller has confided to some other person that this duty is all right. But I submit that this question has nothing whatever to do with the working jeweller. It has solely to do with those who produce rubies, garnets, sapphires, &c., from our mines. It is not a question of the Australian diamond having to compete with the foreign diamond, but of the Australian precious stone having to compete with glass and imitation jewellery. We must recollect that whilst it would pay a man to smuggle diamonds, it would not pay him to bring in a load of glass worth only about 4½d. per oz. If the Treasurer will agree to the imposition of a specific duty upon this item, that will be sufficient.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [9.12].—I would point out to the honorable member for West Sydney that any increase of the duty proposed upon imitation precious stones would be absolutely ineffective, because the value of our own precious stones is regulated by the London market.

Mr. HUGHES.—The prices of all our goods are determined by that market.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Whatever duty we may impose will have no effect whatever, because the price of precious stones in the Commonwealth is regulated by the London market. If precious stones are dearer here than they are in London, our supplies will come from London. But if a certain price can be realized for our stones upon the London market, the vendors will expect to obtain very nearly the same price for them here. It by imposing a heavy duty upon imitation precious stones we could cause an increased demand for the real—which is very doubtful—that increased demand would be so small that it would not affect the markets of the world.

Mr. HUGHES (West Sydney) [9.14].—The honorable member for North Sydney appears to think that the value of precious stones is determined by some factor other than that which determines the value of all our commodities. As a matter of fact, the price of every bushel of wheat grown in Australia is regulated by the price of wheat in London. In the same way, the price of boots here is determined by their price in London, New York, and Berlin, and by nothing else. The honorable gentleman seems to think that the value of imitation jewellery is a matter of a few pence. But he can go down town and s-

a good paste diamond worth £5 or £6, independent of its setting.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Not a diamond?

Mr. HUGHES.—That statement is quite true. Does not the honorable member know that Australian garnets can be produced and sold by the bucket? He does not know anything about them. Therefore these articles do compete with the better grade imitation jewels. If we put a reasonable duty on imitation jewels we shall reduce the difference between Australian precious stones and imitation stones, and it will lead people to buy the former.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Moreton) [9.16].—I ask the Treasurer to give me an opportunity to move the deletion of the words "and imitation jewellery" in the first line, with a view to moving later the insertion of a new paragraph dealing with imitation jewellery and imitation precious stones.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment (by Mr. SINCLAIR) proposed—

That the words "and Imitation Jewellery" be left out.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [9.17].—I hope that the Treasurer will accept the amendment, which I think will be a useful one and meet the views of a large number of honorable members.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—If imitation jewellery is omitted from this item I shall move the insertion of the article as a separate item, subject to duties of 40 and 35 per cent.

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment (by Mr. SINCLAIR) agreed to—

That the words "Imitation Precious Stones" be left out.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That after the word "materials" the words "and all articles, n.e.i., partly or wholly made of gold or silver, including gold and silver lace," be inserted.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) proposed—

That the following new item be inserted:—

"334A. On and after 7th December, 1907—Imitation Jewellery, n.e.i., and Imitation Precious Stones, ad val. (General Tariff), 40 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 35 per cent."

Mr. FOSTER (New England) [9.20].—I protest that this arrangement will not have the effect of bringing into use the cheaper precious stones. A duty of 40 per cent. on imitation precious stones amounts to practically nothing, as they are

worth only a few pence each. But if they were subjected to a duty of so much per carat it would prohibit their importation to a great extent and force into use the smaller diamonds, garnets, sapphires, rubies and so forth which we can produce, and which are of a fairly low value. I consider that if a definite attempt were made to bring into use our cheaper precious stones it might induce a cutter to set up an establishment in Australia. One of the greatest troubles to the miner who has precious stones is that there is no local buyer. They have all to be sent to the London or German market to be cut, and then they are returned to Australia. I believe that an almost prohibitive duty on imitation precious stones would lead to a decided increase in the use of our lower-priced precious stones.

Proposed new item agreed to.

Item 335 (All articles partly or wholly made up of gold or silver, unless dutiable at a higher rate, or specified or included under the head of jewellery elsewhere) negatived.

Item 336. Bullion and Coin; Gold and Silver Bar Ingot and Sheet; Cameos, Intaglios, and Precious Stones, unset, including Pearls, Coral, and Doublets; Gold and Silver Wire for Embroidery Bullion, Purl, free.

Mr. BOWDEN (Nepean) [9.23].—I ask the Treasurer to consider whether the articles embraced in this item ought to be free? Can we not produce in Australia bullion and coin and gold and silver bar? If so, why should those articles be made free?

Item agreed to.

Item 337. Watches, Clocks, and Chronometers, n.e.i., and parts thereof; Time Registers and Detectors; Opera, Field, and Marine Glasses; Pedometers; and Pocket Counters and the like, ad val. (General Tariff), 30 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 20 per cent.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [9.24].—In this item we are asked to give to British imports a preference of 10 per cent. as against cheap Swiss watches. I am told that there is no serious competition between Swiss and British watches, and that this duty will be a heavy tax on the poorer classes. In my opinion we ought to make the preference a little less than is proposed. Therefore, with a view to allowing the 20 per cent. in the preferential column to stand, I move—

That after the words "30 per cent." the words "and on and after 7th December, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 25 per cent.," be inserted.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [9.25].—I hold in my hand letters from four of, I believe, the leading firms in England, complimenting the Government and the Parliament upon the preference which has been offered in this Tariff to British imports. William Ehrhardt Limited, of Birmingham, the Lancashire Watch Company Limited, of Prescott, Henry Williamson, of London, and Rotherham and Sons, of Coventry, have written long letters in which they approve of the action of the Parliament, and thank the Government for proposing this preference to British watches.

Mr. HANS IRVINE (Grampians) [9.26].—I went to Rotherham and Sons to get a gold watch which had been presented to me many years before, and which bore the name of that firm, made into a stem-winding watch, but I found that they had only a fitting establishment in England, and that the bulk of the works of their watches were made in Switzerland. It has only been within the last two or three years that any large firms for the making of cheap watches for the multitude have been established in Great Britain. This duty will have the effect of raising the value of cheap watches by two or three shillings each. A watch that will keep good time for many years can be bought in London at from 3s. to 5s.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE (Flinders) [9.27].—I do not know why the preference has been made so much in this case and only 5 per cent. in other cases. It has gone forth to the world that we were giving a particular preference, and no doubt some of the British firms have based their calculations thereon. Unless there is strong reason for departing from it, it seems to me that it would be wiser not to do so.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—We have departed from it dozens of times.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—I do not think we have cut down the preference.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Yes; on scores of items.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—In some cases we have wiped out the preference, but that, I think, was done because the opposing sides were really fighting as to the amount of the general duty. I think that, as far as possible, we ought to maintain the preference which British people have been led to understand was being offered to them. Of course, the Committee is not responsible

for the offer of the Government, but if it goes back upon that offer it will not produce the most favorable impression in the Old Country. We ought not to depart from the offer except in special circumstances.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [9.29].—I am informed that the Swiss manufacturers have a monopoly of the manufacture of the cheaper sorts of watches. My informant says that the bulk—in fact, nearly all of them—are made in Switzerland for Great Britain, and distributed from the latter country.

Mr. HARPER.—And in America also. I have a dollar watch which keeps excellent time.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Clocks come from America in large numbers.

Mr. HARPER.—And watches also.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I am told that the Swiss have a traditionary skill in this trade, just as the British have in producing some sorts of cutlery. It has been developed through centuries.

Mr. PAGE (Maranoa) [9.32].—I should like to reply to the honorable member for Grampians in reference to the Rotherham Watch Company. I think he has been misinformed. I am told that every particle of the watches turned out by the Rotherham Company are made in Coventry. For that reason alone, I think that we should give a preference against the American watches. The English companies are now putting up expensive machinery to enable them to compete against the American watch trade. As the honorable member for Parramatta is constantly vaunting his desire for preference to the Mother Country, I appeal to him to agree to a preference of 10 per cent. in favour of English manufacturers in this line.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Will the honorable member undertake to vote with me on all preference amendments if I do?

Mr. PAGE.—No, I cannot; but I will undertake to vote for preference to the Old Country as often as I possibly can.

Mr. HANS IRVINE (Grampians) [9.34].—I have here a watch manufactured by Rotherham and Sons, London. It is a watch of a pattern well known in Australia. I had the greatest difficulty, when I was in London, in finding their establishment. I discovered it after great trouble, and I asked them whether they could convert my watch into a stem-winding watch. They said they could, but that it

would take them a little while. I asked them how long, and they said a month or six weeks. They could not do it in less time, because they had to get some of their parts from, or send it to, Switzerland.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [9.35].—Perhaps it would be well for me to read to the Committee part of a letter received by the Customs from Rotherham and Sons, London and Coventry. They say—

I am writing on behalf of my firm—the watch manufacturing firm of Rotherham and Sons—to express a wish that we may record how much we appreciate the sympathy of your Government in granting a preferential Tariff which extends to English watches; and I may add that this is also appreciated by our work people to an extent that could not have existed a few years ago. We hope that in the best interests of English manufacture, watches to gain the preference will have to be certified as English, both in movement and case, as there is a tendency amongst some makers of cheap goods to use foreign cases, a proceeding that is quite unnecessary.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Item agreed to.

Item 338. Watch and Clock Main and Hair Springs; Compasses of all kinds except for external wear; Ships' Chronometers, Patent Logs, and Sounding Machines; Microscopes; Telescopes; Barometers and Thermometers except advertising ad. val. (General Tariff), 5 per cent.; (United Kingdom), free.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That after the word "wear," line 3, the words "and except those of gold or silver or mounted in gold or silver," be inserted.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 339. Kinematographs, including sensitized and exposed films; Kinetoscopes, Phonographs, Graphophones, Gramophones, including accessories, n.e.i., ad val. (General Tariff), 35 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 25 per cent.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That after the word "Kinematographs" the word "Bioscopes" be inserted.

Mr. MAHON (Coolgardie) [9.38].—I move—

That the words "Phonographs, Graphophones, Gramophones, including accessories," be left out.

If this amendment be carried, I shall move that talking-machines, phonographs, commercial or business, graphophones, gramophones, including all accessories, be free.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not know whether it will affect the amendment of the honorable member, but I had intended to propose the addition of the words "machines for the manufacture in Australia of

phonograph, graphophone, and gramophone records, free."

Mr. MAHON.—I apprehend that very little argument will be required to recommend my amendment to the Committee. The object is, of course, to put talking-machines, including gramophones, graphophones, and phonographs on the free list. The phonograph is now largely used in commerce. I need not explain its operation. Seeing that these goods cannot be manufactured in Australia under present circumstances, the advisableness of not imposing a duty on them should be obvious. The Treasurer must be perfectly aware, also, that it is impossible to produce the records in Australia, because the artists' whose songs and music it is desired to be produced live for the most part at the other side of the world. Even supposing that these goods were manufactured in Australia, it would be necessary to pay a royalty on them, because the instruments are the subject of patents. I do not think that I need elaborate the point, but if the Committee wish I will enter into arguments in support of the contentions fully stated in the petition presented to the House from those engaged in the trade.

Mr. HUGHES.—The duty was 20 per cent. under the old Tariff.

Mr. MAHON.—Yes; but at the time it was passed the trade was insignificant compared with what it is now. Nobody took any notice of the duty, and the 20 per cent. was imposed for revenue purposes. Now, however, the imports have become of considerable volume.

Mr. SALMON.—Does the honorable member think that the records and instruments will become any cheaper if the duty is removed?

Mr. MAHON.—Yes. I am also certain that the price will be increased to the consumer by the amount of any duty we impose.

Mr. SALMON.—Will the price be reduced if we make the goods free?

Mr. MAHON.—I imagine that it will be reduced in time. At any rate, according to the Customs returns £60,000 worth of these goods were imported last year. When we passed the 1902 Tariff, the imports were comparatively trifling.

Mr. HUGHES.—Does the honorable member's amendment include kinematographs?

Mr. MAHON.—No, only talking machines.

Mr. KING O'MALLEY.—Cannot they be made in this country?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Is there any reasonable prospect of their being made here?

Mr. MAHON. — I am informed that there is not. In any case, it would be impossible to make the records here. The machines also are the subject of patents, and they are very complicated. If they were manufactured in Australia, it would be under great disadvantages, because, as the Treasurer knows very well, the demand in Australia is so limited that it would never pay a company to manufacture such complicated machines here.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Oh, but we shall have 50,000,000 people here in a few years' time!

Mr. MAHON.—There are many possibilities affecting the development of Australia, of course, but we are legislating for our own day and generation.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Not at all; we are legislating for ever!

Mr. MAHON.—I hope the honorable member will be long here to legislate. I content myself with submitting the amendment.

Amendment agreed to.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Amendment (by Mr. MAHON) agreed to—

That the following new item be inserted:—

"339A. On and after 7th December, 1907—Talking Machines, Graphophones, Gramophones, Phonographs, commercial or business, including all accessories, free," be inserted.

What about the amendment which the Treasurer said he intended to move?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The amendment carried at the honorable member's instance obviates the necessity for it.

Proposed new item agreed to.

Item 340 (Spectacle cases) agreed to.

Item 341. Spectacle Frames (not being partly or wholly of gold or silver, or gold or silver plated), with or without glasses (General Tariff), 10 per cent.; (United Kingdom), free.

Mr. CROUCH (Corio) [9.45].—If this item be passed without amendment, then gold and silver-rimmed spectacle frames will be dutiable under item 332 at 40 per cent. and 35 per cent.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—Surely they are not jewellery.

Mr. CROUCH.—That is the item under which they would come. I am glad to notice that common steel-rimmed spectacles are rapidly falling into disuse, and that even men and women in humble circumstances who need glasses are using superior spectacles with either gold or silver frames. Spectacles are not a luxury, and we should endeavour to make them available at a cheap rate. The people of Australia are recognising more than ever the necessity for carefully protecting the sight, and I think that good glasses should be brought within the reach of the poorest people in the community.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [9.48].—If the honorable member will allow me, I have an amendment to propose which I think will meet his objection. I move—

That the words "and on and after 7th December, 1907, Spectacles and Spectacle Frames, not being gold, and Glasses for Spectacles, ad val. (General Tariff), 10 per cent.; (United Kingdom), free," be added.

Mr. CROUCH (Corio) [9.49].—Even under the honorable member's amendment the spectacle frames to which I refer would be dutiable at 40 per cent.

Mr. SALMON.—Cannot gold spectacle frames be made here?

Mr. CROUCH.—They are not made here. About four years ago Messrs. W. Wood and Company, of Hovey-street, Melbourne, brought out two expert gold frame spectacle makers under a two years' contract, which provided that they should each receive a salary of £6 per week. It was found, however, that it would be impossible to carry on the industry of making gold spectacle frames in Australia, unless with the assistance of a duty of about 200 per cent. Four-dwt. spectacle frames, which can be imported for 15s., cost £1 14s. 4d. to produce here, and as the result of this experience, one of the experts returned to England after his period of service had expired, and the other is now carrying on a small repairing business in Melbourne. Most of these frames are imported from Germany, America, and France, and can be obtained there so cheaply that, as I have said, a duty of about 200 per cent. would be necessary to enable the industry to be successfully carried on in Australia. Under the Victorian Tariff gold-rimmed and silver-rimmed spectacles of all kinds were free, an attempt under an earlier Tariff to encourage the industry having failed.

I would ask the Minister to omit the words "not being partly or wholly of gold or silver."

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I cannot do that.

Mr. HUME COOK.—The honorable member is wrong as to the duties to which such spectacle frames would be liable. If the item be amended as proposed, they will be dutiable under item 334 at 30 per cent. and 25 per cent.

Mr. CROUCH.—Rolled gold spectacles would fall under item 332.

Mr. SALMON.—Rolled gold and silver frames are free, only standard gold frames being dutiable.

Mr. CROUCH.—In a letter to the press, a man in the trade wrote—

The preference in favour of the United Kingdom is an absolute farce. If it were raised to 20 per cent. it would not be effective in any of the lines mentioned. The Americans and Germans have succeeded in turning out superior goods at a much lower rate, and in the cheaper class of spectacles the Britisher does not attempt to compete, and I very much doubt whether a 50 per cent. preference would induce him to enter into competition.

Will the Minister give me his assurance that rolled gold spectacle frames will be free?

Mr. HUME COOK.—Rolled gold frames will be free.

Amendment agreed to.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Division XII.—Leather and Rubber.

Item 342. Boots, Shoes, Slippers, Clogs, Patens, and other footwear (of any material), n.e.i.; and Boot and Shoe Uppers and Tops; Cork, Leather, or other Socks or Soles, ad val. (General Tariff), 35 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 30 per cent.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [9.55].—I should like to know whether the Minister is prepared to agree to these duties being reduced to 30 per cent. and 25 per cent.?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—That would mean that most of these goods would come in under a duty 5 per cent. less than that which prevailed under the old Tariff.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Will the Treasurer re-enact the old duty in its entirety? If so, I will say no more.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—No.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The reason I ask for this reduction is that I find that last year we imported only £173,000 worth of boots and shoes, although I daresay that the total boot and shoe bill for Australia was at the very least £6,000,000 or 7,000,000.

Mr. SALMON.—That would be equal to 30s. per annum per head of the population.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I am sure that the honorable member will find that my estimate is not far out. These figures show that our own manufacturers have done very well under the old Tariff. They have practically driven importations out of Australia, so that this increased duty is unnecessary. Will the Treasurer agree to the old rates?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—No.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Then I shall move to apply duties of 30 per cent. and 25 per cent. to both items. Surely the Minister will make some difference in regard to infants' boots and shoes. In a communication which I have received from the chairman of the Bootmakers' Association of New South Wales, a protectionist I think, he says in regard to infants' shoes—

There are in Sydney, as far as I can trace, three very small manufacturers employing only a few hands. In Melbourne there are four unimportant manufacturers. Under the old Tariff these makers complained they could not make it pay to manufacture, and under the new Tariff none of them have extended their factories, nor do they employ more hands. As a fact, it is within my knowledge that hands for this class of work are not to be got. In the first place, they require female machinists, and there is a dearth of that class of labour in the market, as not only the shoe trade but all other trades complain they cannot get sufficient labour of this class to carry on. Then, where male labour is employed men will not do the work, as it is too small, and, consequently, it will develop into a trade for women and boys if that class of labour can be obtained.

He asks that infants' shoes be placed on the free list. The manufacture of these shoes does not pay, because other classes of business are much more profitable. I move—

That after the words "35 per cent." the words "and on and after 7th December, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 30 per cent.," be inserted.

Mr. LIDDELL (Hunter) [10.5].—The honorable member for Parramatta has shown that there is no good reason for increasing the duties on boots and shoes. Manufacturers have prospered under the old rates, the importations of boots and shoes being exceedingly small in comparison with the total number used in the Commonwealth. The bootmaking industry is not a new one. It is now settled on a firm basis. Therefore the proposal to reimpose the old rates will, I suppose, have the

support of the Labour Party. Honorable members know very well that children who go barefooted to school are looked down upon by their fellows.

Mr. FOSTER.—That is snobbery on the part of those who are wearing boots.

Mr. LIDDELL.—There is, of course, a school of physicians which claims that it is a good thing, in a climate like this, for children to go barefooted; but class distinctions never will be abolished, and children who go barefooted to school are made to feel by the others that they are in a lower social position.

Mr. SALMON.—Does the honorable member know what aged child would use a No. 6 boot, infants' size?

Mr. LIDDELL.—No; but I know that the increase in these and other duties will make it very hard for some parents to make both ends meet. If a man who is in receipt of a small wage has his expenditure increased by 3s. or 4s. a week, he may be reduced from a position of comparative luxury to one of poverty.

Mr. SALMON.—A child wearing a No. 6 boot, infant's size, is generally in the perambulator.

Mr. PAGE.—I have seen youngsters going barefooted to school in the Hunter electorate, and healthy kiddies they were, too.

Mr. LIDDELL.—That does not affect my argument. Children who go barefooted to school are looked down on by their fellows.

Mr. PAGE.—That is absurd. My children when going to school would not wear boots.

Mr. LIDDELL.—Not only the members of the Opposition, but the members of the Labour Party as well, should, in the interests of the workers whom they profess to represent, oppose any increase of duty on boots and shoes. Not long ago, when the New South Wales elections were on, the members of the Labour Party said that they would vote against any increase of duties on the necessities of life, and surely in a country like this, boots and shoes are among the necessities of life. The proposed increase should be voted against by all honorable members, no matter what their fiscal opinions.

Mr. PAGE (Maranoa) [10.12].—You, Mr. Chairman, having lived for many years in Western Queensland, are aware that there are more children troop to school barefooted than wear boots. The children of rich and poor alike will not wear boots to

school if they can avoid doing so. I could always afford to supply my youngsters with boots, but they used to plant them in the bush on their way to school, and then some one would come along and shake them. Let the members of the young Australia party say whether they have not done that sort of thing themselves when school children.

Mr. LIDDELL.—The honorable member did not bring his children up very well.

Mr. PAGE.—They have never caused me a moment's worry, and are a credit to me. The honorable member for Darling Downs will bear out my statement that Queensland children dislike wearing boots to school.

Mr. GROOM.—I went barefooted myself.

Mr. PAGE.—Things may be different in Melbourne, but in Queensland, it is the hardest thing in the world to get children to wear boots.

Mr. LIDDELL.—Going without boots is only a fashionable fad.

Mr. PAGE.—If the honorable member were in Queensland, he would be only too ready to adopt the fashion of wearing as few clothes as possible.

Mr. LIDDELL.—The honorable member is talking about the tropical districts.

Mr. PAGE.—I am talking about the sub-tropical districts. The honorable member knows nothing about any place outside the Hunter electorate. If he travelled more, he would not be as one-eyed as some of the Victorian protectionists. At Mungindi, on the New South Wales border, a few hundred miles north of Maitland, I have seen children going to school barefooted. The stock in Western Queensland are not degenerating, even though the youngsters do not wear boots when going to school. They are equal to sample. I have lived there thirty years, and am not, I think, a bad sample. The honorable member for Moreton is another good type of Queenslander, and I think he would corroborate my statement that youngsters go to school in that State barefooted, and are not looked down upon on that account. In the circumstances, the honorable member for Hunter, in pleading for the youngsters who have to go to school barefooted, is barking up the wrong tree.

Mr. COON (Batman) [10.16].—The honorable member for Parramatta has made a statement which I wish to correct. He referred to a letter in which it was

stated that a leading boot and shoe manufacturer in New South Wales had expressed the opinion that it was not likely that factories for the manufacture of infants' boots would be established in Victoria or any other State.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The honorable member is wrong. The statement was made that there are four factories.

Mr. COON.—The statement was made that no increase in the number was likely. Let me tell honorable members opposite that, since the present duty was imposed, the number of hands in one factory alone in this State has been increased by 25 per cent.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—How many were working there before?

Mr. COON.—They had five. The increase in the number of hands in another factory has been over 100 per cent. More than that, they have reduced the price of children's boots. The honorable member for Hunter spoke of children having to go to school without boots. The price of sizes 4 to 6 of boots such as these I have here were sold under the old Tariff at 1s. 8d. per pair, and we have reduced the price to 1s. 6d. per pair. These boots are made of Australian leather, under Australian conditions, and are competing successfully against the products of sweated labour in other countries, where the employes have to work every day in the week, in some cases, including Sundays. We pay in this industry 25s. a week to a girl who would get only 8s. or 9s. a week in the Old Country. Yet we have reduced the price under the present protective Tariff to the extent of 2d. per pair in these small sizes. Why, then, should the duty be taken off?

Mr. LIDDELL.—If those boots are examined, they will probably be found to be made mostly of brown paper.

Mr. COON.—I challenge the honorable member to examine the boots I have here. If he compares them with imported boots, he will find them superior. When the honorable member talks about brown paper, let me tell him that only a short time ago a gentleman waited on the Minister of Trade and Customs to ask him to allow infants' boots to come in at a low rate because the insoles were made of cardboard. I was approached in connexion with the matter, and refused to have anything to do with it. The Australian-made boots I have here are made entirely of leather. The duty should be maintained,

and, as a result, a number of men and girls will receive employment. There is no justification for a reduction of the duty, and the honorable member for Parramatta has not given a single reason why it should be reduced, whilst I have shown that under the present protection the prices of these boots have been reduced. In every line the prices of these sizes have been reduced in some cases by 1d. per pair and in others by 2d. per pair. The price charged for one line of these boots is 17s. per dozen, whilst the imported price for the same article is 18s. per dozen. The price for another line is 11s. per dozen, and the imported price 12s., and in connexion with another line I have here the price, as I have already said, has been reduced from 1s. 8d. to 1s. 6d. per pair. The honorable member for Parramatta comes from a State where those engaged in this industry have asked for the highest protection. They have asked for a duty of as high as 50 per cent. If I did not advocate the claim of New South Wales manufacturers when they ask for an increased duty, I should be told that as it was not a Victorian industry, I would not stand up for it. That is one of the reasons why I have stood up for it to-night.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [10.21].—The honorable member for Batman is like a travelling pedlar. First of all he brings a china cup into the chamber and flourishes it before the eyes of honorable members. Now he is hawking babies' boots about. I wonder where the honorable member picks these things up. He seems to be a veritable depository of all the nicks and nacks to be found in Australia. I am sure he must feel the responsibility of his position very keenly. He feels, no doubt, that he is the embodiment of the protectionist sentiment of Australia, and that he is performing a very solemn and sacred duty.

Mr. COON.—Let the honorable member give some reason against the duty.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I intend to do so, and I shall not give my own reasons. I prefer to give the reasons of a man who is the chairman of a great association in New South Wales, and who has been in this business all his life. Of course, he does not know half as much about the subject as does the honorable member for Batman, who, I suppose, has never worked

in a boot shop in his life, and therefore knows all about it.

Mr. COON.—I had ten years' experience in the boot trade.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I am sure I do not know what the honorable member has not done. He told us the other day that he has worked in mines. His biography, if written, should prove interesting reading. I guarantee that if he was in the boot factory to which he has referred at all, it was the first time he was ever in a boot factory. I might as well tell the honorable member that the writer of the letter to which I have referred, is Mr. Joseph Vickery, of Sydney, a man who has been manufacturing boots all his life. The letter continues—

Then, as to felt slippers, there is only a rise of 5 per cent., but this duty should be reduced as low as possible as these are the cheap goods that are made in Lancashire by non-sweated labour, made next to the mills where the material is manufactured. This class of work it would be impossible to make in this country, the material not being available nor the labour.

Another point I wish to put before you. In taxing these lines of infants' shoes and slippers you are taxing the little children and the working classes, as the goods that are imported are for labouring people in nearly all cases, and adding the duty on the imported price simply means adding considerably to the price of the article for the working man.

To sum up, the extra duties do not apparently benefit the Australian manufacturers, and, without doubt, they do seriously affect the Australian consumer of limited means.

It is signed "Joseph Vickery, Chairman." The Treasurer knows him well.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not know whom the honorable member means.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Surely the honorable member remembers the Honorable Ebenezer Vickery?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—He is not alive.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—No; but his sons are. This son, Joseph Vickery, is carrying on the business.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The Vickerys are the rankest of free-traders. Old Vickery was a red-hot one.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The Treasurer is, I think, misstating the facts, or he does not know anything about it.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—That is not so.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Mr. Joseph Vickery is, I believe, protectionist. He has been in the business all his life, and he makes that statement as chairman of the Boot Warehousemen's Association of New South Wales.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Did the honorable member ask Mr. Jackson, the great boot-maker in Sydney, who has retired, what he thought about it?

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I did not; but as he has retired I suppose the honorable member thinks that he knows more about it than does a man who is actively engaged in the business.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Mr. Jackson is very strongly in favour of high protection for boots. Let us get on.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I want to have this duty restored to its old level. The holding up of a small pair of boots in this chamber bears no relation whatever to the millions and millions of pairs that are consumed every year by the working people of Australia.

Mr. COON.—You can buy a pair of working boots now for 2s. 11d.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Here is a protectionist advocating 2s. 11d. boots! He is going to give good wages out of 2s. 11d. boots, and sound, solid leather boots into the bargain! We ask only for a small reduction of the duty, and only a small increase has been proposed by the Treasurer; but I have quoted an authoritative statement that an increase in duty will do no good to the manufacturers—they do not want it, as they had a virtual monopoly of the Australian market under the old duties—but will simply make boots dearer to the public. We ought, therefore, to let well alone.

Mr. LIDDELL (Hunter) [10.32].—The honorable member for Batman exhibited a pair of boots which he said were made in Australia, after stating that if the imported boots were examined it would be found that they were composed partly of paper. I have taken the trouble to examine very carefully the boots exhibited by the honorable member, and out of one small boot I have taken quite a handful of paper. On the surface there is a material which is made to imitate the finest white kid, but which after all is only paper. Below that again I find paper with printing on it—something about a company and a catalogue—and then again layer after layer of paper, and yet the honorable member for Batman says that those boots are made entirely of leather.

Mr. HUME COOK.—The soles are of solid leather. Every pair of boots of that kind is made in the same way.

Question—That after the words “35 per cent.” the words “and on and after 7th December, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 30 per cent.” be inserted (Mr. JOSEPH COOK’s amendment)—put. The Committee divided.

Ayes	11
Noes	28

Majority	17
----------	-----	-----	----

AYES.

Archer, E. W.	Johnson, W. E.
Atkinson, L.	Poynton, A.
Bowden, E. K.	Thomson, Dugald
Cook, Joseph	<i>Tellers:</i>
Edwards, R.	Liddell, F.
Fuller, G. W.	McWilliams, W. J.

NOES.

Bamford, F. W.	O'Malley, King
Chapman, Austin	Page, J.
Crouch, R. A.	Quick, Sir John
Deakin, A.	Salmon, C. C.
Ewing, T. T.	Spence, W. G.
Foster, F. J.	Storrier, D.
Frazer, C. E.	Thomas, J.
Groom, L. E.	Thomson, John
Hedges, W. N.	Tudor, F. G.
Irvine, Hans	Watkins, D.
Irvine, W. H.	Wise, G. H.
Knox, W.	<i>Tellers:</i>
Lyne, Sir William	Cook, Hume
Maloney, W. R. N.	Coon, J.
Mathews, J.	

PAIRS.

Kelly, W. H.	Kingston, C. C.
Glynn, P. McM.	Batchelor, E. L.
Smith, Bruce	Sampson, S.
Fysh, Sir Philip	Harper, R.
Reid, G. H.	Hall, D. R.
Willis, Henry	Watson, J. C.
Sinclair, H.	McDougall, J. K.
Wilks, W. H.	Webster, W.
Brown, Tilley	Carr, E. S.
Hughes, W. M.	Palmer, A. C.
Livingston, J.	Hutchison, J.
Mahon, H.	Chanter, J. M.
Fowler, J. M.	Catts, J. H.
Brown, Thomas	Mauger, S.
Foxton, Colonel	Wilson, J. G.

Question so resolved in the negative.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [10.37].—I desire to know whether I shall be in order in moving an all-round duty of 30 per cent.?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I shall object to such a duty, because large quantities of these goods come from Great Britain, and I desire to give a preference to the Old Country.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—What the Treasurer desires is a duty against the Old Country—it is a miserable sham preference!

Item agreed to.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Moreton) [10.38].—1 move—

That the following new item be inserted:—
“342A. On and after 7th December, 1907, Children’s Boots and Shoes, sizes 0 to 12, ad val., 15 per cent.”

Personally, I think that my proposal is a fair compromise.

Mr. SALMON.—The proposed duty is lower than that in the old Tariff, which only went as far as size 6.

Mr. SINCLAIR.—Honorable members will observe that the duties on adults’ boots are 35 per cent. and 30 per cent. We desire an increase of population; and people who have large families feel the boot bill very severely.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [10.41].—I cannot think that honorable members are aware of what is proposed. I quoted just now, when only a few members were in the chamber, a letter from the Chairman of the Association of Manufacturers of Boots and Shoes, pointing out that no infants’ boots are being made in Australia. The only exception is that related by the honorable member for Batman, who has found in Melbourne a factory employing five hands. In order to protect an industry employing five hands in Melbourne, it is proposed to tax all the infants’ boots and shoes throughout the Commonwealth. I say that this is protection run stark mad.

Proposed new item negatived.

Amendment (by Mr. SINCLAIR) proposed—

That the following new item be inserted:—
“342A. On and after 7th December, 1907, Infants’ Boots and Shoes, sizes 0 to 6, ad val., 15 per cent.”

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [10.49].—I would suggest that an all-round duty should be imposed upon footwear. That was the principal request urged by those interested in the boot industry who appeared before the Tariff Commission. No differentiation should be made in favour of infants’ boots and shoes, which are made of the poorest material. As a matter of fact, these boots are sold at from 6d. to 7d. per pair, and a duty of 30 per cent. upon such goods would not amount to much.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—Does the honorable member think that he can buy infants’ boots for 6d. per pair?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—Those interested in the industry desire that the same rate shall be levied upon all classes of boots

and shoes—infants' and adults' alike. Under the old Tariff, which imposed a duty of 15 per cent., the outside competition was so great that the Australian market was swamped, and prices were reduced to such a low level that our local manufacturers could not successfully compete.

Question put. The Committee divided.

Ayes	15
Noes	22

Majority	7
----------	-----	-----	---

AYES.

Archer, E. W.	Johnson, W. E.
Atkinson, L.	Knox, W.
Bowden, E. K.	McWilliams, W. J.
Cook, Joseph	Poynton, A.
Frazer, C. E.	Thomson, Dugald
Hedges, W. M.	<i>Tellers:</i>
Irvine, Hans.	Fuller, G. W.
Irvine, W. H.	Liddell, F.

NOES.

Chapman, Austin	Quick, Sir John
Coon, J.	Salmon, C. C.
Crouch, R. A.	Spence, W. G.
Deakin, A.	Storrer, D.
Ewing, T. T.	Thomson, John
Foster, F. J.	Tudor, F. G.
Groom, L. E.	Watkins, D.
Lyne, Sir William	Wise, G. H.
Maloney, W. R. N.	<i>Tellers:</i>
Mathews, J.	Cook, Hume
Mauger, S.	Page, J.
O'Malley, King	

PAIRS.

Kelly, W. H.	Kingston, C. C.
Glynn, P. McM.	Batchelor, E. L.
Smith, Bruce	Sampson, S.
Fysh, Sir Philip	Harper, R.
Reid, G. H.	Hall, D. R.
Willis, Henry	Watson, J. C.
Sinclair, H.	McDougall, J. K.
Wilks, W. H.	Webster, W.
Brown, Tilley	Carr, E. S.
Hughes, W. M.	Palmer, A. C.
Livingston, J.	Hutchison, J.
Mahon, H.	Chanter, J. M.
Fowler, J. M.	Catts, J. H.
Foxton, Colonel	Wilson, J. G.
Edwards, R.	Bamford, F. W.

Question so resolved in the negative.

Proposed new item negatived.

Item 343 (Goloshes, Rubber Sand Boots and Shoes and Plimsolls); item 344 (Slipper Forms and Royal Cord in the piece; Prunella, Lasting, and Stuff for Boots, Shoes and Slippers); and item 345 (Boots, Rubber, namely, Gum and Wading boots) agreed to.

Item 346. Rubber and other Hose, ad val. (General Tariff), 25 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 20 per cent.

Mr. JOHNSON (Lang) [10.57].—In this case, the A section of the Tariff Commission recommended a duty of 20 per cent., and the B section a duty of 15 per cent.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The preference is only 5 per cent.

Mr. JOHNSON.—In my opinion, we ought to fix the duty at 20 per cent. in the general Tariff, and at 15 per cent. in the preferential Tariff. Therefore, I move—

That after the words "25 per cent." the words "and on and after 7th December, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 20 per cent.," be inserted.

Question put. The Committee divided.

Ayes	12
Noes	24

Majority	12
----------	-----	-----	----

AYES.

Archer, E. W.	Johnson, W. E.
Atkinson, L.	Poynton, A.
Bowden, E. K.	Thomson, Dugald
Cook, Joseph	<i>Tellers:</i>
Forrest, Sir John	Liddell, F.
Fuller, G. W.	McWilliams, W. J.
Hedges, W. N.	

NOES.

Chapman, Austin	Mauger, S.
Coon, J.	O'Malley, King
Crouch, R. A.	Page, J.
Deakin, A.	Quick, Sir John
Ewing, T. T.	Salmon, C. C.
Foster, F. J.	Spence, W. G.
Frazer, C. E.	Thomson, John
Groom, L. E.	Tudor, F. G.
Irvine, Hans	Wise, G. H.
Irvine, W. H.	<i>Tellers:</i>
Lyne, Sir William	Cook, Hume
Maloney, W. R. N.	Storrer, D.
Mathews, J.	

PAIRS.

Kelly, W. H.	Kingston, C. C.
Glynn, P. McM.	Batchelor, E. L.
Smith, Bruce	Sampson, S.
Fysh, Sir Philip	Harper, R.
Reid, G. H.	Hall, D. R.
Willis, Henry	Watson, J. C.
Sinclair, H.	McDougall, J. K.
Wilks, W. H.	Webster, W.
Brown, Tilley	Carr, E. S.
Hughes, W. M.	Palmer, A. C.
Livingston, J.	Hutchison, J.
Mahon, H.	Chanter, J. M.
Fowler, J. M.	Catts, J. H.
Foxton, Colonel	Wilson, J. G.
Edwards, R.	Bamford, F. W.

Question so resolved in the negative.

Amendment negatived.

Item agreed to.

Item 347. Rubber Manufactures, n.e.i., and Articles, n.e.i., in which Rubber forms a part; including Air and Water Beds; Air Cushions and Pillows; Surgical Tubing, Bandages, Elastic

Stockings, Leggings, Knee Caps, Thigh-pieces and Wristlets; Hat-makers' Press Bags and Rings; Gas Bags; Soles, Pads, and Heels; Cash Mats; Rubbered Tyre Fabric; Tyre Rubber; Tyres, not accompanying Cycles or Vehicles; Tubes, valved or unvalved; Rubber Stoppers or Corks; Reclaimed Rubber, ad val. (General Tariff), 25 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 20 per cent.

Mr. JOHNSON (Lang) [11.1].—In this item I find several articles which, in my opinion, ought to be excised.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I intend to propose that several articles be made free.

Mr. JOHNSON. — If the honorable gentleman is going to do that, it will be all right.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [11.2].—I propose to ask the Committee to delete air and water beds, and air cushions and pillows, and later on to submit another proposal. I move—

That the words "Air and Water Beds; Air Cushions and Pillows," be left out.

Mr. BOWDEN (Nepean) [11.3].—I ask the Treasurer to agree to the omission of surgical tubing, bandages, elastic stockings, leggings, knee caps, thigh pieces and wristlets. These are all surgical articles which are used by invalids and sick persons, and which I venture to suggest ought not to be taxed. Hospital furniture has been allowed to come in at a lesser rate than other furniture, and these articles may fairly be described as hospital furniture.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—If the honorable member will allow my amendment to be made, his suggestion can be dealt with afterwards.

Mr. MALONEY (Melbourne) [11.4].—I hope that the Treasurer will not consent to the omission of the articles which have just been mentioned by the honorable member for Nepean.

Mr. FRAZER (Kalgoorlie) [11.5].—If Australia is able to manufacture rubber and other hose, it appears to me that it ought to be possible to manufacture rubber sheeting and pillows. I should think that the difficulty of making such articles would be much less than that of making hose. The Minister might have given reasons for his amendment.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [11.6].—The reason supplied to me is that these goods are extensively used by invalids.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—Does not the same remark apply to surgical bandages?

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. BOWDEN (Nepean) [11.8].—I do not see why we should not also leave out surgical tubing, bandages, elastic stockings, leggings, knee caps, thigh pieces, and wristlets. The Treasurer's reason for leaving out air and water beds, air cushions and pillows applies just as strongly to these articles—namely, that they are used by invalids.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I will not agree to leave out anything but surgical tubing.

Mr. BOWDEN.—Then I move—

That the words "Surgical Tubing" be left out.

Mr. MALONEY (Melbourne) [11.10].—I wish to point out that these surgical appliances are being manufactured in Melbourne at very reasonable prices. I know from experience that elastic stockings, leggings, thigh pieces, and wristlets of excellent quality and low price are being locally made. What is proposed is simply an increase of 5 per cent. over the old duty. I have had reason to purchase some of these goods for my own patients lately, and I found that the price was much less than I had to pay some years ago.

Mr. LIDDELL (Hunter) [11.12].—It is all very well to say that rubber bandages are cheaper to-day than they were a few years ago; but I have letters from two leading firms, one in Sydney and another in Melbourne, which throw a different light on the question. I point out that these letters are not of the character of those with which we have been deluged during the past few weeks. They were sent in reply to inquiries made by me, because I wished to inform myself on the subject. The writers did not approach me in the first instance; I approached them. Consequently, I place more value upon them than I do upon letters such as have been sent to every member of Parliament. One of the leading firms of surgical instrument dealers, Messrs. Denyer Brothers, Melbourne, write to me—

Now that the new Tariff is before the House for discussion, we desire to bring prominently under your notice, and through you to the members of the Commonwealth Parliament, certain articles which are classed as dutiable, which in our opinion should for suffering humanity's sake be admitted duty free.

Mr. STORRER.—Do they always think of that when they are selling these goods?

Mr. MALONEY.—No, they do not!

Mr. LIDDELL.—I think that people in this line of business do make considerable

reductions when selling their goods to hospitals.

Mr. MALONEY.—They make a very good profit.

Mr. LIDDELL.—Honorable members must not forget that there is a very small sale for articles of this description. They are not bought as we buy boots and clothing. The demand being limited, they are naturally expensive. It would not pay any one to set up a large factory for the manufacture of such articles. As the output is so small, of necessity the dealers are compelled to import them. Take the case of elastic stockings and knee caps. We know that they are articles which must of necessity be of good quality, or they are absolutely useless. The man who buys elastic stockings which are not well made, and of the best material, might as well throw his money into the sea.

Mr. MALONEY.—Newly-made stockings of that kind are better than are those which come from Europe, and which must suffer by passing through the tropics.

Mr. LIDDELL.—The voyage in the present day does not take long, and the goods in question might, if necessary, be placed in cool chambers. Silk elastic hosiery, in the opinion of the trade, should be free. I have here a letter from a Sydney firm—Messrs. Potter and Birks, of Macquarie-street, who write—

We cannot see that imposing duties upon the lines in question would lead to any increase of employment in Australia, as the constant changes and improvements that are taking place in modern surgery would not justify any firm in attempting to manufacture locally, and moreover, what would be the raw products to a firm wishing to manufacture in Australia are also subject to duties, viz., cotton, glassware, &c.

I appeal to the Treasurer to agree to the removal of the duty on bandages, elastic stockings, leggings, knee caps, thigh-pieces, and wristlets. He has already agreed to allow surgical tubing, which is nothing more nor less than gas tubing, to come in free, but it is far more essential that the goods I have named should be placed on the free list.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—What are elastic knee caps?

Mr. LIDDELL.—They are made of elastic interwoven with silk, and are very useful for such diseases as housemaid's knee. I would urge honorable members generally to support me in this request, and am satisfied that the honorable member for

Laanecoorie, although he is an ardent protectionist, will agree with me that these goods should be placed on the free list.

Mr. SALMON (Laanecoorie) [11.21].—I approve of the proposal of the Treasurer to omit the words "surgical tubing," but I am assured on the very best authority that the other surgical goods mentioned in the item can, and have been, made in Australia, and that as a matter of fact they are sold at a lower price than is charged for them by those who have approached the honorable member.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Are they really manufactured here?

Mr. SALMON.—I am assured that the whole process of manufacture is carried out in Australia. Since the firms which import them charge exorbitant prices—prices out of all proportion to their initial cost—I do not feel inclined to help them in this matter. I have it on good authority that rubber manufacturers in the Commonwealth, whom we have assisted very materially by the imposition of protective duties, have taken up a class of manufacture which has taken the place of certain importations which have been stopped at the Customs House. Certain goods of an illicit character, which are sold by chemists and other dealers for purposes which Australia at all events should endeavour as far as possible to minimize, are now being manufactured by rubber-makers in the Commonwealth. A great deal has been done by the Customs Department to prevent the importation of such goods, and I am very grieved to find that manufacturers whom we have protected are now taking up their production.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—Let us vote.

Mr. SALMON.—I am sure that the honorable member does not grasp the importance of the matter with which I am now dealing.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—I do, and I agree with the honorable member.

Mr. SALMON.—I wish to let these manufacturers know that so long as I am a member of this Parliament I shall devote the closest scrutiny to the manufacture of such goods, and that I am prepared, if they continue the methods said to have been recently adopted by them, to bring the matter before the House with a view to action being taken.

Mr. PAGE.—This is the fault of the Treasurer, who has given the manufacturers close protection.

Mr. LIDDELL.—It is not the only evil result of protection.

Mr. SALMON.—I felt it incumbent on me to make this statement, in order that it may reach the ears of those who may need the warning.

Mr. JOHNSON (Lang) [11.25].—The honorable member for Laanecoorie has spoken about the excessive cost of these articles, and yet wishes the Committee to impose a duty which will practically establish a local monopoly enabling makers to still further increase their charges. The best way to prevent overcharging is to create the freest competition. If there is any force in the arguments of the honorable member for Laanecoorie, these goods should be on the free list.

Mr. SALMON.—The exorbitant prices I have spoken of were charged when they were on the free list. They were made free under the Victorian Tariff, and on a motion moved by me in the State Parliament.

Mr. JOHNSON.—For years the price of rubber was very high, and consequently all articles manufactured of rubber were dear, but of late there has been a drop in rubber, and, as a result, a cheapening of rubber goods.

Mr. SALMON.—The price is out of all proportion to the cost of the rubber.

Mr. JOHNSON.—The imposition of a heavy duty will not cure the evil.

Mr. SALMON.—These things are cheaper now.

Mr. JOHNSON. — They are cheaper everywhere now, because of the reduced price of rubber. I know that honorable members are anxious to get through with the Tariff. We could finish in a night if we let the Treasurer and his supporters have their way; but I am not prepared to do that. I am pledged to my constituents to try to secure the reduction of duties, and I shall do what I can to carry out my promise.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. BOWDEN (Nepean) [11.32].—I move—

That the words "Bandages, Elastic Stockings, Leggings, Knee Caps, Thigh-pieces, and Wrist-lets," be left out.

I move this amendment with the object of having these goods placed on the free list. In the interests of humanity, the Committee should agree to my proposal.

Mr. MATHEWS (Melbourne Ports) [11.33].—There is too much talk about the interests of humanity, the result of which

is that the Tariff is being whittled away piecemeal. The india rubber trade of Australia is progressing, and we do not wish it to fall back. I hope that the Treasurer will not give way to the Opposition any more.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. TUDOR (Yarra) [11.35].—In the last Tariff we differentiated to the extent of 5 per cent. in the duties on valved and unvalved tubes, in order to provide that the tubes should be finished here. That was done at my instigation, and, as I see both are now included in the same item, I should like to know the reason for the change.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I think they are all made here now.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That the words "Reclaimed Rubber" be left out.

Mr. JOHNSON (Lang) [11.36].—With a view to subsequently moving that the duty on imports from the United Kingdom shall be 15 per cent., I move—

That after the words "25 per cent." the words "and on and after 7th December, 1907, ad. val. (General Tariff), 20 per cent.," be inserted.

I hope the Treasurer will accept the amendment, and, if we carry proportionate duties on the items lower down, we shall be able to get through the Division in no time.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I cannot accept the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Then it is necessary that I should point out that under the old Tariff the goods included in this item were dutiable at 15 per cent., and the recommendation of the protectionist section of the Tariff Commission is that the duty should be 20 per cent., which is what I have just proposed. If we have in the preference column a duty equal to that imposed under the old Tariff, and under the General Tariff impose a duty in accordance with the recommendation of the protectionist section of the Tariff Commission, that should satisfy the Treasurer. The insurance and other import charges added to the duties I propose should provide ample protection for the local producers of these goods.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—This is carrying out the arrangement made by the Opposition to get through the Division as soon as possible.

Mr. JOHNSON.—As soon as possible, consistently with doing what is right.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I can assure the honorable member that I cannot accept his amendment. He should let it go to a division, and I shall be prepared to accept the decision of the Committee.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Then, I suppose I shall have to let it go to a division. I suppose I have suffered as much as any member of the Committee. I have had to stick at the business very closely, though I have been suffering for hours daily from a splitting headache, and feel very ill through having to breathe the poisonous atmosphere of the House; but I shall let it go to a division, chiefly out of consideration for the officers and pressmen who are compelled to remain in connexion with the business of the House.

Amendment negatived.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Mr. BOWDEN (Nepean) [11.42].—I think that I should here move the insertion of a new paragraph to cover air and water beds, air cushions and pillows, and surgical tubing. If they are not dealt with separately, they will be dutiable under rubber manufactures n.e.i. I do not care what course is adopted, so long as they are specially mentioned and admitted free.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—They will be dealt with in a special item.

Item 348. Rubber and Rubber Manufactures, viz. :—

Indiarubber, crude or powdered; Rubber Waste; Hard Rubber, in sheets; Rubber Thread; Boot and Apparel Elastics; Masticated Rubber; India-rubber Syringes, Enemas, Injection Bottle, Urinals, free.

Mr. MATHEWS (Melbourne Ports) [11.44].—I should like to remind the Treasurer that hard rubber in sheets is largely manufactured here, and I think that it is a mistake to include it in this item. I see no reason why hard rubber sheets should be admitted free. The Opposition are most persistent when they want anything, but if any one else makes a proposal they are up in arms at once. It is a good job that they are not in a majority.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—It is not at all fair to keep us here so long. I will attend to anything for the honorable member if he will speak to me about it.

Mr. MATHEWS.—The treatment I have received is not fair, and I feel it very much.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [11.46].—I move—

That after the word “powdered” the words “and reclaimed” be inserted.

This was struck out of the previous item, and I wish to insert it here to make sure that it does not fall under another item at a higher rate.

Amendment agreed to.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [11.47].—I do not know whether rubber in sheets, of which the honorable member spoke, is manufactured here to any great extent.

Mr. MATHEWS.—The proprietors of the establishment assure me that they do make it.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—If the honorable member will see me, I will ascertain what I can do. I move—

That the word “bottles” be inserted in lieu of “bottle,” and that the words “and Air and Water Beds, Air Cushions and Pillows, and Surgical Tubing,” be inserted after the word “urinals.”

Amendments agreed to.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 349. Leather Manufactures, n.e.i.; Leather cut into shape; Harness, Razor Straps; and Whips, including Keepers, Thongs, and Lashes, ad val., 25 per cent.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [11.50].—The Treasurer should at least allow a preference on harness and razor straps. I move—

That the words “and on and after 7th December, 1907, ad val. (United Kingdom), 20 per cent.,” be added.

Mr. CROUCH (Corio) [11.51].—Does the Treasurer agree to a preferential rate of 20 per cent.? That would reduce the duty to what it was previously:

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I have not agreed to it.

Question put. The Committee divided.

Ayes	9
Noes	18
Majority				9

AYES.

Cook, Joseph	Poynton, A.
Forrest, Sir John	Thomson, Dugald
Hedges, W. N.	Tellers: Bowden, E. K.
Irvine, Hans	McWilliams, W. J.
Johnson, W. E.	

NOMS.

Chapman, Austin
Crouch, R. A.
Ewing, T. T.
Groom, L. E.
Lyne, Sir William
Maloney, W. R. N.
Mathews, J.
Mauger, S.
O'Malley, King
Page, J.

Quick, Sir John
Storrer, D.
Thomson, John
Tudor, F. G.
Watkins, D.
Wise, G. H.

Tellers:

Cook, Hume
Coon, J.

PAIRS.

Kelly, W. H.
Glynn, P. McM.
Smith, Bruce
Fysh, Sir Philip
Reid, G. H.
Willis, Henry
Sinclair, H.
Wilks, W. H.
Brown, Tilley
Hughes, W. M.
Livingston, J.
Mahon, H.
Fowler, J. M.
Foxton, Colonel
Edwards, R.
Liddell, F.
Fuller, G. W.

Kingston, C. C.
Batchelor, E. L.
Sampson, S.
Harper, R.
Hall, D. R.
Watson, J. C.
McDougall, J. K.
Webster, W.
Carr, E. S.
Palmer, A. C.
Hutchison, J.
Chanter, J. M.
Catts, J. H.
Wilson, J. G.
Bamford, F. W.
Salmon, C. C.
Foster, F. J.

Question so resolved in the negative.

Amendment negatived.

Item agreed to.

Item 350—

(A) Leather, Rubber, and Composition Belting and Green Hide for Belting and other purposes, ad val. (General Tariff), 25 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 20 per cent.

(B) Leather, n.e.i., including Chamois Leather and unspecified articles used in the manufacture of Boots and Shoes, ad val. (General Tariff), 30 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 20 per cent.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Pendigo) [11.55].

—I desire to suggest a slight reduction or modification in the duty on leathers.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—A reduction? Nonsense!

Sir JOHN QUICK.—With reference to leathers, I may say that it has been found that there is a deficiency in what is known as upper leather of a superior character, including kid, patent, enamel and calf leathers. The boot manufacturers and tanners have had a conference; and I understand, after a deputation to the Minister, have unanimously agreed that the proposed duty should be reduced.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not agree to a reduction.

Mr. MALONEY (Melbourne) [11.56].—I have a prior amendment. I desire to move an amendment in paragraph A to the effect that after the words "other purposes" the words "and belt butts" be inserted.

These belt butts are largely imported from Great Britain, and are used in a certain way. They are made in Australia; but I point out that if these belt butts are left n.e.i. they will be charged 30 per cent., and the result will be that they as raw material will be charged 5 per cent. more than the manufactured article. I move—

That after the words "other purposes" the words "and Belt Butts" be inserted.

Mr. CROUCH (Corio) [11.57]. — I suggest that the honorable member for Melbourne should embody his amendment in a new paragraph, and make these belt butts subject to duties of 20 and 15 per cent. I am told that there is one English belt butt used to ninety-nine Australian belts; but, at the same time, it is necessary to import a certain proportion of English manufacture.

Mr. MALONEY.—I understand that the Treasurer desires to move an amendment, and, under the circumstances, I ask leave to withdraw my amendment temporarily.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) proposed—

That the words "and on and after 7th December, 1907, Leather, rubber, and composition belting, and greenhide for belting, and other purposes, ad val. (General Tariff), 25 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 20 per cent.

B. Leather, namely, kid and patent and enamelled leather, ad val. 20 per cent.

C. Leather, viz., calf n.e.i., white sheep and white lamb, ad val., 15 per cent.

D. Leather n.e.i., ad. val., 20 per cent." be added.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The Treasurer has acted on the circular immediately.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—This amendment has been prepared in the Department.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—What a set of puppets the Government are! Anybody outside can pull the strings!

Mr. HUME COOK.—This amendment was agreed on between the manufacturers and the bootmakers.

Mr. JOHNSON (Lang) [12.0].—Here we have another instance of the Treasurer, without any knowledge of the purpose or effect of this proposal, introducing without notice, after midnight, an important amendment. The Committee have a right to resent being treated in this off-hand manner. The circular referred to by the honorable member for North Sydney has just been placed in the Treasurer's hands.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—It is not the circular which has caused me to move the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Simply because somebody in the industry whispers a request, the Treasurer immediately asks the Committee to accept an amendment of this kind. I refuse to be a party to this sort of legislation. We are supposed to be a deliberative body; and yet what are we asked to do? The Treasurer, whilst expressing anxiety to deal with these items as they appear in the schedule, has the temerity at the very last moment to submit absolutely new proposals. I should like to know what the proposed duty of 2d. per square foot means from an *ad valorem* stand-point.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [12.7 a.m.].—A little while ago I stated that the duties upon leather should be reduced, and the honorable member for Parramatta appeared to welcome my suggestion. But now that the Treasurer has actually proposed a reduction, his proposal is meeting with violent opposition.

Mr. JOHNSON.—He has not explained the nature of his proposal.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—At any rate, I intend to support it. The A section of the Tariff Commission recommended the imposition of a duty of 20 per cent. upon all kinds of leather. Since then fresh information has become available, from which it appears that there is a deficiency in certain classes of leather in Australia, such as kid, patent, and enamel leather, which are used for uppers in certain kinds of boots. There is also a deficiency in calf leathers known as white sheep and lamb leather.

Mr. WATKINS.—Do we not grow the best sheep in the world?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—But the tanners have not yet entered upon the production of this class of leather. When the A section of the Tariff Commission recommended a duty of 20 per cent upon all classes of leather, its members were under the impression that their recommendation met the requirements of the trade.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Where is kid leather being made in Australia?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—In slight quantities, I understand that it is being made in Richmond, Melbourne. Since the report of the A section of the Tariff Commission was drawn up the manufacturers of Victoria and South Australia have met in conference, and, in conjunction with the kid tanners, have waited as a deputation upon the Minister of Trade and Customs. Upon the 22nd August last, they

urged that the duty upon calf should be reduced to 15 per cent., and that 2d. per square foot should be levied upon kid leathers. I have been informed that the manufacturers and tanners in all the States concur in this proposition, and I fail to see why such a howl of indignation should emanate from the free-trade members of the Committee, when a request is made to reduce the duties levied upon their raw materials.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—The Treasurer says that his proposal will involve an increase.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—It means a reduction in the case of calf leathers from 30 per cent. to 15 per cent.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—If it cannot be produced here, why tax it at all?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—It is being produced here in limited quantities. I am endeavouring to facilitate importations for the sake of meeting the requirements of the trade. At the present time, no attempt is being made to produce these superior kids. I have been informed by the honorable member for Batman that he was present at the deputation which waited upon the Minister of Trade and Customs, and I appeal to the latter to say whether a request was not preferred for a reduction.

Mr. TUDOR.—I was present.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—Then what is the reason of the honorable member's opposition to my proposal? I am not wedded to a fixed duty of 2d. per square foot—I have no objection to an *ad valorem* rate of, say, 10 per cent.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [12.15 a.m.].—I do not mind admitting that the proposal of the honorable member for Bendigo came as a positive shock to me. I cannot yet realize that the Chairman of the Tariff Commission has actually proposed a reduction of the duty upon the articles enumerated in paragraph A. I hope that it will be chronicled in our history, and that 100 years hence people will recollect that on the 7th December, 1907, the honorable member proposed a reduction in a duty. Does the honorable member for Batman concur in this proposal? Will the Sphinx speak? It is of no use for the honorable member for Bendigo to make these proposals unless the honorable member for Batman concurs in them.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—It is all right.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The honorable member proposes to reduce the duty on these articles because they are not generally manufactured here. He says that there are some manufactures of the kind going on.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—On account of the small output of kid.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—We were told a little while ago, on the authority of the honorable member for Batman, that there were five men and a boy making children's boots, and therefore we decided to put duties of 30 and 35 per cent. on those articles.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—Because there is plenty of raw material for making them; but this other raw material is not available to the bootmakers.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Have we not the hides?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—We have not the kid. I did not concur in these proposals until I was thoroughly convinced.

Mr. STORRER (Bass) [12.20 a.m.].—I remind honorable members that the agriculturists who supply the skins need protection as well as any one else. I have received a copy of the circular from the bootmakers and tanners, who, I venture to think, are wonderfully kind persons. They suggest certain duties, and point out that it is not necessary to give any preference to Great Britain because the leathers which come from that country are only used by the bookbinders and upholsterers. Practically they say that they are not affected by those duties, and that therefore it is not necessary to give a preference to Great Britain.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Why should they? The honorable member would not give a preference to British saddle leather just now.

Mr. STORRER.—I am willing to vote for the proposals of the Government as printed, but I shall not vote for anything of the kind which the Treasurer has foreshadowed. I believe in *ad valorem* duties, and I intend to adhere to that principle.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [12.22 a.m.].—I move—

That after the words "25 per cent.," paragraph A, the words "and on and after 7th December, 1907, *ad val.* (General Tariff), 20 per cent.," be inserted.

Under a free-trade Tariff in New South Wales the manufacture of leather belting was extremely successful, and the trade grew. There is not the least occasion to

increase the duty on the article. If it is increased it will only afford the manufacturers an opportunity to charge a higher price to the users.

Mr. TUDOR (Yarra) [12.23 a.m.].—I am opposed to the alteration of the duty on belting, because I believe that it has not too high a protection at the present time.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—In New South Wales the industry did excellently when there was no duty.

Mr. TUDOR.—Since the duty was placed on composition belting the manufacture of belting has increased here.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—How many persons are working at that tannery?

Mr. TUDOR.—I was present when the Minister of Trade and Customs received the deputation of boot manufacturers and master tanners, representing, I believe, all the States. I understand that the boot manufacturers of all the States have agreed to the amended proposals. In the majority of cases a fixed duty of 2d. per square foot on kid will be less than a duty of 15 per cent.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I suggest to the honorable member that he should reserve his remarks until paragraph A has been dealt with.

Mr. TUDOR.—I oppose the decrease on the leather belting, and hope that the protective duty provided for in paragraph A will be maintained.

Question—That the words proposed to be inserted be so inserted—put. The Committee divided.

Ayes 12

Noes 19

Majority 7

AYES.

Bowden, E. K.	McWilliams, W. J.
Cook, Joseph	Poynton, A.
Forrest, Sir John	Thomson, Dugald
Fuller, G. W.	
Hedges, W. N.	<i>Tellers:</i>
Irvine, Hans	Liddell, F.
Johnson, W. E.	Atkinson, L.

NOES.

Chapman, Austin	Page, J.
Coon, J.	Quick, Sir John
Crouch, R. A.	Storror, D.
Ewing, T. T.	Thomson, John
Foster, F. J.	Tudor, F. G.
Groom, L. E.	Watkins, D.
Lyne, Sir William	Wise, G. H.
Maloney, W. R. N.	<i>Tellers:</i>
Mauger, S.	Cook, Hume
O'Malley, King	Mathews, J.

PAIRS.

Kelly, W. H.	Kingston, C. C.
Glynn, P. McM.	Batchelor, E. L.
Smith, Bruce	Sampson, S.
Fysh, Sir Philip	Harper, R.
Reid, G. H.	Hall, D. R.
Willis, Henry	Watson, J. C.
Sinclair, H.	McDougall, J. K.
Wilks, W. H.	Webster, W.
Brown, Tilley	Carr, E. S.
Hughes, W. M.	Palmer, A. C.
Livingston, J.	Hutchison, J.
Mahon, H.	Chanter, J. M.
Fowler, J. M.	Catts, J. H.
Foxton, Colonel	Wilson, J. G.
Edwards, R.	Bamford, F. W.
Liddell, F.	Salmon, C. C.

Question so resolved in the negative.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. CROUCH (Corio) [12.32 a.m.].—In the temporary absence of the honorable member for Melbourne, I move—

That the words "and on and after 7th December, 1907, 350AA Belt butts, ad val., 20 per cent.," be inserted.

If this amendment is agreed to I shall move that the preferential rate of duty be 15 per cent.

Mr. MAUGER.—What are belt butts?

Mr. CROUCH.—They are the raw material for the manufacture of belting, and it is absolutely necessary to import them, as they cannot be made here.

Mr. MALONEY.—I think that if the suggestion made by the Treasurer is adopted, the case will be met.

Mr. CROUCH.—I can assure the honorable member that, having consulted the gentleman who has been advising him, I know that what I am proposing is the right thing.

Mr. STORRER.—Why study one individual?

Mr. CROUCH.—I am studying the interests of the whole of the tanners, leather manufacturers and employes in Australia. The matter affects a very large class.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [12.34 a.m.].—Why should there be any more debate about the matter? Has not the honorable member for Corio told us that he has consulted some gentleman, and has moved this amendment in consequence? What more is there to be said? He having consulted a gentleman, there is an end of it.

Mr. CROUCH.—We should have it discussed by a gentleman, does not the honorable member think?

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—This Federal Parliament is not to use its own judgment. It has not been doing so all through the discussion on the Tariff. Somebody consults a gentleman and proposes the duty. Ergo, the thing is done. That is what they call bullocking the Tariff through. Is the Treasurer satisfied?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Yes.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Then I suppose we must not exercise our reasoning faculties? The honorable member for Corio has consulted a gentleman.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [12.36 a.m.].—I should be glad if the honorable member for Corio would not press his amendment. I have an amendment to propose which may probably meet the object which he has in view.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) proposed—

That the words "and on and after 7th December, 1907, A. Leather, Rubber, and Composition Belting and Greasehide for Belting and other purposes ad. val. (General Tariff), 25 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 20 per cent.

B. Leather, namely, kid and patent and enamelled leather, ad val., 20 per cent.

C. Leather, viz., calf n.e.i., white sheep, and white lamb, ad val., 15 per cent.

D. Leather n.e.i., ad val., 20 per cent.

Mr. BOWDEN (Nepean) [12.37 a.m.].—In view of the fact that the Minister proposes to considerably reduce the duties on the raw material of the boot manufacturers, I should like to know whether he intends to re-commit the items relating to boots so that we may re-consider our decision with regard to them. My complaint against the honorable member for Bendigo is that, although he had in his mind at the time a reduction of these duties, he as Chairman of the Tariff Commission pressed for high duties upon boots, giving us no information that these reductions were contemplated. Had the Committee known that such a reduction was to be proposed the vote on the boot items might have been different. In this case as in others the Treasurer at the last moment has sprung new proposals upon the Committee, and we have no opportunity to consider what their effect may be. I protest against such tactics. The boot manufacturers have the protection of high duties, and they should be prepared to do something for the tanners.

Mr. TUDOR (Yarra) [12.38 a.m.].—I should like to know—

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Will the honorable member say how many hands are employed in the glacé kid tannery?

Mr. TUDOR.—Over 1,000 doz. glacé kid skins were turned out last month, so I have been informed. The question has been asked whether the glacé skin industry will be useful to those on the land. As a matter of fact, the skins have to be imported from India or Persia.

Mr. STORRER.—There is no land in Australia to run goats on!

Mr. TUDOR.—The tanners are willing to buy all the kid skins that can be produced here. The amendment moved by the Treasurer carries out proposals agreed to by a combined deputation of manufacturers and master tanners, representing practically all parts of the Commonwealth, which waited on the Minister of Trade and Customs. The union operatives on the Wages Board were told that the employers could not pay higher wages because they had agreed to these reductions. As a matter of fact these are slightly lower duties than were originally proposed by the Government. The employers object to a preference being granted because the leather is not produced in England. I propose to refer briefly to the question of chamois leather gloves.

Mr. HUME COOK.—They are to be made free.

Mr. TUDOR.—There is another paragraph, "Crust or rough tanned goat skivers Persians and sheep, free," which I understand is to be inserted. I do not think that this re-arrangement of the duties will be very harmful to the industry, and I regret that there was not an agreement on the part of employers and employes on behalf of proposals of this kind before they were submitted to the Minister.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Moreton) [12.42 a.m.].—I would urge the Treasurer to grant a slight preference to British imports. The difficulty under which tanners in Queensland labour is that the Japanese buy up the local hides and skins, and carry them off to Japan to be tanned.

Mr. HUME COOK.—We need an export duty.

Mr. SINCLAIR.—I was asked to urge the imposition of an export duty, but do not favour such a proposition. I appeal to the Treasurer to make the duties 30 per

cent. and 20 per cent. I have some sympathy for the tanner as well as for the boot manufacturer, and I trust that my request will be acceded to.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I cannot accede to it.

Mr. EDWARDS (Oxley) [12.46 a.m.].—The information which I have received from the leather manufacturers and tanners of Queensland is that the duties proposed originally were too high, and therefore I intend to support the amendment.

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment (by Mr. MALONEY) agreed to—

That the words "E. Belt Butts, ad val. (General Tariff), 20 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 15 per cent." be added.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 351. Leather, viz. :—

(A) Pump Butts weighing not less than 48 lbs. each hide, free.

(B) Goat and Sheep Skins, raw, Hogskins, free.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) proposed—

That paragraph A be left out.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Why are pump butts being taken out of the free list to be made dutiable at 30 and 25 per cent.?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [12.47].—When pump butts were put on the free list they were not being manufactured here to the same extent; but now they are being largely manufactured, and those locally made are as good as any that can be imported.

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That the following words be added—"and on and after 7th December, 1907, Chamois leather, free."

Mr. MALONEY (Melbourne) [12.48 a.m.].—I hope that goats' skins, kids' skins, and hogskins in the raw will be allowed to remain free. Goat skins are imported chiefly from India and Persia. They are not cured or made into leather, but come here either slightly tanned or salted.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Amendment (by Mr. TUDOR) agreed to—

That the following new item be inserted :—
"351A. On and after 7th December, 1907, Crust or rough tanned goat, skivers, Persians, and sheep skins, free."

Progress reported.

SPECIAL ADJOURNMENT.

Motion (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That the House, at its rising, adjourn until 11 a.m., Monday next.

House adjourned at 12.57 a.m. (Saturday).

House of Representatives.

Monday, 9 December, 1907.

ABSENCE OF MR. SPEAKER.

The CLERK acquainted the House that he had been informed of the unavoidable absence of the Speaker.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER took the chair at 11 a.m., and read prayers.

TEMPORARY EMPLOYEES: HOLIDAYS.

Mr. PAGE.—I desire to ask the Postmaster-General, without notice, a question in which the employes in his Department, particularly the temporary employes throughout the Commonwealth, are interested. It appears that the officers can get no clear information—the matter is clouded in mystery—and to them the rulings of the Minister are as clear as mud. I desire to know to what holidays temporary employes are entitled, and whether they are paid for them; and if they are not paid for holidays, will the Minister see that they are allowed to work on all holidays except Christmas Day and Good Friday?

Mr. MAUGER.—If the honorable member will give notice of the question, I shall give him full particulars to-morrow morning. I think I am correct in saying that all temporary hands are paid for their proclaimed holidays in exactly the same way as are regular employes.

TELEPHONE SERVICE, NEWCASTLE.

Mr. WATKINS. — I desire to ask the Postmaster-General, without notice, whether the Chief Electrician will visit Newcastle before Christmas, in view of the chaotic state of the telephone service there?

Mr. MAUGER.—After consultation with the honorable member, I made an arrangement with the Chief Electrician, who is now on his way to Newcastle.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I desire to know whether the Prime Minister sees his way to put a period to our sittings before Christmas—whether the huge programme of proposed legislation which appears in the *Melbourne Age* of this morning has any likelihood of being attempted before then? If that programme be entered upon, I should say we are likely to be here all next year.

Mr. DEAKIN.—Like the honorable member, I made myself acquainted with that programme of business for the first time this morning, and only hope it can be carried out.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I do not think that is quite an answer to my question. Is the Prime Minister able to say whether we are likely to get away before Christmas?

Mr. DEAKIN.—I see no reason why the House should meet after this week.

Mr. BAMFORD.—When is it likely that the Estimates will be discussed?

Mr. DEAKIN.—Not before Christmas.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I should like to know what business the Prime Minister proposes to take this week?

Mr. DEAKIN.—Necessarily, we must finish the consideration of the Tariff, and I should be very glad if the Excise Procedure Bill could be disposed of, because then our legal procedure would be simplified.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—That Bill will lead to a long debate.

Mr. DEAKIN.—I think not, seeing that it has already been explained.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—The Bill necessarily raises the whole question, although it has been explained.

Mr. DEAKIN.—It may not be necessary to raise the whole question.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—The Bill necessarily does so.

Mr. DEAKIN.—With all submission, I think not. I am well aware, generally, of the objections that may be taken to the Bill; but when those objections have been recorded here, we might well come to a decision. After all, the final word does not rest with us. We are acting under the advice of our law officers; and, under the circumstances, there would seem to be no other course than to pass the Bill. Those who object to it, or take a different view of the legal questions involved, may

protect themselves by taking their objections; and it is not unreasonable to say that this ought to suffice.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—It is not merely a legal question; it is a question of policy, and of the amendment of the original Act.

Mr. DEAKIN.—Yes, of course, it is desirable that both should be fully considered. The Manufactures Encouragement Bill ought to be disposed of in Committee before we rise.

Mr. CHANTER.—What about the Federal Capital?

Mr. DEAKIN.—I have already answered that question. Unless there is some objection to the amendments in the Quarantine Bill, it would be a great administrative gain if it were passed before Christmas.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—No hope!

Mr. THOMAS.—What about the Patent Medicines Bill?

Mr. DEAKIN.—It is a useful measure.

Mr. THOMAS.—Why not go on with it?

Mr. DEAKIN.—That Bill requires the assent of both Houses, whereas I am now speaking of a Bill which has passed both Houses, and in which only verbal amendments have to be considered. I do not see upon the paper any other measure that needs mention.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—Why not pick out those Bills which have a chance of passing?

Mr. DEAKIN.—I think there is a chance of passing those named.

INVOICE VALUE OF PIANOS.

Mr. JOHNSON.—But for the fact we are likely to reach the item of pianos to-day I should have given notice of the following question, seeing that it is rather a long one. The question is as follows—

Is the Minister aware of the following facts, and, if not, will he cause inquiry to be made into them and communicate the result to the House before a vote is taken on the duties to be placed on pianos—

1. That the Customs returns for the several States show no appreciable decline in the average invoice value of German pianos imported, except in New South Wales?
2. That the decline as shown for New South Wales amounts to about £7 per piano, *i.e.*, from £23 in 1901, to a little more than £16 in 1906, and is accompanied by an exceptional increase in the number of pianos alleged to have been imported?

3. That on these facts being pointed out to the Acting Comptroller-General, this officer unhesitatingly expressed the opinion that a blunder had been made, and that the return for New South Wales was erroneous.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I think the information for which the honorable member is asking, might very well be ascertained on the item in Committee of Ways and Means. It is anticipated that that item will be reached to-day, and the question can be discussed then.

Mr. JOHNSON.—I think the information is necessary to enable us to discuss the item.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—So far as the honorable member has read—I do not know what is to follow—he appears to be going beyond the ordinary form of a question.

Mr. JOHNSON.—I had not quite finished. It will be seen that I am referring to erroneous statistics that have been furnished, and which ought to be corrected before we go into Committee on the item. My question proceeds—

4. That on investigation this was confirmed, and that the Customs Department has now ascertained that no decline has taken place in the average invoice value of pianos imported in New South Wales, and consequently that no decline has taken place in the average value of pianos imported into the Commonwealth as a whole.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The honorable member must see that he is going beyond the ordinary form of a question.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Very well, I shall deal with the question on the item in Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—The honorable member for Coolgardie asked a question in reference to this matter some four or five days ago, and this morning I forwarded him a reply to the effect that a mistake had been made—as stated by the Acting Comptroller-General of Customs—in that only an estimate had been given of the number of pianos imported into New South Wales, instead of the actual number. I have requested the officials in Sydney to furnish me with the most definite particulars that it is possible to obtain, and immediately I receive these, I will supply the information to honorable members. But, undoubtedly a mistake has been made, so that honorable members need not base their remarks in reference to the duty upon pianos upon the figures which have been supplied.

PUBLIC SERVANTS: INCREMENTS.

Mr. POYNTON.—I wish to ask the Prime Minister whether the statement which appears in the newspapers of to-day that arrangements have been made to pay the automatic increments due to public servants before Christmas, is correct?

Mr. DEAKIN.—As promised several days ago, I have had a consultation with the Treasurer, and he now informs me that he intends to make arrangements for the payment of the increments referred to before Christmas.

EXCISE TARIFF (AGRICULTURAL MACHINERY) ACT.

Mr. KING O'MALLEY asked the Minister of Trade and Customs, *upon notice*—

1. What is the policy of the Government, and what is the intention of the Ministry as to the manufacturers of harvesters who have failed to observe the Commonwealth law as to Excise, and who are defying the same while receiving the benefit of the Customs duties on agricultural machinery imported?

2. Does the Minister intend to enforce the law without fear or favour?

3. Will the Government consider the advisability of immediately introducing legislation in order to strengthen the imposition of duties so long as the manufacturers of harvesters defy the law?

4. What does the Government propose to do as regards the employes who have been spending their money in upholding the Commonwealth legislation?

5. Does the Government intend to allow the men to lose this money?

6. What are the intentions of the Government as to reimbursing the employes in the agricultural implement trade, who have incurred heavy expenses in defending Commonwealth legislation?

7. What steps are the Government taking to see that the law is being carried out?

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—The answers to the honorable member's questions are as follow—

1. The policy of the Government will be the subject of a memorandum to be laid on the table immediately. Ministers are not yet aware of any defiance of the law.

2. Yes.

3. Should manufacturers defy the law, and the present remedies be found insufficient, the Government will consider legislation to amend the defects.

4, 5, and 6. The Government cannot undertake to reimburse litigants on the ground that they are suing under Commonwealth legislation.

7. The collectors have general instructions, and the necessary papers are in the hands of the Crown Solicitor. There will be no delay in enforcing the law.

POSTAL OFFICIALS: OVERTIME.

Mr. JOHNSON asked the Postmaster-General, *upon notice*—

Is it a fact that, although instructions from the Central Office have been issued for arrangements to be made to avoid the necessity for officers working after the official hour, some of the heads of branches in Sydney have since given specific instructions for all hands to remain on duty each day from Monday to Friday until 5.30 p.m.?

Mr. MAUGER.—The answer to the honorable member's question is as follows—

The instructions from the Central Office referred to were that officers of Clerical Branches whose ordinary hours were from 9 a.m. to 4.30 p.m. were not to be required to attend on any day later than 5.30 p.m., Monday to Friday, or 1 p.m. on Saturday, except in cases of extreme urgency, and with the express approval of the Deputy Postmaster-General.

The authority for detaining officers until 5.30 p.m. is contained in the Public Service Regulations. Only time worked after 5.30 p.m. is regarded as "overtime" under those Regulations.

TARIFF.

In Committee of Ways and Means
(Consideration resumed from 6th December, *vide* page 7168):

Division XIII.—Paper and Stationery.

Item 352. Paper, viz:—

(A) Manufactures of, Framed or Unframed, having advertisements thereon, including price lists and trade catalogues, and all printed or lithographed matter to be used for purposes of advertising, per lb., 6d.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [11.15].—I move—

That the following words be added:—"and on and after 9th December, 1907, A. Manufactures of, Framed (including the weight of the frame), or Unframed, having advertisements thereon, including price lists n.e.i., trade catalogues n.e.i., show cards n.e.i., and all printed or lithographed matter, pictures n.e.i., and posters of all kinds used or intended to be used for advertising purposes, also all printed bags and cartons, per lb., 6d."

This new proposal is the result of a Conference between the Comptroller-General and a number of persons interested in these particular manufactures.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [11.16].—Will the Treasurer state whether the new proposal is intended to apply to imports by vessels, or to imports by post? Is he going to inconvenience those who may forward price lists and trade catalogues from other parts of the world to Australia by charging duties upon these articles when they come through the post?

Sir JOHN FORREST.—Book catalogues for instance?

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Yes. It seems very extraordinary to charge such a high duty as 6d. per lb. upon the frames. In another portion of the Tariff, frames are dutiable at a different rate—I think, at 30 per cent., under the general Tariff, and at 25 per cent. under the Tariff for the United Kingdom. Yet here it is proposed to charge 6d. per lb. upon them.

Mr. STORRER.—The frames can be made in Australia.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Then they will not be imported. But of course there may be special reasons for occasionally importing them.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [11.19].—The new proposal which I have submitted has been very carefully drafted—

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Why levy a duty upon frames by weight, seeing that they are already subject to a different rate in another portion of the Tariff?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—These frames differ somewhat from those to which the honorable member refers.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Why charge two different rates upon frames?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The new proposal is the result of a meeting of those interested in these manufactures, and it is one with which they are all satisfied.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—A meeting of whom?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Of the importers. During the last two or three days they saw the Comptroller-General in reference to this matter, which I admit is intricate. I instructed the officers to be very careful, and to frame the item in a way which would be least objectionable.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—What about circulars coming by post?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—It will depend a good deal on what they are.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—What about book lists, which weigh half-an-ounce?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Book catalogues will, I think, be free.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—Under what item will they be free?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Under a later item, in respect of which I intend to move an amendment. The present item deals with only the catalogues to which I have referred, but under item 368, "books n.e.i." and "prospectuses and catalogues other than trade n.e.i.," are free.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—That deals with other than trade catalogues?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I shall deal with that matter when we come to the item. The main principle underlying the present item is that persons who have a place of business in Australia shall receive greater consideration than those who have no place of business here. It is intended to prevent the widespread distribution of publications which have no reference to persons engaged in business here.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [11.22].—The catalogues of our exporters, be they colonial wine exporters or others, have free entry to foreign countries through the post. But now it is proposed to withhold from persons in other countries the privilege of sending through the post a circular or catalogue to persons within Australia. Is it intended to stop the circulars and catalogues as they arrive in the mails and impose a duty or to communicate with the senders?

Mr. HUME COOK.—No; they will come in free.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—But this item includes trade catalogues.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Trade catalogues are not included in item 368.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Where a legitimate business is carried on here, it is intended that the catalogues shall come in free, or, at any rate, at a very low duty. The item before the Committee is intended to deal with other things which come in promiscuously.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—There are two aspects of this question. First, is it intended to compel those who are located in Australia, and do business here, to get their printing done locally?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—To a large extent.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The other consideration is, is it intended to compel persons who are carrying on business outside Australia to get their printing done here?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—No.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Then the Tariff should not provide for the exclusion of their trade catalogues.

Mr. PAGE.—What is the idea in imposing a duty upon them?

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I am against the proposal, but now I am trying to elicit what the Ministry desire. We are not treated in that way by European countries. Australian

catalogues are allowed to go through the post, and to be delivered. Is it intended here to stop the delivery of catalogues or trade price lists when posted from other countries to persons in Australia? I hope that the Treasurer does not intend to do that. It would be very unfair in view of the fact that the catalogues and price lists of our business men receive such different treatment from other countries.

Mr. PAGE.—The Ministry must be in sore straits for revenue when it proposes to collect a duty of that kind. It is really hampering trade.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Apart from the propriety of the proposal, I think that the duty proposed is excessively high. It ought not to apply to price lists and trade catalogues sent here by outside persons who, of course, could not get their printing done here. Such persons should not be treated, even from the Minister's stand-point in the same way as persons who are carrying on business within our territory.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [11.27].—Does the honorable member for North Sydney approve of a firm which is doing business in Australia getting its printing done in another part of the world?

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I am not dealing with that question, except that I hold that the duty is too high, even for that purpose.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—In the other cases the catalogues will be duty free.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Under what item?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The honorable member will find that this amendment and another will make them free.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—If the honorable member says that they will be free, I am satisfied.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—It is intended that they shall be free. It has been represented to the Comptroller-General that the catalogues which are posted from other countries give a great deal of information to our business men, and it is not intended that they shall be dutiable. It is intended, however, that every person who does business in Australia shall get his printing done here. Complaints have also been made regarding the printing of supplements to Australian newspapers in other countries. Suppose that the proprietors of a newspaper get their supplements printed in England or elsewhere, it is not fair that they should be admitted free. The object

of this item is to prevent firms which are doing business in Australia from getting their printing done in other parts of the world, and securing free admission of the printed matter.

Mr. SALMON.—It is nearly all done in Germany.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I believe so. It is intended that trade catalogues which are compiled and printed in other parts of the world shall be admitted free when posted to business firms in Australia.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—If that is made clear, it will be all right.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—That is intended. Such publications will be made free.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [11.30].—I point out to the Committee that the A section of the Tariff Commission suggested that price lists and catalogues printed specially for Australian houses to advertise goods sold in the Commonwealth should be liable to this duty. That is a limitation.

Mr. MCWILLIAMS.—Does it mean that if an English house has a large branch in Australia, it will be compelled to get its printing done here?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—The recommendation speaks for itself.

Most of the Master Printers' Associations of Australia had no objection to British and foreign manufacturers' price lists and catalogues being admitted free of duty so long as the same privilege was not accorded to Australian manufacturers attempting to get their work done abroad.

That is the evil; printing done abroad for Australian houses is brought here to compete with local printers, but the local printers do not object to British and foreign merchants being allowed to print their own price lists and catalogues, and bring them in for commercial purposes. Consequently, I suggest to the Treasurer that he should add after the word "Catalogues" the words "printed for Australian houses to advertise goods sold in Australia."

Mr. HUME COOK.—I think the amendment covers such cases.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—It must be made clear, because the Customs have hitherto had great trouble in dealing with such matters. These words were actually suggested by a Customs expert to remove difficulties and ambiguities, and to make the administration of the Tariff easier.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [11.32].—I think that my amendment meets the suggestion of the honorable member for Bendigo, when read in conjunction with an amendment which I intend to move subsequently, and which I will now read—

352B. Catalogues, show-cards, or pictures used by or alluding to the goods of any manufacturer or producer not having a special place of business in Australia, free.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—That covers the case.

Mr. McWILLIAMS (Franklin) [11.33].—I do not think that the Treasurer's amendment would meet the case. I can quite see a very wide distinction between an Australian firm sending its printing outside Australia, and an English firm having branches in Australia, and desiring to import its own printing. Take the case of Sutton's, the well-known seed merchants. They have an establishment in practically every town in the Commonwealth. According to the Treasurer's amendment, Sutton's seed catalogue would be taxed on coming into Australia. I do not think that that is the intention of the Minister, and I am sure that it is not the intention of the Committee. The Master Printers had no intention that the catalogues of large English firms, having branch houses all over Australia, and sending their catalogues out to advertise their business, should be taxed, and I think that that should be made perfectly clear. The Treasurer's amendment would mean that any English firm having an establishment in Melbourne or Sydney would not be able to bring in its catalogues for distribution without paying duty. Personally, I do not desire to impose any taxation at all on catalogues advertising such goods as machinery, books, and seeds, I do not think that this is a source from which we really want to draw revenue. The duty can give no employment to our own people, and it is good policy to admit catalogues and price lists free.

Mr. POYNTON (Grey) [11.35].—I have received a letter from an advertising firm in Adelaide who point out that these duties work out at 100 per cent. The letter is from Fred C. Powell, street car advertising agent, and agent for calendars, novelties, show-cards, and signs. The writer says—

There is no discrimination between the fully finished goods intended to advertise the foreign made article, and the partially finished material intended to be finished here and to be used in advertising Australian made goods.

He goes on to say—

I have employed considerable labour in the finishing of these goods, desiring to have as much work as possible done locally. Therefore, if the Tariff is not made to discriminate as I have suggested between matter with advertisements and matter without advertisements, it will pay better to import them wholly finished.

I have also been requested by the Public Libraries Board in South Australia to say that whatever duty may be fixed on these lines, there should be a proviso to the following effect—

Except when imported for use in Public Libraries, Museums, or Art Galleries;

in which case they should be free of duty. I think that suggestion is worthy of the attention of the Treasurer. I have received a second letter from the firm to which I have previously referred, in which the writer points out that—

the duty under the old Tariff, 3d. per lb., or 25 per cent., whichever was the higher, was often, at the former collection, as high a rate as 50 per cent. on the value, and 6d. per lb. is 100 per cent.—too heavy a tax on the Australian manufacturer who uses advertising matter. Nowadays it is imperative that advertisements be of a very attractive character, and whilst it is possible that a few of the larger firms can have matter of their own special design, this is not possible for those in a smaller way.

The writer also points out that the Dunlop Company can have their own designs, whereas smaller companies like the Phoenix or Atlas Tyre Companies have to use matter procured outside Australia, but finished here. I think that the old duty was quite sufficient. It amounted to 50 per cent.

Mr. SALMON.—The old duty was not 50 per cent.

Mr. PONYTON.—It was equivalent to that, I am informed.

Mr. SALMON.—It was 25 per cent., or 3d. per lb.

Mr. POYNTON.—Whichever was the higher rate; and the duty of 3d. per lb. worked out at 50 per cent. I shall move when I have an opportunity that the duty be 3d. per lb.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—Why do Public Libraries wish to except catalogues?

Mr. POYNTON.—My proposal applies to the whole of paragraph A. They receive price-lists of books.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—Those are dealt with in another paragraph. These people evidently do not understand the proposal.

Mr. POYNTON.—That is a reflection upon the intelligence of the directors. I intend to move—

That the amendment be amended by adding the words "except when imported for use in a Public Library, Museum, or Art Gallery."

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [11.44].—I think that the honorable member would do well to make a separate paragraph of his amendment.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—So do I.

Mr. POYNTON.—Very well, I am agreeable to do that.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I presume that the object of these excessive duties, amounting, as the honorable member for Grey has said, to 100 per cent., is to exclude newspaper supplements and such like material, as well as to compel our business people to have their printing done locally. I do not know why we should be at such pains to make people do so, and I say this with no desire to belittle our own printeries. On the contrary, I hold that we ought to support them: but I do not think that we should eventually help them by completely shutting out this material, representing, as it does, the skill, enterprise and up-to-dateness of the world.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—The supplements come in blocks.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—They come in lithographed. The old duties, to my mind, were sufficient even from the point of view of a protectionist. I am quite sure that magazines will also be taxed under the amendment moved by the Treasurer, which includes the words, "unframed, having advertisements thereon."

Mr. HUME COOK.—Magazines are dealt with in paragraph c.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Is the Treasurer going to strike out that paragraph when we reach it, since we deal with magazines in paragraph a?

Mr. FISHER.—The insertion of the letters "n.e.i." would cover the honorable member's objection.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The Treasurer may propose to cover magazines by this paragraph and to exclude them from later ones. Magazines and periodicals would certainly be covered by the words "unframed, having advertisements thereon," unless we took steps to exclude them. If our people insist upon going to the other end of the world for some particular article or paper, we should not prevent their

doing so, provided that they are prepared to pay a reasonably heavy penalty. But is not a duty of 100 per cent. altogether too high? I have no sympathy with those who seek abroad what can be reasonably done for them here. I have no patience with those who patronize every one but their own people; but my experience is that a good, stiff, hide-bound protectionist always reaches out with both hands for a cheap thing wherever he can get it. That being so, this proposal will fall quite as heavily upon the protectionist section of the community as it will upon any other. Those who clamour most loudly for duties upon foreign goods are the first to use them if they find it to their advantage to do so. Only the other day, when we were discussing the confectionery duties, it came out that manufacturers of confectionery in Melbourne, who were clamouring for high duties, were using Nestlé's milk, and not Australian milk, in their manufacture.

Mr. COON.—That is not in order.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Certainly not. That should only be allowed in regard to the other fellow. Without the slightest desire to encourage the sending away to other parts of the world for anything which can be reasonably done here, it seems to me we should impose a sufficiently high penalty if we adhered to the old duties. I intend to propose that we should substitute the duties under the old Tariff for those now submitted.

Mr. KNOX (Kooyong) [11.50].—I do not think that anything created more irritation in connexion with the administration of the old Tariff than did the influx of these price lists. As honorable members are aware they accumulated in tons in the Post Office. The position I take up is very much that which is embraced by the concrete amendment suggested by the honorable member for Bendigo. We should prevent local firms sending abroad to get their advertisements printed for them, since we can command sufficient skill and ability in the Commonwealth to meet all reasonable requirements in this direction. But to impose a heavy charge upon the admission of trade catalogues which reach us from all parts of the world would be to restrict the information required by the ordinary trader, the need for which has been felt so very much. The comprehensive letters "n.e.i." appear much too frequently in the amended proposal of the Minister.

The amendment suggested by the honorable member for Bendigo would certainly be much more definite, and the Minister would be well advised if he accepted it. I wish to emphasize what has been said by the honorable member for Grey with respect to catalogues for public libraries and galleries. I am glad that the authorities of these institutions communicated with so influential a member of the Committee. They have also communicated with me. The authorities of the public libraries in Sydney, Brisbane, and Adelaide, as well as in Melbourne, join in a representation that in accordance with the custom, followed without exception in every country in the world, information of this character intended for the benefit of the public should be admitted free. I suggest to the honorable member for Grey that it would be well for him to move the insertion of some exclusive provision which would embrace the whole of the items to which he has referred.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—The Minister has agreed to that.

Mr. KNOX.—I am glad to hear it. I was not aware of it. In regard to the other matter, I hope the Committee will be guided by the principle that all work required by our own people should, if possible, be done by our own people, whilst the admission of catalogues, giving necessary information to traders and business people, should not be restricted as was the case in the administration of the old Tariff.

The CHAIRMAN.—Where does the honorable member for Grey desire to introduce his amendment?

Mr. POYNTON (Grey) [11.55].—I understand that it is the wish of the Committee that a new paragraph to meet what I desire should be inserted. I think I can leave that to the Minister.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [11.56].—The Minister might cut this debate short by accepting the suggestion of the Tariff Commission and including an exemption provision to read in this way—

Price lists and trade catalogues not specially printed for Australian houses to advertise goods to be sold in the Commonwealth—free.

That would prevent any restriction of trade circulars, and, I think, would meet with the approval of the majority of the Committee.

Mr. SALMON.—Perhaps the Minister would say what his amendment is.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [11.57].—I am afraid that the amendment suggested by the honorable member for Bendigo involves a repetition of part of my amendment. What I propose is that the following should take the place of paragraph A:—

Manufactures of, framed, including the weight of the frame, or unframed having advertisements thereon, including price lists n.e.i., trade catalogues n.e.i., show cards n.e.i., posters and all printed or lithographed matter, pictures n.e.i., and posters of all kinds used or intended to be used for advertising purposes, also all printed bags and cartons.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—That would include magazines—"or unframed, having advertisements thereon."

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—No; they are dealt with specially in paragraph c. There cannot be two paragraphs including magazines. The honorable member for Bendigo suggests a separate paragraph—

Price lists and trade catalogues not specially printed for Australian houses to advertise goods to be sold in the Commonwealth—free.

That seems to me to be met to some extent by the second amendment I intend to propose—

Catalogues, show cards or pictures issued by or referring to the goods of any manufacturer or producer not having an established place of business in Australia.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—They nearly all have a house here.

Mr. SALMON.—Then they should get their printing done here.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—They merely have an office and address here.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Those are the very men I want to stop. They are indent agents, and if there is anything I want to put an end to it is the creation and continuance of indent agents. They do no good to us.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—If the honorable member would strike out the words "not having an established place of business" it would meet the case.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Then I should let in all the indent agents. I do not want to do that. That is the only point on which I differ from the honorable member.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—That would mean that such productions as Sutton's seed catalogue would be taxed. They have agents here, and established houses.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not want the indent agents to be fostered. They do

no good to Australia, in any business. They certainly take some money themselves, but what good do they do?

Mr. MAHON.—The indent agent must serve some useful purpose, or he would not exist.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not think he serves a very useful purpose for Australia. He has a room, and a boy, or a typewriter, and all his interest in Australia consists in taking as much as he can out of it. From an Australian stand-point, I do not like the indent agent at all.

Mr. MAHON.—It is curious that the retailers find use for him.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The importers may, but I am not sure that even they do. I would rather adhere to my own wording than go past the established or acknowledged houses here. I think we go quite far enough when we go as far as that. From that point of view, I should like the honorable member for Bendigo to think over the matter, and see what his amendment means, because it is extending my proposal very considerably.

Mr. MAHON (Coolgardie) [12.4].—I do not see why the Treasurer should abuse the indent agents. They serve a useful purpose here. They are a convenience to many people who wish to import goods, and they do not deserve the abuse which the honorable member has showered on them.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I did not shower abuse on them. I have always said that they do no good to Australia.

Mr. MAHON.—Every man who comes here and engages in a legitimate industry is of some good to the community. Nevertheless, I think the Treasurer is right from his point of view. If these people have establishments in Australia, they can very well get their printing done here.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—This would not be their printing specially for Australia. It would be printing for the whole world.

Mr. MAHON.—If the whole of their catalogues are not printed here, there is no reason why they should not pay a small duty on those which come here from outside.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—They come mostly through the post.

Mr. MAHON.—Duty is collected on other articles which come through the post. These catalogues arrive here in large quantities.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Other countries take ours through the post, free. We should not treat them differently.

Mr. MAHON.—I do not agree with the honorable member. We are not in a position to give exact reciprocity to other countries, in which manufacture is highly perfected, and which are in a better position to capture our trade than we are to capture theirs. Therefore, it is useless at this stage of development to talk of reciprocity.

Mr. MCWILLIAMS.—Seedsmen's catalogues would not necessarily involve an office.

Mr. MAHON.—I think the general catalogues might come in at a small rate of duty. I wish to draw the Treasurer's attention to the fact that calendars and almanacs, *n.e.i.*, appear in item 353, under a 30 per cent. duty. They are practically the same as the articles included in paragraph A of item 352. Many patent medicine proprietaries send out what are virtually their price lists in the shape of calendars and almanacs. There is really no difference between calendars and almanacs of that kind, and the other articles enumerated by the Treasurer. They are out of place in section 353, and ought to be treated in the same way as are the price lists of foreign houses.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [12.8].—I notice that included in the Minister's amendment are "printed bags and cartons." Cartons mean empty cardboard cases. On those things the duty is tremendous—from 200 to 300 per cent. The object is to make the duty on those articles the justification for the subsequent duty on strawboard. That is really the process that is going to be worked. These cartons are to be made practically unimportable, and then the strawboard maker will say, "The makers of cardboard boxes have been given a high protection, and therefore you can give me the increase of 150 per cent. that I ask for on the old duty." This proposal has been very simply introduced, and I did not notice the mention of bags and cartons until I got a copy of the amendment. It is to be a buttress for the increased duty on strawboard. The strawboard maker will be able to argue, "The increased duty on strawboard will not injure the boxmaker, as the goods that would compete with him are excluded." But the ultimate effect will be that the strawboard maker

will be so securely entrenched that he can get any increase of price right up to the cost of the imported article under the 150 per cent. increase of duty. He will be invincibly entrenched; and the strawboard boxmakers will have to pay the increased price. But the latter are told: "Although you do pay this increased price, you cannot be competed with, because you are given a duty of 6d. per lb. on your manufactured article, and this absolutely excludes competition." What is the effect? These strawboard boxes are used only when they can be sold at a price very near to that of the paper wrappings or packages previously used, and immediately the price is raised the demand will be decreased, with the result of loss of employment. And why is this done? In order to give greater employment in a trade which, according to the proprietor of the Broadford Mill—the only mill producing strawboard in the Commonwealth—gave employment in 1902 to only thirty-one men and seven boys.

Mr. JOHNSON.—And produced very coarse strawboard.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I say nothing about the quality; the manufacturer may say that he has improved the quality, and may still further improve it.

Mr. SALMON.—Why should he not?

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I am not attacking the quality, but merely pointing out that, for the benefit of this mill, it is sought to increase the duty from 35 per cent. to 62½ per cent.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The duty under discussion has nothing to do with strawboard.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Of course it has—this duty is proposed in order to support a proposal later on to increase the duty on strawboard.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—That is an insinuation which ought not to be made.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I do not say that the Minister knew anything about the matter; but, as a matter of fact, I heard that this was to be done.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I know nothing at all about that.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—But I know something about it, because a few days ago I heard what was to be done.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I am afraid that the honorable member has been listening to a lot of tittle-tattle.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I am afraid that it is the Minister who listens

to tittle-tattle; I always take care to sift information which I receive. Whether the Minister's intention is or is not what I have stated, the effect will be an increase of the duty on strawboard, and the strawboard boxmakers who complain so bitterly about the increased duty on their raw material will be protected by a prohibitive duty.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Does the honorable member say that this duty is imposed for the unworthy purpose he indicates?

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I have already said that a few days ago I heard what the intention was, though I do not suggest that the Minister had any knowledge of the matter. However, I leave the question of intention aside, and merely point to what will be the effect. It may be thought that under this arrangement the strawboard boxmakers will have nothing to complain of; but, as a matter of fact, their trade will be seriously affected, because, as I said before, cardboard boxes are used only when the price is close to that of ordinary paper packages. I move—

That the amendment be amended by leaving out the words "also all printed bags and cartons."

At present there are duties of 30 per cent. and 25 per cent. on paper bags, and now it is proposed, simply because of the printing, to raise the duty to at least 100 per cent.

The CHAIRMAN.—Do I understand the honorable member for Bendigo to submit an amendment?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—My desire is, after paragraph A has been disposed of, to insert, as a separate line, the amendment I have already indicated.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [12.19].—I regret that the honorable member for North Sydney has made what I may term an insinuation as to the object of the proposal immediately before us.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I heard this morning that the intention was that indicated by the honorable member for North Sydney.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not care what the honorable member heard; I never heard of the matter.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—That may be.

Mr. MATHEWS.—Why should the Treasurer take any notice of what honorable members opposite may have "heard?"

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I cannot allow an insinuation, and a very unworthy insinuation, to be made.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—No one suggests that the Treasurer knew what the intention was.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—If there is not a reflection on me, there is a reflection on the Comptroller-General.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I do not say that the object is an improper one from the protectionist stand-point.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The Comptroller-General advises me that the statement is absolutely without foundation. If the honorable member for North Sydney says that he does not believe the Comptroller-General—

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Why is this duty proposed?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The duty on printed bags and cartons has nothing to do with the duty on strawboard, but is proposed merely to insure the printing being done here.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I only say that I heard that the strawboard boxmakers intended to move in this direction.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not think that that is any justification for any reflection on either myself or the Comptroller-General. I asked the Comptroller-General and his officers to meet some of those interested in this matter, and the meeting took place. Those interested came from all directions, and the outcome was the amendment I have submitted, to which they all agreed.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I point out that cartons must be printed before they are made up.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Probably so. In reference to bags I may say that, when I was Minister of Trade and Customs, I had considerable trouble, seeing that some bags were imported plain and others came in printed with advertisements. If the amendment suggested by the honorable member for North Sydney be made, printed matter, as well as plain bags, will be imported free, although the policy is to stop the importation of advertisements. I happen to know a good deal about this subject, because, when Minister of Trade and Customs, I was compelled to take legal advice, which was to the effect that I was entitled to charge duty on the printing on the bags. I hope honorable members will not agree to the proposal of the honorable member for North Sydney, which opens the door to evasion of the duty on printed advertisements.

Mr. MATHEWS (Melbourne Ports) [12.23].—I sincerely hope that the Committee will not be influenced by the blandishments of the honorable member for North Sydney. The honorable member must be well aware that the duty proposed on strawboard is quite insufficient, and that, if the duty immediately before us be agreed to, it will be necessary later on, if we are to have true protection, to take some such step as he has indicated. At any rate, when we do reach the item of strawboard, I shall endeavour to induce the Treasurer to raise the duty above that proposed in the schedule. If every time we endeavour to impose an effective duty, we are to be stormed at by the Opposition, we shall be kept here not only until this Christmas, but until the Christmas following. It is our duty, as a protectionist Parliament, to see that effective duties are imposed.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—What does the honorable member mean by an effective duty?

Mr. MATHEWS.—I mean a duty sufficient to insure that the commodity shall be sold at a price which will pay fair wages, and give a fair return to those who have invested money in the industry. I might ask the honorable member for Parramatta what he calls effective free-trade? Does he mean a revenue duty?

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Free-trade is not now in question.

Mr. MATHEWS.—As a protectionist I shall not be satisfied to accept any duty which will not permit of reasonable wages being paid to the employes in the industry, so that they may live up to our standard of civilization, and of a fair return being assured to capitalists who invest their money in it. Whilst I admit that we cannot manufacture certain classes of paper in the Commonwealth because we have not the necessary pulp, I contend that for the manufacture of strawboard we possess the raw material in abundance. Unlike the honorable member for Parramatta, and the honorable member for North Sydney, I wish to insure the payment of reasonable wages to our Australian operatives, and it is impossible to achieve that result whilst our markets remain open to the cheap production of other parts of the world.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [12.27].—In order to limit debate, and at the suggestion of some honorable members, I ask leave to amend my

amendment by omitting from it the words "also all printed bags and."

Amendment of the amendment, by leave, amended accordingly.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [12.28].—The honorable member for Parramatta stated that he heard, a few days ago, that this arrangement was to be made. Here is a letter written on the 26th September last—

We have the honour to submit to you the recommendations of the Master Printers' Association of Victoria, The Paper Manufacturers, The Cardboard Box Makers, The Paper Bag Makers, The Manufacturing Stationers, the Paper merchants of Victoria, in reference to items affecting Paper, Printing and Stationery, in your proposed Tariff. We indorse the Government's proposals with the inclusion of "Printed Bags and Cartons," with the exception of Magazines. We do not think that Magazines would be produced in Australia, so we do not see the necessity for this duty, especially is the case with "Trade and Scientific Journals." We suggest therefore that clause c should read "Printed matter n.e.i. including printed bags and cartons (except newspapers registered for transmission through the post as magazines), 6d. per lb."

That was written on the 26th September last, so that the insinuation that the arrangement had been arrived at within the past few days is utterly without foundation; and it is one which, on behalf of the Comptroller-General, I am justified in resenting.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [12.30].—The Treasurer has confirmed the statement which I made in reference to this matter. A few moments ago he told us that the Comptroller-General of Customs knew nothing whatever about this arrangement. Yet we now know that it was put in black and white, months ago. Will the Treasurer now say that he knew nothing about it? After having denied my statement point blank, the honorable gentleman rose, and read a letter which confirmed it. The honorable member for Melbourne Ports made one remark to which I should like to refer. He said that unlike the honorable member for North Sydney and myself, he wanted to insure the payment of good wages to the employés in this industry. Does he mean to imply that we do not? Let me tell him that I have done more to secure the payment of good wages to employés than he will accomplish in his life-time.

Mr. MATHEWS.—That is doubtful.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—There is no member of the Opposition who does not desire to see good wages paid.

Mr. MATHEWS.—Then their actions do not show it.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The honorable member has only one notion in regard to the method by which the payment of good wages may be insured. He thinks that that result can be brought about only by the imposition of high duties for the protection of our manufacturers.

Mr. MATHEWS.—That is the only method.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—If protective duties in themselves are a guarantee of good wages being paid, why does he want to protect Australian strawboard against Dutch strawboard? His argument means nothing. All the duties that he advocates are duties against the highly-paid, intelligent labour of the world, and not against the low-paid labour of the world. If he wishes to find the lowest-paid labour in the world, he must visit the most highly-protected countries—Russia, for instance.

Mr. MATHEWS.—We pretend to be a little more civilized than is Russia.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The honorable member appears to be particularly active this morning. I congratulate him upon having recovered his vigour. I wish to make only one remark in reference to the agreement which has been forwarded to the Minister in respect of this item. It was discussed during the last week-end, and I understand that the manufacturers of strawboard agreed with the card-box makers to accept a lower duty than that proposed in the Tariff. The Treasurer, however, has gone back upon the arrangement, and desires to get the highest duty possible. I have been told that the whole thing has been discussed many times between the card-box makers and the strawboard manufacturers. The present proposal is a part of the arrangement arrived at between them. Nobody suggests that the Treasurer was a party to it. I hope that he will believe that these arrangements can be made without his knowledge.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—What I chiefly protested against was the insinuation against the Comptroller-General.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Nobody suggests that the Treasurer has been discussing this matter with these individuals. But the fact remains that he has proposed what they requested him to propose some months ago. The arrangement has been discussed more than once lately; but as

they could not agree amongst themselves, each of the parties has been left to act as it pleases.

Mr. MATHEWS.—Have not members of the Opposition been solicited by the importers?

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Yes.

Mr. MATHEWS.—Then where is the difference?

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I am not talking about manufacturers soliciting members of this House. I am merely pointing out that two sections, each wanting a protective duty, agreed as to the rate which they would recommend to the Government. The real object of this proposal is not to protect our printing establishments, but to protect our strawboard manufacturers.

Mr. SALMON (Laanecoorie) [12.37].—I am very glad that the honorable member for Parramatta has changed his ground in regard to this particular duty. When the honorable member for North Sydney first made his statement it impressed me somewhat. I thought that it implied that some arrangement had been arrived at between the Government and certain manufacturers. But now we have an entirely different story. We find that a perfectly legitimate request was made three months ago—a request to which the Government have acceded. Anybody who knows anything about the manufacture of these articles must realize the enormous competition to which our manufacturers are subjected by reason of importations from overseas. I am speaking particularly of illustrated calendars. When these arrive here, nothing remains to be done except to print upon them the name of the person who has ordered them. Under these circumstances we are entitled to extend to those who do that work in Australia a full measure of protection. With respect to cartons, I say, without fear of contradiction, that those made in Australia from our own strawboard are equal to those produced in any part of the world. The honorable member for Lang made some reference to the quality of Australian strawboard. I do not pretend to be an expert—

Mr. BOWDEN.—It is admitted that there has been a vast improvement in the quality of the board produced locally.

Mr. SALMON.—And there might be a much greater improvement if we gave our manufacturers a fair chance of competing.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—They have the advantage of a 25 per cent. duty.

Mr. SALMON.—But the manufacture of strawboard in the old world is carried on under conditions that we should not like to see obtain here. We have to pay decent wages to our workers.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—Does not the honorable member think that a heavy duty on cardboard will embarrass the people here?

Mr. SALMON.—I do not think so, nor do those who are using the manufactured articles. I am glad to say that the prejudice against the local article has been largely removed. I believe that if we give the local makers an opportunity to supply Australia's requirements of strawboard, they will very soon be in a position to do so.

Mr. McWILLIAMS (Franklin) [12.41].—I desire to ascertain from the Treasurer whether this item will apply to fruit-wrappers on which the names of the fruit-growers are printed. For a long while, I have been trying to induce the fruit-growers to put their names on their wrappers, because I believe that that practice would have a more beneficial effect than would the provisions of the Commerce Act. At the present time a good many fruit-growers are getting their names printed on their wrappers.

Mr. CHANTER.—Can they not get that done in Tasmania?

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—The fruit-growers have to import the paper cut to the proper size. As one boy with an up-to-date guillotine could cut all the paper to size, it is not worth our while to bother about what labour would be employed, if the paper were cut on the spot, instead of abroad. Any proposal to limit the size of the paper with a view to getting it cut in Australia is really ridiculous. Under paragraph A of this item every fruit-grower would be liable to a duty of 6d. per lb. upon imported fruit-wrappers bearing his name.

Mr. HUME COOK.—Not unless the wrapper was in the form of a bag.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—The paragraph includes "all printed or lithographed matter to be used for purposes of advertising." If a man had his name printed on his fruit-wrappers, it would be regarded by the Department as printed matter to be used for advertising purposes. Unless the paragraph is amended, it will undo what some of us have been trying to achieve, and that is to induce our fruit-growers to export their fruit in wrappers bearing their or

names, with a view to acquiring an outside reputation as the growers of first-class fruit.

Mr. MAHON.—Can we not get these wrappers included in the proposed exemptions?

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—If the Treasurer will give me an assurance that this item will not be allowed to apply to fruit-wrappers on which the names of the growers are printed, I shall be content.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—If any growers get their wrappers printed in London, they will be liable to the duty. They are allowed to have free paper for wrapping purposes, but it must be free from advertisements.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—I remind the honorable gentleman that his declared object in passing the Commerce Act was to encourage as far as possible the exportation of good articles. Surely there can be no objection to a man putting his name on the paper in which he wraps his product? I impress upon the honorable gentleman that it is not possible to get these wrappers printed here, and, as he is aware, I speak as one who has had considerable experience of the printing trade. If the paper were imported and cut here the growers could not afford to have their names printed on the wrappers because the expense would be too great.

Mr. MAHON.—Does this paper come out in rolls?

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—No; it is imported in small squares ready to be used. I have been exerting all my influence to get the growers to have their names printed on the wrappers so that they may acquire a reputation as the exporters of good articles, but if this paragraph is passed in its present form, they will not use such wrappers, because it would be far too expensive to get the paper cut and printed here. These wrappers are used for not only apples but also lemons and oranges. I may inform the Treasurer that a large quantity of this wrapping paper is now in transit for use during the coming season.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The paper is allowed to come in free.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—No. Wrapping paper is dutiable at 15 per cent.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I am informed that this wrapping paper is duty free.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—I ask the honorable gentleman to reconsider the matter, and to see whether, for this year, at least,

he cannot allow the printed wrapping paper to come in free.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I will not make any promise now, but the time to deal with this matter is when we come to the paragraph dealing with wrapping paper.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [12.50].—In my locker I have just found a circular which shows that the manufacturers of strawboard are agitating in a most industrious way. It contains this passage—

After careful consideration it has been agreed that if all writing, news, glazed, and unglazed printing and surface-coated papers were admitted free, the Victorian Master Printers' Association would support an increase of 1s. per cwt. on strawboard (making the duty 2s.), and a 25 per cent. duty on surface-coated boards.

I begin to wonder whether it might not be better to hand over the Tariff to these outside people and allow them to enact it as well as frame it. This is about the most curious circular I have ever seen. We have these proposals made outside and submitted here without a blush. The Master Printers say "We have agreed to these duties," and therefore I presume that Parliament has just to say "ditto," and, hey! presto! the thing is done. I have always imagined that this was a deliberative assembly.

Mr. WILKS. — The honorable member would not have expressed that opinion if he had seen the proceedings in the Queen's Hall this morning.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—It seems that all we have to do is to register, to crystallize, the decisions of interested persons. I do not pretend to know very much about a number of these items, and therefore I am always glad to get information from any quarter. But when we are furnished with a circular stating that this, that and the other have been agreed to at a private meeting, and that, therefore, there is an end of the matter, I venture to suggest to honorable members that this Parliament has a higher function to perform than the mere registration of decrees which have been issued outside. We are not here to put on the statute-book some ukase issued by interested individuals, but to exercise our discretion, and to make the best possible arrangement in the interests of those who consume the goods which are made dutiable with so much alacrity, and with so little compunction as regards the consequences to their pockets.

Question—That the words “and cartons” proposed to be left out stand part of the amendment (Mr. DUGALD THOMSON’S amendment of Sir WILLIAM LYNE’S amendment)—put. The Committee divided.

Ayes	23
Noes	20
Majority	3

AYES.

Chanter, J. M.
Chapman, Austin
Coon, J.
Deakin, A.
Ewing, T. T.
Foster, F. J.
Frazer, C. E.
Groom, L. E.
Harper, R.
Lyne, Sir William
Maloney, W. R. N.
Mathews, J.

Mauger, S.
Page, J.
Quick, Sir John
Salmon, C. C.
Storrer, D.
Thomson, John
Tudor, F. G.
Watkins, D.
Wynne, A.
Tellers:
Cook, Hume
O’Malley, King

NOES.

Archer, E. W.
Atkinson, L.
Bamford, F. W.
Cook, Joseph
Edwards, R.
Forrest, Sir John
Foxton, Colonel
Fuller, G. W.
Hedges, W. N.
Johnson, W. E.
Knox, W.

Mahon, H.
McWilliams, W. J.
Poynton, A.
Sinclair, H.
Thomas, J.
Thomson, Dugald
Wilks, W. H.
Tellers:
Bowden, E. K.
Liddell, F.

PAIRS.

Batchelor, E. L.
Carr, E. S.
Catts, J. H.
Fairbairn, G.
McDougall, J. K.
Hall, D. R.
Hutchison, J.
Webster, W.
Kingston, C. C.
Sampson, S.
Watson, J. C.
Spence, W. G.
Wise, G. H.
Crouch, R. A.

Glynn, P. McM.
Brown, Tilley
Palmer, A. C.
Fowler, J. M.
Fysh, Sir Philip
Reid, G. H.
Livingston, J.
Irvine, W. H.
Kelly, W. H.
Smith, Bruce
Willis, Henry
Brown, Thomas
Wilson, J. G.
Hughes, W. M.

Question so resolved in the affirmative.

Amendment of the amendment negatived.

Mr. MAHON (Coolgardie) [12.56].—
I move—

That the amendment be amended by inserting after the word “cartons” the words “and calendars and almanacs n.e.i.”

I move this amendment because I do not think there ought to be any difference in the treatment of calendars and almanacs, and that extended to the other goods mentioned in the item.

Amendment of the amendment agreed to.

Amendment (by Mr. JOSEPH COOK) proposed—

That the amendment be amended by inserting after the letters “n.e.i.” just inserted the words “framed, ad val., 25 per cent.”

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [12.59].—Under another item the duties on frames are 30 per cent. and 25 per cent. I shall not object to those duties in this instance. If the honorable member for Parramatta will move that the duties in this case be the same as on ordinary frames, I will agree to it.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Very well, I will do that, and ask that my amendment be amended accordingly.

Amendment of the amendment amended accordingly.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [1.0].—This item deals exclusively with advertising pictures. The other item, in which frames are included, relates to pictures not necessarily of an advertising character.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—This is the same item on which the A section of the Tariff Commission recommended a duty of 25 per cent.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—We recommended a duty of 25 per cent. on picture frames.

Sitting suspended from 1 to 2.15 p.m.

Mr. WILKS (Dalley) [2.15].—I wish to make a personal explanation. On the last division relating to the omission of the word “cartons,” I inadvertently voted, forgetting that I had arranged to pair with the honorable member for Gwydir, from item 320 until his return to-morrow. The whip had not been acquainted of this arrangement, and, therefore, could not remind me of it. Fortunately, the division related only to the omission of a word, and not to any duty, but I thought it due to the honorable member for Gwydir to make this explanation.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [2.17].—I would point out to the honorable member for Parramatta that if the amendment of the amendment which he proposes were carried, it would give rise to complications. The original amendment includes the words “frames including the weight of the frames,” and the honorable member’s proposal would, therefore, conflict with the decision already arrived at. The proper course for the honorable member to pursue would have been to move the omission of certain words in

the amendment. I did not realize this at the time, or I should have advised him accordingly.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—The word "framed" is quite unnecessary.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—At all events, it has been agreed to.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—Could not the paragraph at once be recommitted?

Mr. POYNTON (Grey) [2.18].—I agree with the honorable member for Parramatta that we should substitute an *ad valorem* for a fixed duty. It is unfair that the cheaper classes of goods should have to bear the same duty as is imposed upon the higher priced articles. Since I last spoke to this question, I have received from a Melbourne firm a letter stating that this duty is equal to 80 per cent.

Mr. MATHEWS.—Then the other side also send out circulars. I thought it was only the manufacturers who did so.

Mr. POYNTON.—Of course they do; but the honorable member seems to think that manufacturers alone have the right to deluge the House with circulars and letters. If I had my way, I would not allow either the manufacturers or importers to indulge in lobbying. The practice is becoming intolerable. I repeat that I think we should have an *ad valorem* duty.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—On the whole item?

Mr. POYNTON.—Yes.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—Will the honorable member agree to a duty of 35 per cent.?

Mr. POYNTON.—No; but I would accept a duty of 30 per cent. which would be an increase of 5 per cent. on the old rate.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [2.21].—I cannot agree to the amendment of the amendment as it stands since the amendment covers not only the framing, but the advertisement within it, and the adoption of the honorable member's proposal would make the paragraph ridiculous. I should have been willing to accept the amendment had I been able to do so.

Amendment of the amendment negatived.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [2.24].—How does the Treasurer propose to cure the anomaly that frames elsewhere are taxed at 35 per cent., while he proposes under this paragraph to make them dutiable at 6d. per lb.

Mr. HUME COOK.—No; it is only the paper that is taxed.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Are we to have two rates? I did not press for a division on my last amendment of the amendment, because I wished the Minister to cure the anomaly. I move—

That the amendment be amended by inserting after the letters "n.e.i." just inserted, the words "per lb., 3d."

Question put. The Committee divided.

Ayes	12
Noes	33
Majority	21

AYES.

Archer, E. W.	Sinclair, H.
Atkinson, L.	Thomas, J.
Cook, Joseph	Thomson, Dugald
Fuller, G. W.	
Johnson, W. E.	<i>Tellers:</i>
McWilliams, W. J.	Bowden, E. K.
Poynton, A.	Edwards, R.

NOES.

Bamford, F. W.	Mahon, H.
Chanter, J. M.	Mathews, J.
Chapman, Austin	Mauger, S.
Coon, J.	O'Malley, King
Crouch, R. A.	Page, J.
Deakin, A.	Quick, Sir John
Ewing, T. T.	Salmon, C. C.
Fairbairn, G.	Spence, W. G.
Fisher, A.	Storrer, D.
Forrest, Sir John	Thomson, John
Foster, F. J.	Tudor, F. G.
Frazer, C. E.	Watkins, D.
Groom, L. E.	Wise, G. H.
Harper, R.	Wynne, A.
Irvine, W. H.	<i>Tellers:</i>
Knox, W.	Cook, Hume
Lyne, Sir William	Maloney, W. R. N.

PAIRS.

Glynn, P. McM.	Batchelor, E. L.
Brown, Tilley	Carr, E. S.
Palmer, A. C.	Catts, J. H.
Fysh, Sir Philip	McDougall, J. K.
Reid, G. H.	Hall, D. R.
Livingston, J.	Hutchison, J.
Kelly, W. H.	Kingston, C. C.
Smith, Bruce	Sampson, S.
Willis, Henry	Watson, J. C.
Wilks, W. H.	Webster, W.

Question so resolved in the negative.

Amendment of the amendment negatived.

Mr. POYNTON (Grey) [2.35].—I wish now to move that these goods be dutiable at 30 per cent.

The CHAIRMAN. — The honorable member has allowed the matter to go too far to now move an *ad valorem* duty. I divided the last question submitted in order to give every honorable member an opportunity to vote for a percentage duty

if he pleased; but the Committee has now decided that the duty shall not be an *ad valorem* duty.

Mr. POYNTON.—Since lunch I indicated that I wished to test the opinion of the Committee as to whether an *ad valorem* duty instead of the proposed fixed duty should not be adopted.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I proposed 30 per cent. and 25 per cent.

Mr. POYNTON.—I did not understand the honorable member to do so.

The CHAIRMAN.—I divided the question. I did not put the whole of the honorable member's amendment, in order not to deprive other honorable members of an opportunity to move a further amendment. The Committee has, however, now distinctly decided not to adopt an *ad valorem* duty, and it is therefore impossible for me to accept the amendment suggested by the honorable member.

Mr. MAHON (Coolgardie) [2.37].—I agree that the duty should be a fixed one at a certain rate per lb., because of the difficulty which the officials of the Customs Department would have in ascertaining the value of imported printed matter. I think, however, that a duty of 4d. per lb. would give ample protection to the local industry.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Oh, no.

Mr. MAHON.—The Treasurer must see that a duty of 4d. per lb. would amount to an increase of about 33 per cent. on the duty imposed under the old Tariff, and with landing charges, freight, insurance, packing and so on, would give a very substantial protective encouragement to the printing industry in Australia. The Treasurer would be well advised to accept my suggestion, which, I feel sure, will commend itself to the common-sense of honorable members generally. I am certain that if the Minister would take expert advice, every unbiased and impartial printer would admit that a duty of 4d. per lb. on printed matter of this kind would give ample protection, and would be all that could reasonably be expected by those concerned in this industry. I move—

That the amendment be amended by inserting after the letters "n.e.i." just inserted the words "per lb., 4d."

Question put. The Committee divided.

Ayes	21
Noes	27
			—
Majority	6

AYES.

Archer, E. W.
Atkinson, L.
Bowden, E. K.
Cook, Joseph
Edwards, R.
Fairbairn, G.
Forrest, Sir John
Foxton, Colonel
Fuller, G. W.
Irvine, W. H.
Johnson, W. E.

Knox, W.
Mahon, H.
McWilliams, W. J.
Poynton, A.
Sinclair, H.
Thomas, J.
Thomson, Dugald
Wynne, A.
Tellers:
Liddell, F.
Wilson, J. G.

NOES.

Bamford, F. W.
Chanter, J. M.
Chapman, Austin
Coon, J.
Deakin, A.
Ewing, T. T.
Fisher, A.
Foster, F. J.
Frazer, C. E.
Groom, L. E.
Harper, R.
Lyne, Sir William
Maloney, W. R. N.
Mathews, J.

Mauger, S.
O'Malley, King
Page, J.
Quick, Sir John
Salmon, C. C.
Spence, W. G.
Storror, D.
Thomson, John
Tudor, F. G.
Watkins, D.
Wise, G. H.
Tellers:
Cook, Hume
Crouch, R. A.

Question so resolved in the negative.

Amendment of the amendment negatived.

Amendment (by Mr. JOHNSON) negatived—

That the amendment be amended by inserting after the letters "n.e.i." just inserted the words "per lb., 5d."

Amendment, as amended (Sir WILLIAM LYNE's), agreed to.

Paragraph, as amended, agreed to.

Mr. MALONEY (Melbourne) [2.43].—I wish to make an explanation in reference to a dispute I have had with some one who lobbied me in Parliament House. I was lobbied here by Mr. McDougall, of Sands and McDougall, and I think it is only right that honorable members should understand what occurred. Briefly, I had simply been told that he could not make the very finest qualities of coated boards, and when he came here I asked him—and it was the only question I asked him—if any evidence had been given before the Tariff Commission, and whether he would read it and let me know if he had a different view. On the following day I received from him this letter, which is the most insulting letter I ever received from any one in my life.

Mr. LIDDELL.—These men ought not to be admitted inside the building.

Mr. MALONEY.—When I was a clerk in the Colonial Bank, Mr. McDougall, as the representative of a big firm, impressed me greatly, and we were very friendly;

but I do not think I can be friendly with him after this letter. He has written me as follows:—

365 Collins-street,
Melbourne, 7th December, 1907.

Hon. Dr. Maloney, M.P.,
Parliament House, Melbourne.

Dear Dr. Maloney,

I was under the impression that you were returned as the member for Melbourne as a protectionist. You therefore very much surprised me yesterday when you said that you would oppose the proposed duty of 25 per cent. on surface-coated board.

I said no such thing.

At present the duty on plain and coated boards is the same. We now only ask for a protection of 15 per cent. We have invested a large sum in up-to-date plant, occupying one whole floor of our factory, and employ a large number of men in the production of these boards, and have continued their production in the hope that when the Tariff should be revised we would get the protection that we are entitled to. Should we not receive that protection we will be compelled to close that department and throw all those hands out of work. It is sad to think that that result should be brought about by you, a supposed protectionist. How can you justify your action?

Yours faithfully,

JAS. MCDUGALL.

Perhaps if I read my reply it will be clearer than anything I can say. But I wish it to be understood that I have respect and regard for any man who is a free-trader, so long as he honestly holds that opinion, and if I use the term in what I write, I only do so in the course of my answer to the insult and slur that has been thrown upon me as the honorable member for Melbourne—

Sir,

Yours of the 7th inst. to hand. Your impression is correct. I am a protectionist. My political faith has been, and will ever be, publicly declared. I do no skulking, double-dealing, or underhand scheming. My votes embody my principles. I point to the votes I have given.

But I am surprised, after lobbying me at Parliament House, you should now write me—and such a letter—a letter of craft and wile and not straightforwardness. You threaten to turn men out of work—with what object?—to frighten me!

You know the thought that “Houseless heads and unfed sides” of my fellow men and women would break my heart, if I were directly or indirectly the cause. You care nothing about them. Gain is your object. To put money in your purse you try to frighten me by conjuring before my eyes workless men and hungry children. You want money only, and I am to be but a tool in your hands—and you threaten men and women and children to influence me to vote—

desire.

I not admire you? Noble character, and humanitarian!

loney.

Yet you are the man—you lover of protection and of workmen—who did your utmost, who hesitated at no expedient, to oust me from Parliament House and put in—who, a protectionist? No—a free-trader. Yes—wealth went to wealth. The wealthy McDougall supported the wealthy Sir M. McEacharn. Where was the poor workmen then?

Now carry out your threat to dismiss your workmen if you dare. I believe that manhood and womanhood in this country will say you are not the master of their lives—that you are not as God—that to you they need not pray “Give us this day our daily work that we may earn the bread of sweat.”

It proves conclusively to my soul's satisfaction that the policy of the Labour Party is the right one—the right of the man to live without being at the beck and call of his fellow man, because that man has money. With tenfold earnestness will I advocate a policy of nationalization of industries, so that the McDougalls may become as Dodos—extinct.

The fact that Sir M. McEacharn was one of the four who voted against “White Australia,” and who was then an acknowledged free-trader, shows me it is not of your workmen you are thinking—black or slave does not signify to you.

To you your men are machinery—instruments of money-making. To me they are men with God-created souls and “rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.”

When the duties are considered, you may rest assured I will think of my duty to my fellow-men and to my country, Australia, and your threats will not operate on my mind.

After my experience of your lobbying, and of your letter, I deem it my duty to prevent your misunderstanding my words, or misrepresenting me, and all future communications, if any, must be in writing.

Mr. WILKS (Dalley) [2.48].—I do not think this incident ought to be allowed to pass unnoticed, although the highly-coloured reply of the honorable member for Melbourne may excite a little laughter. Right through the Tariff that sort of thing has been the experience not only of the honorable member for Melbourne, but of myself and others. We have been waylaid by importers' agents and manufacturers' agents. The one side is as bad as the other. I gave short shrift to them both, for I have refused on all occasions to go into matters with them. It is only right that the Government should now intervene. The Tariff Commission sat for the purpose of getting all the necessary information from interested parties, and it should not have been necessary for the corridors of Parliament to be crowded with persons desiring to make representations. This sort of thing has been going on throughout the discussion of the Tariff, and to-day it is more marked than ever. The honorable member for Melbourne has

taken up the right position, but he has not done so a bit too soon. The honorable member for Lang mentioned Mr. Beale's name. Although that gentleman is a manufacturer in a large way in my electorate, I have treated him in the same way as I have treated the importers' agents. I only wish that every other member would do the same. Of course, those interested have a right to make representations, but they can approach honorable members by circular, instead of personally. Only to-day I received a large sheaf of circulars by post. The honorable member for Melbourne has done the best public action that we have had since the Tariff has been under consideration. Only a fortnight ago Mr. Speaker was asked to intervene against the placing of exhibits in this building. If interested parties want to make exhibits, let them hire a place in Collins-street for the purpose. When the last Tariff was being considered, I said that we appeared to be threatened with the American system of lobbying, but if the present condition of things is going to continue, what goes on in America will be only a circumstance to it. No member, whether a free-trader or protectionist, should be intimidated as to his votes. Importers' agents and manufacturers' agents should use the one channel only—by letter—and should not come to this House to make personal representations when their interests are at stake.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [2.53].—I desire to propose a new paragraph. I think that this is the proper place to provide for the exemption of price lists and trade catalogues not printed for Australian houses. Adopting the form of the exemption suggested by the Tariff Commission, I move—

That the following new paragraph be inserted :—

"AA. On and after 10th December, 1907, Price lists and trade catalogues not printed for Australian houses to advertise goods sold in the Commonwealth—free."

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [2.54].—When the honorable member for Melbourne rose, I rose also with the intention of submitting a comprehensive amendment, as follows—

Catalogues, show-cards, or pictures issued by, or referring to the goods of, any manufacturer or producer not having an established place of business in Australia, and all printed matter and photographs, the property of any public institution, and intended for deposit or exhibition therein.

The latter part has been framed by the Comptroller-General to meet the suggestion of the honorable member for Grey.

Mr. HARPER.—Is it intended to make those things free?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Yes. The paragraph was framed after the discussion, which took place this morning.

Mr. HARPER.—Is it to enable foreign houses to advertise their own goods in this country if they have no branch here?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Yes. The amendment moved by the honorable member for Bendigo is not so comprehensive as the one which I have outlined.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—I will withdraw my amendment for the present.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) proposed—

That the following new paragraph be inserted :—

"AA. On and after 10th December, 1907, Catalogues, show-cards, or pictures issued by, or referring to the goods of, any manufacturer or producer not having an established place of business in Australia, and all printed matter and photographs, the property of any public institution, and intended for deposit or exhibition therein—free."

Mr. POYNTON (Grey) [2.57].—I am afraid that the Minister's amendment does not cover all that I suggested, such as works of art, including sculptures—

Mr. HUME COOK.—They come later on. I believe they are free now, as works of art.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [2.58].—Apparently price lists are not included in the amendment moved by the Minister, although I understood him to say that they were.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—They are covered by the word "catalogues," according to the practice of the Department.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I am not sure that they are.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—If the honorable member desires me to include "price lists," I will do so.

Amendment amended accordingly.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [2.59].—If, as I anticipate, magazines are left out of the next paragraph, they will fall under this.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Whatever the Committee decides I shall be willing to make effective.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—These articles are to be free, and really magazines ought to be included in them. However, if the Minister prefers, I shall deal with magazines in the next item.

Proposed new paragraph, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraph B. Australian Directories, Guides, and Time Tables, per lb., 6d.

Mr. POYNTON (Grey) [3.1].—Under the old Tariff this item was free; and I understand that this duty is aimed at one directory which is printed outside the Commonwealth. The firm which publishes this directory employs a considerable number of people in Australia, and distributes a large amount in wages. For three years the directory was printed in Sydney, but, at the expiration of that time, the printers declined to renew the contract, chiefly because of the limited time allowed for the printing of such a large number of names in order that the book might be issued at the beginning of the new year. The directory to which I refer is *Wise's Post Office Directory*, and the duty proposed means an impost of 3s. 6d., the weight of each volume being 7 lbs. I understand that the printing represents only one-fourth of the cost of production, the other three-fourths being expended in Australia. This duty is proposed for the benefit of a particular firm.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—What firm is that?

Mr. POYNTON.—The firm of Sands and McDougall.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—There are other directories besides that of Sands and McDougall.

Mr. POYNTON.—But Sands and McDougall are very prominent in this matter.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The honorable member must recollect that there are very important directories published in New South Wales.

Mr. POYNTON.—When a deputation waited on the Minister of Trade and Customs some time ago, it was pointed out that in the preparation of *Wise's Post Office Directory* thirty married men and twenty-five single men and women were constantly employed in Australia, and that, in addition, there were partially employed, say for six months of the year, seventy-five men and women, many of the former being married. A comparison of this directory with the directory issued by the firm who are so anxious to have this duty posed, may be interesting. Of forty-

eight towns dealt with in *Wise's Post Office Directory*, only five are dealt with in the directory issued by Sands and McDougall. Then in *Wise's Directory*, 1,872 country postal towns are given as compared with 472 in the directory of Sands and McDougall. In regard to the number of names given, the following table affords some examples—

Bendigo and Eaglehawk—		
Wise	...	6,500
Sands and McDougall	...	1,500
Geelong—		
Wise	...	5,750
Sands and McDougall	...	800
Bacchus Marsh—		
Wise	...	244
Sands and McDougall	...	91
Echuca—		
Wise	...	784
Sands and McDougall	...	275

The approximate number of names given in the country portions of the directories are—in *Wise's Directory*, 116,000; and in Sands and McDougall's directory, 36,000. It appears to me that a directory is only a directory in so far as it is complete; and, surely, under the circumstances, a duty of 3s. 6d. per volume is too much.

Mr. MATHEWS.—We do not desire to collect the duty, but rather that the work shall be done here.

Mr. POYNTON.—I have already explained the reason why the Sydney firm of printers refused to renew their contract. I move—

That the words "and on and after 10th December, 1907, per lb., 3d.," be added.

This will make the duty 1s. 9d. on each volume of *Wise's Directory*, and with that, I should say, the Committee, with all the greed there is for duties, ought to be satisfied. The publishers do not desire to be at the mercy of a local printer, when the main point is to have the directory issued at a certain time.

Mr. SAMPSON.—And that is to be accomplished by having the printing done at the other end of the world!

Mr. POYNTON.—The publishers of *Wise's Directory* spend £10,000 per annum in wages in Australia, and of the total expenditure, as I have said, only one-fourth is represented by the printing.

Mr. ATKINSON (Wilmot) [3.9].—I can understand the anxiety of the honorable member for Melbourne Ports to have the whole of this work done in Victoria.

Mr. MATHEWS.—Not in Victoria, but in Australia.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I think such work is mostly done in Sydney.

Mr. ATKINSON.—Then I shall substitute Australia for Victoria. The publishers of *Wise's Directory* distribute £10,000 in wages in Australia, and if a duty of 6d. per lb. renders the enterprise unprofitable that distribution will cease, because the book will not be published.

Mr. STORRER.—Some one else will bring out a directory.

Mr. ATKINSON.—No one else, so far, seems to have been able to bring out a satisfactory directory of the kind.

Mr. MAUGER.—This directory is not satisfactory.

Mr. ATKINSON.—Perhaps it is not so satisfactory as it ought to be, but it is the best we have had up to now. The publishers have endeavoured to get the printing done in Australia, but have failed, simply because the printers require, perhaps, nine months to do work which is required in three months. Under the circumstances, I think that the publishers are not to be blamed for going abroad for their printing; and I have much pleasure in supporting the amendment of the honorable member for Grey.

Mr. MATHEWS (Melbourne Ports) [3.11].—Of course, we may take it that the whole of the information supplied by the honorable member for Grey is his own compilation—that he did not receive it by means of a circular from the publishers, or that their representatives did not follow the example of manufacturers, and bring the information here.

Mr. ATKINSON.—Can the honorable member refute the information?

Mr. MATHEWS.—I am not endeavouring to do so, but merely pointing out that apparently importers as well as manufacturers can supply all the information necessary to promote their own interests. We have been told that philanthropic publishers spend £10,000 per annum in wages in Australia. I point out, however, that that money is obtained from Australia, before it can be paid as wages. We are told that the imposition of a duty of 3s. 6d. per volume will stop the circulation of the directory. But can we believe that these publishers would "bite off their nose to spite their face"? This is a business run on commercial lines, and while a profit can be made the directory will be issued. Free-traders will admit that if there is any work that can be done in Australia, it is

a compilation of a directory of the residents of Australia. Extreme protectionist as I may be regarded, I think I am not asking too much, even from so-called free-traders, when I suggest that publications of this sort ought to be printed here.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [3.13].—The honorable member for Melbourne Ports expresses satirical anxiety as to whether the information given by the honorable member for Grey has been supplied, or is his own compilation. If there is any honorable member who has given abundance of supplied information to the Committee, it is the honorable member for Melbourne Ports.

Mr. MATHEWS.—But I do not condemn the supplying of information—the condemnation comes from honorable members opposite.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Whence the strength of the satire on the honorable member for Grey? Those interested by these duties have a perfect right, not by lobbying, but in a proper way, to place the effects of the duties before honorable members.

Mr. MATHEWS.—I have been lobbied myself in this matter.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I am making no accusation against the honorable member. I do not approve of lobbying; but those interested have a perfect right to place what information they have before us, if they do so in a proper way; and on that information honorable members may come to a conclusion. Some protectionist members will not accept any representations, simply because they come from protectionists, and so with free-trade members in regard to representations from free-traders. They will themselves weigh the arguments advanced on either side. I think that the case put forward upon the present occasion possesses some strength. The duty proposed is aimed entirely at one individual.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Who is that?

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—It is aimed at the proprietor of *Wise's Directory*.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—What about the other directories?

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I am aware that some directories are printed in Australia, but *Wise's Directory*, though compiled in Australia, is printed in England.

Mr. SALMON.—The honorable member's objection to the strawboard duty was based

upon the fact that only one manufacturer was engaged in the industry. His efforts are now being directed in favour of one person.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—If the honorable member is so “mixed” that he associates strawboard and directories, I confess that I have not yet reached that frame of mind. Who is the person to whom he refers?

Mr. SALMON.—Mr. Wise. The honorable member stated that the protectionist members of the Committee were operating against one importer.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Is it not within the honorable member’s own knowledge that threats have been used in this connexion, and that the outcome of those threats is this attempt to compel a particular individual to print his directory in Australia? Mr. Wise says that he has endeavoured to get his directory printed in the Commonwealth, but that the time required for its production would be nine months, and that the information which it contained would thus be stale by the time it was published.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—How are the other directories printed?

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Mr. Wise declares that nine months is the shortest period within which he can get his work printed in Australia. If his statement be accurate, there seems to be some justification for his getting it printed elsewhere. Therefore I shall support the amendment of the honorable member for Grey. I would further point out that we admit other printed books—some of which could be printed in the Commonwealth much more easily than could a directory—free. The issue of a directory is a special class of work. Only a few firms are willing to undertake it, and it is stated they require nine months within which to print it.

Mr. CHANTER.—Would it not be better to have this directory printed here so that its publisher might revise the proofs?

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—No doubt there are advantages attaching to having it printed here. But when the compiler says that he cannot get the work done in the Commonwealth within a reasonable time, we must pay some attention to his statement. I object to this special attack being made upon one individual.

Mr. CROUCH (Corio) [3.21].—I understand that a deputation recently waited

upon the Minister of Trade and Customs in regard to the publication of *Wise’s Directory*. Upon that occasion it was stated that the work could not be printed in Australia. That assertion has been repeated by the honorable member for North Sydney, who says that the directory cannot be printed here in less than nine months, which means that it cannot be printed locally at all. The Minister of Trade and Customs promised the members of the deputation that he would make inquiries and ascertain whether the statement to which I have referred is correct. I should like him to give the Committee the result of his inquiries, and to say whether *Wise’s Directory* can be printed in the Commonwealth within a reasonable period.

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN (Eden-Monaro—Minister of Trade and Customs) [3.23].—I recollect the deputation to which the honorable member for Corio has referred. At that deputation conflicting statements were made. Of course, those who were interested in having the work done oversea made out the best case that they could. But to those who have seen the directories that are printed in Australia, it must be obvious that the work can be performed locally. As a matter of fact, a number of printers who waited upon me some time ago pointed out that this work could be done within the Commonwealth at a time when printing work was slack, and that it would thus provide employment for men who would otherwise be idle. I cannot understand the statement that nine months is required to print this directory.

Mr. CROUCH.—The Minister does not accept that statement?

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—No. I gave the deputation to understand that, as far as possible, the Government believed in encouraging work to be undertaken locally, in preference to having it performed across the sea.

Mr. MAHON (Coolgardie) [3.25].—The duty proposed might be reduced with advantage. I regret that I cannot see my way to support the amendment of the honorable member for Grey. It is idle to contend that the directory to which reference has been made cannot be printed in Australia with advantage to everybody concerned. I will undertake to say that it can be done by any large firm. If Mr. Wise chose to enter into a contract with any large firm for the production of his

directory for a period of five or seven years, I am certain that he could get the work turned out within three months. It is simply a question of paying the necessary price. At the same time, I think that 6d. per lb. is rather too heavy an impost to levy upon directories. Some honorable members have argued that the publications mentioned in paragraph A cannot be produced in Australia to commercial advantage. But certainly directories can. There is nothing elaborate about them. They involve only ordinary plain setting. It is ridiculous to suggest that the publisher can economize time by sending his copy oversea, thus sacrificing six weeks upon the voyage each way.

Mr. CHANTER.—He also has to wait for his proofs.

Mr. MAHON.—He has either to incur the risk of error or engage some person oversea having some knowledge of Australia to read the proofs very carefully. I think that one might search the world vainly in an effort to discover a directory which is printed in other than the country in which it is issued. I was utterly astounded when I learned that Mr. Wise's directory is printed in London. Apart altogether from fiscalism, these books ought to be printed in the country to which they refer.

Mr. ATKINSON.—If they were printed in Australia, would it add to the employment here? Would not the present firms be able to turn them out without adding to their staffs?

Mr. MAHON.—Undoubtedly the printing would add to the employment here.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Mr. Wise complains that he cannot get the work turned out in Australia with sufficient expedition.

Mr. MAHON.—That is because he is not willing to make the necessary financial sacrifice.

Mr. ATKINSON.—If the work can be done in Australia, I should like to see it done here.

Mr. MAHON.—It can be done here much more advantageously than can the work connected with a number of other items upon which we have placed protective duties.

Mr. KNOX (Kooyong) [3.30].—I wish to enter my protest against the suggestion that these directories cannot be printed in Australia, and with very great advantage. To my mind, the whole matter is one of pounds, shillings, and pence, because it

is recognised that the directories which are issued in Melbourne by Messrs. Sands and McDougall, and in Sydney by Mr. John Sands, are as good as those which are published in any other part of the world.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—But their establishments are large ones, and they employ special staffs for the purpose.

Mr. KNOX.—The suggestion that time can be economized by sending the copy for these directories to Great Britain is positively ridiculous. In the circumstances I shall support the imposition of the duty, believing that not to do so would be to do an injustice to our printing establishments, which are turning out most excellent work, and which, if afforded the opportunity, would turn out this additional work creditably.

Mr. BAMFORD (Herbert) [3.31].—In my opinion, a duty of 6d. per lb. is too high. I do not know whether the honorable member for Coolgardie intends to propose a reduction of the duty, but I certainly mean to vote against the amendment of the honorable member for Grey. I am informed that a great quantity of this work is done in Germany. I know, as a matter of fact, that similar work is done there. If it be a fact that these directories are printed in Germany, or elsewhere, I do not see why we should not give a small preference to the United Kingdom, and I suggest to the Treasurer that if the amendment before the Committee be rejected, the duty per lb. should be fixed at 6d. in the general Tariff, and at 4d. in the preferential Tariff. That, I think, would meet the case very well.

Amendment negatived.

Amendment by (Mr. POYNTON) agreed to—

That the words "and on and after 10th December, 1907, per lb. (United Kingdom), 4d." be added.

Paragraph, as amended, agreed to.

Mr. MAHON (Coolgardie) [3.36].—I propose to move the insertion of a new paragraph. We are imposing duties of 10 and 15 per cent. on various papers used in the production of books in Australia, and to admit books from outside countries free. This is an anomaly, and one which I find it very difficult to defend. During the consideration of the old Tariff it was made an argument for the abolition of all duties on what is known as printing newspaper. My proposal, if I can get the support of the Committee, will keep out low class literature of the

Deadwood Dick type, which comes in very freely. The list of books which I propose to admit free may not be very complete, but my proposal is open to amplification—

Books dealing exclusively with art, science, or religion, scholastic publications, histories, biographies, dictionaries, encyclopædias, and works of travel, subject to departmental by-laws (General Tariff), free.

Mr. THOMAS.—The honorable member proposes to leave out all kinds of fiction.

Mr. MAHON.—Yes, because it is impossible to differentiate against one class of fiction in favour of any other class without making the Customs House a literary censor. My additional proposal is to levy a duty of 10 per cent. on "books n.e.i." That, I admit, is rather a novel proposal.

Mr. THOMAS.—Do not talk about taxing books.

Mr. MAHON.—I am not proposing to tax any useful books.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The honorable member's proposal, if carried, would shut out a great deal more than publications like *Deadwood Dick*.

Mr. MAHON.—I admit that. I have not been able to make my list as complete as I would like, but the honorable member will see that it includes every work connected with the arts, science, or religion, scholastic publications, histories, biographies, encyclopædias, works of travel, and other works, subject to departmental by-laws. All those works would be free.

Mr. WYNNE.—It does not include books of poetry.

Mr. MAHON.—No; because it would be difficult to admit books of poetry and to shut out high-class novels.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE. — I suggest to the honorable member that it would be better for him to raise this question on item 368, under which "books, n.e.i." are free.

Mr. MAHON.—If it will afford the honorable gentleman an opportunity of considering the matter I shall wait until that item is reached.

Paragraph C. Printed Matter n.e.i. (except newspapers registered for transmission through the post) being or containing advertisements, including Magazines containing advertisements being more than one-fifth of the printed matter contained within the outside covers, per lb., 6d.

Mr. WILSON (Corangamite) [3.40].—This item imposes a duty on all kinds of magazines. In my opinion they ought to be made free, and therefore, I move—

That the words "and on and after 10th December, 1907, free," be added.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [3.41].—This item has not been inserted in this division without having received due consideration. We have imposed a duty on advertisements and these magazines, if I may use the term, are surreptitiously circulating advertisements without paying a duty thereon.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—We have not a duty on advertisements.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE. — I ask the honorable member to allow me to finish what I have to say. I hold in my hand a copy of *Munsey's Magazine*, containing 269 pages of advertisements and 138 pages of magazine matter. It is the most ridiculous thing that it is possible for any one to imagine. At one time I used to be very glad, each month, to get the magazines to read the really good matter in them, but now, with their small proportion of reading matter, they are really not worth reading. They are advertising mediums, and nothing else.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON. — Does not a magazine get better reading matter when it has a large number of advertisements?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—If the honorable member will take the trouble to read the magazines of the present day he will realize the absurdity of his statement.

Mr. MAHON.—The best magazines are those which have the fewest advertisements.

Mr. THOMAS.—What do they charge for them?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I have heard the honorable member speak on this subject, and I know that he is biased. The magazines which have the fewest advertisements are the most readable.

Mr. THOMAS.—Which magazines?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—There is a number of them.

Mr. THOMAS.—The honorable gentleman never reads one of them, not even the *Nineteenth Century* or the *Contemporary Review*.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do.

Mr. THOMAS.—The honorable member does not.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The honorable member fancies that he knows better than I do what I read. As a matter of fact, I read the magazines.

Mr. THOMAS.—The honorable gentleman has never read those magazines in his life.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Here is a case which the honorable member cannot answer, nor can any one else. It is proposed to

admit free this magazine which contains 269 pages of advertisements, and only 138 pages of reading matter.

Mr. PAGE.—And every one of the advertisements is a work of art.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—It may be a work of some sort.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—We have already freed similar advertisements.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Honorable members on the other side need not jump at me in this way because I have had to deal with this matter. When I was Minister of Trade and Customs, prior to the Reid Ministry coming into power, I found that it had reached the proportions of a scandal. It was such an imposition upon those who were paying practically for advertisements, that I decided that if the magazines contained more than one-third of advertisements, they should pay the duty. The proportion fixed—one-third of advertisements—is very fair. Ever since I did this the importers of magazines have been agitating and ear-wiggling every member of Parliament they could get hold of, with the object of having these duties taken off.

Mr. PAGE.—Quite right, too.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—It is quite wrong; and if the honorable member would look at this matter fairly, he would agree with me.

Mr. PAGE.—I want our people to get their literature cheap.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not care a twopenny dump what the honorable member wants. What has been done is a round-about and sneaking way of getting foreign advertising matter in.

Mr. PAGE.—Why is it a sneaking way?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I know that the honorable member has been canvassing about this matter.

Mr. PAGE.—I rise to order. Is the Treasurer in order in saying I have been canvassing? I ask him to name a single member of this House who can say that I have interviewed him on the subject. It is a highly offensive remark to make, especially as it is not true. The Treasurer is constantly doing that sort of thing.

The CHAIRMAN.—It is not in order for the Treasurer to impute motives.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The honorable member told me not very many minutes ago that he knew that the duty would be taken off.

Mr. PAGE.—Hear, hear; and I am going to do my best to have it taken off.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I have heard the honorable member speaking to other honorable members about it. Not that I think there is any harm in that. If I wanted to get an honorable member to support me, I would ask him to do so. I did not make the remark of which the honorable member has complained offensively, and did not intend it to bear the meaning which some people outside would give to it. It is a scandal to permit the free importation of magazines such as the one I hold in my hand, when they contain so many pages of advertisements and so few of reading matter.

Mr. WYNNE.—What good would it do to Australia to shut such magazines out?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I thought it was my duty to see that these advertisements were charged for.

Mr. WYNNE.—Not one of those advertisements would be printed here if they were not charged for.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—We have already determined to free advertising matter pertaining to English and foreign firms.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Only when they have no places of business here. Of course, my honorable friend will go to great lengths to assist his foreign friends. In addition to that, we should do everything we can to foster our own magazines.

Mr. THOMAS.—Why does not the honorable gentleman propose to tax the *Contemporary Review* and the *Nineteenth Century*?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—They contain, comparatively speaking, few advertisements.

Mr. THOMAS.—The honorable the Treasurer says that he reads them.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—So I do.

Mr. THOMAS.—He does not want to tax the magazines that he reads, so that he will be all right. He is a free-trader in matters relating to himself!

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The honorable member is placing an improper interpretation upon my words. He is getting excited.

Mr. PAGE.—Sit down; the numbers are up.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I dare say the numbers are up, and largely owing to those who have been canvassing outside. There has been scandalous canvassing, which should have been put down.

Mr. PAGE.—Canvassing all round.

The CHAIRMAN.—I must ask honorable members to cease these continuous interruptions. It is almost impossible for the Treasurer to be heard.

Mr. THOMAS.—Why should he be so unfair?

The CHAIRMAN.—I ask the honorable member not to interject.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The canvassing is a scandal, and has been for some time. Something has been said about my receiving people here. I have refused to receive people in connexion with the Tariff. Numbers of people have asked to see me, and I have refused to talk to them.

Mr. MAUGER.—The Treasurer has snubbed them.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I have.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Maybe after they have seen some one else.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not do such things. I think honorable members will see how unfair it is to allow these magazines to come in without putting a check on the quantity of advertising matter in proportion to reading matter in each magazine. The present practice is destroying the readable character of magazines, as well as being objectionable in many other ways.

Mr. THOMAS.—That is a brilliant idea!

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The honorable member is so full of brilliancy that one can see right through him. I believe the action that I have taken has tended to improve the quality of the magazine imported.

Mr. SALMON.—Many of them are a swindle on the public.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—They are, and those who are circulating them are promoting the swindle. The public suppose that they are buying reading matter, when they are simply buying books of advertisements.

Mr. SALMON.—And one does not know it until one is in the railway train.

Mr. PAGE.—I have seen the Treasurer reading advertisements in the train.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I try to buy something better to read; but it is difficult to buy a good magazine nowadays.

Mr. THOMAS.—Does the Treasurer ever read anything?

Mr. WYNNE.—He has not even read his own Tariff.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I get quite enough of that in my office; and I have given the honorable member who interjects a few shots about the Tariff at various times which have made him shy. It is a pity that he will not come up to the scratch

and carry out his election pledges. I am quite aware that I shall have to abide by the opinion of the Committee; but I emphatically put my opinion on record, and state plainly that if ever I get an opportunity to stop the importation of these alleged magazines which are simply bundles of advertising matter, I shall do so.

Mr. PAGE.—We will see that the honorable gentleman does not.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I should be unworthy of my office, if, holding such strong opinions on this matter, I did not express them.

Mr. ATKINSON.—How long has the honorable gentleman held them?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Longer than the honorable member has been alive. I place on record my opinion of these magazines and those who circulate them, and state in conclusion that before long some drastic action will be taken—even if it is not taken now—in reference to them.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [3.54].—I wish to remind the Committee of the item which we have just passed. We have determined that—

Show-cards or pictures issued by or referring to the goods of any manufacturer or producer not having a special place of business in Australia

shall be free. So that nearly all the advertisements which appear in these magazines are specially allowed to be admitted free under the last item we dealt with, when they are sent out as advertisements only through the post.

Mr. HUGHES (West Sydney) [3.55].—The Treasurer in his rather remarkable speech seems to have quite misunderstood the point at issue, or has been incapable of stating his case in such a way as to commend it to honorable members who are accustomed—in spite of the fact that he has been permitted to be in charge of this Tariff for a considerable time—to have cases presented to them in a logical manner. The honorable gentleman says that it is desirable to foster art and literature. No doubt it is; but if that be the object which he has in view, I ask: What earthly connexion is there between a number of advertisements which he declines to be allowed to be attached to *Munsey's Magazine* and the fostering of literature and art? The whole gravamen of the Treasurer's charge is that these magazines are accompanied by quantities of advertisements. If they are cut out he has no objection to allowing the magazines to

come in. Therefore, his objection is to the advertisements, not to the literature and art of foreign countries. As to the honorable gentleman's remarks about lobbying—which, of course, are made rather late in the day, and when the precincts of this chamber are full of exhibits of various kinds—I remind him that not very long ago he came down to this House with a sheep-shearing machine, the driving gear of which occupied the lobby and which he said was made in Australia when, as a matter of fact, it was imported. We have not heard the Treasurer taking exception to men coming here day after day and stating their case to honorable members. A hundred of them have tried to speak to me, but few have been successful. I should be very sorry if I could not present a case better than the Treasurer has done on this occasion. The magazine which he has exhibited is an American magazine — *Munsey's*. The American magazines, without exception, differ from the English magazines in the number of advertisements which they contain. I take up half-a-dozen English magazines, and find hardly any advertisements in them. Now, I am perfectly prepared to listen to a proposal in favour of excluding the literature and art of all foreign countries, on the ground that it is desirable to foster literature and art in Australia. But I am not to be influenced by foolish fulminations against advertisements contained in foreign magazines, and which come in merely incidentally. I am sure that some of us enjoy reading the advertisements in magazines. There is no greater evidence at once of the ingenuity and the credulity of mankind than can be found in reading the advertisements in the American magazines. But the literary men of Australia do not want to exclude magazines because of their advertisements. They want to exclude them—if they have any such desire at all—because they have their own brains to sell here. But the Minister in charge of this Tariff does not want to exclude American magazines for that reason. They are to be permitted as magazines to come in; but their advertisements are to be cut out. That is an illogical and senseless position to take up. The Treasurer seems to think that literature and art can be dealt with on the basis of so much per pound—that works over a certain weight ought to be excluded, whilst those under a certain weight should be admitted free. He appears to think that

literature is a thing that is capable of being weighed and measured.

Mr. JOHNSON.—He would probably like to tax paintings on the square foot of canvas.

Mr. DEAKIN.—Ah; that touches the honorable member!

Mr. HUGHES.—I certainly agree that the contents of some magazines are very trivial and foolish, but I should be sorry to think that we are guilty of the intolerable assumption that we do not require all that the intellect of foreign countries can give us. Half-a-dozen magazines which I have in mind have, perhaps, only half-a-dozen pages of advertisements as against thirty or forty pages of general reading matter. The Treasurer has said a great deal on the question of preference to Great Britain, but this is an opportunity which I am sure he will not avail himself of to grant a preference to the Old Country, because according to him advertisements alone are *anathema*. If he excludes only those magazines in which advertisements preponderate he will allow British magazines to come in at a cheaper rate. I hope that the Committee will determine that magazines shall come in free.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [4.2].—I am inclined to think that—

Several HONORABLE MEMBERS.—Divide! divide!

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I am quite willing to at once go to a vote, for I admit that it seems like flogging a dead horse to debate this question further.

Amendment agreed to.

Paragraph, as amended, agreed to.

Mr. MAHON (Coolgardie) [4.3].—I propose to move the insertion of a new paragraph providing for the free admission of illustrated supplements. Certain newspapers are importing high-class art pictures for distribution as Christmas supplements, and I am informed that under paragraph c those supplements will be dutiable at 6d. per lb.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—They have now been made free.

Mr. HUME COOK.—That is so.

Mr. MAHON.—Then my proposed amendment is unnecessary.

Paragraph D. Printing, in Rolls or Folios, known as Newspaper, to be used exclusively for Newspapers under Departmental By-laws, in sizes not less than 20 x 25 inches or its equivalent (General Tariff), 10 per cent; (United Kingdom), free.

Mr. MAHON (Coolgardie) [4.6].—I move—

That the words "and on and after 10th December, 1907, Printing known as Newspaper, in reels or rolls, to be used exclusively for newspapers, under departmental by-laws, ad. val. (General Tariff), 10 per cent.," be added.

If that amendment be agreed to I shall move a further amendment providing that—

Printing, known as newspaper, in the flat, in sizes not less than 20 inches by 25 inches, or its equivalent, to be used exclusively under departmental by-laws—

shall be free.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Moreton) [4.8].—Shall I be in order, Mr. Chairman, in moving at this stage the omission of all the words after the word "folios" in paragraph D with the object of inserting in lieu thereof the letters "n.e.i."?

The CHAIRMAN.—The honorable member may move such an amendment provided that the honorable member for Coolgardie will temporarily withdraw that moved by him. I would point out, however, that I should have to put the question "that the words proposed to be omitted stand part of the item," and that if the honorable member did not carry his amendment the paragraph would stand as it is, and the honorable member for Coolgardie would then have to move, by way of addition, "That on and after 11th December," and so forth.

Mr. MAHON.—On a point of order, I submit that the honorable member for Moreton cannot move the amendment proposed by him.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Not unless the honorable member withdraws his amendment.

Mr. MAHON.—I do not think that I should be justified in doing so.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—It is usual to do so.

Mr. MAHON.—It is in order to enable a prior amendment to be moved, but in this case I have moved the omission of the whole paragraph—

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—And if the honorable member's amendment be negatived, the paragraph will stand, and the honorable member for Moreton will be unable to move the insertion of the words proposed by him.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I was just going to point out that the amendment proposed by the honorable member for Coolgardie would not give the Committee an opportunity to deal straight out with the question.

Mr. MAHON.—Then I am prepared to temporarily withdraw my amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Moreton) [4.11].—I move—

That the words "known as Newspaper, to be used exclusively for Newspapers under Departmental By-laws, in sizes not less than 20 x 25 inches, or its equivalent" be left out, with a view to insert in lieu thereof the letters "n.e.i."

The object of this amendment is to place all printing paper used for newspaper purposes on the same footing. On the other hand, the amendment proposed by the honorable member for Coolgardie will place the larger newspapers at a disadvantage.

Mr. THOMAS.—Does the Treasurer support that amendment, or will he put up the same fight on this question as he did on the paragraph relating to magazines?

Mr. SINCLAIR.—I do not know.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not vote to shove money into Gordon and Gotch's pockets.

Mr. THOMAS.—The Treasurer should make a fight on this question, and some of us will help him.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not want the honorable member's help.

Mr. SINCLAIR.—I hope, at all events, that my amendment will be carried.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [4.14].—I trust that the amendment of the honorable member for Coolgardie will not be inserted, since its introduction would lead to embarrassment in regard to the structure as well as the intention of the paragraph. This paragraph was based partly on the item in the original Tariff, paragraph B of which read—

Printing, uncoated, in sizes not less than 20 x 25 inches, or its equivalent—free.

In drafting this item, I intended that paper for the printing of newspapers should be admitted free; but the Government have proposed a duty of 10 per cent.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—That was the recommendation of the B section of the Tariff Commission.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—My recommendation was that the paper imported in sizes of not less than 20 x 25 inches, or the equivalent, should be free.

Mr. MAHON.—What was the object of that limitation?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—I understood that those were the ordinary dimensions of the paper used for printing newspapers,

and it was thought that other printing paper should be dutiable. That limitation should be agreed to if it is intended to make free printing paper used for printing newspapers.

Mr. THOMAS.—Would the honorable member allow paper for printing newspapers to be admitted free, and tax other paper?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—Certainly.

Mr. MAHON.—Does the honorable member think that it is possible to limit the use of this paper to the printing of newspapers?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—I believe that difficulty has been experienced by the Department, newspaper imported for the printing of newspapers having been used for other purposes.

Mr. SALMON.—Why are the words "in rolls or folio" used?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—The intention was that all paper, whether in rolls or in folio, imported for the printing of newspapers, should be admitted free. It is felt that it would be unfair to tax one kind of paper and to allow another to be admitted free.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—Will the honorable member object to printers using this paper for printing dodgers?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—If paper for the printing of dodgers is to be admitted free, that must be stated in another paragraph. I understand that paper of a different size is used for that purpose.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—No; the same paper that is used for printing newspapers.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—There is not the same reason for admitting free paper for the printing of dodgers as there is for admitting free paper for the printing of newspapers, which are vehicles for the spread of information of the most valuable and useful kind.

Mr. MAHON.—Such as the reports of the Wallace divorce case.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—That is an exceptional matter. A tax on the paper used for printing newspapers is a tax on knowledge. The honorable member for Coolgardie intends to introduce a most objectionable discrimination by making paper in rolls used for the printing of newspapers dutiable at 10 per cent., and allowing the same paper, if imported in folio or flat, to be admitted free.

Mr. MAHON.—The honorable member might wait until my amendment is before the Committee.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—This discrimination would be unfair. The honorable member says that his object is to hit the big newspaper proprietors.

Mr. MAHON.—I have not said so publicly. I do not think that the honorable member should use words spoken in a private conversation.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—I heard the honorable member make the statement pretty loudly in this chamber. He forgets that some of the country newspaper proprietors use printing paper imported in rolls.

Mr. MAHON.—Very few of them do.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—The *Ballarat Courier* and the *Bendigo Advertiser* are printed from rolls. I have been told that the proposed duty would mean a tax of £5 or £10 a week on the proprietors of those newspapers.

Mr. MAHON.—What would it mean to the proprietors of the *Melbourne Age* and *Argus*?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—The honorable member would hit others besides those whom he desires to hit.

Mr. MAHON.—My amendment would not hit them hard.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—It would amount to a tax of £300 or £400 a year, in some instances.

Mr. MAHON.—If the honorable member wishes to do so much for newspaper proprietors, why did he not vote to make type free?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—Nowadays linotypes are very largely used.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Cannot the newspaper proprietors save this tax out of the make-up of the newspapers?

Mr. THOMAS.—Or pay it out of their dividends?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—The use of linotypes has largely reduced the cost of printing; but the newspaper proprietors have given the public a substantial equivalent by increasing the size of their news columns. The *Melbourne* and *Sydney* newspapers, the *West Australian*, and the *Brisbane Courier* are magnificent literary productions, unequalled in the world. If printing paper in rolls is taxed at the rate of 10 per cent., the proprietors of these newspapers will probably have to economize by reducing their Saturday supplements.

Mr. MAHON.—The duty will reduce their dividends a little, that is all.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—I do not stand here to support the rich newspaper proprietors. If it is wished to get at them, that

ought to be done by means of an income tax, though at the present time they contribute largely to the State revenues.

Mr. THOMAS.—Cannot printing paper be made here?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—It is not made here. I have a copy of a letter sent to the Minister of Trade and Customs by and on behalf of all the papermakers in Australia, saying that they do not desire a duty on printing paper for newspaper purposes, because they do not make such paper.

Mr. THOMAS.—Would not a duty compel them to make it, and give a large amount of employment to our own people?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—I am afraid that the honorable member is in a frivolous mood.

Mr. THOMAS.—No, I am merely appealing to a protectionist to create work for the people of Australia.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—I believe in giving protection where there is a reasonable prospect of establishing industries, either at once or in the immediate future, but we cannot make here paper for the printing of newspapers. Canada is now proposing to put an export duty on the pulp used for making such paper.

Mr. MAHON.—Does not the honorable member regard as a curious coincidence the appearance in this morning's newspapers of the telegram about that proposal?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—The agitation in Canada has been going on for some time. There is no chance of making printing paper in Australia. If there were, I should support a duty on it. I am concerned, not so much for the big metropolitan newspaper proprietors, as for the country newspaper proprietors, many of whom, in addition to the proprietors of the newspapers which I have mentioned, intend to use rolls as soon as they can get the necessary machinery.

Mr. MAHON.—About 2 per cent. of the country newspaper proprietors are concerned.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—All the big country newspaper proprietors will shortly be using rolls for the sake of economy. In Victoria there are 414 newspapers, in New South Wales 347, in South Australia 67, in Western Australia 63, in Queensland 136, in Tasmania 26; or in all, 1,053.

Mr. MAHON.—It is hardly fair to read those figures in connexion with the remarks which the honorable member has made in criticising my amendment. They have application only to the Tariff proposals.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—I protest on behalf of the proprietors of these newspapers against any duty on paper used for printing newspapers, and particularly against any discrimination between paper imported in rolls and paper imported flat or in sheets. Such a discrimination would stand in the way of those who, for the sake of economy, and to keep pace with the times, may desire hereafter to use paper imported in rolls. My objection to the Government proposal is that it is a tax on literature, which, in the end, will bring loss upon the public.

Mr. MAHON (Coolgardie) [4.28].—Although speeches made in Committee are supposed to be confined to the amendment before the chair, the honorable member for Bendigo has been allowed to discuss my amendment, which is not before the chair.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The whole subject is before the Committee.

Mr. MAHON.—As I have not yet moved my amendment, I shall defer my reply to the honorable member until it is before the Committee.

Mr. WYNNE (Balaclava) [4.29].—I think that no one is in earnest about this duty, and that the Government do not want it to pass. Therefore, it would save time to withdraw the proposal.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I shall not withdraw it.

Mr. WYNNE.—Whenever a duty affecting newspapers was proposed in the Victorian Parliament—and it has been the same here—it has always gone to the wall, because no one was in earnest about it. That seems to be the case again now, and as we have many debatable items yet to deal with, it would save time if the Treasurer were to tell us that he does not intend to press this proposal.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [4.30].—I am not going to say anything of the kind. I wish shortly to give the history of this matter. In the first report submitted by the Tariff Commission, under the heading "Importations of Paper and Stationery," the item is framed in this way—

"Printing, in rolls or folios, known as 'News,' to be used exclusively for newspapers under Departmental By-laws, in sizes of not less than 20 x 25 inches, or its equivalent."

To that form of the item no duty was attached.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—Because we could not agree.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—On the original typed document I found the name of the

honorable member for Bendigo had been attached and then erased. I suppose the honorable member made the erasure himself?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—Hear, hear. But I always opposed the duty.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—That was the first stage. Then in the second stage this appeared in the report of the protectionist section of the Commission—

“We are of opinion that this item should be amended to read—

Then followed the words I have just quoted, and in addition the words “*ad valorem* 15 per cent.” That is signed by Mr. Frank Clarke and Senators Higgs and McGregor. There was apparently a difference of opinion between them and the Chairman of the Tariff Commission, who did not sign the report which was signed by the other three protectionist members of the Commission. Then I come to the report of the B section of the Tariff Commission, who unanimously recommended a duty of 10 per cent. That is how the duty of 10 per cent. came to be placed in the first column of this Tariff. I recognise that we have not so far found in Australia a sufficient supply of softwoods or other material suitable for the manufacture of this paper, in view of the large quantity of it that is required. We have paper mills in the Commonwealth, one in Sydney and one, I believe, in Geelong. I have made inquiry as to whether this class of paper is manufactured here, and so far as I can gather it is not.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—The local manufacturers do not use wood.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I believe that is so. This class of paper is not made at either of the mills to which I have referred. I have been at a loss to know how to submit a provision which would induce its manufacture within the Commonwealth.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—How can the honorable gentleman expect to do that when no material suitable for the purpose is found in Australia?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not think that that is definitely known. I believe that if the manufacturers were put to it they might find a suitable material.

Mr. MATHEWS.—They cannot get any pulp.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I have had some conversation with both metropolitan and country newspaper proprietors, who say that so far a suitable pulp has not been found in Australia for this purpose. But

I am not sure that there has been any very determined effort to find it. In the circumstances the Government have felt it to be their duty to submit the item as proposed. I think that perhaps it would have been better had we offered a bounty to induce persons to set about the discovery of some material suitable for this purpose. I have an idea that we have in Australia, and especially in Tasmania, a peculiar kind of rush which would make good paper. But I have never heard that any one has experimented in that direction. I believe that this rush would be suitable for the purpose, though as a layman I cannot speak with any authority on the subject.

Mr. MALONEY.—What about the paper-bark tree, and the various varieties of ti-tree?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not know that sufficient quantities of that material would be available. So far as this item is concerned, I am prepared to leave the decision of the matter to the Committee, but the item will not be withdrawn.

Mr. SPENCE (Darling) [4.35].—Honorable members should realize that this is neither more nor less than a revenue duty. The Government propose a duty of 10 per cent. in the general Tariff, and that imports from Great Britain should be free. The roll paper does not come from Great Britain.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—No, only rag paper and paper of that kind.

Mr. SPENCE.—The roll paper is imported chiefly from Canada. If this paper is made in England, it must be from imported pulp. From recent cables honorable members will have observed that in the United States it has been suggested that wood pulp for the manufacture of paper should be admitted duty free. There is an evident shortage of material. The great Canadian forests have so far been able to meet the demand for wood pulp, but I have not been surprised to hear that the action of the United States in proposing the free admission of wood pulp has been met in Canada by a proposal to impose an export duty upon it. British manufacturers have, so far, been importing wood pulp from Sweden, where there are extensive softwood forests. No attempt has been made in Australia to manufacture this paper, because we have no softwoods suitable for the purpose. In the circumstances this can only be regarded as a revenue duty.

Mr. MAHON.—Could we not import the pulp and manufacture it into paper here?

Mr. SPENCE.—I do not think we could get it. If an export duty were imposed in the countries from which it comes, it would probably add so much to the cost of manufacturing the paper here that the local newspaper proprietors would prefer to pay the duty to paying the price which would have to be charged by local manufacturers of this paper from imported wood pulp. The honorable member for Bendigo appeared to think that this class of paper is used only for the printing of newspapers. But I can inform him that it is largely used for job printing as well as for dodgers. I know of one job done recently which involved the use of 10 tons of paper, and the printing was done from the roll.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—That paper would come under the item dutiable at 25 per cent. to 20 per cent.

Mr. SPENCE.—No, it would be the very paper we are now speaking about. It is a mistake to suppose that this paper is used only for the printing of newspapers, as paper from the same roll is used for job printing. I am opposed to the item on the ground that it provides merely for a revenue duty.

Mr. MAHON.—In 1902 the honorable member voted for this revenue duty which he is now denouncing.

Mr. SPENCE.—I was not particular how I voted before. I voted both ways.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—It is a go-as-you-please.

Mr. SPENCE.—No, it is not. I am guided in this matter by a definite principle. On this occasion the country has said that we should have protective duties. I have been fighting for them, and I am opposed absolutely on principle to revenue duties. I wish that those things which cannot be made here should be admitted free, and there is no doubt that we cannot make this class of paper. The Treasurer has said something about rushes. But I wonder how long the greatest field of rushes in Australia would last if drawn upon for this purpose, and how long the rushes would take to grow again.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The rushes I refer to grow up every year.

Mr. SPENCE.—I suppose that the whole of the rushes grown in Australia would be used up in the manufacture of the paper required to print a couple of

issues of one of our large daily newspapers. The search for material suitable for the manufacture of printing papers of this class has been the business of busy brains in every part of the world. So far the greatest quantity has been derived from soft-wood forests. Canada has almost a monopoly of woods suitable for the purpose. I can support the statement made by the honorable member for Bendigo that an increasing number of newspapers are being printed from the roll. The use of the Cox duplex machine, which does not cost anything like the Hoe printing machine, is enabling a number of the proprietors of country newspapers to print from the roll.

Mr. MAHON.—Can the honorable member name a country newspaper that is printed from the roll?

Mr. SPENCE.—I think the Government should omit the item. The proposed duty of 10 per cent. in the general Tariff and free from Great Britain is misleading, because this paper is not imported from Great Britain. I oppose the item, because I am opposed to a revenue Tariff.

Mr. MALONEY (Melbourne) [4.40].—I take the same view of this matter as does the honorable member for Darling. This is a purely revenue duty, and I cannot see my way to vote for it. I admit, of course, that revenue must be derived in some way for the services of the Commonwealth, while the Braddon blot is allowed to remain. I hope that the wisdom of this House and another place combined will shortly lead to the removal of the Braddon blot. So far as is known at present, wood pulp suitable for the manufacture of this paper cannot be obtained in Australia. I am not sure that a suitable material will not yet be discovered, and I suggest to the Minister that the production of a pulp suitable for the manufacture of paper would be a fitting subject for a bounty. I find from a communication placed in my hands by a gentleman who has had much experience that wood pulp for this purpose is obtained from large forests of larch and spruce, and comes principally from Canada, the United States, Norway, and Sweden. I know of one newspaper—*Le Petit Journal*, which, at the time to which I refer, had the largest circulation in the world, 1,500,000 subscribers—of which it was said that every year it ate out a forest in Norway. I am informed that logs of New Zealand pine were sent to England and the Continent in order to see if they could be made into a

pulp suitable for the manufacture of this paper, but the experiments show that they could not be used for this purpose in the same way as the soft wood, such as the larch and spruce. I understand that if larch and spruce were planted here, it would take twenty years before they could be used for this purpose. Another difficulty is that these trees are found in countries in which there is heavy frost and snow, and it would appear that intense cold is necessary for their proper development. To import pulp is almost out of the question. One cannot verify information on these subjects by personal observation, but if my information be correct, and I think it is, pulp, to be imported here, would require to be 50 per cent. dry, or one-half water and one-half pulp.

Mr. MAHON.—Nonsense.

Mr. MALONEY.—I shall give the information I have first, and the honorable member can correct it afterwards if he is able.

Mr. MAHON.—Might I ask from whom the honorable member received his information?

Mr. MALONEY.—It is quite sufficient that I should read the statement made, and if the honorable member can correct it, he need not ask me for my authority.

Mr. MAHON.—It is usual to quote authorities in Parliament.

Mr. MALONEY.—The honorable member will have to be content with the authority of my lips at present, though I can tell him that his question is by no means an awkward one, since, if there were any necessity to do so, I should have no objection to mention the authority.

To import pulp is out of the question. Wood pulp can be carried only in what is called a condition 50 per cent. dry—half pulp and half water. The freight alone on the pulp necessary to make a ton of paper, even at the most favorable sailing ship rate of 15s. a ton measure, would amount to over 60s. per ton, in addition to charges for insurance, exchange, &c. In a long voyage of 90 to 100 days, pulp would considerably deteriorate, owing to its tendency to decompose. If it dried to any extent, the material would lose its fibrous quality and become mere powder, from which only the coarsest paper could be made.

Newspaper could not be produced in this country in any quantity from rags because the supply is limited, but all writing papers should bear a heavy duty. I have here the following statement with reference to the

difficulties that small printers and others are experiencing at present—

All stocks of papers here before the introduction of the Tariff have been charged a duty by the Paper Combine, which have circularized all printers to that effect.

There is a paper combine at all events in Victoria, if not throughout Australia.

Sands and MacDougall make a certain printing paper—this paper was invoiced prior to the Tariff at 25s. per ream duty. The duty of 20 per cent. was not, of course, operative on such a paper. They were asked for some 35 reams to be delivered immediately, and answered this way:—25s. old price, 5s. per ream duty; 30s. a ream new price, and you must wait a month for the delivery of the order, as since the Tariff our mills are overworked.

Mr. MCWILLIAMS.—What sort of paper is that?

Mr. MALONEY.—A certain high class paper that Sands and McDougall manufacture, but such is the power of the Combine that the duty is being charged even where it has not been paid. I feel that I am perfectly justified in voting against the duty, so that the paper which we cannot manufacture here should be admitted free, but I trust that this or some other Government in the near future will take steps to encourage by a judicious bounty the production of suitable wood pulp.

Mr. MATHEWS (Melbourne Ports) [4.48].—I think it will be admitted that I am fairly keen on anything that affects my electorate. I happen to have in my electorate one of the largest paper mills in Australia, and I am assured, both by employers and employes who are well versed in the manufacture of paper, that it is almost an impossibility to manufacture newspaper here.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—What about those rushes?

Mr. MATHEWS.—I assure the honorable member for Parramatta that I am a scientific protectionist. If I thought there was a hundred to one chance of manufacturing newspaper and printing paper in Australia I should vote for the highest duty I could get, but, having been assured by those in the trade that it could not be done, I intend to vote to make this article free. I know there is a feeling—I must admit that I have it myself—that it would be well to make some people pay a little bit more taxation than they are paying just now; but, seeing that that would be stretching my belief as a protectionist, I am willing to let it go. I should like to see "printing paper" inserted in this paragraph as

well as newspaper, as ordinary printing paper is not made here.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I am going to try to deal with that point in a separate paragraph.

Mr. MATHEWS.—Very well. I wish to impress upon the Treasurer, and upon honorable members, that in taking up this attitude I am not "slipping" on paper. I have assured myself that this paper has not been and cannot be made here. The Minister has admitted that the production of pulp requires encouragement by means of the bounty system, and I believe that he himself will place it upon the bounty list. I believe the House would indorse that, seeing that the paper question involves such large interests. As the pulp is not produced here, and our timber is not suitable for pulping, I shall vote against the duty on newspaper and printing paper.

Mr. EDWARDS (Oxley) [4.50].—Will the Treasurer give way, and allow printing paper to be made free?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Only a vote of the Committee will make me give way.

Mr. EDWARDS.—I hope the Minister will give in, seeing that every member who has spoken on the other side intends to vote against the duty.

Mr. MAHON.—That is quite incorrect. I am not going to vote against it.

Mr. EDWARDS.—I have a great deal of material, with which I could go on for an hour; but out of consideration for the Treasurer and the Committee I shall deny myself the privilege of saying much about this question, except that I rather favour the amendment, moved by the honorable member for Moreton, to delete all the words after the word "folios," so that the paragraph may apply to all sizes of printing paper. Why should newspaper be made free, in sizes not less than 20 inches x 25 inches, or its equivalent—because I am quite satisfied that it will be made free—while all smaller sizes are penalized? The smaller sizes are used in various ways for books, particularly school books. Printing paper of all sizes should be made free.

Mr. PALMER (Echuca) [4.52].—A fear is expressed by the Country Press Co-operative Company that paper in rolls will be made free, while paper in the flat is dutiable. I wish to be assured that all classes of paper will be on the same footing.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I think the honorable member will find that none of it will be dutiable.

Question—That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the paragraph (Mr. SINCLAIR'S amendment)—put. The Committee divided.

Ayes	27
Noes	15
<hr/>				
Majority	12

AYES.

Bamford, F. W.	Mauger, S.
Catts, J. H.	Palmer, A. C.
Chanter, J. M.	Poynton, A.
Chapman, Austin	Quick, Sir John
Coon, J.	Spence, W. G.
Deakin, A.	Storror, D.
Ewing, T. T.	Thomas, J.
Fisher, A.	Thomson, John
Groom, L. E.	Tudor, F. G.
Harper, R.	Watkins, D.
Hedges, W. N.	Wise, G. H.
Knox, W.	<i>Tellers:</i>
Lyne, Sir William	Cook, Hume
Mahon, H.	Frazer, C. E.

NOES.

Archer, E. W.	Mathews, J.
Bowden, E. K.	Page, J.
Cook, Joseph	Sinclair, H.
Edwards, R.	Wilson, J. G.
Foxton, Colonel	Wynne, A.
Gull, G. W.	<i>Tellers:</i>
Johnson, W. E.	Liddell, F.
Maloney, W. R. N.	McWilliams, W. J.

Question so resolved in the affirmative.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. MAHON (Coolgardie) [5.0].—I move—

That the following words be added:—"and on and after 10th December, 1907, Printing, known as Newspaper, in Reels or Rolls, to be used exclusively for Newspapers under Departmental By-laws, ad val., 10 per cent."

Later on I propose to add to the amendment another clause providing that paper in the flat used exclusively by country newspapers shall be free. This line of demarcation is necessary; and, despite what the honorable member for Bendigo has said, absolutely just. Those newspaper proprietors who use paper in reels or rolls will pay a duty of 10 per cent., while those who use paper in the flat in the publication of small country newspapers will obtain it free of duty; and thus the object of the honorable member for Moreton will be gained. I take some exception to the honorable member for Bendigo commenting on this amendment before I had an opportunity to speak on it. The honorable member was very eloquent in his appeal on behalf of the smaller newspaper proprietors, and

he described the daily press of Bendigo and Ballarat as country newspapers.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—Hear, hear.

Mr. MAHON.—I do not consider Bendigo and Ballarat country towns, but provincial cities; and the newspapers there are very fine publications indeed. The honorable member also informed us that there are 1,000 newspapers published in Australia, but he did not add that the proposed tax will not touch more than 2 per cent. or 3 per cent. of them—that the proprietors who use paper in reels or rolls can be counted on the fingers of both hands. There are three or four such proprietors in Sydney, about three in Melbourne, two in Adelaide, two in Perth, two or three in Brisbane, and, it may be, there are others in Newcastle, Rockhampton, and perhaps Charters Towers.

Mr. EDWARDS.—Reel paper is used in half-a-dozen establishments in Brisbane alone.

Mr. MAHON.—I do not think so. Unless a newspaper has a very large circulation it does not pay to instal the machinery necessary in the use of reel paper. I appeal to honorable members who desire to give country newspapers fair play. The other day we imposed a tax of 20 per cent. on type, while, at the same time, we made linotypes and other printing machinery free.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Does the honorable member wish to tax for the sake of taxing?

Mr. MAHON.—No; but I think every class in the community ought to pay their due share to the revenue. The honorable member for Bendigo also declared that we have no timber in Australia suitable for pulp for the manufacture of paper. I point out that if the proposed duty be imposed, the large consumers will no doubt put their heads together, and endeavour to discover here some substitute for the foreign timber. When I hear vaunted protectionists like the honorable member for Melbourne Ports and the honorable member for Melbourne stating that newspaper cannot be manufactured here, and that, therefore, no duty should be imposed, I marvel at their short-sightedness, because, after all, necessity is the mother of invention. If the large newspaper proprietors are allowed to dose other people with taxes, and impose heavy duties on country newspapers, while enjoying free-trade themselves, they will never have any spur or incentive to discover in Australia a substitute for the foreign paper. I advise the honorable members to

whom I have referred to reconsider their position before their constituents. As I have said, the country newspaper proprietor pays a duty on his type, while the large newspaper proprietor of the city has his linotype and other expensive machinery admitted free. There is one metropolitan newspaper proprietor who draws between £60,000 and £70,000 a year from his newspaper; and he, and other wealthy proprietors, are to be free of taxation, while the poor country printer, who often employs his sons and daughters picking up type when they ought to be at school, is taxed on everything he uses. The honorable member for Bendigo spoke of advantages which he says readers of newspapers have been given by the proprietors since the introduction of the linotype. I deny the honorable member's statement flatly. I shall take one case in proof. If we look up a Saturday issue of the Melbourne *Argus* of twenty years ago, we shall find that it compares more than favorably in literary work with the Saturday *Argus* of to-day. That was long before the linotype was introduced; and the same remark applies to the *Sydney Morning Herald* or the *Sydney Daily Telegraph*.

Mr. BOWDEN.—But the *Herald* was then published at 2d.

Mr. MAHON.—That is true, but there were 1d. newspapers to which the remark applies, at any rate in a modified way. The reduction in the cost of production owing to the linotype has enabled newspaper proprietors to make enormous fortunes; and neither the remuneration of the staffs, nor the advantages given to readers, are in any way proportionate to the increased profits. I challenge the honorable member for Bendigo to successfully refute what I say. Twenty years ago the daily newspapers of Australia maintained two cable services from England, but there is now a syndicate service for the whole, and thereby considerable saving. These savings and economies have in no way advantaged the readers of the newspapers; nor, as I say, have the staffs had their position materially improved. I regret very much that there should have been such lengthy discussion on this item, but I intend dividing the Committee on the question.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Does the honorable member propose any preference?

Mr. MAHON.—No; I do not think a preferential duty would do much good. A good deal of the reel paper comes from Great Britain, but the countries of origin

are not British. I wish it to be clearly understood that my amendment contemplates that the paper used by the small country newspaper proprietors shall still be admitted free.

Mr. ARCHER (Capricornia) [5.10].—It would appear that the honorable member for Coolgardie, in his keen anxiety to tax the wealthy metropolitan newspaper proprietors, is quite prepared to do a great injustice to a number of other newspaper proprietors. The honorable member mentioned Rockhampton, and other coastal towns, and classed the newspapers there with the great metropolitan dailies. But I entirely disapprove of any step being taken which would impose heavy burdens on struggling newspaper proprietors, who are ill prepared to bear them. Bundaberg, Rockhampton, Maryborough, and other places are growing in importance; and there came under my notice the other day a newspaper which has just been changed into a daily.

Mr. MAHON.—But all the newspaper proprietors in those places do not use roll paper.

Mr. ARCHER.—But the time is arriving when they will use that paper, and some are using it now. The honorable member said that the newspaper proprietors who use this roll paper could be counted on the fingers of both hands; but, as a matter of fact, it is used by many more, and numbers of them are by no means wealthy. In all the towns which have been mentioned newspapers have been started by enterprising men in the face of great difficulties, and yet, in his anxiety to tax the large proprietors, the honorable member is prepared to put a heavy impost on the paper required by men who are doing good work for the country. Some of these newspapers are excellent publications, providing good news at considerable expense, though the proprietors are just managing to scrape along, faced, in some cases, no doubt, with overdrafts incurred in improving their plants.

Mr. THOMAS.—Can the honorable member see his way clear on this occasion to support the Government, who are very anxious to have this duty?

Mr. ARCHER.—I have supported the Government on many items, but I am afraid I cannot support them on this item.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [5.13].—The amendment of the honorable member for Coolgardie simply repeats the words of the item, and inasmuch as I

originally intended to move that it should be free, I think the only way to raise the question is for me to now move—

That the amendment be amended by leaving out the words "10 per cent.," with a view to insert in lieu thereof the word "free."

The honorable member for Coolgardie has endeavoured to show that there should be some differentiation shown between the paper used by the small country newspaper proprietors and that used by the proprietors of the large city dailies.

Mr. MAHON.—I have done so.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Whether the honorable member has or has not succeeded in doing so, I decline to have anything to do with class taxation of any description. We ought to treat the big proprietors of the cities with the same fairness and justice that we extend to the proprietors of small weekly newspapers; even a big newspaper proprietor has a right to expect that at the hands of the Committee. It is all very well for the honorable member to say that we propose to let the big city newspaper proprietor escape taxation, whilst taxing the small newspaper proprietor in the country. As a matter of fact, we wish to do nothing of the kind. We intend, I hope, to give all newspaper proprietors their printing paper free. I need not enumerate the reasons why this commodity should be free. But I wish to reply to the statement made by the honorable member for Coolgardie as to what is going on in other parts of the world. Two months ago I read in a British newspaper that in New York a movement was in progress to requisition the United States Government to remit the duty upon wood pulp.

Mr. BAMFORD.—Does not the honorable member think that that is rather a strange coincidence?

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I am speaking of a movement which was in progress two months ago. Already the duties imposed under this division of the Tariff are injuring our Australian publishers, who, I am told, are forwarding their books to London to be made up there. It may be that the time will come when we shall be able to convert the rushes grown in Tasmania, of which the Treasurer spoke, into newspaper, but even if we could do that I do not know whether there is an unlimited supply available. It seems to me that if all the rushes grown in Tasmania were utilized for the purpose they would not keep a huge newspaper mill running very long. The prospects in that direction

are, therefore, very small indeed. This newspaper problem is becoming a very serious one all over the world. There is no doubt that the supplies of pine wood, from which the pulp is made, are becoming exhausted, and already the industry is in the hands of one or two individuals. Even if we impose a tax upon printing newspaper we shall not stimulate enterprise in the direction of finding an efficient substitute for pine. It will be a tax pure and simple, and we ought not to impose a burden upon newspaper proprietors for the sake of levying taxation. I think that printing paper ought to be admitted free, inasmuch as it is the raw material of the printer's finished product.

Mr. FISHER (Wide Bay) [5.19].—The proposed duty is undoubtedly a revenue duty. A number of items have been included in the Tariff for reasons which have never been explained, and this is one of them. I sympathize with the proposal of the honorable member for Coolgardie, but cannot see that there is any justification for proposing a tax upon newspaper. I shall vote in favour of the item being made free.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [5.20].—I think that the Government are quite justified in challenging the opinion of the Committee upon this item, because no less than seven out of eight members of the Tariff Commission recommended the imposition of a duty upon this class of paper. There is no reason, however, why that recommendation should be accepted by the Committee. I should like to remind the honorable member for Coolgardie that, in voting for the free admission of newspaper rolls, honorable members will not be voting solely in the interests of the great metropolitan newspapers alone. In Sydney there are twelve newspapers and other publications using these rolls—

Mr. MAHON.—I challenge the accuracy of that statement.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—In Melbourne there are six, in Adelaide there are six, in Perth four, in Kalgoorlie two, in Launceston two, in Hobart two, in Brisbane six, in Townsville two, in Charters Towers two, and in Victorian country towns six. I give these figures upon the authority of Mr. James Spicer, a Melbourne merchant. There is no reason to doubt that they are substantially accurate.

Mr. SPENCE (Darling) [5.22].—I have very grave doubts whether the amendment of the honorable member for Coolgardie

would have the effect of taking a single penny out of the pockets of the large newspaper proprietors. All of these firms are in a position to pass on the duty. That is their policy. As is well known, the mere cost of the paper actually used in the production of a big daily newspaper exceeds the price which the public pay for it. But it must be recollected that the city newspapers can command larger prices for advertising space than can country journals. The latter cannot obtain anything like the same rates. Any tax that we may impose upon printing paper will be passed on to the advertisers, who in turn will pass it on to the consumers. For these reasons I hope that the Government proposal will be defeated.

Mr. WILSON (Corangamite) [5.25].—I am sorry that this item is not the first or second item in the Tariff. Had it been, we might have been in a position to take to heart the injunction of the honorable member for Bendigo. He has told us that seven out of the eight members of the Tariff Commission recommended the imposition of a duty upon printing paper, but that that was no reason why the Committee should accept their recommendation. His words should be written up in large letters. Again and again he has urged that the recommendations of the Tariff Commission should be upheld. Yet here is an item upon which he advises the Committee to vote against its finding.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—I did not recommend the imposition of this duty.

Mr. WILSON.—But upon the honorable member's own showing seven out of eight members of the Tariff Commission recommended it. I feel that it is in the public interest that printing paper should be admitted free. Country newspapers are deserving of every consideration, because they are working under great disabilities. I shall support the amendment of the honorable member for Parramatta.

Mr. MAHON (Coolgardie) [5.28].—I regret that so many honorable members are apparently oblivious of the fact that under my amendment the paper required by country newspaper proprietors would be admitted free.

Mr. ARCHER.—I question that.

Mr. MAHON.—It is only those large newspaper offices which can well afford to pay the extra impost which would be touched.

Mr. ARCHER.—We say that the honorable member's statement is entirely wrong.

Mr. MAHON.—The honorable member ought to know that when I speak of the country press I mean the small journals which are published once or twice a week. I should like to read a short extract from the debate which took place upon this item a little more than five years ago. The then Treasurer, Sir George Turner, who I suppose understood the Tariff better than did any other member of the Committee, said—

I know that an agitation has been started, and that circulars have been sent right and left from a particular centre in Melbourne to prove that this duty will mean ruin to the proprietors of the country newspapers. But the duty is really a light one, and is put on in order to obtain revenue. I do not see why printing paper should be more sacred than anything else. He went on to say—

I am certain that the imposition of a duty of 10 per cent. will not discourage the publishing of books and pamphlets within the Commonwealth. The proposed duty, besides providing £25,000 of revenue, will give encouragement to the large mills which are now starting in New South Wales.

I point out to the honorable members for Melbourne and Melbourne Ports that Sir George Turner, when Treasurer, thought that the duty would have a protective incidence—

If the Committee wish to strike out revenue duties, there are other items which can more fairly be amended.

I commend that statement to the consideration of the honorable member for Darling. I do not wish to delay the Committee in arriving at a decision. I regret very much that there should be so much hostility offered to my proposal, which, I repeat, is simply made to give to the country printer his paper duty free, his type being already taxed, and to put an impost on the proprietors of the larger publications in the cities, who have had their linotypes and printing machinery free of duty.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [5.31].—I am sorry that the deputy leader of the Opposition has moved his amendment in this way, because it has placed the Committee in a very awkward position.

Mr. LIDDELL.—No, the Government.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—It has not placed the Government in an awkward position. The fair way is to take a vote on the proposal of the honorable member for Coolgardie, which I will oppose, because I think that if a duty is to be imposed at all it should be levied all round; and then, if that proposal is defeated, as probably it will be, to take a straight-out

vote on the proposal of the honorable member for Parramatta. The Government desire an opportunity to vote for the item as it is printed, and if that is given we can get a straight-out vote as to whether or not that class of paper shall be made free.

Mr. FRAZER.—The amendment of the honorable member for Parramatta will settle that with one decision instead of two.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The honorable member is very clever, but it will not do that.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—It is just the same.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—When the amendment of the honorable member for Parramatta is put, the question practically will be that the figures "10 per cent." stand part of the item, and there can be no straight-out vote. If, however, we had an amendment to the item—which could easily be submitted—the Government could get a straight-out vote.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—But the honorable gentleman forgets that the honorable member for Coolgardie has separated his proposal. He is to follow up this amendment with another.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not know what proposal the honorable member for Coolgardie is going to submit after his present amendment has been dealt with.

Mr. THOMAS.—We will support the Government in putting on a duty of 10 per cent.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The honorable member for Parramatta has created a complicated situation, in which it is absolutely impossible to get a straight-out vote.

Mr. WYNNE.—We can get a straight-out vote on the amendment of the honorable member for Parramatta.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Not at all. If the amendment of the honorable member for Coolgardie can be submitted by itself we shall know how to vote.

Mr. WYNNE.—So we can on the other amendment.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—No.

Mr. WYNNE.—The question will be whether the paper shall be free, or dutiable at 10 per cent.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not want to vote for the amendment of the honorable member for Coolgardie, but if the other amendment is pressed I must vote with him, that the duty of 10 per cent. stand; because I do not want to vote to make the paper free. On the other hand, I do not want to vote to differentiate between the users of

this paper, and that is what the other amendment would oblige me to do.

Mr. WYNNE.—No; its object is to make paper free.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—No. The amendment of the honorable member for Parramatta introduces a complication which is not fair, because it prevents us from getting a straight-out vote.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—In what way have I complicated the situation?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Here are two amendments before the Committee. I do not want to vote for either of them. But I must either vote for the amendment of the honorable member for Coolgardie, with an explanation that I am not in favour of the other amendment to get the whole of the paper made free, or I must vote to make it free.

Mr. WILKS.—Let the honorable member vote both ways without an explanation, and he will be right.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I cannot. It is not fair on the part of the honorable member for Parramatta to complicate the position in this way.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—All that the honorable gentleman has to do is to vote for or against either of the proposals; and they cover the whole ground.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Not at all.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—It is of no use for the honorable gentleman to blame me. I have had to come in after the honorable member for Coolgardie. I want a straight-out vote.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not want to vote for an amendment to differentiate between country and city newspapers, but the honorable member is forcing the Government into a position in which they must do so.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Not at all.

Mr. ARCHER.—The Minister can vote first against one amendment, and then against the other.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Nothing of the kind. I do not suggest that the honorable member for Parramatta has moved this amendment to play a trick, but that is what it amounts to.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I did it on the suggestion of the Chairman.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not know why that suggestion was made, but it certainly places the Government in a most awkward position.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—It is the only way in which it can be put.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—No. I ask the honorable member to withdraw his amendment, and let us have a straight-out vote on the other; and when he re-submits his amendment I will vote against it, though, of course, I do not know what the Committee may do finally with the item as amended.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The Minister forgets that the honorable member for Coolgardie intends to submit a proposal to give free paper to country newspapers. What does he propose to do when that is submitted?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I will vote against it.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I will not; so that we are obliged to take it piecemeal.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The honorable member will not vote against it?

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—No; why should I, when I want paper to be made free?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I will vote against making any paper free. This is not a fair way for the honorable member to submit his proposal.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I should like the honorable member to point out any difficulty if it exists.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—If I vote for the honorable member's amendment, I shall vote in favour of the honorable member for Coolgardie's amendment.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—But the Minister can vote against both proposals.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—No. I do not know how the Chairman intends to put the question, but in the ordinary way he would put the question practically that the figures "10 per cent." stand part of the item. If I vote with the honorable member for Parramatta on his proposal to strike out the duty I shall vote to make the duty stand as regards half the paper.

Mr. WYNNE.—No.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Yes. I would not care if it was a vote with regard to the whole of the paper, because I should then know what I was doing.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I have not proposed to put the duty on one-half of the paper; that has emanated from the honorable member for Coolgardie.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I know that. He has moved an amendment which relates to country newspapers, but they represent only a small proportion of the press.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—My position is that wherever the honorable member for Coolgardie goes for a duty of 10 per cent. I must follow him to make the paper free.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—That is putting the Government and those who wish to vote for a duty of 10 per cent. in a very improper position. I cannot vote for or against the amendment of the honorable member without making the duty of 10 per cent. stand, and if it stands—

Mr. THOMAS.—Does not the honorable gentleman want the duty to stand?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I want the duty to stand against the whole and not against a portion of the press.

Mr. BAMFORD.—Let us deal first with the question of whether or not the paper shall be free, and if it is made free the trouble will be ended.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I like the business to be conducted in order, but so far as I can see that is not being done. I do not want, nor does the Government want, to vote with the honorable member for Coolgardie to give a preference to one section of the press, but the amendment of the honorable member for Parramatta makes it imperative for me to vote for or against one section of the press. I do not want to vote to make the duty of 10 per cent. stand as regards only a part of the press.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—What is to stop the honorable gentleman from proposing afterwards a duty of 10 per cent. on the paper for the other section of the press?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—That would not give us a straight-out vote. The honorable member wants to get his amendment carried even if the Committee are against it.

Mr. JOHNSON.—He will be very clever indeed if he does that.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Owing to the way in which the question will be put, a number of honorable members will probably vote for the amendment of the honorable member for Parramatta, although they do not approve of it. It is very unfair to place us in that position. It is not a straight way of raising the issue. If the honorable member wished to let us have a straight-out vote he would ask leave to withdraw his amendment for the time being.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The honorable member is raising a bogey.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—No; it is not a bogey.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Let the honorable member for Coolgardie withdraw his amendment, and give us an opportunity to have a straight-out vote.

Mr. MAHON.—Let the honorable member withdraw his amendment.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Will the honorable member for Parramatta let us have a straight-out vote on the amendment of the honorable member for Coolgardie?

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The honorable gentleman will get a straight-out vote on my amendment.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I appeal to the honorable member to withdraw his amendment for the time being, and thus let us have a straight-out vote on the other amendment.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—There are some who will vote that the goods be free; and if they cannot secure their object they will vote with the honorable member for Coolgardie.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—My feeling is that the matter is so overclouded that we cannot get a straight-out vote. I should give way in a moment if the honorable member for Parramatta appealed to me under a similar condition of things.

Mr. FRAZER.—If the Committee determines that the goods shall be free, that will settle the matter.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—If the deputy leader of the Opposition does not meet me in the matter, he cannot expect me to withdraw amendments on future occasions when he may desire that I shall do so to give him an opportunity to submit propositions of his own.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I will withdraw my amendment at once if the honorable member for Coolgardie will withdraw his.

Mr. MAHON.—I will withdraw the second one.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—As the matter stands, the Government and those who support them will have to vote as to a certain portion of the imports of printing paper, whereas they want to vote as to the whole. The matter is complicated to such an extent that honorable members cannot vote as they wish. I should like to know from the Chairman what he thinks about the position.

The CHAIRMAN.—Perhaps I can shorten the discussion somewhat. The whole matter appears to me to be quite plain and simple. We have paragraph D before us. The honorable member for Coolgardie desires to substitute some other words. His original intention was to propose to omit the item altogether, with a view of inserting another one. But the Department of Trade and Customs have hitherto found it necessary, to enable the Tariff

to be properly administered, to have words added to items so that the existing duty may be collected up to to-day and the new one from to-morrow. The object of the amendment of the honorable member for Coolgardie is quite simple. He has moved to add "printing paper known as newspaper, in rolls or reels, to be used exclusively for newspapers under departmental by-laws, *ad valorem* 10 per cent." He therefore desires that on and after to-morrow 10 per cent. shall be collected on such paper. The honorable member for Parramatta desires that such paper shall be admitted free. Therefore, he has moved to omit the words "*ad valorem*, 10 per cent." with a view of inserting in lieu thereof the word "free." If the Treasurer desires that the duty shall be 10 per cent., he must vote to retain that rate of duty in the amendment of the honorable member for Coolgardie.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—That I do not want to do.

The CHAIRMAN.—We cannot help that. Honorable members occasionally have to vote differently from what they might prefer to do. Unfortunately, the rules under which we are working do not always permit us to vote exactly as we should like. If the duty of 10 per cent. were retained the Treasurer could, if he chose, vote to knock out the whole item, and then some other honorable member could move that on and after such and such a date the goods be free.

Mr. SINCLAIR.—I desire to have your ruling, Mr. Chairman, as to whether it is competent for a private member to move to increase a duty?

The CHAIRMAN.—The duty under the original item was 10 per cent. The honorable member for Coolgardie has merely moved a fresh form of words. He is not proposing to add to the duty.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Except in this way: that under the original item a preference is given, whereas the proposal of the honorable member for Coolgardie is to wipe out that preference, and thereby to increase the duty.

The CHAIRMAN.—The item was free in the second column.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The honorable member for Coolgardie proposes to wipe out that degree of preference.

Mr. FISHER (Wide Bay) [5.53].—I must confess that after the Treasurer's long explanation I am still unable to

discover where his difficulty lies. He has stated clearly that he is against the amendment of the honorable member for Parramatta, who wishes to make this paper free. He is quite clear that he is also against the amendment of the honorable member for Coolgardie. It is therefore quite easy for him to vote first against the amendment of the honorable member for Parramatta and then against the amendment of the honorable member for Coolgardie. If they are defeated the honorable member can vote in favour of his own proposal. The procedure is simplicity itself. The main question is whether this paper shall be free or dutiable. That will be the first test. The Treasurer need not be afraid of being put in a false position.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I am put in a false position, and the honorable member's explanation proves it.

Mr. FISHER.—I cannot see why. I have tried to discover the Treasurer's difficulty, and do not think that it exists. Those who believe that the goods should be free can vote with the honorable member for Parramatta; those who believe in a duty will vote against him. If the honorable member for Parramatta is defeated the Treasurer can move for a higher duty if he likes. He will have the Committee in his own hands if he can defeat the honorable member for Parramatta.

Mr. KNOX (Koovong) [5.56].—The impression that I derived from the oration of the Treasurer was that he feared lest the proposal of his own Government should by any mischance be carried. My belief is that no one would regret it more than he would if the proposal of the Government were agreed to. So far as I am concerned, I intend to vote that these goods be free. I think that there should be no differentiation. At a later stage I also intend to propose that ordinary printing paper be free. I can see no complication about our procedure. The honorable member for Coolgardie has presented his case very clearly, and I do not think that there is any difficulty as to how honorable members wish to vote.

Mr. THOMAS (Barrier) [5.57].—I must confess that I am rather surprised at the action of the Government in reference to this matter. Not a single word has been said by the Treasurer or by any member of the Ministry in defence of this item.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I said something about it when the matter was introduced to-day.

Mr. THOMAS.—It was a very feeble effort. The honorable gentleman could wax very eloquent and put up a very big fight when defending a duty on wire netting. He seemed to be absolutely in earnest about that. He did his best. To-day also, in reference to the duty on magazines, he put up a very good fight. I believe that he did his very best.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Gordon and Gotch were too strong for me.

Mr. THOMAS.—If I were the Treasurer I think I should be the last man to say anything of that kind, because the man who is most unfairly liable to attacks like that is he who happens to be in charge of a Tariff.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—You can make any attacks you like. I defy you. I care nothing for insinuations.

Mr. THOMAS.—I have never attacked the Treasurer. I have always defended his personal honour. I have never said an unkind word about him, and when any other honorable member has attacked him I have always defended him. But I say that he is the last man who should make such an insinuation as he has done, because, if he insinuates against others, others will insinuate against him.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—They can do it as much as they like.

Mr. THOMAS.—I do not think they ought to do it. This Parliament should be above conduct of that sort. The Treasurer should be above baseless insinuations, and if he makes them others will do the same. He ought not to set a bad example. The Treasurer should have put up a big fight on this question if he really wants the duty. But there is a vague idea that the Government do not want the item carried. It has been left for the honorable member for Coolgardie to defend the item. If the Government were in earnest they should have said that they would stand or fall by the item. Why not make the stand of their life about it if they really believe in it. But we have had the Treasurer for three-quarters of an hour orating about a point of order and practically dragging a red herring across the trail. If he had only devoted that time, and the powerful oratory and argumentative ability which he possesses and can use when he likes to defending this item, it would not have mattered about the point of order—he could have had his own way on the main issue.

Unless the Government are prepared to make a stand on this item I, for one, shall be forced to the conclusion that they would prefer to see it rejected rather than carried. I am prepared to support the item, and I think that when a number of honorable members who, as a rule, vote against the Ministry are prepared to vote for one of their proposals, they should put up a fight for it.

Mr. SPENCE (Darling) [6.1].—The Government proposition places a limitation on the extent of the taxation on paper, and the honorable member for Coolgardie proposes to impose a further limitation. It seems to me quite proper that the Committee should have a chance to vote upon such an amendment. At the same time, I can fully understand the position taken up by the Treasurer. He is afraid that the further amendment moved by the honorable member for Parramatta will, since it is proposed by the honorable member for Coolgardie to exempt paper required for country newspapers, secure votes that it would not carry in other circumstances.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Hear, hear; that is so.

Mr. SPENCE.—Nevertheless, I think that the Committee has a perfect right to vote on that basis.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—But we should not be tied down to such a position.

Mr. SPENCE.—I do not think that any complication will arise. Those who prefer that the item should be free will be able to vote for the amendment moved by the honorable member for Coolgardie. Both amendments may be rejected, and we shall then revert to the original proposal submitted by the Government. The Committee have a right to vote for any limitation that may be proposed, but if either amendment were withdrawn we should not have an opportunity to do so.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [6.3].—The Chairman's explanation absolutely supports my contention. The amendment moved by the honorable member for Parramatta will force honorable members to take up a position regarding the amendment moved by the honorable member for Coolgardie which they do not wish to occupy.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—How will it do so?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I am opposed to the honorable member's amendment.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—What for?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Because I am opposed to making the item free. At the same time, by voting against the amendment moved by the honorable member for Parramatta, I shall be voting in favour of that moved by the honorable member for Coolgardie, and that I do not wish to do.

Colonel FOXTON.—Then vote against both.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—It is all very well for honorable members to tender such advice—

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The amendment moved by the honorable member for Coolgardie, as far as it goes, agrees with the Government proposition.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Unless the amendment moved by the honorable member for Parramatta be withdrawn, it will be placed on record that I voted to differentiate between two classes of newspapers. I do not wish to do so; I wish to have a straight-out vote.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—But if what is proposed is in order, it must be fair.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—That does not follow. It is unfair to force an honorable member to vote contrary to his own wishes. I do not want to be compelled to vote for the amendment moved by the honorable member for Coolgardie.

Mr. SPENCE.—The honorable member will not be forced to do so.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I shall. If I vote against the amendment moved by the honorable member for Parramatta, then I shall be voting for a duty of 10 per cent. on certain paper as proposed by the honorable member for Coolgardie.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Exactly, and that is the duty proposed by the Government.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—But the duty will relate to only a part of our proposal.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—That is not my fault.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—When the honorable member for Parramatta has asked me to withdraw an amendment to give him an opportunity to move a prior amendment, I have always done so, and I think that it is only reasonable that he should do the same for me.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—But the circumstances of this case are different.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I have civilly asked the honorable member more than once to withdraw his amendment, and if he refuses to do so, then he need not expect

me to ever give way to him. I wish to publicly repudiate the suggestion that I am in favour of the amendment moved by the honorable member for Coolgardie, and to say that if the honorable member for Parramatta forces me into such a position that I shall have to vote for it, I shall move, rather than do so, that the item be free.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—In those circumstances, I shall not withdraw the amendment.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Then the honorable member will never induce me to withdraw a motion in order to enable him to submit one. His attitude is most contemptible.

The CHAIRMAN. — The honorable member must withdraw that remark.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I withdraw it.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [6.7].—The Treasurer, for the last quarter of an hour, not only when on his feet, but when in his chair, has been making all sorts of insinuations against my action in this matter.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—And deservedly so, I think.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I simply acted on the suggestion of the Chair as to the only way in which I could move this issue to a straight-out vote.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—But it leads to a complication.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I see none; if I did I would immediately withdraw my amendment. I cannot conceive of a matter being put more clearly to the Committee than is the issue raised by my amendment. If the honorable member for Coolgardie will withdraw his amendment I will willingly withdraw mine, so that we may have a straight-out vote. I did not raise this question; it was raised by the honorable member for Coolgardie, and if he will not withdraw his amendment I certainly shall not withdraw mine.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [6.9].—I am not going to submit quietly to this situation. I should be much obliged to the honorable member for Coolgardie if he would withdraw his amendment, and so save me from an awkward situation. It is not fair, perhaps, to ask him to do so, but, in the peculiar circumstances of the case—I think his amendment will be defeated—he might well accede to my request. He will have an

opportunity to again submit his amendment after a straight-out vote on the item has been taken.

Mr. MAHON (Coolgardie) [6.11].—I think that the Treasurer is right. If a vote be taken on the amendment moved by the honorable member for Parramatta, the Treasurer will undoubtedly be compelled to vote for a principle that he has already repudiated. If the honorable member for Parramatta will give the matter a moment's reflection he will recognise that, having regard to the form in which the question would be put, the Treasurer, by opposing his amendment, would be voting quite contrary to the principle he has advocated. My proposal is for the imposition of a duty of 10 per cent. on a portion of the item only. Such a vote would commit the Treasurer to a division of the item differentiating between two classes of newspapers.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The same thing happens every day.

Mr. MAHON.—I cannot recall to mind any similar complication. At any rate, I am not going to subject the Treasurer to the humiliation to which he has referred, and I regret that the honorable member for Parramatta has not withdrawn his amendment. Had he done so he would have simplified the position.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Go on; I can stand it all while the honorable member climbs down.

Mr. MAHON.—I am not climbing down. I still occupy the position that I originally took up, but I may say at once that I think the honorable member, by adhering to his amendment, has caused the last hour and a half to be wasted.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—If the honorable member is going to talk like that he will not be permitted to withdraw his amendment.

Mr. MAHON.—I do not intend to withdraw my amendment except on the understanding that I have an opportunity to again submit it. The honorable member knows perfectly well that the second part of my amendment meets the object he has in view. If he desires a straight-out vote he has only to vote against it, and the effect of such a vote would be just the same so far as he is concerned as if his own amendment were carried. By leave of the Committee I withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN.—The honorable member cannot withdraw his amendment unless the honorable member for Parramatta withdraws that moved by him.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [6.14].—I do not know that I ought to do so after what has been said. Am I to be submitted to a lot of abuse and then to be asked to accommodate these same honorable members? The honorable member for Coolgardie, after asserting that I am responsible for the trouble that has occurred, wishes leave to withdraw his amendment, whilst the Treasurer for the last hour has been throwing out all sorts of insinuations. I know what is the matter. It is just as well that it should be publicly stated that the Treasurer fears that the feeling on the part of some of the members of the Labour party against the big daily newspapers will lead to the duty originally proposed by him being carried if they are kept together. That is at the bottom of the trouble. It is a sinister move on the part, not of the Opposition, but of honorable members opposite to get the old duty through when it is tied together.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Nonsense.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—As the honorable member for Coolgardie desires to withdraw his amendment, I do not object to withdraw mine.

Amendments, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment (by Mr. JOSEPH COOK) proposed—

That after the words "10 per cent.," the words "and on and after 10th December, 1907, (General Tariff), free," be inserted.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Moreton) [6.15].—As I am sure that my previous amendment was misunderstood by a number of those who voted on it, I wish to test the feeling of the Committee again by proposing the omission of all the words after the word "by-laws."

The CHAIRMAN.—The Committee has already determined that those words shall remain part of the item.

Mr. THOMAS (Barrier) [6.16].—Do I understand that we are now being asked to vote on the main question whether paper for the printing of newspapers shall be free or dutiable?

The CHAIRMAN.—Yes.

Mr. THOMAS.—In that case I appeal to the Government, before a division is taken, to say something in defence of their proposals. So much is due to those of us who are ranging ourselves with them, assuming that, as the duty has been proposed, there is some particular reason for it. A large number of members have voted for revenue and protective duties, and are now backing out, although the big newspaper

proprietors are as well able to pay a duty as are those upon whom they have been piling up taxation. As a matter of fact, even the Postmaster-General would faint if this duty were carried. However, reason or no reason, I shall support the Ministry on this occasion, though they cannot expect support on other items if they do not make a fight in this case.

Question—That after the words "10 per cent.," paragraph D, the words "and on and after 10th December, 1907 (General Tariff), free" (Mr. JOSEPH COOK's amendment) be inserted—put. The Committee divided.

Ayes	29
Noes	14
Majority	15

AYES.

Archer, E. W.	McWilliams, W. J.
Atkinson, L.	Page, J.
Chanter, J. M.	Palmer, A. C.
Cook, Joseph	Poynton, A.
Edwards, R.	Quick, Sir John
Fisher, A.	Sinclair, H.
Foxton, Colonel	Spence, W. G.
Frazer, C. E.	Storror, D.
Harper, R.	Thomson, John
Hedges, W. N.	Wilson, J. G.
Irvine, W. H.	Wise, G. H.
Johnson, W. E.	Wynne, A.
Knox, W.	
Liddell, F.	
Mathews, J.	

Tellers:

Bowden, E. K.
Fuller, G. W.

NOES.

Catts, J. H.	Mahon, H.
Chapman, Austin	Mauger, S.
Coon, J.	Thomas, J.
Crouch, R. A.	Watkins, D.
Deakin, A.	
Ewing, T. T.	
Groom, L. E.	
Lync, Sir William	

Tellers:

Cook, Hume
Foster, F. J.

PAIRS.

Forrest, Sir John	Tudor, F. G.
Maloney, W. R. N.	Bamford, F. W.

Question so resolved in the affirmative.
Amendment agreed to.

Mr. LIDDELL (Hunter) [6.26].—As a matter of privilege, I wish to draw your attention, Mr. Chairman, to the fact that this afternoon, at intervals, the privacy and silence of the room allotted to the Opposition has been disturbed by the playing of pianos. Pianos have been placed in one of the ante-chambers which we have been accustomed to use for the interviewing of our constituents and friends. Having been ousted from that apartment, we are now compelled to use the lobby for the purpose. I do not complain of that so much as I do of the fact that when one sits down to the study of the Tariff in the Opposition

room, he is annoyed by the noise to which I refer. Honorable members should jealously guard their privileges, and especially those which are designed to facilitate the discharge of their functions within the precincts of this building. I ask you, Mr. Chairman, to take notice of this complaint, and get rid of the nuisance. Several honorable members have spoken to me about the matter.

The CHAIRMAN.—I shall see that it is attended to.

Paragraph, as amended, agreed to.

Amendment (by Mr. KNOX) proposed—

That the following new paragraph be inserted:—"DD. On and after 10th December, 1907—Printing n.e.i., free."

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [6.28].—I think that the amendment should be carried. Under the old Tariff the Customs authorities had great trouble in determining whether imported printing paper was to be used for the printing of newspapers or for other purposes. The best thing to do is to make all printing paper free.

Mr. BOWDEN.—Is the amendment in order, since its effect would be the same as that of the amendment moved by the honorable member for Moreton, with which the Committee has dealt?

The CHAIRMAN.—The Committee decided that it would not make printing paper free by doing what was proposed by the honorable member for Moreton; but that does not prevent it from doing what is proposed by the honorable member for Koo-yong.

Sitting suspended from 6.30 to 7.45 p.m.

Mr. SPENCE (Darling) [7.45].—We should know exactly what is covered by the amendment. It seems to me that, in accordance with their policy, the Government should be prepared to do something to encourage the local paper mills. I believe the proposed new paragraph would cover all kinds of paper, because there is hardly any limit to the variety of paper which is used for printing. The new magazine known as the *Native Companion* is, I understand, printed on paper made in Geelong.

Mr. THOMAS.—Is the *Lone Hand* also printed on Geelong paper?

Mr. SPENCE.—I could not say, though I am aware that the people connected with that magazine strongly advocate protection. In the case of the *Native Companion*, however, I am able to say that the

editor, writers, and artists are all Australians, and the paper used is manufactured in Australia. I think the amendment should not be accepted. It is too much of a drag-net, since it would cover paper used for the printing of books, magazines, and job printing, as well as for the printing of newspapers. If we do not give some encouragement to the local manufacturers of paper we cannot expect any development of that industry, although, as we make greater progress in forestry, we shall probably grow timber from which pulp can be obtained for the manufacture of paper. The proposed new paragraph would cover every kind of paper except that specially mentioned in paragraph w—writing paper and paper for typewriting. I should like to hear the views of the Treasurer on the amendment.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [7.50].—I think the honorable member is quite right in asking these questions. I believe the proposed paragraph would be found to be too much of a drag-net, and the honorable member has given excellent reasons why it should be opposed. We have paper mills, in which paper used for these purposes is at present being manufactured. I think the Committee has gone very far already in allowing printing paper to be admitted free. This is a serious matter for those who have established and are carrying on the manufacture of paper in the Commonwealth. I think the Committee should be prepared to give them encouragement and support.

Proposed new paragraph agreed to.

Paragraph z. Writing (plain), cut less than 16 in. x 13 in., ad. val., 15 per cent.

Mr. MAHON (Coolgardie) [7.55].—I think the Government might just as well eliminate this paragraph. The quantity of this paper imported in 1906 amounted in value to only £308. There is an anomaly in this division to which I should like to direct the attention of the Treasurer. It will be found that, although this paper is dutiable at 15 per cent., writing and typewriting paper identical with it is dutiable under paragraph (w) at only 5 per cent. Some of this paper is used for the printing of the better class of circulars. I do not know how the Customs officials are to administer a Tariff of this kind. It seems to me that they would require to have an expert constantly at hand, and even then should say there would be great difficulty in deciding what paper should be admitted at the lower duty and what at the

higher duty. I suggest that the Treasurer should postpone this paragraph until we reach paragraph (w), and then deal with the papers contained in both at the same time.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [7.58].—The object of this paragraph is to secure that the cutting of the paper shall be done here.

Mr. MAHON.—That is no argument at all. The cutting would be done by machinery.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—That is why it is proposed that this paper should be dutiable at 15 per cent.

Mr. MAHON.—That cannot be, because it refers to paper 16 in. x 13 in., and the same paper is referred to in paragraph w, where it would be dutiable at 5 per cent.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I was going to say that I think the paper included in paragraph w should also be dutiable at 15 per cent.

Colonel FOXTON.—In one case the reference is to paper "cut less" and in the other to paper "not less" than 16 in. x 13 in.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—That is so.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—How much work would this give in Australia?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I suppose that it would give a considerable amount of work. I know the intention is to secure that the cutting of the paper shall be done here. The A section of the Tariff Commission recommended a duty of 15 per cent., which is the same as the duty under the old Tariff, and that is also the duty proposed by the Government in this Tariff. There is, therefore, no alteration in this case. I admit that there is something in the contention of the honorable member for Coolgardie that the two kinds of paper should be on the same basis.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Was this a separate line in the last Tariff?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Apparently it was. I have not inquired.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [8.1].—In the old Tariff these items were the same as they stand in this. It was provided that writing paper cut less than 16 x 13 inches, and paper (toilet) in rolls or packets, should be dutiable at 15 per cent., while writing and typing paper in sheets not less than 16 x 13 inches was free. These two provisions relating to writing paper are reproductions of the old Tariff, involving no alteration except in the latter case the 5 per cent. general Tariff. The reason for the

discrimination is that it is thought desirable to encourage the importation of writing paper in bulk in order that the cutting up may be done here, so giving a considerable amount of labour in the Commonwealth. The one is comparatively the raw material.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Did the Commission make inquiries as to what labour would be involved?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—We had no suggestion one way or the other. We merely recommended the reproduction of the old Tariff.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [8.2].—It is a great pity that the Commission did not make a simple inquiry of that kind.

Mr. FULLER.—No one came before us.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I have yet to learn that the Commission were appointed merely to take statements from any interested persons who came along, without testing them.

Mr. FULLER.—If we had been sending for witnesses to come before us, we should have been sitting for the next ten years.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—That may be; but in connexion with some of these items, as to which there is practically no evidence, a little inquiry might have been made before the Commission recommended the old duty. If that had been done, it would have been found that this line gives very little employment. I understand that all that is necessary is a machine, and that practically no labour will be employed. One or two men and a machine doing nothing else but cutting the paper would cut up enough for the whole Commonwealth. One hesitates to interfere with old duties, but if ever there was a case made out for that interference it is this one. It does not give any employment, and is only another instance of many which we have already had under review, in which Ministers, while pretending to impose duties in order to bring into being great national industries, are taxing the whole of the people of the Commonwealth for the purpose of trying to bring into operation a small incidental process.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—It means that the paper is cut, folded, and bound in parcels.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Which means hardly any labour. Without disturbing the general duty, we might at least give Great Britain a preference on articles of this sort. I therefore move—

That the words "and on and after 10th December, 1907, ad val. (United Kingdom), 10 per cent.," be added.

Mr. MAHON (Coolgardie) [8.5].—I desire to impress again upon the Treasurer the necessity of putting paragraphs x and w together. There must be something wrong, because the importation last year of the paper under this paragraph amounted only to £308 worth, and it is quite possible that a great quantity of it was imported free under the other description. Without saying anything at present about the rate of duty, I urge the Treasurer to put the two together, and also typing paper. There is no reason why a man who wants to type a letter should be able to buy cheaper paper than another who wants to write a letter. That is an absurd distinction.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Leave it over until we reach paragraph w. I will then see if I can meet the honorable member in some way.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [8.7].—Has the Treasurer agreed to make both paragraphs subject to the one duty?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I will not say until we reach the other paragraph.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—It is ridiculous, for the sake of 5 per cent., to make a distinction which gives the Customs no end of trouble, makes the checking of the imports very much more difficult, and is of no earthly use.

Paragraph, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraph F. Ruled and bordered papers, ad val., 25 per cent.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [8.8].—Wherein does this article differ from plain writing paper, that there should be an additional duty of 10 per cent.? That seems to be an anomaly. The A section of the Tariff Commission has made no recommendation on this subject.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The B section of the Commission has.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The Treasurer is ready enough to take the recommendation of the B section when he cannot take that of the A section, but he will never take that of the B if there is one from the A section for him to take. I shall move that the duty be 15 per cent. in this case as in the other.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Under the old Tariff, "plain ruled" was 15 per cent., and "otherwise" 25 per cent.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Then I move—That the words "and on and after 10th December, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 20 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 15 per cent.," be added.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [8.10].—I will accept duties of 25 per cent. and 20 per cent. The honorable member seems to forget the provisions in the last Tariff.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Would it not be fair to take the mean between the two old duties of 15 per cent. and 25 per cent.?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—No; we should have the proper duties. We want no compromises of that sort.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [8.11].—The Treasurer is consolidating the two classes of this paper as distinguished in the old Tariff, and he should consolidate the old duties also by accepting a compromise of 20 per cent.

Mr. MATHEWS (Melbourne Ports) [8.12].—I hope the Treasurer will adhere to his offer to take nothing lower than duties of 25 per cent. and 20 per cent. Ruling is carried on by many firms in Australia. I do not say that it is art work, but the men who are employed at it get good wages, and therefore it cannot be a very simple process. It is still better in the case of bordering. We ought to endeavour to keep those occupations at any rate for the workmen in Australia.

Mr. SPENCE (Darling) [8.13].—If there was any justification for imposing a duty in order to have writing paper cut here—a process of great rapidity by the use of the modern guillotine—there is much greater reason for imposing a duty to encourage ruling and bordering here. It is done by machinery and insures the giving of a good deal of work. The Government will do right to retain the duty proposed.

Amendment negatived.

Amendment (by Mr. JOSEPH COOK) agreed to—

That the words “and on and after 10th December, 1907, ad val. (United Kingdom), 20 per cent.,” be added.

Paragraph, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraph G. Browns, and Sugar (grey, blue and other tints); Fruit Bag Paper, per cwt. (General Tariff) 6s. 6d., (United Kingdom), 6s.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [8.16].—I move—

That after the word “Paper,” the following words be inserted:—“Candle (blue and grey) Paper, Candle Carton Paper.”

I submit the amendment because these papers are of the same class as those already in the item. The alternative rate is proposed to deal with light-weight papers. In 1906 the imports from the United Kingdom amounted to 12,000 cwt., and from other countries to 78,000 cwt.

Mr. MATHEWS (Melbourne Ports) [8.17].—I should like to see carpet-felt paper included in this paragraph.

Mr. HUME COOK.—That paper is dealt with in paragraph K.

Mr. MATHEWS.—But the duties on the papers in paragraph K are not so high as the duties imposed in the paragraph under discussion. This paper is made here in large quantities from any sort of pulp, and its manufacture ought to be adequately protected.

Colonel FOXTON (Brisbane) [8.18].—One reason for not including carpet-felt paper in this item is that the papers already included, and those proposed to be added by the Minister, are largely the raw material of the paper-bag manufacturing industry. Carpet-felt paper, so far as I know, is not the raw material of any industry. The carpet-felt paper is simply used as imported, whereas the papers which are included are closely related to those comprised in paragraph J. I call attention to the fact that the duty on paper bags is considerably lower than the duty on raw material; and I should like to move that the duties be reduced to 3s. 6d. and 3s. as in the old Tariff. In order to preserve the paper-bag industry, which employs a much larger number of people than is employed in the making of the paper itself, it is necessary to leave a margin of at least 2s. per cwt. in the duty. I have a letter here from a firm which is largely engaged in the manufacture of paper bags, and as it is short, and puts the case very clearly, I shall read it—

So far as we are concerned, we have been working quite satisfactorily under the old Tariff of 3s. per cwt. duty on paper, and 5s. per cwt. on bags; and we think any addition to the duty unnecessary. There are, so far as we know, only two paper mills working in Australia, employing, on a liberal estimate, perhaps 100 hands. A fair price for paper, such as is used for sugar bags, which form a considerable portion of their output, is 7s. per cwt. f.o.b. London. The freight and charges, exclusive of duty, average about 4s. per cwt., so that, with the old duty of 3s. per cwt., the total charges amount to 7s., giving the local mills a protection of 100 per cent. If the duty is made 6s., as proposed, the protection will amount to 143 per cent. In the paper-bag business alone, there are a far larger number of hands employed than in the two paper mills. According to the proposed Tariff, our raw material, paper, is to have its duty doubled—though a large portion of it must be imported in any case—in order to give an unnecessarily high protection to the paper-makers. That it is unnecessarily high is shown by the fact that a paper mill was run for many years in New South Wales without any

protection. We hope, therefore, you will see your way to assist in having the duty on paper, "Brown sugar (grey, blue and other tints) and Fruit Bag Paper," reduced to the old rate of 3s. per cwt. Far more serious to us than the increase in duty on paper is the alteration of the duty on paper bags. This was formerly 5s. per cwt., which allowed us a margin of 2s. per cwt. over the protection of 3s. on paper. This is now altered to 25 per cent. on English manufactured bags, and 30 per cent. on foreign. What is the result? Grey and brown sugar bags, which form the larger proportion of our, and many other, manufacturers' output can be bought in London at from 8s. to 10s. per cwt.; so that the duty on these will be reduced from 5s. per cwt. to 2s. to 2s. 6d. less than half, while the duty on paper, of which they are made, is to be doubled, viz., raised from 3s. to 6s. per cwt. The result of this will be to do away with the present protection both to the paper mills and the paper-bag makers; as, unless the mills reduce their present prices, which they say they cannot afford to do, it will pay the makers of such bags better to stop making and import, thus throwing a large number of hands out of employment. We should suggest that, as the present Tariff has worked satisfactorily, the duties on paper and bags should be as before, 3s. and 5s. per cwt. respectively; but if this cannot be secured, at least the duty on bags should be at a fixed rate per cwt., as that on paper is, not *ad valorem*; and that the same proportion should be maintained between the two as under:—

	Paper.	Bags.
	per cwt.	per cwt.
Old Tariff (1901) ...	3s.	5s. od.
If increased 1s. on paper ...	4s.	6s. 8d.
If increased 2s. on paper ...	5s.	8s. 4d.
If increased 3s. on paper as proposed ...	6s.	10s. od.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I have a memorandum here to move that the duties on bags be increased to 11s. and 10s.

Colonel FOXTON.—I do not know what protection the duty gives to the maker of paper. My proposal would give continued employment to a large number in the bag-making industry, and would, I imagine, though, personally, I do not know, give some protection, at all events, to the paper-making industry. From the point of view of the employment given, the paper-bag industry is much more important than the paper-making industry; and it is necessary, therefore, that the former should have this modicum of protection. There is a further passage in the letter, as follows—

It is important to note in this connexion, that 6s. per cwt. on paper was the rate of the old Victorian Tariff previous to 1901, and that in that Tariff the duty on paper bags was 10s. per cwt., the same as we now suggest, in the event of the 6s. duty being retained on paper. If it is necessary to raise the duty in the case of the paper-making industry, it is

also necessary, in the interests of the general community, and of a large number of workers, that the duties in connexion with the paper-bag making industries should be proportionately raised.

Mr. SPENCE (Darling) [8.29].—We ought to have more information to justify the doubling of the duty on the raw material of the paper-bag maker. I desire to see some protection given to the paper-making industry, but we have heard nothing to show that more than the old duty is necessary. It is very clear that if the duty be so excessive as to make importation the more advantageous, the industry will not be encouraged. We ought to have some information from the Treasurer to justify us in doubling the existing rate of duty.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [8.30].—I explained just now that when we come to deal with the question of bags I intend to propose increased duties.

Mr. SPENCE.—That will have the effect of increasing the price of bags.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not think that it will. If the bag-makers get a larger measure of protection the bags will not be any dearer than they are now. The Government have merely adopted the recommendation of the A section of the Tariff Commission.

Mr. WILSON.—That section does not recommend a duty of 10s. per cwt. upon bags.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—It recommends a duty of 6s. per cwt. upon browns and sugar and fruit bag paper.

Mr. WILSON.—What is its recommendation in regard to bags?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—It has made no recommendation.

Mr. WILSON.—It has recommended 25 per cent.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—It stands to reason that if we increase the duty upon the paper we must also increase the duty upon bags. The proposal that I have promised to submit is rendered necessary by the fact that we must preserve a margin in favour of those who desire to manufacture bags in the Commonwealth.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—But why increase the duty upon paper so enormously?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Honorable members are discussing this question a little bit prematurely. Let us first insert the words which I have already proposed.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Then we can reduce the duties.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—We are not going to reduce them.

Mr. SPENCE (Darling) [8.33].—The Committee has already rejected a proposal to extend any protection to paper manufacturers in respect of certain other lines. This class of paper is being made here under the operation of a duty of 3s. per cwt. Yet the Government now propose to increase that rate to 6s. per cwt. without assigning any reason whatever for their action.

Mr. MATHEWS.—I will give the honorable member a reason.

Mr. SPENCE.—The honorable member is not the Treasurer. To say that because the duty upon paper has been raised to 6s. per cwt. we must necessarily increase the rate upon bags to 10s. per cwt., is no answer to my question. I should like to hear the honorable member for Bendigo, who was Chairman of the Tariff Commission, throw some light upon this subject. To me it does not appear that any reason has been assigned for increasing the duty upon paper from 3s. to 6s. per cwt.

Mr. STORRER (Bass) [8.35].—I think that 6s. per cwt. is rather a high impost to levy upon this class of paper. If the first amendment be defeated I shall be prepared to move that the duty under the general Tariff be 5s. per cwt., and under the preferential Tariff 4s. 6d. per cwt. It is only right that all industries should receive a fair amount of protection.

Amendment (Sir WILLIAM LYNE's) agreed to.

Mr. WYNNE (Balaclava) [8.37].—I think that the duties proposed upon the paper enumerated in this paragraph are too high. In this connexion we have to consider the interests of the small shopkeepers. I know that in Victoria the industry of bag-making has been a remunerative one under the old rates. But confectioners have complained that they are unable to sell their goods at a reasonable profit on account of the increase in the duty upon bags.

Mr. PAGE.—They weigh them with the lollies.

Mr. WYNNE.—But under the Government proposal the duty upon paper-bags will be far heavier than that upon sweets. Consequently, if confectioners weigh the bags with the sweets they will lose money.

Mr. PAGE.—Can the honorable member get lollies for 6s. 6d. per cwt.?

Mr. WYNNE.—But the bags made from this class of paper weigh very heavy. By agreeing to the Government proposal we

shall be placing upon the retailers a charge which they will not be able to pass on to their customers. Consequently it will fall very heavily upon the small men. I would further point out that very few paper-bags are imported. The total value of our imports under this heading is only about £3,000 annually. If we increase the duty upon bags to 4s. 6d. per cwt. under the general Tariff, and to 4s. per cwt. under the Tariff for the United Kingdom—an increase of 50 per cent.—I am sure that that will be sufficient.

Mr. MATHEWS (Melbourne Ports) [8.39].—I would point out that in 1906 we imported 4,542 tons of brown sugar paper of the value of £65,920, and during the first six months of the present year we imported 2,419 tons, valued at £34,853. It will thus be seen that we annually import nearly £70,000 worth of this paper. That fact in itself—seeing that we have mills in every State of the Commonwealth capable of producing this particular paper—demonstrates that the existing duty is not sufficiently high. Of course, if we increase the duty upon paper it will be necessary to increase that upon bags. In New Zealand the duty upon brown sugar paper is 7s. 6d. per cwt., and that upon bags 11s. 3d. per cwt. The Treasurer's proposals, therefore, are less than the New Zealand rates. In view of the fact that this class of paper can be manufactured in every State, the Committee may very well assent to those proposals.

Mr. WILSON (Corangamite) [8.41].—The question of the duty upon paper-bags is one that seriously affects a large number of deserving persons throughout the Commonwealth. It affects shopkeepers, confectioners, grocers and others who have to give away these bags with the goods that they sell.

Mr. STORRER.—They do not give them away; they weigh them in with the goods.

Mr. WILSON.—In many cases they do not. The honorable member for Melbourne Ports has argued in favour of absolute prohibition. Because paper-bags are imported he declares that we ought to raise the duty upon them to such a point as would exclude them. That is no argument for the advancement of the country. It is a positively ridiculous statement. We must permit a certain amount of competition, otherwise the industry will be injured. Under the old rate of 3s. per cwt. this brown sugar paper has been manufactured in the Commonwealth. We have also been

manufacturing the bags. As the honorable member for Brisbane has pointed out, there must be a considerable differentiation between the duty upon paper and that upon bags, because the former is the raw material of the bag-makers. Hitherto we have made the raw material of industries dutiable at 15 per cent. The Government, however, now propose a duty of 6s. 6d. per cwt. upon the raw material and duties of only 30 and 25 per cent. upon the finished product.

Mr. MATHEWS.—The Treasurer has notified his intention to move for an increase of those *ad valorem* rates.

Mr. WILSON.—When the honorable member for Darling asked him what was the recommendation of the Tariff Commission in respect of bags, what did our cunning Treasurer do? He looked at his Tariff, noticed that the Commission had recommended a duty of only 25 per cent., and accordingly remained silent upon the point. I noticed a twinkle in his eye as he observed the recommendation of 25 per cent., but he would not tell the honorable member for Darling that the A section of the Tariff Commission had recommended a duty of 6s. per cwt. on the raw material of the bag manufacturer, and that the duty on the finished bags should be reduced by one-half.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Is the honorable member going to help us to wipe out the anomaly?

Mr. WILSON.—I want to show the honorable gentleman where the anomalies are. Is it not an anomaly that the A section of the Tariff Commission should recommend that the duty on raw material should be increased by 100 per cent., and the duty on the finished bags decreased by 50 per cent.? Obviously, it shows that they did not consider the relationship between the two items, and in the circumstances the Committee should pause before it accepts either recommendation. I think that the suggestion of the honorable member for Balaclava, that the duty should be fixed at 4s. 6d. and 4s. per cwt., is a fair compromise, and if the Treasurer is not prepared to accept that he is very greedy. Surely he cannot expect us to double the duty on the bags? If we did so, it would do harm to a very large number of deserving persons.

Mr. SALMON.—Why does not the honorable member support the recommendation of the Tariff Commission?

Mr. WILSON.—If I did I would be voting to bring about an anomaly, the very thing I was elected to prevent. I am surprised at the honorable member trying to lead me astray. I trust that he will yet look into the matter, and see that the duties on the papers for bag-making and the bags are properly adjusted one to the other.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [8.49].—A large proportion of these bags are imported and are made of a paper which our mills do not make. I have received from the trade a communication, in which this passage occurs—

It does not seem to us that any benefit will result by putting such a heavy impost on bag papers. Paper known as "kraft" is generally used for this purpose, and cannot be made in Australia. Kraft paper is only made in northern Europe. Thousands of tons are sent annually to the United States, showing that it cannot be made even in America, neither is it made in England.

We are asked to put a tremendous impost on that paper. The honorable member for Melbourne Ports has said that in New Zealand the duty on paper is 7s. 6d. per cwt., but I think that he has made a mistake.

Mr. MATHEWS.—No; that will come into force in February.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—No. I have a copy of the Tariff which has just been passed; and I find that the duty on paper bags, not paper, is 7s. 6d. per cwt.

Mr. MATHEWS.—No; it is 11s. 3d. per cwt. on paper bags.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Item 156 in the New Zealand Tariff reads—"Paper bags, coarse, including sugar bags, 7s. 6d. per cwt." In New Zealand, as in Australia, the larger quantity of the imported bags is made of a paper which is not made locally, and also a large proportion of the paper which is imported for bag-making is not made locally. So in item 156 of its Tariff New Zealand imposes a duty of 7s. 6d. per cwt. on "paper bags, coarse, including sugar bags," and in item 157 a duty of 5s. per cwt. on paper, that is, wrapping paper of all kinds; while in item 165 it levies a duty of 25 per cent. on "paper bags n.o.e." namely, all but the coarse paper bags, on which the duty of 7s. 6d. per cwt. is fixed. The Parliament of New Zealand recognised that a large proportion of the paper which is imported for the bags cannot be made within the Dominion. Nor can it be made

in Australia. That largely accounts for our importations of a peculiar paper which, while light, is yet strong and tough. I agree with honorable members that the relationship of these duties is not fair to the manufacturer of bags; and although I am a free-trader I object more to a protection that protects the outside manufacturer than to a protection which protects the inside manufacturer. This duty is a protection to the outside manufacturer. Under a duty of 3s. per cwt. the mills have been turning out a large quantity of these papers, and no reason has been given why the duty should be increased. I shall vote for the amendment foreshadowed by the honorable member for Brisbane, and try to get the duty on the paper brought as nearly as I can to the old rate. After that I shall vote proportionately as regards the duty on the paper bags. We ought to recognise, as in New Zealand, that it is only the coarser paper for bags which is made here, and that there is a certain quality which is not even made in America or Great Britain, but is imported largely to those countries for making bags.

Mr. POYNTON (Grey) [8.54].—I have received a copy of the circular which in October last was addressed to the Minister of Trade and Customs by the South Australian Master Printers' and Allied Trades' Association. They point out that "white sulphide" and "kraft brown" papers, which are largely used in Australia, are not made locally. They also mention that sugar paper in grey blue and other tints costs about £9 per ton in the Old Country, suggest that a duty of 6s. 6d. on the Home cost is unreasonable, and show that a duty of 3s. per cwt. gives a protection of 33½ per cent. to the mills. They further state that the Australian mills make only a few grades of paper, and that there is a large quantity of paper which must be imported in the interests of the makers of paper bags. They submit that a duty of 3s. per cwt. is ample in the case of fruit bags, sugar bags, or brown bags. They allege that the old duty gave ample protection. If the Committee impose a duty of 6s. 6d. per cwt. on material which costs from £8 to £9 a ton, it will be prohibitive, and do considerable injury to the manufacturers of paper bags. On the other hand, if the Committee increase the duty on the bags it will penalize the users of them, especially so if the material cannot be made, or is not being made, in Australia. It will become a

revenue duty, which must be passed on. The only sensible plan is to reduce the duty on the first item, and leave a fair margin to the bag-makers.

Mr. CROUCH.—Does the honorable member mean to say that this paper cannot be made in Australia?

Mr. POYNTON.—That statement was made, not by me, but by the South Australian Master Printers' and Allied Trades' Association, who surely should know what they are talking about. It must be patent to honorable members that a reduction of the duty is necessary.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [8.58].—In 1901 the original duty imposed on this item was 6s. per cwt. In Victoria the duty was 6s.; in New Zealand it was 5s., and pretty well the same proportion was maintained in Canada and the United States. I intend to propose that the duty on brown paper be 5s. in the general Tariff and 4s. 6d. in the preferential Tariff, as suggested by the honorable member for Bass. And when we come to deal with bags, I intend to propose an addition of 2s. per cwt. on each item, in order to give about the same protection as is given in New Zealand. That will reduce the duty on each item to that which was intended or proposed. After listening to the debate, it seems to me that a proportion should be maintained. The duty of 6s. 6d. per cwt. as proposed was, perhaps, a little too high.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Fix the duties in the paragraph at 4s. 6d. and 4s.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—No; I prefer the duties to be fixed at 5s. and 4s. 6d., and on the other two items I intend to propose that the duties be fixed at 7s. and 6s. 6d. per cwt., which will be lower than the rate in New Zealand. I am reminded that these papers are being made in Australia.

Colonel FOXTON.—No.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I am informed that they are being made both in Melbourne and Sydney. I think that I am treating the Committee very fairly in agreeing to duties below the present rates in New Zealand in both cases.

Colonel FOXTON.—Why does not the Minister accept the proposal of the honorable member for Balacava that the duties be 4s. 6d. and 4s.?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Why should we make our rates lower than that of New Zealand and lower than the old Victorian rate, which was 6s.?

Mr. JOHNSON.—Three shillings has proved ample for all purposes.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—No, it has not.

Mr. EDWARDS (Oxley) [9.2].—The duties as proposed in the Tariff are 6s. 6d. and 6s., which are extraordinarily high. The Treasurer has agreed to reduce them to 5s. and 4s. 6d. But he might reasonably accept the amendment of the honorable member for Balaclava.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Our duty ought to be higher than that of New Zealand.

Mr. EDWARDS. — What have we to do with New Zealand? A short time ago a committee of commercial men was appointed in Sydney to report on various matters connected with the Tariff. In their report on this particular matter they say—

The proposed tax of 6s. 6d. per cwt. as against 3s. per cwt. in the old Tariff is a percentage that is altogether out of proportion to even the requirements of the manufacturers. On some papers it means a duty of 75 per cent.; and is a prohibitive duty on an enormous quantity of bag-making paper that cannot possibly be made in the Commonwealth. It also tends to place the ordinary bag-maker absolutely at the mercy of the paper merchant and the paper manufacturer; the latter especially (in lines that he can manufacture), is able to quote his made bags at a price which, when compared with his quotations to the bag-maker for paper, leaves the latter no option but to go out of the business. Three shillings per cwt. should be an ample duty on these lines. No bag-making papers are imported from Great Britain.

I will gladly vote for the amendment foreshadowed by the honorable member for Balaclava, although I had intended to support that suggested by the honorable member for Brisbane.

Mr. CROUCH (Corio) [9.5].—The honorable member for Brisbane made a great mistake in saying that these goods could be made in Australia. I am sorry that I cannot take him down to the Geelong Paper Mills, where I have actually seen the papers in question being manufactured.

Colonel FOXTON.—Not all of them. Some of them cannot even be made in the United States, and have to be imported from Great Britain.

Mr. CROUCH.—That is a dreadful thing! A little while ago they could not manufacture eucalyptus oil in the United States, but was that a reason why we should not make it in Australia? Because America cannot manufacture an article, is that a reason why Australia cannot? I know that these goods are made in Geelong, and I believe that they are also made in Sydney. The South Australian printers, whose opinion has been quoted by the hon-

orable member for Grey, are blind to what is being done in Australia. We do not find the Victorian Printers' Association, who live on the spot where the goods are manufactured, saying that they cannot be made here. They recommend the acceptance of the proposed duties.

Colonel FOXTON.—The duties do not affect the printers a bit.

Mr. CROUCH.—If the duties do not affect the printers, why was such an appeal made by the honorable member for Grey on behalf of the South Australian printers, who are asking that the duties shall be reduced? The honorable member for North Sydney has said that we should not protect outsiders. I agree with him. I urge the Government to allow the duty to remain as it stands, and to increase the duty on bags to about double what is at present proposed. I wish to appeal to those who are in favour of good wages being paid, and short hours of labour worked, to support these duties. We have lately had an example of the good effects of the new protection, which honorable members opposite seem glad to talk about without doing much to promote when they have an opportunity. In consequence of the imposition of these duties the mills of Geelong have been able to reduce the hours of labour from sixty per week to forty-eight without a reduction of the wages of the workmen, and I am glad to be able to publicly state that the directors have promised me that that shall be a permanent reduction of hours.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—They were too long before. Surely that state of things did not exist in the honorable member's electorate?

Mr. CROUCH.—I am sorry it did. Forty-eight hours is long enough for any man. It existed under the Tariff proposed by the Government to which the right honorable member belonged. The duty was so low that it was impossible to reduce the hours of labour. But they have been reduced under the present Tariff. Seeing that that has been the effect of increased duties, I trust that the Committee will not reduce them.

Mr. WYNNE (Balaclava) [9.10].—Personally, I do not mind whether the duty in the first column is made 4s. 6d. or 5s. But why should we not insert a new paragraph providing that, while the duties on brown and sugar grey, blue, and other tints shall be 5s. and 4s. 6d., those on white sulphide and kraft brown, which cannot be made here, shall be 4s. and 3s.?

Mr. CROUCH.—The consequence would be that papers imported at the lower duties would be used, and we should not have the brown made here at all.

Mr. WYNNE.—White sulphide and kraft brown can only be used for fruit bags and similar purposes. We do not want to put duties on the raw material of the bagmaker. I do not object to higher duties on the other varieties.

Mr. STORRER (Bass) [9.12].—Before Federation the duty on bags in Queensland was 8s. per cwt., and in South Australia and Victoria 10s. Therefore, if the Minister agrees to make the duties 7s. and 6s. 6d., they will be much lower than they were before Federation in the three States I have named.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—In Tasmania the duty was 20s., in Western Australia 15 per cent., and in New South Wales the goods were free.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [9.13].—In Sydney there is a large paper mill in Moore-street, at which blues, greys, and wrapping paper are very largely made. A witness, representing the mill, appeared before the Commission, and informed us that it was an established fact that, notwithstanding the duty of £3 per ton on wrapping paper, it could be landed in Sydney from Germany, Sweden, and other foreign countries at about £2 per ton cheaper than the cost existing prior to the formation of the present Tariff. The witness consequently claimed consideration against this fierce competition. He particularly drew attention to the fact that this printing paper, which we have made free, and which is made free under the character and in the name of printing paper, is often brought into use as wrapping paper. I should like the Minister to consult his officers about this question, and to see whether some strict definition of printing paper cannot be introduced into the Tariff. I think that it is possible to provide that free printing paper should not be allowed to be used as paper for wrapping purposes. I also think that the manufacturers should receive consideration for their wrapping paper. In the meantime, I am disposed to think, on re-perusing the evidence, that 6s. per cwt. for these papers is too high. I am disposed to accept the Minister's suggestion, and to bring it down a little.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [9.15].—The evidence just read by the honorable member for Bendigo supports my proposition. It shows that the

imported paper can be sold at £2 per ton less than the price of the locally-manufactured paper. The increased duty which I propose, namely, 5s. per cwt., instead of 3s. per cwt. in the case of general imports, will make good that difference.

Mr. WYNNE (Balaclava) [9.16].—I propose to move that the words "Fruit-bag Paper" be left out, and that we insert another paragraph, providing that white sulphide and kraft brown paper for bag-making be dutiable at 4s. and 3s. per cwt.

The CHAIRMAN.—We have already carried a later amendment, which renders it impossible for the honorable member to submit that suggested by him.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [9.18].—Since the suggestion was made, I have consulted the officers of the Department, who tell me that it would be almost impossible, as proposed by the honorable member, to separate the papers. The work would be so difficult that they urged me not to agree to such an amendment.

Mr. WYNNE.—Then I shall not press it.

Colonel FOXTON (Brisbane) [9.19].—By way of explanation, I should like to point out that under the old Queensland Tariff this paper came under the heading of "Paper, E.O.E."—except otherwise enumerated—and was dutiable at 5 per cent. *ad valorem*. Paper bags not printed were dutiable at 8s. per cwt., while paper bags printed were dutiable at 12s. 6d. per cwt.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [9.20].—I move—

That after the figures "6s. 6d." the words "and on and after 10th December, 1907, per cwt. (General Tariff), 4s. 6d.," be inserted.

If that amendment be carried, I shall move that the duty on imports from the United Kingdom be 4s. per cwt.

Question put. The Committee divided.

Ayes	18
Noes	27
Majority	9

AYES.

Archer, E. W.	Poynton, A.
Cook, Joseph	Sinclair, H.
Edwards, R.	Thomas, J.
Fisher, A.	Thomson, Dugald
Foxton, Colonel	Thomson, John
Fuller, G. W.	Wilson, J. G.
Hughes, W. M.	Tellers:
Johnson, W. E.	Atkinson, L.
Liddell, F.	Bowden, E. K.
Palmer, A. C.	

NOES.

Catts, J. H.
Chanter, J. M.
Chapman, Austin
Coon, J.
Crouch, R. A.
Deakin, A.
Ewing, T. T.
Forrest, Sir John
Frazer, C. E.
Harper, R.
Irvine, W. H.
Knox, W.
Lyne, Sir William
Mahon, H.

Mathews, J.
Mauger, S.
Page, J.
Quick, Sir John
Salmon, C. C.
Spence, W. G.
Storrer, D.
Tudor, F. G.
Watkins, D.
Wise, G. H.
Wynne, A.
Tellers:
Cook, Hume
Foster, F. J.

PAIRS.

McWilliams, W. J.
Glynn, P. McM.
Fysh, Sir Philip
Red, G. H.
Livingston, J.
Kelly, W. H.
Smith, Bruce
Willis, Henry
Brown, Tilley
Fowler, J. M.
Brown, Thomas
Wilks, W. H.

Groom, L. E.
Batchelor, E. L.
McDougall, J. K.
Hall, D. R.
Hutchison, J.
Kingston, C. C.
Sampson, S.
Watson, J. C.
Carr, E. S.
Fairbairn, G.
O'Malley, King
Webster, W.

Question so resolved in the negative.

Amendment negatived.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE)
agreed to—

That after the figures "6s. 6d." the words "and on and after 10th December, 1907, per cwt. (General Tariff), 6s.," be inserted; and after the figures "6s." the words "and on and after 10th December, 1907 (United Kingdom), 4s. 6d.," be added.

Paragraph, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraph H. Cartridge and Blotting, per cwt. (General Tariff), 6s. 3d.; (United Kingdom), 6s.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [9.24].—I intend to move—

That after the figures "6s. 3d." the words "and on and after 10th December, 1907, per cwt. (General Tariff), 4s. 9d.," be inserted; and after the figures "6s." the words "and on after 10th December, 1907 (United Kingdom), 4s. 3d.," be added.

This will be a reduction in proportion to that which we have just made in regard to paragraph G.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [9.25].—It is complained by some makers of envelopes that this is another case in which the duty on the raw material has been increased to the detriment of the manufactured article. They assert that the duty on envelopes is not more than the duty on cartridge paper, which is largely used in their manufacture. I do not know to what extent cartridge paper is made here. Can the Treasurer explain the reason for the increase?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The protectionist section of the Tariff Commission recommended an increase.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Perhaps the honorable member for Bendigo will be able to tell us whether cartridge paper is made here.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—I cannot find any reference to the subject.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I do not think that it is, and this duty is said to be as high as, if not higher than, the duty on envelopes.

Mr. CROUCH.—Blotting-paper is made here.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I am dealing only with cartridge paper. I move—

That the words "and Blotting" be left out. If the amendment be agreed to, I shall move that the duty on cartridge paper under the old Tariff be adopted.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [9.29].—Under the New Zealand Tariff cartridge paper is free, but blotting-paper is dutiable at 20 per cent. The departmental officers inform me that both cartridge and blotting paper are made here.

Mr. ATKINSON.—Of good quality?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not know much about the cartridge paper, but I have used the locally-made blotting paper, and found it very good.

Mr. MAHON.—It is very inferior; one generally has to re-copy his letters after using it.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—At any rate, I am willing to make the duties 5s. and 4s., to bring them into harmony with those in paragraph G.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendments (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) proposed—

That after the figures "6s. 3d.," the words "and on and after 10th December, 1907, per cwt. (General Tariff), 5s.," be inserted; and that after the figures "6s.," the words "and on and after 10th December, 1907 (United Kingdom), 4s. 6d.," be added.

Mr. SPENCE (Darling) [9.33].—Both blotting and cartridge papers are made here; but some of those in the trade have suggested that there should be an *ad valorem* duty of 20 per cent. on cartridge paper and a fixed duty on blotting paper. I am not sufficiently acquainted with the subject to know what is best to be done, but I should like the Treasurer to consider the matter.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not think an alteration necessary.

Amendments agreed to.

Paragraph, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraph 1. Strawboard, per cwt. (General Tariff), 2s. 6d.; (United Kingdom), 2s.

Mr. J. H. CATTS (Cook) [9.34].—I wish to know if the Treasurer will agree to reduce the proposed rates to the old duty.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—That was 1s. per cwt.

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—Yes. Although I do not wish to occupy the time of the Committee unduly, I am in a position to show that the local manufacturer of strawboard, notwithstanding his promise to the Tariff Commission not to increase the price of that article if the duty were increased, has increased it to an amount equivalent to the increase in the duty; that he either cannot or will not supply the local demands; that he has a monopoly; and that there are very few hands employed in the manufacture of strawboard, the article being made almost entirely by machinery. In short, I can make out a good case for the reduction for which I ask.

Mr. WILKS.—Is not one of the biggest users of strawboard located in the Cook electorate?

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—Yes. One of the largest makers of cardboard boxes, of which strawboard is the raw material, is established in my electorate. The old duty of 1s. per cwt. was equivalent to an *ad valorem* rate of 25 per cent., while the proposed duty of 2s. 6d. per cwt. is equivalent to 62½ per cent. But under the old rate the local manufacturer was able to increase his output; and that he had a large margin of profit is shown by the fact that, when the Tariff Commission were taking evidence, he was selling strawboard in Sydney at the price at which he sold it in Melbourne, notwithstanding freight charges amounting to 16s. per ton, and other charges bringing up the total to £.1 per ton. If the Treasurer will meet me in this matter, I shall be glad. I make the request as one who has given him a good deal of support in connexion with the Tariff.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The honorable member must not bargain.

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—There has been a good deal of bargaining already. Members of the Opposition have declared that, in order to prevent undue discussion, and to enable us to return to our homes by Christmas, they would accept what they termed a fair thing; and now I, who have given Government support, ask that in a

matter in which I am very much concerned the Treasurer will grant a request for a reduction. If he will meet me in this matter, I shall sit down, but, if not, I shall be compelled to show the Committee what a strong case there is for reducing the proposed rates.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I cannot come down to the old duty.

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—Then I had better state the case as it appears to me. Although the Government propose a preference to Great Britain, in 1906, as a reference to page 4957 of Volume XXXIV. of *Hansard* will show, both he and the honorable member for South Sydney agreed that strawboard is practically not made in the United Kingdom.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—It is not really; that is, not very much.

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—No. Consequently we may dismiss the proposed preference in favour of Great Britain as likely to be inoperative, and we can regard the duty for all practical purposes as that set down in the general Tariff, namely, 2s. 6d. per cwt.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Will the honorable member accept a duty of 1s. 6d. per cwt.?

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—If the Minister will come down to 1s. 6d. per cwt., which is nearly half the rate proposed, I shall resume my seat; but, before doing so, I move—

That after the figures "2s. 6d.," the words "and on and after 10th December, 1907, per cwt. (General Tariff), 1s. 6d.," be inserted; and after the figures "2s.," the words "and on and after 10th December, 1907, per cwt. (United Kingdom), 1s. 6d.," be added.

Mr DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [9.41].—Even from the point of view of the local manufacturer of strawboard, there can be no justification for the duties proposed by the Government. We were told when the old duty of 1s. per cwt. was agreed to that it would have the effect of closing the factory; but, as a matter of fact, the business has developed and extended so as to give no logical or sufficient reason for even a small increase in the duty. The Treasurer has intimated that he is willing to agree to a duty 50 per cent. higher than the old rate; but I do not think that we should accept that offer. It must be remembered that, while only a comparatively small number of hands are employed in the one mill which makes strawboard here, many hundreds are employed in the factories which use it. The preference to Great Britain is a mere pretence, and the Minister is prepared to

abolish it, knowing as he does that, practically, strawboard is not made in the United Kingdom. The old rate of duty was equivalent to 25 per cent. on unlined strawboard, to 20 per cent. on strawboard lined on one side, and to 15 per cent. on strawboard lined on both sides. That information is given in answer to question 93,689 of the Tariff Commission's evidence. It is true that Mr. McDougall, the manufacturer, said that in some instances the duty was equivalent to only 12½ per cent., but he can have referred only to strawboard lined on both sides with glazed paper. The duty of 1s. 6d. at present proposed is an increase of 50 per cent. on the old Tariff, and will make the figures 37½ per cent. on unlined strawboard, 30 per cent. on strawboard lined on one side, and 22½ per cent. on strawboard lined on both sides. That must have a serious effect on the users of this material. It represents a very considerable increase on a line which is the raw material of an industry which must supply its manufactures at a cheap rate if they are to be used at all. They are used as a substitute for paper wrapping, and they will not be used unless they are sold at a rate which will bring them within measurable distance of the price of paper. The Bradford mills, which are the only mills manufacturing strawboard, are in the hands of a combination consisting of two companies who pooled their assets, and who have a monopoly. I allude to that not as an attack upon them, but in order to show that the company has every opportunity to take full advantage of any duty that may be imposed. I do not object to a monopoly properly conducted, but I object to passing a duty for the benefit of a monopoly, which, because it has no competition to contend with, is able to take full advantage of that duty, when no good reason can be shown for its imposition, and when it is clear it will injure another industry. Those interested in the Bradford mills form part of a paper mill combine. I am assured that they have formed a combine, can fix their own prices, and in that way also take every advantage of any duty imposed. I understand that sales of their papers, not strawboard, in Queensland and New South Wales are allotted to one company, and sales in Victoria and South Australia to another, and they have agreed as to the prices they shall give for their raw material. There might be no ob-

jection to such an arrangement if it were reasonably conducted, and without State assistance, but when we are asked to give this industry assistance by means of the Tariff we have a right to ask whether it is needed, and whether it will be good for other industries. The statements I have made will be found to be borne out by the evidence submitted by the Tariff Commission. Freight and charges on the imported article amount to over 50 per cent. That in itself is surely a large protection, and yet we are asked to give from 22½ per cent. to 37½ per cent. more. In this case we have not to ask whether the price will be raised as the result of the imposition of the duty, because the price has already been raised by 30s. a ton, and advantage has therefore already been taken of the increased duty. It is true that Mr. McDougall, for the company, said that if some of the duties on the raw materials of the industry were reduced they would not raise their price.

Mr. HARPER.—The cost of straw is very much higher than it was.

Mr. ATKINSON.—Those risks were pointed out when Mr. McDougall was before the Tariff Commission.

Mr. HARPER.—The cost of straw has risen since that time.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—A director of the concern made a very stupid promise to the Tariff Commission which has not been fulfilled. He said that if they got an increased duty they would agree not to raise the price.

Mr. HARPER.—Was that promise made without any qualification?

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Yes, it was pointed out to him that it was a dangerous promise to make, because the price of his raw material might go up, and he said he would take that risk and give the promise. The promise has not been fulfilled. There has been no increase in the duties upon the raw materials of the industry which would justify the increase in the price of strawboard, whilst the duty has been taken off dextrine and has been lowered in the case of other materials. The effect of the proposed duty is shown in this way. I have here a carton for a candle-maker which would be dutiable at 30 per cent. and 25 per cent.

Mr. HUME COOK.—Paper for candle cartons has been made dutiable at 5s. and 4s. 6d. per cwt. under paragraph c.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I am not dealing with this carton as specially used by candle manufacturers. It might be used for other purposes.

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—If empty it would come in under item 353A.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—That is so, and it would be dutiable at 30 per cent. in the General Tariff and 25 per cent. if imported from the United Kingdom. I do not remember the wording of the alteration the Treasurer has made in paragraph G, but it would not affect such packets as this carton, which would come under item 353A. Now, what has the carton-maker to pay? On the strawboard alone he would have to pay, according to the duty proposed by the Government, $37\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.

Mr. HUME COOK.—That is if the duty is 2s. 6d. per cwt.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—No. The percentage of duty would be from $62\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. to $37\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., at the 2s. 6d. and 2s. rates. But taking the duty at 1s. 6d. a cwt., as I have shown, the percentages of duty would be $37\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., 30 per cent. and $22\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. for strawboard unlined, lined on one side, and lined on both sides respectively, so that the maker of the carton would actually pay more on unlined strawboard imported for its manufacture than the duty charged on the unlined strawboard made up in the form of the carton I produce. That is a serious matter for those engaged in the business, and yet that would be the condition of affairs brought about by the proposal now made. I think the Minister will see that we should not impose a duty in excess of that imposed under the old Tariff. Under the operation of that Tariff the single factory has expanded, and presumably there was reason for it in the results achieved. I could say a great deal more about this, but I do not wish to delay the Committee. I trust the Minister will reduce his demand to the rate of the old duty. No reason has been shown for increasing, whilst good reason has been shown for retaining it.

Mr. POYNTON (Grev) [9.56].—If there is one thing which more than another should induce the Committee to revert to the old duty on this item, it is the action which has been taken by the local manufacturer of strawboard. When this gentleman was before the Tariff Commission he was emphatic in his assertion that if he could get an increased duty there would be no increase in the price of locally-made strawboard.

Mr. COON.—He was only one.

Mr. POYNTON.—He was cross-questioned, and it was suggested that that was a rash promise to make. Still he was positive, and said that if he were given an increased duty he would be prepared to enter into a guarantee that he would not increase the price of strawboard. As a matter of fact, he has increased his price twice since he gave that promise. The first increase was by 10s. per ton, and immediately after this Tariff was tabled he increased his price by another 20s. The Government propose to fix the duty at 1s. 6d. per cwt. The old duty represented 25 per cent. on the cost price, and the natural protection 60 per cent., so that under the old duty of 1s. per cwt. the local manufacturer enjoyed a protection of 85 per cent.

Mr. CHANTER.—What does the honorable member call the natural protection?

Mr. POYNTON.—The cost of landing the article here, which is £2 10s. for sailing boats and £3 5s. per ton for steamers.

Mr. CHANTER.—It has been landed here at 5s. 6d. per ton.

Mr. HARPER.—I have landed it at 5s. per ton.

Mr. BOWDEN.—That was during the freight war.

Mr. POYNTON.—This is the old gag, and it is on a par with the statement we heard a little time ago that boilers were dumped in Australia. This industry does not employ one-tenth of the number of persons employed in the making up of boxes, yet the larger number of employés is to be penalized for the benefit of this firm established near Melbourne. I had a very interesting telegram sent to me to-day, and I believe a copy of it was sent to every member of the Committee.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Except me. They knew too much to send me one.

Mr. BOWDEN.—I did not get one either, and I consider that I have been badly treated.

Mr. POYNTON.—This telegram is supposed to come from the employés in the industry, and I presume they have paid for it.

Mr. JOHNSON.—They are sure to have done so out of their magnificent wages.

Mr. POYNTON.—The telegram is to this effect:—

Support Government proposals strawboard. Employers voluntarily conceded reduction in hours from twelve to eight. No reduction in daily pay.

When was this reduction in hours made? Was it just at this time and in order to secure the increased duty?

Mr. CHANTER.—It was done after the last Tariff.

Mr. POYNTON.—Then the telegram is altogether misleading. According to the evidence there are only about twenty hands employed in the industry. Surely a protection of 85 per cent. under the old Tariff is enough. If we are to consider the number of employes, we ought to give greater weight to the claims of the box-makers, who employ a much larger number of hands than the strawboard-makers do. It looks as if we were to starve a big industry in order to keep a little local combine going. This firm have had orders on hand for months past, and are unable to execute them. Yet they want a higher duty. There is not a duty proposed in this Tariff that is less warranted, and the Minister knows it. If a duty which, plus the natural protection, amounts to 85 per cent., is not sufficient, then, in all conscience, the industry ought to go under. If it is a question of whether that or the box-making industry, which employs between 3,000 and 4,000 hands, is to go under, then the strawboard-making industry ought to go under. There are ten times as many hands employed in making boxes in South Australia, which is only a part of the Commonwealth, as there are in that industry. We ought also to consider those who use the boxes. The duty has already put the price of the boxes up by from 15 to 20 per cent. What is there about this particular firm, who were so positive when before the Royal Commission that they would not increase their price, that this Committee should give them all they ask for, especially in view of the fact that they have increased their prices twice since they made that statement? Their price now has exactly absorbed the whole advantage of the increased duty. Where it was £7 10s., it is now £9. If we were to put on another 50 per cent. duty they would increase their prices proportionately. They knocked out all the other small makers, and it is not the function of this Committee to bolster up combines of that kind, which have no concern about any other business man. This firm would crush any other firm if it got a chance. It has done so already.

Mr. CHANTER.—The honorable member did not speak in that way in regard to the Standard Oil Trust, which has been trying to crush out the British Imperial Oil Company. He supported it.

Mr. POYNTON.—The honorable member is just about as correct in that allegation as he was when he asserted positively that I was wrong in saying that discs were not made in Australia. He was satisfied that they were made in his own district, but he afterwards found that they were not made in Australia at all. I was not here when the kerosene item was passed, so how can the honorable member say that I was standing up for the Standard Oil Company?

Mr. CHANTER.—By the honorable member's pairs in the book.

Mr. POYNTON.—If I had been here I would have stood up for free kerosene.

Mr. CHANTER.—And supported the great Standard Oil Trust?

Mr. POYNTON.—Of course! I go for cheap kerosene, as the honorable member did a few years ago, when we put it on the free list. This strawboard-making firm has increased its prices in face of its own sworn evidence, and the only excuse it gives is that the cost of its raw material has been increased. I defy the members of the firm to point to an increase of more than 3s. 6d. in the value of a ton of their raw material since this Tariff was introduced.

Mr. HARPER.—Does the honorable member mean to say that straw has only increased in price by 3s. 6d. a ton?

Mr. POYNTON.—They do not say that it is the increase in price of the straw that has led them to raise their prices. They put it down to the other materials used, such as paper for lining, dextrine, &c. Dextrine has been put on the free list. I shall move—

That after the figures "2s. 6d.," the words "and on and after 10th December, 1907, per cwt. (General Tariff), 1s.," be inserted.

That will give the firm a protection of about 85 per cent., which is quite enough. If they cannot carry on with that, they ought to, and it will teach them, at any rate, that they cannot increase their prices with impunity in face of their own sworn evidence that they did not intend to do so.

Mr. SPENCE (Darling) [10.7].—I do not think that we should be concerned about any foolish statement that a representative of any firm made to the Tariff Commission. If we are to deal with big industries on that basis we shall get very much astray. It was a foolish thing for a man to say, and a foolish thing to ask anybody. It is only fair to state that one of the reasons given since then for the increase of price is the immense rise in the price of straw, which is the absolute raw material.

Mr. BOWDEN.—They never gave that as a reason.

Mr. SPENCE.—The firm gave me that as one of the principal reasons. We are not here to base our consideration of proposed duties upon statements made by individuals. We should dismiss them altogether. A statement of that kind did not bind the company if they did not wish to keep to it. Nor have we been, so far, in this Tariff, legislating out of consideration for the numbers of persons employed in particular industries. It is said that there is only one factory concerned in this case; but it is reasonable to assume that if there were large profits in the industry a number of other strawboard factories would have been started in the Commonwealth, because the raw material is obtainable anywhere. There have been other cases where there was only one concern in an industry, but some of us appealed in vain to the Committee for consideration of the much greater number of other people who would be affected. I therefore take it that we might dismiss the argument about the statement which was made and not kept, and as to which they possibly have an answer, and also the fact that there are not a very large number of hands employed in the industry. What we have to consider is what is a fair amount of protection to give to the industry, so that it may be carried on at a reasonable profit and in such a way that there may be a fair chance of encouraging competition. I think the 2s. 6d. proposed by the Government is too high. At the same time we have to consider the strawboard makers.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I have agreed to accept 1s. 6d.

Mr. SPENCE.—That would be a fair compromise. I am informed that prior to the last Tariff the condition of the industry was such that the men in this factory offered voluntarily to work for twelve hours a day in order to keep the thing going. That helped their employers through, and when the last Tariff was adopted the employers gave them a forty-eight hours' week without any reduction of wages. I believe those are the facts.

Mr. BOWDEN.—That shows that the old duty was sufficient.

Mr. SPENCE.—It only proves that previously without the duty they were unable to carry on. It does not prove that when the duty was imposed in the last Tariff the employers made big profits. We have no evidence as to how much profit they have

made, but I take it that there cannot be a great deal in the industry, or there would have been other competitors. There could not be a monopoly in an industry with the raw material so plentiful in every State, but the fact is that there has not been enough in it to induce others to take it up. We have also to consider the box-makers, for I am sure that the 2s. 6d. duty first proposed would have been too heavy a burden upon them; but the Committee might fairly accept a duty of 1s. 6d., and give the strawboard industry the same encouragement as we are giving the other industries.

Mr. HARPER (*Mernda*) [10.12].—The Broadford factory is in my electorate. I know something about it, and it is only due to the proprietors that I should state a few facts. The number of employes in the factory is seventy-five, so that it is not a small concern. In addition to those directly engaged in the factory, a large number of people are employed in carting wood and straw, and the company buy straw from the farmers. The product is entirely the result of labour at every point. The honorable member for Lang stated that the firm had recently imported 500 tons of strawboard from Germany, with which to supply their orders. I am assured that that is absolutely incorrect.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Is the honorable member prepared to say that during the last three years they have not imported any strawboard?

Mr. HARPER.—I asked them if they had imported any strawboard, and they said "No."

Mr. JOHNSON.—During the last three years?

Mr. HARPER.—I did not limit the time. I did not go back for three years, because the honorable member did not mention that term, but simply made a broad statement which conveyed to the Committee the impression that the firm, within a period pertinent to the case, were importing foreign strawboard and selling it to their customers.

Mr. POYNTON.—I have a statement here that they are importing hundreds of pounds worth.

Mr. HARPER.—I have their direct statement that they have done nothing of the kind.

Mr. POYNTON.—My statement comes from the Sydney box-makers.

Mr. HARPER.—I saw that statement, but, like many others, it is not correct.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—Sixteen thousand pounds worth of strawboard was imported last year.

Mr. HARPER.—My own firm have imported some strawboard within the last five years, and there are many other importers.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—How came the honorable member's firm to import strawboard?

Mr. HARPER.—Because we thought it desirable to do so.

Mr. JOHNSON.—But there is a factory in the honorable member's own electorate.

Mr. HARPER.—We had reasons for importing strawboard, of which we are large consumers. I am assured by the honorable member for Riverina, who has just inquired, that at no time has strawboard been imported for the Broadford Mills. I merely give the information as it is given to me by people who are in a position to know that the statement made here to-night is not correct; and I may say, further, that it is not true that the Broadford Mills cannot execute orders. After the last Tariff was settled, the question was whether, under the low duty, the Broadford Mills could be carried on; and I am informed that the employes agreed to work longer hours in order to tide over the trouble, and that no dividend was paid by the company for several years. I have no personal knowledge of these facts, but give them as they have been related to me.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—Is the imported article the cheaper?

Mr. HARPER.—I think it is dear just now, though I do not know. I am assured, however, that the supplies are ample for present requirements. There are, of course, certain kinds of strawboard, which are not produced at the Broadford Mills, and which must be imported whatever duty be imposed. It is only fair that the case for the other side should be laid before honorable members, in view of the many incorrect statements that have been made. I visited the Broadford Mills some time ago, and found that they were largely the support of the town. The employes, who, of course, reside there with their families, were ready to help their employers in difficult circumstances; but I hear to-night that since the imposition of the new duty the hours have been made forty-eight instead of sixty per week, the latter being the number which the men volunteered to work in the time of trouble.

I think the proposal of the Government is a fair compromise, and I intend to support it.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [10.20].—The question of strawboard is like "King Charles' head"—it is always cropping up. This is the third time this session that we have had a discussion relating to this particular commodity. Whether this is because those interested hope to ultimately arrive at what is substantially prohibition, I do not know; but so sure as any interference with the Tariff is proposed, up comes the question of strawboard. On the two previous occasions, the discussions resulted in the maintenance of the duty of 1s., which has always been regarded as fair in the case of an article which ought certainly to be easy of manufacture in a place like Australia, where there is plenty of the raw material available at a very cheap rate. Honorable members talk about the price of straw having gone up lately; but I venture to say that it has not gone up to anything like the extent to which it has in the older countries of the world. I have been wondering why the Government have reintroduced this question. On the last occasion, the then Treasurer himself gave the best of all reasons why the proposed duty should not be imposed, and eventually withdrew it on his own motion. It may be, however, that a new Treasurer has promised that the increased duty would be proposed. Reference has been made by the honorable member for Mernda to the fact that the Broadford mill has not been doing particularly well. Can we wonder at that when protectionists of the bright, particular star-colour of the honorable member sends to the United Kingdom for his strawboard?

Mr. HARPER.—I do not do anything of the kind.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The honorable member said that he has imported some strawboard.

Mr. HARPER.—Some time ago.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—There is a strawboard mill in the electorate of the honorable member, and I fancy that his constituents will be likely to vote against him for importing this commodity.

Mr. HARPER.—My constituents have some sense!

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I am glad to hear that; at any rate, I am sure they have an excellent representative. At the same

time, I think that the honorable member might turn his attention to the Broadford mill when he requires strawboard.

Mr. HARPER.—So I do.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I am particularly anxious to hear why the honorable member sent to England for strawboard, and I fancy the reason, if the matter were probed to the bottom, is that he found the imported strawboard to suit his purpose better than the local strawboard. That, of course, is always a legitimate reason for preferring one strawboard to another. I have heard that there is great difference in the quality of strawboard, and that for some purposes it is still necessary to import. I presume the honorable member for Mernda had in his mind the smaller sorts of boxes which require a particular kind of strawboard that can be turned and twisted into shape. I believe that some strawboard is very brittle, and, when made into small shapes, has a tendency to break. However, it does occur to me that, with straw as cheap as it is in Australia, and considering what, I presume, is the simple process of manufacture, we ought to be able, in view of the natural protection which our isolation affords, to make strawboard equal, at least, to any that can be procured from abroad. This matter was investigated by the Tariff Commission, and I presume that the evidence by Mr. McDougall was well weighed. Why the Chairman of the Tariff Commission should recommend this increase of duty I do not know? I am informed that the chairman of this company, Mr. McDougall, told the Tariff Commission that the old rate was equivalent to $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. If that be so, I am prepared to vote for a duty of 25 per cent. upon this article.

Mr. MATHEWS.—The honorable member is too kind.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I am prepared to give Mr. McDougall a 25 per cent. rate in lieu of the fixed duty proposed. I ask the Treasurer if there is any particular reason why a specific duty should be adopted. For my own part, I would much prefer an *ad valorem* rate. If the honorable member for Grey will withdraw his amendment, I will move that the duty upon strawboard be 25 per cent.

Mr. CHANTER.—Make it 1s. 6d. per cwt. or 25 per cent., whichever is the higher duty.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I will do nothing of the kind. I am prepared to

take the statement of Mr. McDougall, that the old rate of 1s. per cwt. is equivalent to $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.

Mr. CHANTER.—The A section of the Tariff Commission recommended an increase of the duty to 2s. per cwt.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Then they recommended an increase of 50 per cent. upon the old rate.

Mr. CHANTER (Riverina) [10.29].—I am glad that this question is being discussed by honorable members without heat. There are one or two matters connected with it that we ought to take into consideration. I can easily understand that it was quite possible for a witness before the Tariff Commission, without looking ahead, to promise that the price of strawboard would not be increased. But when the cost of the raw material is increased it is necessary that the duty upon the finished article should also be increased.

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—But Mr. McDougall promised that he would not increase the price of strawboard even though the cost of the raw material was increased.

Mr. CHANTER.—I do not deny that fact. I am merely pointing out that it is reasonable to suppose that the duty upon the finished article should be increased in proportion to the increase in the cost of the raw material. The honorable member for Grey spoke of the natural protection which this industry enjoys. But I have been informed upon the most reliable authority that instead of the freight upon strawboard being £2 or £3 per ton it has been brought from Holland for 5s. and even 2s. 6d. per ton.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—We are constantly being told that all our imports come in for nothing.

Mr. CHANTER.—The statement has been made that the company which conducts the Broadford Mills has sent strawboard to Sydney upon which it paid 16s. per ton by way of freight. Now the freight from the works to Melbourne represents an additional 22s. per ton.

Mr. THOMAS.—Do I understand the honorable member to say that the freight upon strawboard from Melbourne to Sydney is 16s. per ton, whilst that from Holland to Melbourne is only 2s. 6d. per ton?

Mr. CHANTER.—I am credibly informed that very recently a quantity of strawboard was destroyed by fire in Melbourne upon which the freight paid from Holland was only 5s. per ton.

Mr. WILSON.—Was that by measurement or by weight?

Mr. CHANTER.—Possibly it was by measurement. I wish the Committee to recollect that those engaged in this industry have to compete against the manufacturers of strawboard in Holland who work their employes sixty hours per week, as against forty-eight hours worked by the operatives in the Commonwealth, and who pay them considerably less.

Mr. BOWDEN.—What is the honorable member's authority for that statement?

Mr. CHANTER.—My authority is the particular company which has established the strawboard factory to which I have already referred.

Mr. BOWDEN.—I have been informed that the wages paid in Holland are £2 10s. per week.

Mr. CHANTER.—The wages paid in that country, not merely in this industry but in every other, are considerably lower than those which are paid in Australia. Here is a certificate given by the employes of this firm, who, sooner than see an infant industry crushed out of existence, volunteered to continue to work at a smaller wage.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—As that occurred a long while ago, how can it apply now?

Mr. CHANTER.—Immediately the industry got a little assistance under the old Tariff, the manufacturers voluntarily reduced the hours from 60 to 48 without altering the pay. All these factors should induce honorable members to stand by an industry which if assisted will be considerably enlarged and will deprive no one of any work.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Is it not standing by the industry to double its protection?

Mr. CHANTER.—I think that the compromise offered by the Treasurer—a duty of 1s. 6d. all round instead of a duty of 2s. 6d. and 2s. as proposed—is very reasonable, and I suggest that we should now go to a division.

Mr. JOHNSON (Lang) [10.37].—During the consideration of the Tariff we have had many examples of protected industries which have been established asking for an increased duty. Here is another instance of that kind. In the beginning a duty was asked for to establish the industry until it had attained sufficient strength to stand without it.

Mr. MATHEWS.—And if it was not established the honorable member would say that it was not worth while to establish it.

Mr. JOHNSON.—No. What happens in all these cases? In the beginning a duty is asked for and obtained under false pretences. Certain persons come to the Legislature and say, "If you will only give us a certain duty"—and they generally ask for a small duty to start—"we shall be able to establish the industry, and once we are firmly established we shall not want a duty." But no sooner do they get the duty and start the industry than they come cap in hand for more power to dip their hands into the public Treasury to increase their profits. Here we are confronted with another example of that kind of conduct. *Oliver Twist* was not in it with these people. There was every excuse for the poor unfortunate hero of Dickens, but there is no excuse for these well-fed, pampered manufacturers, who are centred chiefly in and around Melbourne. Even if they should get a protection of 2s. 6d. per cwt. on this occasion, next time they will want a protection of 5s., and so the eternal cry for "more" will go on. That is the kind of greed which feeds upon itself. The more protection they receive the more they want; when they get hoary-headed with age they will be still crying out for more protection.

Mr. WILSON.—It is only a protection of 1s. 6d. per cwt. that is wanted now.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Yes, because they know they have no hope of getting more, and that is fully 1s. too much. It is all very well for the honorable member for Mernda to plead on behalf of this industry. He is understood to be a protectionist from principle. But I believe that he is a protectionist because—without meaning any offence to him—he makes a considerable amount of money out of the policy.

Mr. HARPER.—I could do just as well under free-trade.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Then I will assume that the honorable member is a protectionist from personal conviction. In his electorate there is a little industry which has already enjoyed much protection, but which is asking for more. I interjected that 500 tons of strawboard had been imported by the firm mentioned in order to meet the demands of their business.

Mr. HARPER.—That statement is contained in a letter which has been circulated.

Mr. JOHNSON.—I am not depending entirely upon that letter for my information.

In a circular which has been addressed to honorable members I find the following statement—

The Broadford Strawboard Mills have been so busy the last three years that a year ago they imported 500 tons of strawboard to try to keep pace with the demand. They also enlarged their plant considerably, including putting in two extra lining machines.

Whether this statement is true or not I am not prepared to say, because, like the honorable member for Mernda, I can only depend upon the information which has been given to me.

Mr. HARPER.—It is not true.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Persons who are well qualified to give correct information have told me that the statement is true, but the honorable member says that it is not, and in these circumstances it will be for the Committee to judge between the conflicting statements.

Mr. HARPER.—The one statement is based on hearsay and the other emanates from the principals themselves.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Yes; but it must be remembered that both statements come from sources which are interested in the industry, though perhaps from opposite stand-points. It will rest with the Committee to determine which statement is right. I am not prepared to vouch for the accuracy of the statement I cited, but I am prepared to vouch for the character of the person from whom I obtained my information. Strawboard is not manufactured in England. As a matter of fact, there is a clause in the leases of most English farmers requiring them to return all the straw to the soil for manuring purposes. It is stated in a journal published in the interests of the box-makers and strawboard manufacturers that practically all the strawboard manufactured in Holland is exported to Great Britain.

The American Vice-Consul at Rotterdam has been going specially into the strawboard industry of that country, and in putting the report before his Government states that the manufacturers will not give any information on the subject.

It is stated that practically all the strawboard exported from England is first imported into England from Holland. Reference has been made to the number of telegrams sent to honorable members with the object of influencing their votes on this question. It is a strange thing that these telegrams should have been sent simultaneously. I wonder who paid for them. Does any one really believe that the employés sent them at their own expense? I

am sure that they have not money to spare for sending so many telegrams to honorable members. Now in his evidence before the Tariff Commission, Mr. James McDougall was questioned with regard to prices. He told the Commission that if the duty was increased the prices of strawboard would not be raised. I will quote from his evidence—questions 80,787 to 80,789—

You also said that you are making a profit of $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., and you are asking for an increased duty equivalent to $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.—Yes; but I also told you that we do not intend to increase our price.

You can give no guarantee beyond your word, and, as a matter of business, you know that we have to look at the matter from the bare figure point of view?—We could give an undertaking that we will not increase the price.

That would be unwise when the price would be contingent upon the price of raw material?—I am quite prepared to take the risk.

Here is sworn evidence that if Mr. McDougall secured this duty he would not increase the price. Yet we know that he has increased the price. I have in possession a circular which has been issued in reference to cardboard boxes by a firm called the Morris Manufacturing Company, carrying on business in Degraes-street, Melbourne. I do not know who the members of the firm are, but I have obtained a copy of this trade circular, which I may as well read to the Committee—

Dear Sir,

On account of the increase in price of our raw material, occasioned by the introduction of the new Tariff, from $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. to 20 per cent., we shall have to increase our prices 15 per cent., as from the 9th of September. All invoices from that date will bear the additional percentage.

Thanking you for your past favours, and trusting you will continue to place your orders with us, which at all times will receive our best and careful attention,

Yours faithfully,
THE MORRIS MANUFACTURING COY.

We see from this document that the makers of cardboard boxes have had to increase their prices to their customers because of the increase of the price of strawboard, which is their raw material.

Mr. SPENCE.—They may not get it from Mr. McDougall's firm at all.

Mr. JOHNSON.—There is no other local firm which makes strawboard. The increase referred to is, I understand, in the locally-manufactured article. The circular speaks for itself. In face of this evidence, I hope that honorable members will pause before they consent to an increase in the duty. They must remember that strawboard is the raw material of a very large

number of industries employing many hands—many more than those employed in the strawboard industry itself. Are not these people to have any consideration? Are not the people who use strawboard boxes for the purpose of enclosing their wares not to have consideration either? Is the consumer always to pay the piper, and grin and bear it? He is the one individual in the community whose interests do not seem to enter into the consideration of protectionists for a single moment. There is only one other point to which I wish to refer, and that is the case of those who have to import strawboard for the purpose of manufacturing the finer kind of boxes. I am credibly informed by those in the trade that the locally-made strawboard, although it is useful, cannot be used for all purposes. It is not useful for the manufacture of the better class of boxes which are required for the more delicate articles of manufacture. We have therefore to consider first that the local strawboard, although it is improving in quality, is not equal to the imported article, and secondly that the works of the manufacturers of the local strawboard are not sufficiently large to supply all the requirements of the Commonwealth. The suggestion of the honorable member for Parramatta for an *ad valorem* duty, even as high as 25 per cent., as preferable to the fixed duty of 1s. 6d., or even 1s., is one that should commend itself even to high Tariff protectionists in the Committee.

Mr. BOWDEN (Nepean) [10.53].—I rise principally on account of a remark made by the honorable member for Mernda, who observed that the making of strawboard was almost entirely a manual labour industry. As a matter of fact, the Committee will find that Mr. McDougall himself, in his evidence—question 80,768—when asked, “How many hands do you employ in the strawboard mill?” replied—

I should think that we have between fifty and sixty hands at Broadford, but the manufacture of strawboard is almost all automatic.

That disposes of the statement of the honorable member for Mernda that this is a manual labour industry. The honorable member for Lang has quoted from the evidence of Mr. McDougall, showing that he undertook, after due consideration, not to raise the price of strawboard if the duty were increased. The honorable member for Darling urges that we ought not

to pay much consideration to such statements. But Mr. McDougall is not the man to speak lightly of such things. He is not the man to make a promise of that kind without consideration. He knew what he was talking about when he gave that promise. One is almost forced to the conclusion that he made it with the reservation that he would break it as soon as he got an opportunity. His explanation of the increase in the price will not, to my mind, hold water. In writing to the *Sydney Morning Herald*, Mr. McDougall said—

We have a perfect right to increase our price until such time as the duty is determined upon, because we have now to pay heavy duty on felts, wires, lining paper, and dextrine, etc., that were heretofore free. Should the increased duty be passed, we will at once reduce our price to the rate that it was when I gave evidence before the Commission plus the extra cost that we will have to pay consequent upon the increased duties—if carried—on felts, wires, lining paper, dextrine, etc.

Mr. HUME COOK.—Dextrine is free.

Mr. BOWDEN.—I am simply reading Mr. McDougall's explanation. I propose now to read a reply to which Mr. McDougall has not seen fit to answer. In the same newspaper, Messrs. Fuerth and Nall wrote—

In reply to this, we question the justness of raising the prices while the Tariff is under consideration, but totally disagree with him in his reasons for so doing, based as they are on the heavy duties imposed on felts, wires, lining paper, and dextrine. In the first item, “felts”—even if used in a strawboard-making machine—would come in free under division XVI. (Miscellaneous). Item 441 reads—“Felts for paper-making machine, free.” Next, “wires” is dealt with under division VI. (Metals and Machinery), item 225, General, 5 per cent., British, free. As the British-made wire is better quality and as cheap as any other make, this item can be reckoned free also. Lining paper and dextrine—As neither of these is used at all on un-lined boards, no extra duty on them need be considered.

In this letter Messrs. Fuerth and Nall, who are paper-box manufacturers in Sydney, show that every one of the reasons given by Mr. McDougall for raising prices is without foundation. Even if these raw materials were not free Mr. McDougall could not be released from the promise that he made when before the Tariff Commission that he would not, under any circumstances, increase the price of strawboard. The only other point with which I desire to deal is that relating to the natural protection enjoyed by the local manufacturers. It is true that for a short time a

few consignments of strawboard came in—while the freight war lasted—at 5s. per ton. A special shipment was brought in at that rate when the ship-owners were cutting freights, but those circumstances do not pertain to-day, and are not likely to recur. The *Bulletin*, in writing in opposition to Messrs. Fuerth and Nall's contention, in its issue of 12th September last, acknowledged that it was only while the freight war lasted that this rate was charged.

Mr. HARPER.—The war of freights lasted for about two years.

Mr. BOWDEN.—But it is dead now.

Mr. HARPER.—Yes.

Mr. BOWDEN.—It will be interesting to place on record a comparison of charges on Dutch and Australian strawboard. The expenses on one ton of Dutch strawboard are as follow:—Freight from Holland to Hamburg, 10s.; Hamburg dues and agency f.o.b., 7s. 6d.; freight from Hamburg to Sydney by sailer, 18s. 9d.; insurance, 3s. 7d.; exchange, 5s.; agent's commission, 5 per cent. on c.i.f., 5s. 5d.; wharfage, 3s. 9d.; cartage, 3s.; duty under old Tariff, £1; total, £3 17s. The expenses on one ton of Broadford strawboard are as follow:—Expenses from mill, Broadford, to f.o.b. Melbourne, 12s. 6d.; freight, Melbourne to Sydney, at 12s. 6d., less 10 per cent., 11s. 3d.; insurance, 8d.; wharfage, 3s. 9d.—these are the actual charges—cartage, 3s.; leaving a balance of £2 5s. 10d., which is equal to an *ad valorem* duty of 51½ per cent. f.o.b. in favour of the Broadford mill. The strawboard mill gives employment to twenty or thirty hands, whereas the industries that seeks a reduction of the duty give employment to between 3,000 and 4,000.

Mr. HARPER.—The local mill gives employment to about sixty-five hands.

Mr. BOWDEN.—Even if it does, I think these facts show that it is undesirable to increase the duty. If, however, the Treasurer is prepared to agree to a duty of 25 per cent. as a compromise, I shall be ready to accept it.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment (by Mr. POYNTON) negatived—

That after the figures "2s. 6d." the words "and on and after 10th December, 1907, per cwt. (General Tariff), 1s.," be inserted.

Amendments (by Mr. J. H. CATTS) agreed to—

That after the figures "2s. 6d." the words "and on and after 10th December, 1907, per

cwt. (General Tariff), 1s. 6d." be inserted; and that after the figure "2s." the words "and on and after 10th December, 1907, per cwt. (United Kingdom), 1s. 6d." be added.

Paragraph, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraph J. Bags, ad val. (General Tariff), 30 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 25 per cent.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [11.8].—When moving in connexion with a previous paragraph the reduction of rates to 5s. and 4s. 6d., I said that I thought that a corresponding reduction in the rates on bags would be 7s. and 6s. 6d.; but I have since been informed by a number of honorable members that those rates would not give a sufficient margin, and that the rates should be 8s. and 7s. 6d. I therefore move—

That after the words "30 per cent." the words "and on and after 10th December, 1907, per cwt. (General Tariff), 8s.," be inserted; and that after the words "25 per cent." the words "and on and after 10th December, 1907, per cwt. (United Kingdom), 7s. 6d.," be added.

Mr. JOHNSON (Lang) [11.10].—The Treasurer has behaved rather shabbily towards the Opposition in regard to this matter. He made a certain proposal, on the strength of which the call for a division was withdrawn.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The honorable member voted against what I proposed.

Mr. JOHNSON.—I shall always vote against high duties; but that does not relieve the Minister of his responsibility. Had he stated earlier that he intended to make these rates 8s. and 7s. 6d., honorable members might have voted for a greater reduction of the duties on raw material. What has happened savours of sharp practice.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—No.

Mr. JOHNSON.—I do not say that the Treasurer has been guilty of sharp practice; but to an outsider it might seem that he has worked a point on the Opposition in getting honorable members to agree to certain rates on raw material on the promise that he would propose lower rates on the finished article, and failing to carry out that promise. I do not deny that he may have been asked to make this alteration; but, having made a bargain, he should have stuck to it. Of course, it is no use talking, but I enter my protest against what has been done.

Colonel FOXTON (Brisbane) [11.12].—There may be some misapprehension on the part of the honorable member for Lang in regard to what the Treasurer has done. The rates originally proposed in connexion

with bag paper were 6s. 6d. and 6s. per cwt.; and when I suggested their reduction to 3s. 6d. and 3s., the Treasurer intimated that he was prepared to increase the duty on bags to 11s. and 10s. to preserve the proportion. On the reduction of the duty on paper the Treasurer proposed to make the duty on bags 7s. 6d. and 7s. In regarding those as fair rates on bags, he was evidently misled by the fact that the difference between the two sets of duties remained the same, forgetting that the proportion was different. Under the circumstances, he was justified in moving for rates of 8s. and 7s. 6d., which preserve as nearly as possible the old proportion. If the paper-bag industry is to be preserved, the margin given will be little enough.

Amendments agreed to.

Paragraph, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraph K. N.E.J., including Cardboard, Pasteboard, Pulpboard, Cloth-lined Boards, and Cloth-lined Paper, Floor Paper, Paper-hangings or Wall-papers, Millboard, Greyboard, Leatherboard, and Woodboard and Toilet Paper in rolls or packets, ad val. (General Tariff), 20 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 15 per cent.

Mr. J. H. CATTS (Cook) [11.15].—This item involves increases, in some cases of 10 per cent. and in other cases of 5 per cent., on the old Tariff. Millboard, greyboard, leatherboard and woodboard are not manufactured in Australia, and I wish to ask the Treasurer whether he will agree to these articles being omitted from this paragraph with a view to their inclusion in a new paragraph and being made dutiable at 5 per cent. in the general Tariff and free from the United Kingdom, where I understand they are made.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I am prepared to accept that amendment.

Amendment by (Mr. J. H. CATTS) proposed—

That the words "Millboard, Greyboard, Leatherboard, and Woodboard" be left out.

Mr. TUDOR (Yarra) [11.17].—When the old Tariff was being discussed six years ago, I had a letter similar to the one I have in hand now from the Bookbinders and Paper-rulers' Union, which at that time was a Victorian institution, but has since become a federated union, making the same suggestion as that which has been made by the honorable member for Cook, with the exception that cardboard and pasteboard should also be admitted free. These articles are the raw materials of the book-binding industry, and as books when made up are admitted free it is not right

to penalize the local book-binding industry by levying any duty at all upon cardboard or pasteboard. These articles are not made here.

Mr. HUME COOK.—Is the honorable member quite sure that cardboard and pasteboard are not made here.

Mr. TUDOR.—The letter which I have says that these boards are not manufactured in the Commonwealth, and the duty would therefore be merely a revenue duty. The letter is signed "James Munn, Secretary to the Australian Book-binders and Paper-rulers' Federated Union."

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I am informed that they are made here.

Mr. TUDOR.—I am informed that they are not made here, and if the Minister believes they are we shall have to let them go for the present, make inquiries in the meantime, and if necessary see that they are omitted when the Tariff is before another place.

Mr. JOHNSON (Lang) [11.19].—I think I have a prior amendment to that moved by the honorable member for Cook, because I wish to have cardboard and pasteboard left out. I have here a photographic mount which is manufactured in Australia, but the whole of the middle of the mount is manufactured from what is called "wood-pulp middles," a material which is not manufactured and cannot be manufactured in Australia, and which is useless for any other purpose than the manufacture of these mounts.

Mr. HUME COOK.—The Minister has agreed to leave out woodboard.

Mr. JOHNSON.—If that will cover wood-pulp middles I am satisfied.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [11.20].—My honorable friend, the leader of the Opposition, will no doubt be pleased to hear that I join in requesting a reduction of the duty upon these items.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The millerium is coming.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—In the Tariff Commission I was over-ruled by my colleagues. I suggested the reduction of these duties from 15 per cent. to 10 per cent. all round, and I am quite prepared to go even lower than 10 per cent. on these boards, which I do not think are made here.

Mr. FRAZER (Kalgoorlie) [11.21].—In view of the statement made by the Chairman of the Tariff Commission, I do not see why only the particular articles referred to should be removed from this

item. Why should we adopt the course proposed if we know that these articles are not made in Australia?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Some of them are made here.

Mr. FRAZER.—Pasteboard, cardboard, millboard, leatherboard, greyboard, and woodboard have all been mentioned as articles that are not made here, and the statement has been confirmed by the Chairman of the Tariff Commission. It is now proposed to leave out four of these articles about which there seems to be no doubt, and to include two which the Chairman of the Tariff Commission says are not made here.

Mr. MAUGER.—Cardboard and pasteboard are made here.

Mr. FRAZER.—We have the opinion of the Chairman of the Tariff Commission to the contrary.

Mr. MAUGER.—I have not given an opinion, but a statement of fact based on knowledge.

Mr. FRAZER.—The Chairman of the Tariff Commission has been inquiring into the matter for two years, and I am prepared to accept his opinion. The Government, when they have found themselves in trouble, have been keen enough to shelter themselves behind the decisions of the Tariff Commission. I do not think we should leave the articles about which some doubt has been expressed to be struck out of this item when the Tariff is before another place. I prefer that the honorable member for Cook should add to his amendment "pasteboard and cardboard."

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—No.

Mr. FRAZER.—Very well, I shall move their omission myself. I ask the honorable member for Cook to temporarily withdraw his amendment in order to enable me to submit a prior amendment.

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—I do not think I should stand in the honorable member's way if he desires to move a prior amendment, though I shall not vote for the amendment he proposes. I ask leave to temporarily withdraw my amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment (by Mr. FRAZER) proposed—

That the words "Cardboard, Pasteboard," be left out.

Question—That the words "Cardboard, Pasteboard," proposed to be left out, stand

part of the paragraph (Mr. FRAZER's amendment) — put. The Committee divided.

Ayes	19
Noes	16
<hr/>				
Majority	3

AYES.

Catts, J. H.	McDougall J. K.
Chapman, Austin	Salmon, C. C.
Coon, J.	Spence, W. G.
Ewing, T. T.	Storrier, D.
Groom, L. E.	Thomson, John
Lyne, Sir William	Watkins, D.
Mahon, H.	Wise, G. H.
Maloney, W. R. N.	<i>Tellers:</i>
Mathews, J.	Cook, Hume
Mauger, S.	Foster, F. J.

NOES.

Archer, E. W.	Quick, Sir John
Cook, Joseph	Sinclair, H.
Forrest, Sir John	Thomas, J.
Foxton, Colonel	Thomson, Dugald
Frazer, C. E.	Tudor, F. G.
Hedges, W. N.	<i>Tellers:</i>
Johnson, W. E.	Bowden, E. K.
Palmer, A. C.	McWilliams, W. J.
Poynton, A.	

PAIRS.

Batchelor, E. L.	Glynn, P. McM.
Hall, D. R.	Reid, G. H.
Hutchison, J.	Livingston, J.
Kingston, C. C.	Kelly, W. H.
Sampson, S.	Smith, Bruce
Watson, J. C.	Willis, Henry
Carr, E. S.	Brown, Tilley
Fairbairn, G.	Fowler, J. M.
Webster, W.	Wilks, W. H.
Harper, R.	Fuller, G. W.
Page, J.	Atkinson, L.
Bamford, F. W.	Wilson, J. G.
Chanter, J. M.	Liddell, F.
Crouch, R. A.	Hughes, W. M.
O'Malley, King	Fysh, Sir Philip
Deakin, A.	Brown, Thomas
Fisher, A.	Edwards, R.

Question so resolved in the affirmative.

Amendment negatived.

Amendment (by Mr. J. H. CATTS) agreed to—

That the words "Millboard, Greyboard, Leatherboard, and Woodboard" be left out.

Mr. POYNTON (Grey) [11:32].—I have a letter from the Master Printers' Association, pointing out that quite a number of these lines, more particularly pasteboard, pulpboard, leatherboard, greyboard, and woodboard are not made here. I move—

That after the words "20 per cent.," the words "and on and after 10th December, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 15 per cent.," be inserted.

I intend, if that is agreed to, to move that the duty be 10 per cent. in the case of imports from the United Kingdom.

Question put. The Committee divided.

Ayes ... 15
Noes ... 20

Majority ... 5

AYES.

Cook, Joseph
Forrest, Sir John
Frazer, C. E.
Hedges, W. M.
Johnson, W. E.
Mahon, H.
McWilliams, W. J.
Palmer, A. C.

Poynton, A.
Quick, Sir John
Sinclair, H.
Thomas, J.
Thomson, Dugald
Tellers:
Archer, E. W.
Bowden, E. K.

NOES.

Catts, J. H.
Chapman, Austin
Coon, J.
Ewing, T. T.
Foster, F. J.
Foxton, Colonel
Groom, L. E.
Lyne, Sir William
Maloney, W. R. N.
Mathews, J.
Mauger, S.

McDougall, J. K.
Salmon, C. C.
Spence, W. G.
Storrer, D.
Thomson, John
Tudor, F. G.
Watkins, D.

Tellers:

Cook, Hume
Wise, G. H.

PAIRS.

Glynn, P. McM.
Reid, G. H.
Livingston, J.
Kelly, W. H.
Smith, Bruce,
Willis, Henry
Brown, Tilley
Fowler, J. M.
Wilks, W. H.
Fuller, G. W.
Atkinson, L.
Wilson, J. G.
Liddell, F.
Hughes, W. M.
Fysh, Sir Philip
Brown, Thomas
Edwards, R.

Batchelor, E. L.
Hall, D. R.
Hutchison, J.
Kingston, C. C.
Sampson, S.
Watson, J. C.
Carr, E. S.
Fairbairn, G.
Webster, W.
Harper, R.
Page, J.
Bamford, F. W.
Chanter, J. M.
Crouch, R. A.
O'Malley, King
Deakin, A.
Fisher, A.

Question so resolved in the negative.

Amendment negatived.

Paragraph, as amended, agreed to.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) proposed—

That the following new paragraph be inserted:—“(KK) On and after 10th December, 1907, Millboard, Greyboard, Leatherboard, Woodboard, ad. val. (General Tariff), 5 per cent.; (United Kingdom), free.”

Mr. BOWDEN (Nepean) [11.40].—I suggest that Manila board should also be included. This board is made from grey board, with an outside of wood board, and is used for purposes similar to those for which the boards proposed by the Treasurer are used. I am afraid that unless it is included it may fall under some other paragraph.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I accept the suggestion of the honorable member.

Proposed new paragraph amended accordingly.

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—Why should not the whole item be free?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Because it is desired to bring these boards in unison with a number of other articles which bear a similar duty.

Mr. JOHNSON (Lang) [11.41].—There is no advantage in the preference that is proposed. For instance, wood pulp middles are not brought from the Old Country, and those interested in the paper mills admit that the article ought to come in free. I have here a statement from the manufacturers as follows—

The middles are a rough paper, forming the body of the cardboard, and they are made from spruce and some other soft woods, which in Canada and Sweden and some other countries where water-power is plentiful are ground up into a kind of pulp, and in the one process made into middles, such as we use. There is no wood grown in Australia in any marketable quantity which could be used for this purpose, nor is water-power available.

No witness on behalf of the local paper mills or, as far as we know, on behalf of any Australian paper mill, made any request that these wood pulp middles should be made to pay duty. They do not compete against any article produced in Australia, or likely to be produced, as they are far too expensive to compete against strawboard, and the thickness to be admitted free might be limited to an equivalent of 140 lbs. per ream royal, and under.

It will be seen from this that wood pulp middles are not made in the United Kingdom, and that, therefore, the proposed preference is a sham. The Treasurer wishes the Committee to believe that by admitting these articles free under the Tariff for the United Kingdom he is giving a substantial preference to the Mother Country. But, as a matter of fact, he is doing nothing of the kind. I move—

That the proposed new paragraph be amended by leaving out the words “5 per cent.,” with a view to insert in lieu thereof the word “free.”

Mr. MALONEY (Melbourne) [11.46].—I ask the Treasurer, to include in this paragraph cardboard and pasteboard, which are not made here, and which are imported in the rough.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—They have already been dealt with, and we cannot revert to them.

Mr. MALONEY.—If I cannot get the articles I have mentioned placed upon the free list by this Committee, it will be my duty to endeavour to persuade the Senate to put them in that category.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—It is such a small matter that I shall not worry about it.

Amendment of the proposed new paragraph, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment (by Mr. BOWDEN) negatived—

That the proposed new paragraph be amended by inserting after the words "Manila board" the words "lined and unlined."

Amendment (by Mr. JOHNSON) negatived—

That the proposed new paragraph be amended by leaving out the words "5 per cent.," with a view to insert in lieu thereof the word "free."

Proposed new paragraph agreed to.

Paragraph (L). Surface-coated Paper, including Marble and Foil Paper, ad val., 20 per cent.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) proposed—

That the following words be added:—"and on and after 10th December, 1907—(L). Flint or Surface-coated Paper, plain or embossed, also Marble and Foil Paper and Box Makers' Bordering and Lace Paper, free."

Mr. THOMAS (Barrier) [11.51].—Will the proposal of the Treasurer permit of paper that is used in the production of magazines and books being admitted free? We have already placed both magazines and books in the free list, and it would be unwise, therefore, to make the paper used in their production dearer than is absolutely necessary.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The papers used in the production of books and magazines will be free.

Mr. THOMAS.—I take it that that is the desire of the Treasurer?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Yes. We have already made magazines free. In addition, I understand that this paper is used in connexion with photography.

Mr. THOMAS.—Having received the assurance of the Treasurer that his proposal will accomplish what I desire, I shall raise no objection to it.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [11.53].—The object of my proposal has already been stated by the honorable member. But I should like to hear an explanation from the honorable member for Bendigo in regard to the recommendation of the Commission upon this item, which to me appears to be an extraordinary one. The A section of the Commission has recommended that it should be dutiable at 20 per cent., and the B section that it should bear a 10 per cent. duty. But the Department is absolutely opposed to either of the duties suggested, and I should like to know whether a mistake has not

occurred. The duty proposed has been adopted on the recommendation of the A section of the Commission.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—Upon very strong evidence.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I have been urged by a large number of honorable members to place the item upon the free list.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—Has the Treasurer read the evidence taken by the Tariff Commission?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I have not read all of it. If I had, I should probably be deaf and dumb.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [11.55].—I may inform the Committee that Mr. McDougall made a very strong appeal to the Tariff Commission in regard to this matter, as will be seen by reference to page 273 of volume 6 of the minutes of evidence. Referring to surface coated paper being free, he pointed out that the printing paper of which it is composed was also free; but that as regards the materials used for surface coating the paper, there was a duty of 2s. per cwt. on pulp colours; 2s. per cwt. on blanc fixe; 2s. per cwt. on satin white; and 20 per cent. on albumen glue. He went on to say—

How can an industry be carried on under such conditions? We have invested over £5,000 in this department under the protection of the old Tariff, and think that it is a fair thing now to ask for 20 per cent. protection. I trust that the appeal will meet with your favorable consideration.

In reply to question 80828, "What have you to say as to surface coated papers?" he complained that most of his raw materials were liable to duty, and said that "the charge is the same on the raw material as on the manufactured article." That is the reason why the A section of the Tariff Commission recommended that there should be a duty of 20 per cent. Mr. McDougall made a very strong appeal, and we thought that he had made a very strong case for surface coated paper to be protected—not to the same extent, perhaps, as the strawboard, but still to some extent, considering that he was taxed on his raw material.

Mr. MATHEWS (Melbourne Ports) [11.58].—I suppose that this duty will become one of the slaughtered innocents, as the Treasurer has, unfortunately, agreed to make the article free. This commodity has been manufactured in Australia for some time. Surely we can believe the manufacturers when they tell us that they

can make surface coated paper. I am sure that it can be made here, and made well too. A duty on the finished article is essential, because the majority of the raw materials are liable to duty. But as I understand that the Treasurer has another proposition to make in connexion with this matter I shall resume my seat.

Mr. SPENCE (Darling) [12.0].—On this matter I have a statement from the Master Printers' Association of Victoria, the Associated Press of Tasmania, the paper manufacturers, the cardboard box makers, the paper bag makers, the manufacturing stationers, and the paper merchants of Victoria, asking that these articles shall be made duty free, because, as they say, a tax on surface coated papers in almost endless varieties would press unduly on the printing and bag making industries. I presume that the trade is not yet in a position to supply the endless varieties which are required.

Mr. FRAZER (Kalgoorlie) [12.1 a.m.].—I desire to elicit from the Treasurer how he proposes to deal with paragraph R, which subjects paper shavings and waste paper for paper making to a duty of 5 per cent., except when imported from the United Kingdom, whence they are admitted free. I also desire to know how he intends to deal with paragraph T, under which pulp for manufacturing paper is dutiable at 5 per cent., except when it is imported from the United Kingdom, whence it comes in free. It seems to me that if surface coated paper is to be made free, the articles embraced in paragraphs R and T should be dealt with in the same way. I presume that if the United Kingdom is incapable of supplying the finished article it will not have much of the raw material to supply to the Commonwealth. Apparently, the Treasurer does not intend to reply to my inquiries on these heads. But there is another question on which, perhaps, he may be able to give me some information. I understand that certain weekly newspapers use a surface coated paper, which of course is superior to the news paper that has been made free. I desire to ascertain from the honorable gentleman what paper in the past has been imported under the designation of surface coated paper.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I intend to make the articles embraced in paragraphs R and T free.

Mr. FRAZER.—I desire to know whether in the past any news paper used in

the production of weekly newspapers has been imported under this head.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I cannot tell the honorable member without reference to the records.

Mr. FRAZER.—I suppose we may assume that in the event of this item being made free it will cover the whole of the news paper that is used throughout the Commonwealth. A certain kind of paper for printing newspapers is to be free. But my information is that some newspapers use surface coated papers.

Mr. SALMON.—Only for printing illustrations.

Mr. FRAZER.—Will the paper used by those who use surface-coated papers be made free? If the Minister will give me a decision on that subject I shall be satisfied.

Mr. SALMON.—If the surface-coated papers are produced in the country, will the honorable member vote for the duty?

Mr. FRAZER.—Certainly. If the honorable member can satisfy me that these papers are produced in satisfactory quantities I will vote with him. But I am unable to get an opinion from the Minister as to whether or not the item covers the whole of the papers required by the newspapers, and whether the proprietors have been clearing under this item in the past.

Mr. SALMON (Laanecoorie) [12.8 a.m.].—I understand that the papers dealt with in this paragraph are to be made free with the proviso that coated boards shall be dutiable. Surface paper is undoubtedly produced in the Commonwealth. But the manufacturers of it will be prepared, if they receive a sufficient protection on coated boards, to forego a duty on this particular class of paper.

Mr. FRAZER.—Does the honorable member say that it is imported in rolls or folios, and coated within the Commonwealth?

Mr. SALMON.—I am informed that it is imported as printing paper and surface-coated by the local manufacturers. The honorable member will therefore be able to vote for this surface-coated paper being made free, but it must be understood that it would be unfair to take from the manufacturers their protection on surface-coated paper, and then refuse to give them the protection they require on surface-coated boards.

Mr. FRAZER.—We ought to get the proviso before voting on the original item.

Mr. SALMON.—That would be a fair thing. All that they are asking for is a duty of 15 per cent. on the coated boards. They pay 10 per cent. on their raw material.

Amendment agreed to.

Paragraph, as amended, agreed to.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [12.12 a.m.].—I move—

That the following new paragraph be inserted:—"L. On and after 10th December, 1907—Coated Boards n.e.i., which, at the size of a single royal 20 x 25 inches, or its equivalent, weigh 80 lbs., or over, per ream of 480 sheets, ad val. (General Tariff), 25 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 20 per cent."

The object of this new paragraph is to make a margin between the duty on the goods dealt with in paragraph L, and those included here.

Mr. TUDOR.—The Minister only proposes a margin of 5 per cent.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE. — It was originally proposed to me that the duty should be 30 per cent. and 35 per cent. I have been guided largely by what we have done in regard to other items.

Mr. TUDOR (Yarra) [12.13 a.m.].—The position, as I understand it, is this: Under paragraph K we have imposed duties on the raw material of 20 per cent. and 15 per cent. Now it is proposed to give a margin of 5 per cent. for the surface coating of boards. I am given to understand that that is not nearly enough. A margin of 15 per cent. is asked for. I have here a letter on the subject. Honorable members have been inundated with letters. I almost wish that we could impose a heavy duty on letters to members of Parliament.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Some of the manufacturers have done themselves, in my estimation, a great deal of harm by their grasping nature and the statements they have made.

Mr. TUDOR.—The requests made by persons connected with industries will not influence me in any vote which I give.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—They are too grasping altogether.

Mr. TUDOR.—I ask the Minister if he possibly can to reconsider this paragraph so as to give the manufacturers an opportunity of securing a greater amount of protection for surface-coated boards. I know that the Treasurer is endeavouring to do the fair thing, and we must admit that he has a very trying task to perform.

Mr. POYNTON.—Let us vote.

Mr. TUDOR.—When certain honorable members display an anxiety to accept the

proposal of the Treasurer the honorable gentleman must recognise that he is not on a good wicket.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—This duty is higher than that recommended by the protectionist section of the Tariff Commission.

Mr. TUDOR.—I do not think that the Tariff Commission dealt with surface-coated boards.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—We dealt only with surface-coated paper. We were not asked to deal with surface-coated boards.

Mr. TUDOR.—There was probably a misunderstanding. A man who is not familiar with the technicalities of the trade might mistake the one for the other. I do not think that a margin of 5 per cent. is sufficient; but if the Treasurer will not agree to grant a wider margin, it is useless to take action. I may add, however, that if it be possible to reduce the duty on the raw material, I shall vote in that direction.

Mr. MALONEY (Melbourne) [12.17 a.m.].—The last suggestion made by the honorable member for Yarra is well worthy of consideration. If an item relating to the raw material of this manufacturer has been passed and too high a duty fixed, then the Minister should recommit it.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I have had such a dose of the Tariff that I cannot undertake to recommit any item.

Mr. MALONEY.—One cannot blame the Treasurer for the attitude that he takes up, because he has been engaged for a very long time upon a very arduous work. I intend to quote from a letter written by Mr. James McDougall, who is moving in this matter, showing that he seemingly wants a duty of only 15 per cent.

Mr. TUDOR.—A margin of 15 per cent.

Mr. MALONEY.—He does not say so. He writes—

We now only ask for a protection of 15 per cent.

I am credibly informed that the material that I hold in my hand cannot be made in Melbourne under present conditions, and that when Mr. McDougall says that he is making here paper of equal quality, he is telling an absolute untruth. That is the assurance that I have received from men who have to use this material. I have here a few samples of three-colour work printed in America and Australia, and I defy any one to say that the Australian product is not equal to the American. I would point out, however, that it is printed on imported paper. No less than six printers who print in colours assure me that the paper made

by Messrs. Sands and McDougall is not equal to the imported.

Mr. JOHNSON.—The honorable member has the samples and can judge for himself.

Mr. MALONEY.—I can prove that the paper which has been handed to the Comptroller-General is not equal in quality to the imported. Any one who has a fine sense of touch can tell by handling it that the texture of the one is finer than the other. I recognise at the same time that they are making here a very fair paper.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—There is no comparison between the two samples.

Mr. MALONEY.—The honorable member, who knows something about these papers, has just examined my samples.

Mr. MATHEWS.—But he is a free-trader.

Mr. MALONEY.—He knows what he is talking about. We need a fair margin, and if necessary the item covering the raw material should be recommitted. The average Customs officer would probably find it difficult to distinguish between the Australian and the imported paper, but an expert in half-an hour could teach him readily to do so by means of a magnifying glass. If the superior surface-coated board is not and cannot at present be made here, it should be placed on the free list. The firm of Messrs. Sands and McDougall seems to have a dominating influence over the printing community, and if Mr. McDougall would swear that he could make high-class paper equal to the imported we should have no difficulty in deciding the matter. As it is, I prefer to accept the evidence of six witnesses as against that of one. The local firm imports the Manila board—which is dutiable at 5 per cent. and free—and coats it, and it is largely used for making cardboard boxes. It is our duty to see that Australian artists engaged in the colour process work are able to secure the best material in order that they may compete with the rest of the world. We have a multitude of post-cards printed in three colours. I shall endeavour if, as I have been assured, cardboard and pasteboard are not manufactured here, but merely coated after being imported, to get the Senate to reduce the duty. In my opinion, we should follow the example of Japan, and nationalize the paper industry. We should not then hear mean and paltry threats of the dismissal of workmen. I read this afternoon a letter in which Mr. McDougall said that since the Tariff was introduced he could not supply a certain kind of paper for

a month or six weeks, and then only at 5s. above the former price, making it 30s. instead of 25s. a ream. This increase was charged although no duty had been paid on the raw material. I voted under a misapprehension in regard to some of the paragraphs in this item, but had I heard the honorable member for Yarra speak I should have voted differently, and I think that the Committee would have voted differently had it known what it knows now. However, I do not suppose that I shall persuade the Treasurer to agree to a re-committal. I never yet knew a political speech to alter the vote of a member whose mind was made up, and I do not lay the flattering unction to my soul that my speech will do so.

Mr. SPENCE (Darling) [12.28 a.m.].—It seems to me rather too late for the Committee to take exception to a duty of 25 per cent. I understand that the rates arrived at were agreed upon at a conference in which all connected with the trade were represented, and in which Mr. McDougall did not get his own way.

Mr. MALONEY (Melbourne) [12.29 a.m.].—I have been asked who is the artist or printer responsible for the splendid work which I have exhibited to the Committee, and it is only just to state that Messrs. Osboldstone and Atkins printed the Australian pictures.

Proposed new paragraph agreed to.

Paragraph M. Gummed paper, n.e.i., ad val., 20 per cent.

Amendment (by Mr. JOSEPH COOK) negatived—

That the words “and on and after 10th December, 1907, ad val. (United Kingdom), 15 per cent.”

Paragraph agreed to.

Paragraph N (Vesta and match-boxes) agreed to.

Paragraph O. Vesta and Match-boxes having advertisements thereon, empty, per gross, 9d.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [12.33 a.m.].—I think that this duty should be reduced to 3d.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I am willing to consent to a reduction to 6d.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Will the Minister agree to 6d. and 3d.?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—No.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Will the honorable gentleman give any preference?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—No.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Then I move—

That the words “and on and after 10th December, 1907, per gross, 6d.,” be added.

Amendment agreed to.

Paragraph, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraph P (Playing cards) and paragraph Q (Fashion plates and books) agreed to.

Paragraph R. Paper Shavings and Waste Paper for Paper-making (General Tariff), 5 per cent.; (United Kingdom), free.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That after the words “5 per cent.,” the words “and on and after 10th December, 1907 (General Tariff), free,” be inserted.

Paragraph, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraph S (Emery Paper, &c.) agreed to.

Paragraph T. Pulp for manufacturing paper (General Tariff), 5 per cent.; (United Kingdom), free.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That after the words “5 per cent.,” the words “and on and after 10th December, 1907 (General Tariff), free,” be inserted.

Paragraph, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraph U (Roofing, Sheathing and Insulating Paper) agreed to.

Paragraph V. True Vegetable Parchment (General Tariff), 5 per cent.; (United Kingdom), free.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Moreton) [12.36 a.m.].—This is a direct tax of 5 per cent. on the whole of the paper used in the dairying industry, and I ask the Treasurer in the circumstances to make vegetable parchment free.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That after the words “5 per cent.,” the words “and on and after 10th December, 1907 (General Tariff), free,” be inserted.

Paragraph, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraph W (Writing and Typing Paper) agreed to.

Paragraph X. Tissue Cap Paper in sheets, 20 x 30 inches and over (General Tariff), 5 per cent.; (United Kingdom), free.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) proposed—

That the following words be added:—“and on and after 10th December, 1907, Copying, Tissue, and Tissue Cap Paper, and Paper for Paper Patterns in sheets or rolls, not to exceed 9 lbs., for 500 sheets 20 x 30 inches, free.”

Mr. BOWDEN (Nepean) [12.38 a.m.].—I wish to ask the Treasurer whether he is satisfied that if fruit papers are printed with the name and address of the exporter

of apples before they are imported, in accordance with the practice which the honorable member for Franklin has said is adopted, they will be admitted free?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—No; I said they would not.

Amendment agreed to.

Paragraph, as amended, agreed to.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That the following new paragraph be inserted:—

Y. On and after 10th December, 1907, Monotype paper for use in Monotype Machine, free.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) proposed—

That the following new paragraph be inserted:—

Z. On and after 10th December, 1907, Baryta Surface Coated Paper or Board for photographic purposes, free.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [12.40 a.m.].—I wish to know if this paragraph will cover all this special photographic paper. I understand that, although it was free under the old Tariff, the Customs officials have been demanding duty on the heavier paper, on the ground that it is cardboard.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The new paragraph is intended to cover all this photographic paper.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—It is a distinct paper, prepared for photographic purposes, but, although that is admitted, two-ply paper used for postcard photographs has been held to be dutiable.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—It is intended under this new paragraph to make it all free.

Proposed new paragraph agreed to.

Item 353. (A) Stationery, manufactured; including Bill Files and Letter Clips; Cardboard Boxes, cut and shaped, or finished; Mounts for Pictures; Calendars and Almanacs, n.e.i.; Date Cases and Cards; Albums, including Birthday, Scrap, Motto, and Character; Cards, and Booklets, including Printers', Visiting, Menu, Programme, Wedding, Funeral, Christmas, Easter, New Year, and Birthday; Scraps; Transfers; Ink-stands; Ink Bottles; Ink-wells; Paper Knives; Blotters; Blotting Cases and Pads; Billheads and other printed, ruled, or engraved forms of paper n.e.i., bound or unbound; Books—Account, Betting, Cheque, Copy, Copying, Diary, Drawing, Exercise, Guard, Letter, Music, Memo., Pocket, Receipt, Sketch, and the like; Envelopes; Stationery Packets; Wrappers for Writing Paper; Memo. and Sketch Blocks; Memo. Slates and Tablets; Labels, Tags, and Tickets; Sealing and Bottling Wax; Pictures of all kinds n.e.i.; Pencil Cases; Pencils n.e.i.; Pen and Pencil Sets and Penholders n.e.i.;

Fountain Pens; Bookmarkers; Rulers; Writing Desks (not being furniture); Writing Cases; Stationery Cases; Paper Binders; Card Hangers; Pen Racks; Bookbinders' Staples; Charts for manuscript use; Corrugated Strawboard; Strawboard made into bottle envelopes; Paper Lace; Academy Boards; Confetti Paper; Printed Parchment, ad val. (General Tariff), 30 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 25 per cent.

(B) Manufactures of Paper n.e.i., including Printers' Matrices, ad val. (General Tariff), 30 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 25 per cent.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [12.42 a.m.].—I wish to make some alterations in this item. In the first place, I wish to have calendars and almanacs n.e.i. left out, as they have been provided for in a previous item. Then I wish to strike out inkstands, pencils n.e.i., fountain pens and rulers, with the intention of making them free.

Amendments (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That the words "Calendars and Almanacs n.e.i." and "Inkstands" be left out.

That the words "Pictures of all kinds n.e.i." be left out, with a view to insert in lieu thereof the words "Postcards n.e.i."

That the words "Pencils n.e.i.," "Fountain Pens," and "Rulers," be left out.

Mr. BOWDEN (Nepean) [12.46 a.m.].—I suggest to the Treasurer the exclusion of "paper lace" from the item. I understand that lace paper is on the free list, but that is not paper lace, which is used by the makers of boxes and cartons for ornamentation, and so is practically part of their raw material.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I will not omit "paper lace." I have gone as far as I can go, and I shall not go any further. The making of this lace gives a great deal of work.

Mr. BOWDEN.—I move—

That the words "Paper lace" be left out.
Amendment negatived.

Mr. JOHNSON (Lang) [12.50 a.m.].—Academy boards are prepared for students for oil-painting. They are not manufactured here. They are made by Winsor and Newton, the English firm. I move—

That the words "Academy boards" be left out.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I agree to that.
Amendment agreed to.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [12.52 a.m.].—This is a large item, and a number of these articles will never be made here at all. It is really a revenue duty.

In order to arrive at a compromise between the old rates, I move—

That after the words "30 per cent.," the words "and on and after 10th December, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 25 per cent.," be inserted.

I propose to move afterwards for a preferential rate of 20 per cent.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I cannot agree to the amendment. It would bring the rates lower than in the last Tariff.

Mr. STORRER (Bass) [12.54 a.m.].—I hope the Minister will not agree to any reduction, because the item includes many articles that come almost under the same category as furniture, on which we have already agreed to duties of 35 and 25 per cent.

Amendment negatived.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

354. Printing and Stencilling Inks, n.e.i., per lb. or ad val., whichever rate returns the higher duty (General Tariff), 6½d., 30 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 6d., 25 per cent.

Mr. ARCHER (Capricornia) [12.56 a.m.].—I desire to draw attention to an anomaly, or an injustice, in this item. Item 355 makes news printing ink, invoiced at under 3d. per lb., and in packages of not less than 1 cwt., subject to duties of 30 per cent. and 25 per cent.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—And although there has been a duty of 25 per cent. for six years, no one in Australia has tried to make this ink.

Mr. ARCHER.—The point is that the ink used by the proprietors of the big daily papers will come under the duties fixed in item 355, whereas the proprietors of small country papers, for reasons connected with their plant, have to use the better ink, which is worth from 4½d. to 6d. per lb.; and that means that they have to pay a duty varying from 100 per cent. to 130 per cent.

Mr. MAUGER.—They are not using imported ink, but ink made in Australia.

Mr. ARCHER.—That may be so, but why should this distinction be made? It is not just that certain users should pay duties representing 130 per cent., while others pay duties of only 30 per cent. and 25 per cent.; and all I ask is that the whole should be placed under one uniform *ad valorem* impost.

Mr. MAUGER.—An *ad valorem* duty will not reach the ink that we desire to reach.

Mr. ARCHER.—Perhaps the Postmaster-General can tell us why item 355 is placed under duties of 30 per cent. and 25

per cent., with no fixed duty in addition, while item 354 is subject to a fixed duty or an *ad valorem* duty, whichever returns the higher revenue. Will the Treasurer agree to submit all these printing inks to one uniform duty?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—From what I gather, I do not think the inks ought to be under one uniform duty. They are altogether different classes of inks, and those subject to the lower duties are used mainly by the country newspapers.

Mr. ARCHER.—That is just where the Treasurer makes the mistake. I have received numerous appeals from country newspaper proprietors in this connexion; and I may say that the honorable member for Wimmera, who is a newspaper proprietor himself, asked me, before he was obliged to go away, to represent the case on their behalf.

Mr. MAUGER.—The honorable member for Wimmera has changed his opinion.

Mr. ARCHER.—The honorable member for Wimmera came to me the day he left, and showed me requests from the Country Press Association that a uniform duty should be imposed, because the country newspaper proprietors had to use the dearer inks. I desire to move that the words "per lb. 6½d. and 6d.," and "whichever rate returns the higher duty," be omitted with a view to afterwards striking out item 355. My desire is to make all printing and stencilling inks subject to duties of 30 per cent. and 25 per cent., and I desire to know whether the Treasurer will accept the amendment?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—No.

The CHAIRMAN.—I think the question had better be tested by moving to omit the words "per lb."

Amendment (by Mr. ARCHER) proposed—

That the words "per lb." be left out.

Mr. SPENCE (Darling) [1.4 a.m.].—I hope the Committee will not decide to adopt *ad valorem* duties, because the quality of printers' ink can never be ascertained until it is actually in use.

Mr. POYNTON.—Does that not also apply to the ink used by the big newspaper proprietors?

Mr. SPENCE.—There is no question of big or little newspaper proprietors.

Mr. ARCHER.—That is just the point. There is a difference.

Mr. SPENCE.—I am discussing the question of printers' ink. It is urged

that a difficulty is experienced in valuing it. I claim that it may look very well, and yet be of inferior quality. It can be tested only by actual use.

Mr. ARCHER.—If the contention of the honorable member be correct, what is to prevent printers from importing their ink at a low duty under item 355?

Mr. SPENCE.—If we retain a fixed duty it will apply equally to all. There is a difficulty experienced in judging of the quality of printers' ink at the Customs House.

Mr. MCWILLIAMS.—Not more than is experienced in determining the quality of any other article.

Mr. SPENCE.—Yes. Considerably more.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—If we make the duty uniform, the quality of the ink need not be judged at the Customs House.

Mr. SPENCE.—I ask the Government to adhere to a fixed duty.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [1.8 a.m.].—May I point out to the Treasurer that in respect to several other duties of a double-barrelled character, he has consented to adopt a uniform rate. I submit that the same principle should be observed here. The objection urged by the honorable member for Darling to the Government proposal is based upon the difficulty of accurately ascertaining the value of printers' ink. But I would point out to the honorable member that that objection applies equally to the proposed duty, which is part fixed and part *ad valorem*. I trust that the Government will not adhere to this double-barrelled duty. The Treasurer himself has confessed that he does not like it. The duty proposed upon some of the inks amounts to more than 100 per cent. That is a very heavy impost upon an article, the production of which does not require an expensive plant, but merely a knowledge of a recipe, and the making of fluids from certain solubles.

Mr. TUDOR (Yarra) [1.10 a.m.].—The honorable member for North Sydney—I do not know whether he did it with the intention of misleading the Committee—

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—That is a nice insinuation.

Mr. TUDOR.—The honorable member must know that the printing ink used in the large newspaper offices—

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Nobody has been talking about the large newspaper offices.

Mr. TUDOR.—The honorable member for Capricornia spoke of the ink which is specified in the next item—

Mr. STORRER.—Why limit the proposal to large quantities of inks?

Mr. TUDOR.—If the honorable member desires all printing ink to be admitted at an *ad valorem* rate he has his remedy. It must not be forgotten that the manufacturers of ink in the Commonwealth have to pay a duty upon their raw materials. They are required to pay 6s. per gallon upon their resin oil, which is equivalent to an *ad valorem* rate of 60 per cent. or 70 per cent., and they have to pay a similar amount upon their linseed oil.

Mr. ARCHER.—We are willing to accept the Government *ad valorem* proposal as it appears in the schedule.

Mr. TUDOR.—That provides only for the retention of the old rate of duty. I ask the Treasurer to adhere to a fixed duty, especially as there is a heavy duty upon most of the raw materials used in the manufacture of printing inks.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [1.14 a.m.].—I should like to add a few words to what has been said by the honorable member for Capricornia and the honorable member for North Sydney upon this item. My information is that the duty proposed by the Government is equivalent, in some cases, to an *ad valorem* rate of 200 per cent.

3½d. per lb. it must be.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Upon ink at

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—If we force inferior ink upon the country newspapers—as we shall do by the imposition of high duties—it will be at the loss of their readers. These journals should not use the ink that is used by the large newspapers with bad results to the eyes of their readers. For the sake of their readers we ought not to force country newspapers to use cheap inks. The Postmaster-General is referring me to an article which was prepared under special conditions.

Mr. MAUGER.—That shows the quality of the ink.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I am pointing out that an ink which may be perfect in the *Age* office may be of scarcely any use in a small country office. If their ink is taxed to the extent of 200 per cent. it can only tend to drive the proprietors of country newspapers to use an inferior ink. We ought to see if we cannot make the article a little cheaper to them so as to give them the same advantage as the large newspapers

enjoy with their cheaper ink. This is essentially a tax on country newspapers, and as such ought to be discouraged.

Mr. McWILLIAMS (Franklin) [1.17 a.m.].—I assure the Committee that there is no more difficulty in differentiating between the varieties of printers' ink than there is in distinguishing between the varieties of any other imported article. That statement is corroborated by inquiries which I have just made. There can be no doubt that the Treasurer is proposing an extraordinary duty, being practically equal to 100 per cent. Is the Committee prepared to vote that high tax? It has been stated that one of the reasons for keeping the fixed duty was that it was practically impossible for the Department to distinguish between the values of the ink. But I can assure honorable members that that statement is absolutely wrong, as they can ascertain by reference to the officers of the Department. Is it desirable to place a high duty on these inks? In my opinion it is not. A duty of 25 or 20 per cent. is practically the proposal of the Tariff Commission.

Mr. TUDOR.—No, a duty of 6d. per lb., or 25 per cent.

Mr. ARCHER.—The duty proposed in the Tariff is 30 and 25 per cent.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—If it is intended to impose a duty of 30 and 25 per cent. that is going farther than the Tariff Commission recommended. If honorable members give the Department the option of levying a fixed or an *ad valorem* duty it will put those who have to use the dearer inks at a decided disadvantage.

Mr. STORRER (Bass) [1.20 a.m.].—We have really been engaged in discussing two items. Of course I know that stencilling ink is different from printing ink, but what the difference between them is I am not in a position to state at the present time. I do not see why there should be any limitation. If a man wants 50 lbs. of cheap ink he should be in a position to get it just as readily as a man who wants a ton of the article. I trust that the Minister will remove that limitation.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—When we get to that item I will alter it.

Mr. ARCHER (Capricornia) [1.21 a.m.].—A great injustice is sought to be done. It is most objectionable that when strong representations are made from this side the Treasurer and his supporters should merely interject and deny our statements. I have absolute knowledge that what I said is tr—

I am assured that the smaller newspapers have to use the more expensive inks. The Postmaster-General sits on the Treasury bench and shakes his head, but he is not game to get up and show that I am wrong. He expects us to accept his denial, but he cannot rise in his place and give a reason for his action. A small consignment of printers' ink from America was invoiced at £18 18s. 6d., and the duty thereon came to £18 4s., being close to 100 per cent. Evidently the ink was worth 6d. per lb. But would the newspaper in question—the *Rockhampton Bulletin*—pay 6d. per lb. for its ink if it could use ink worth 3d. per lb.?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—Let it buy Australian ink.

Mr. ARCHER.—Let it buy Australian ink if it likes, but is that any argument for making this differentiation? Why is not the same rate of duty imposed? I protest strongly against the differentiation.

Mr. MCWILLIAMS.—The large newspapers print off stereotype and the small newspapers off type.

Mr. ARCHER.—No reason has been advanced why the same rate of duty should not be imposed, and I ask the Treasurer if he cannot meet us to some extent? Earlier in the sitting I went round the chamber and ascertained what honorable members thought of this proposal. If we had a fuller attendance we should carry our point without any difficulty.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Indeed the honorable member would not.

Mr. ARCHER.—I assure the honorable gentleman that we would.

Mr. MAUGER.—No, a number of honorable members changed their minds when they were made acquainted with the facts.

Mr. ARCHER.—I know that a number of honorable members who have gone home paired would have all voted for our proposal. If we are defeated in this thin Committee it will be simply owing to the lateness of the hour. It will certainly not represent the decision of a full Committee. But it will perpetuate a gross injustice to the users of the ink. We are not asking for a lower duty, but for that which the Government proposed in the Tariff originally, namely, 30 and 25 per cent. I do not think that the Treasurer is justified in taking up this stand. He will not even rise and tell us why he is acting in this way. If he wants to stick to a fixed duty, why does he not propose the same rate all round?

Colonel FOXTON (Brisbane) [1.25 a.m.].—I should like to point out, in reply to an interjection made by the Postmaster-General to the effect that if more honorable members had been present and had heard the facts of the case they would have changed their minds, that not one solitary fact has been advanced from the Ministerial side of the chamber. All the facts have been stated by those who support the amendment of the honorable member for Capricornia. Many of the salient facts have been clearly stated by the honorable member for Franklin, who has had practical experience, and who says that if the proposed duty be carried it will have the effect of almost compelling the country newspaper proprietors to use cheaper ink. The effect of this would be that the high duty would defeat its object. A further effect of the duty will operate upon the readers of the country newspapers. I approach this matter in an entirely unbiased frame of mind. I have not been approached in regard to it by any one. All that I know about it has been learnt from reading the circulars which have been issued, and from hearing the speeches of honorable members. It appears to me that the honorable member for Capricornia is quite right in his contention, and I shall vote with him.

Question—That the words "per lb." proposed to be left out stand part of the item (Mr. ARCHER's amendment)—put. The Committee divided.

Ayes	18
Noes	11

Majority	7
----------	-----	-----	---

AYES.

Chapman, Austin	Quick, Sir John
Coon, J.	Salmon, C. C.
Ewing, T. T.	Storrier, D.
Foster, F. J.	Thomson, John
Groom, L. E.	Tudor, F. G.
Lyne, Sir William	Wise, G. H.
Maloney, W. R. N.	
Mathews, J.	<i>Tellers.</i>
Mauger, S.	Cook, Hume
McDougall, J. K.	Watkins, D.

NOES.

Archer, E. W.	Poynton, A.
Cook, Joseph	Sinclair, H.
Foxton, Colonel	Thomson, Dugald
Hedges, W. M.	<i>Tellers:</i>
Johnson, W. E.	Bowden, E. K.
Palmer, A. C.	McWilliams, W. J.

Question so resolved in the affirmative.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. ARCHER (Capricornia) [1.32 a.m.].—I should like to ask the Treasurer

whether he favours a fixed duty as against an *ad valorem* duty?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Yes.

Mr. ARCHER.—Then I shall ask the honorable gentleman to accept a lower duty than 6½d. per lb., which amounts to an enormous impost upon those who use printers' ink. If he insists upon a fixed duty, it would be fair to make it, say, 2d. per lb., which would be about 33½ per cent. Will the Treasurer accept such an amendment?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I am going to endeavour to maintain the proposed duty.

Mr. ARCHER.—Then the Treasurer is going to impose a heavy tax, amounting to over 100 per cent., upon the newspaper proprietors who use the dearer ink, whilst the proprietors of the big metropolitan dailies will not pay more than from 30 to 25 per cent. With the object of, as far as possible, minimizing the injustice, I move—

That after the figures "6½d." the words "and on and after 10th December, 1907, per lb. (General Tariff), 3d.," be inserted.

Question put. The Committee divided.

Ayes	12
Noes	17

Majority	5
----------	-----	-----	---

AYES.

Cook, Joseph
Foxton, Colonel
Hedges, W. M.
Johnson, W. E.
McWilliams, W. J.
Palmer, A. C.
Poynton, A.

Sinclair, H.
Thomson, Dugald
Thomson, John

Tellers:

Archer, E. W.
Bowden, E. K.

NOES.

Chapman, Austin
Coon, J.
Ewing, T. T.
Foster, F. J.
Groom, L. E.
Lyne, Sir William
Maloney, W. R. N.
Mathews, J.
Mauger, S.

McDougall, J. K.
Quick, Sir John
Salmon, C. C.
Storrer, D.
Tudor, F. G.
Watkins, D.
Tellers:
Cook, Hume
Wise, G. H.

PAIRS.

Glynn, P. McM.
Reid, G. H.
Livingston, J.
Kelly, W. H.
Smith, Bruce
Willis, Henry
Brown, Tilley
Fowler, J. M.
Wilks, W. H.
Fuller, G. W.
Atkinson, L.
Wilson, J. G.
Liddell, F.
Hughes, W. M.
Fysh, Sir Philip
Brown, Thomas
Edwards, R.

Batchelor, E. L.
Hall, D. R.
Hutchison, J.
Kingston, C. C.
Sampson, S.
Watson, J. C.
Carr, E. S.
Fairbairn, G.
Webster, W.
Harper, R.
Page, J.
Bamford, F. W.
Chanter, J. M.
Crouch, R. A.
O'Malley, King
Deakin, A.
Fisher, A.

Question so resolved in the negative.

Amendment negated.

Amendment (by Mr. ARCHER) put—

That after the figures "6½d." the words "and on and after 10th December, 1907, per lb. (General Tariff), 4d.," be inserted.

Question put. The Committee divided.

Ayes	3
Noes	18

Majority	15
----------	-----	-----	----

AYES.

Poynton, A.

Tellers.

Cook, Joseph
Johnson, W. E.

NOES.

Chapman, Austin
Coon, J.
Ewing, T. T.
Foster, F. J.
Groom, L. E.
Lyne, Sir William
Maloney, W. R. N.
Mathews, J.
Mauger, S.
McDougall, J. K.

Quick, Sir John
Salmon, C. C.
Storrer, D.
Tudor, F. G.
Watkins, D.
Wise, G. H.

Tellers.

Cook, Hume
Thomson, John.

PAIRS.

Glynn, P. McM.
Reid, G. H.
Livingston, J.
Kelly, W. H.
Smith, Bruce
Willis, Henry
Brown, Tilley
Fowler, J. M.
Wilks, W. H.
Fuller, G. W.
Atkinson, L.
Wilson, J. G.
Liddell, F.
Hughes, W. M.
Fysh, Sir Philip
Brown, Thomas
Edwards, R.

Batchelor, E. L.
Hall, D. R.
Hutchison, J.
Kingston, C. C.
Sampson, S.
Watson, J. C.
Carr, E. S.
Fairbairn, G.
Webster, W.
Harper, R.
Page, J.
Bamford, F. W.
Chanter, J. M.
Crouch, R. A.
O'Malley, King
Deakin, A.
Fisher, A.

In division:

Mr. WATKINS.—Can an honorable member who calls for a division leave the chamber before the vote is taken?

The CHAIRMAN.—I have no power to prevent his doing so. As it appears from the Tellers' lists that there is no quorum present, I must report the matter to the House.

In the House:

No quorum reported.

Mr. Deputy Speaker adjourned the House at 1.55 a.m. (Tuesday).

House of Representatives.

Tuesday, 10 December, 1907.

Mr. SPEAKER took the chair at 3 p.m., and read prayers.

PETITION.

Mr. KNOX presented a petition from a number of electors interested in the sale, use, and production of cinematograph exposed films, praying that the duty imposed on these articles might be removed.

Petition received.

CADETS: PHYSICAL EXAMINATIONS.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—I wish to ask the Minister of Defence, without notice, whether it has been reported to him that at the last King's Birthday Review, held in Adelaide, owing to the fact that the day was very hot, over twenty cadets fainted, and had to be removed from the ground on which the review was held; whether he knows that this has had the effect of rendering the cadet movement to some extent unpopular, and also if he does not see his way to carry out a suggestion already made by me, that cadets should be examined as to their physical fitness before undergoing military training?

Mr. EWING.—I will take into consideration the suggestion made by the honorable member. On general principles, I agree with him as to the necessity for ascertaining the physical fitness of cadets for the work they are asked to perform. Instructions have been given to all the responsible officers in the various States to see that no boy physically unfit for such work is permitted to join the cadets. Further attention will be given to the matter.

PROPOSED TRAINING CAMP AT HEIDELBERG.

Mr. PAGE.—I wish to ask the Minister of Defence, without notice, whether his attention has been directed to the following paragraph in this morning's *Age*, headed, "Training Citizen Soldiers: Field Work Blocked":—

The announcement made last month, with a great flourish of trumpets, by the Victorian District Commandant that the parades for the King's Birthday were to be of a service and not a show nature seems to have exhausted the efforts of the head-quarters' staff in this direction.

Although it was pointed out then that the useful parades were the work of the regimental commanders, it would seem that their attempts to continue this really valuable work are to be rendered nugatory. One of the metropolitan militia infantry regiments, after great trouble and preparation, recently wrote to the District Commandant for leave to hold a moving camp and two nights' bivouac from Heidelberg to Diamond Creek on the coming Foundation Day in January. Nearly 400 of the men had agreed to give the necessary time to the work. They have now been informed that Colonel Stanley will not consent to this programme, and refuses to recommend the expense, which is less than £50. As there are several salary increases to the head-quarters' staff list this year largely exceeding this sum, and as a moving camp is one of the very necessary war condition practices of which the local troops have too little opportunity, it is to be hoped that personal consideration will be given by the Minister to the matter. So keenly do the officers and men on the infantry feel over the incident that if Colonel Stanley remains obdurate they will themselves endeavour to subscribe the amount necessary to carry out a military service too frequently neglected.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Is the honorable member asking a question?

Mr. PAGE.—Yes; I wish to ask whether the Minister's attention has been drawn to the paragraph I have read, and, if so, whether he will inform the House as to the correctness of the statements contained therein, and as to what he intends to do in the matter?

Mr. EWING.—I did see the paragraph referred to, and have asked the Commandant to report in connexion with the matter. I hope to be able to-morrow to inform the House of the action which is, in the circumstances, considered wise.

PAPUA: PURCHASE OF CONFLICT GROUP.

Mr. BAMFORD.—I wish to ask the Attorney-General a question without notice. In view of the fact that the Papua Bill is so low down on the business-paper that it is very unlikely that it can be dealt with this session, in what position does Mr. Wickham stand in reference to the New Guinea Government? He is the gentleman for whom the Bill was practically introduced. He is the lessee of an island on the coast of New Guinea, and I wish to know whether his rights under the lease will be affected by the delay in the passing of the Bill?

Mr. GROOM.—I ask the honorable member to give notice of his question for to-morrow. The position of the matter at present is that, some years ago, Mr.

Wickham took a lease from the New Guinea Administration, under which he had a right to purchase the fee-simple of certain islands. He exercised his option under the contract before the Papua Act of 1905 came into operation, but the deed was not issued. The land law was changed, and no deed in fee simple can be issued. It is open to question whether he has not a claim for compensation against the Government, if they fail to fulfil the contract made with him. The object of the Bill is to enable the Commonwealth Government to fulfil the obligations of the contract.

MARINE SURVEY. NORTH-WEST COAST OF AUSTRALIA.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—I wish to ask the Prime Minister, without notice, whether he has any information which he is in a position to communicate to the House in regard to the proposed marine survey of the North-West coast of Australia? I think that on a previous occasion the honorable gentleman stated that he regarded the survey of the coast of Australia as a work for which the Commonwealth Government is responsible, or, at any rate, should give particular attention to. As a good deal of correspondence has taken place between the State Government of Western Australia, the Admiralty, and the Commonwealth Government, I should be much obliged if the Prime Minister can give the House any information with regard to the position of this very important matter at the present time.

Mr. DEAKIN.—Within the last few days we have agreed with the State Government of Western Australia to expedite the progress of the survey referred to, the Commonwealth and State Governments defraying the cost in equal proportions. We have inquired the earliest date at which the Admiralty can commence the work.

LIGHTING OF CHAMBER.

Mr. JOHNSON.—I desire to ask you, Mr. Speaker, whether there is any chance of improving the electric lighting of the chamber? The present light has had a very bad effect upon my eyes, and several other honorable members have complained that it has affected their sight. Some, I believe, have had to take to wearing glasses. The defective light also has, in some instances, had the effect of causing violent pains across the temples. Is there any probability of

an improvement being made before the sittings are resumed next year?

Mr. SPEAKER.—No complaint had been made to me about this matter until the honorable member for Lang drew attention to it, or I should have taken some steps earlier to improve the lighting. The fact is that the colouring which is used to tint the globes of the electric light gradually deteriorates in use. This makes it necessary that the globes should be taken down each session, and freshly tinted globes substituted. I shall have that done before we meet again next year.

ENLISTMENT: MILITARY FORCES.

MEDICAL EXAMINATION.

Mr. CROUCH.—I desire to ask the Minister of Defence a question without notice. On 8th October last, a promise was made to me that certain information should be supplied as to the enlistment and rejection of recruits for three years. That is not a very large demand, and I should like to ask the Minister whether he can arrange that the district Commandant should, without overworking himself, supply the information, at any rate, within the next few months?

Mr. EWING.—I believe that the question asked by the honorable member was replied to, but not completely. I instructed the Commandant to furnish full information, and I am at a loss to know why that has not yet been done. I shall make inquiries, and inform the honorable member of the result.

SYDNEY-WOLLONGONG TRUNK TELEPHONE.

Mr. FULLER.—I wish to ask the Postmaster-General, without notice, whether the Treasurer has yet approved of the necessary funds being made available for the carrying out of the trunk telephone line from Sydney to Wollongong—a work which was approved months ago?

Mr. MAUGER.—The matter is under the consideration of the Treasurer, and I have no doubt that action will shortly be taken.

TASMANIAN MAIL CONTRACT.

BURNIE-MELBOURNE SERVICE.

Mr. KING O'MALLEY asked the Postmaster-General, *upon notice*—

In view of the promise made by the Union Steamship Company, when the Tasmanian Mail

Contract was entered into, to put the steamer *Oonah* on the Burnie-Melbourne service before the end of 1907, will the Minister insist on that part of the contract being fulfilled, so that the thousands who desire, for the purposes of health and pleasure, to visit Tasmania may, after a journey of only twelve hours' duration, enjoy the bewildering enchantment of the magnificent scenery of Burnie and the surrounding beauty spots of the northern and western portions of the Garden of Eden of the Commonwealth?

Mr. MAUGER.—The answer to the honorable member's question is as follows—

The Union Steam-ship Company advised, under yesterday's date, that the *Oonah*, which was due in Melbourne yesterday afternoon, would at once be laid up in order to undergo her periodical survey, and that, when this was completed, she would take the place of the *Flora* in terms of the contract. Steps will be taken to see that the provisions of the contract are complied with.

MARSHALL ISLANDS, PACIFIC: CLAIM OF BURNS, PHILP & CO.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON asked the Prime Minister, *upon notice*—

1. Regarding cabled extracts from German newspapers as to the counter claims made by Germany as a set-off against Australia's Marshall Islands claim, has any official communication yet been received from the British Government?

2. Is it a fact that Germany received large sums from Great Britain for claims made during the Boer War, which claims were paid promptly, and, it was understood, satisfactorily, by the British Government?

3. Has Germany ever advanced any satisfactory reason why she should not settle the monetary loss sustained through breach of treaty rights in the Pacific, and has Australia any guarantee that she will in the future have protection under such treaties?

4. Has not Germany admitted liability in connexion with the Marshall Islands claim, and, if so, is it comprehensible that there should be serious difficulty in arranging for arbitration to assess the amount of the liability?

Mr. DEAKIN.—The answers to the honorable member's questions are as follows—

1. No reply of any kind has been received from the Colonial Office.

2. The Government have no official information on this subject, but it is believed that the facts are as stated.

3. Germany has not advanced any satisfactory reason that we are aware of, nor does Australia seem to have acquired any better guarantee for future protection under treaties.

4. Germany has not formally admitted liability in connexion with the claim, but offered to pay a sum of money *ex gratia*.

PAY FOR PROCLAIMED HOLIDAYS.

TEMPORARY EMPLOYEES.

Mr. PAGE asked the Postmaster-General, *upon notice*—

1. Whether he has made any arrangement or come to any determination to pay all temporary hands in the employ of his Department for time lost on proclaimed holidays?

2. Will he name the holidays for which payment will be made?

3. If he declines to pay temporary hands for proclaimed holidays, will he allow the men concerned to work on all such holidays, except Christmas Day and Good Friday?

Mr. MAUGER.—In answer to the honorable member's questions, I have to state as follows—

1. This matter is governed by Public Service Regulation 136, which provides that every temporary employé shall be deemed to be subject to the Regulations for the time being for the guidance of officers of the Commonwealth Public Service relating to holidays prescribed by section 72 of the Public Service Act.

2. The holidays (for which payment is made to temporary employes in connexion with permanent employes of the service), as set forth in section 72 of the Public Service Act, are 1st January, Commonwealth Day, Christmas Day and the following day, Good Friday and the following Saturday and Monday, the anniversary of the birth of the Sovereign. Any day proclaimed by the Governor-General or required by any Act to be observed in lieu of the said days. Any days prescribed under the law of any State to be observed in lieu of such days in that State. Any day or part of a day appointed by or proclaimed under the law of a State to be a public holiday or bank holiday or half-holiday throughout such State or in any part of such State. Any specified day or specified part of a day proclaimed by the Governor-General to be kept as a holiday or half-holiday in the public offices of the Commonwealth or in any part thereof.

3. See answer to No. 1.

TELEGRAPHIC DELAYS.

Mr. MAUGER.—In reply to questions asked by the honorable member for Calare, upon notice, on the 6th inst., *vide Hansard*, p. 7117, I have to state that the Deputy Postmaster-General, Sydney, has furnished the following information:—

1. Yes; a communication was received on the 5th inst. from the Chamber of Commerce.

2. The Electrical Engineer reports that the interruptions during October and the early part of November were due to the abnormal conditions prevailing, viz., bush fires and fierce westerly gales. Since fires have been extinguished and the gales have abated, the interruptions have virtually ceased, and those since experienced are no greater than must be expected when length of pole lines and number of wires are considered. The erection of several additional lines is now being arranged for, and in order

to obtain the best possible results from present circuits, line inspectors have for some time past been making a pole-to-pole examination of the principal northern, southern, and western circuits in order to ascertain what is necessary, if possible further to strengthen the lines and prevent interruptions, and the carrying out of portions of this work is now being arranged for.

PIANOS: IMPORTATION.

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—A question was asked recently by the honorable member for Coolgardie regarding the importation of pianos, and it was claimed that some misstatement had been made regarding the information supplied. A mistake was made. It has been put right as far as possible, and I now present the following information:—

It appears that for 1905, 1906, the numbers were not recorded in New South Wales, but estimated only on the basis of previous records. It is, therefore, impossible to give absolutely correct numbers, but numbers have been inserted obtained by dividing the average value—£22—into the total value.

The total values have been checked, and the collector assures me that the average value now given—£22—may be accepted as correct.

Return sent to Mr. Wertheim, on which Mr. Mahon questioned the Minister:—

COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA.

STATE OF NEW SOUTH WALES.

Imports of Pianos from Germany.

	No.	No.	Value. £
1901 ...	3,170	—	74,782
1902 ...	2,392	—	52,026
1903 ...	1,836	—	39,136
1904 ...	2,555	—	54,271
1905 ...	*3,641	†2,629	57,843
1906 ...	*5,380	†3,667	80,672

*Figures originally given, but found to be incorrect.

†Figures deducted as mentioned in memo.

COUNT-OUT: RESUMPTION OF BUSINESS.

Motion (by Mr. DEAKIN) agreed to—

That, anything to the contrary in the Standing Orders notwithstanding, the House do immediately resolve itself into the Committee of Ways and Means, and that business be resumed at the point which it had reached at the last sitting.

TARIFF.

In Committee of Ways and Means
(Consideration resumed from 9th December, *vide* page 7247):

Item XIII.—Paper and Stationery.

Division 354. Printing and Stencilling Inks, n.e.i., per lb. (General Tariff), 6½d.; (United

Kingdom), 6d.; or ad val. (General Tariff), 30 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 25 per cent.; whichever rate returns the higher duty.

Upon which Mr. ARCHER had moved by way of amendment—

That after the figures "6½d.," the words "and on and after 10th December, 1907, per lb. (General Tariff), 4d.," be inserted.

Mr. ARCHER (Capricornia) [3.18].—It is necessary that I should again discuss this item. I explained the position fully this morning, but at such an early hour, and with so many honorable members necessarily absent, that the majority now present could not have heard any of the arguments adduced, whilst some of those who were present then did not hear them because they were so fatigued that they were asleep. The whole point of the matter lies in this and the next item. Item 355 provides—

News Printing Ink, invoiced at under 3d. per lb., and in packages of not less than 1 cwt., ad val. (General Tariff), 30 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 25 per cent.

The news printing ink mentioned in that item is the same as the printing ink mentioned in item 354, but that class of ink which is invoiced at under 3d. per lb. and in packages of not less than 1 cwt. is used by the very large papers, who can import and use ink in large quantities.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—A hundredweight is not a large quantity.

Mr. ARCHER.—My authority is the honorable member for Wimmera, who is a newspaper man, and also obtained information from the Country Press Association. He assures me that the proprietors of the smaller newspapers do not like to get their inks in quantities of 1 cwt., because they use it slowly, and, as it deteriorates, it does not pay them to do so. My information comes not only from the honorable member for Wimmera, but from individual newspaper proprietors who are entirely disinterested parties, and are technical experts on the question of printing. The honorable member for Wimmera, as he could not be present, has asked me to take up the case on behalf of the Country Press Association. As I said last night, the ink for the great newspaper proprietors is admitted at 30 per cent. and 25 per cent., but the small proprietors, who, owing to technical difficulties, have to use more expensive ink, costing from 4d. to 6d. per lb., are subject to duties ranging from 100 to 130, and even 200 per cent. One invoice which I have

here shows that the landed cost of a small consignment of ink was £18 18s. 6d., and that the duty amounted to £18 4s., or practically 100 per cent. I appealed to the Treasurer to place all printers' inks on a common basis by making them subject to the duties proposed in item 355, namely, 30 per cent. and 25 per cent., but he declined to accept the suggestion. Various members on the Government side shook their heads, reminding me very forcibly of those images which nod when they are touched; but not one was "game" to attempt to refute my statements. I have taken some interest in this matter, and I know, as well as such a thing can be known, that a majority of honorable members saw the justice of the proposition which I advanced, and were prepared to support my proposal. Unfortunately, the settlement of the question was delayed so late that many honorable members had been obliged to pair and go away; and when I saw that the Government were determined to force their proposal through on a minority vote, I got disgusted and marched out of the chamber, followed by other honorable members.

Mr. WISE.—After calling for a division! It was distinctly against the Standing Orders.

Mr. ARCHER.—As a matter of fact, I know very little of the Standing Orders. I asked that all inks should be placed on one basis, and was not particular whether the duties chosen were *ad valorem* or fixed. I hope that to-day the Committee will see that justice is done. Last night I moved that the fixed rate should be omitted, but failed, and I also failed in having the duty reduced to 3d. I then moved the duty should be 4d.

Mr. MAUGER.—And then the honorable member walked out!

Mr. ARCHER.—Yes, as a protest against the Government attempting to force through an unjust proposal on what they knew to be a minority vote.

Mr. FRAZER (Kalgoorlie) [3.27].—For the best part of an hour yesterday afternoon I listened to the Treasurer explaining a difficulty which had arisen in regard to amendments. One portion of the speech was a sermon and another portion an appeal, and the whole was directed to showing that no power would force him to accept differential treatment of newspaper proprietors in relation to the duty on news paper. The honorable gentleman declared that all newspapers must be treated alike—

that there must be no discrimination as between the large newspaper proprietors and small newspaper proprietors. In the item now under discussion, however, there is a discrimination, not in favour of the small proprietor, but in favour of the large proprietor; and we have no sermon or appeal from the honorable gentleman about being forced into a false position. On the contrary, the Treasurer is seeking, by sheer force of numbers, to bring about that discrimination which he so violently denounced yesterday. There is now an opportunity presented to the Government to carry out a declared policy of treating all sections of the community alike.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—At any rate, we ought not to favour the large proprietors.

Mr. FRAZER.—I am opposed to favouring any man. Yesterday the Treasurer declaimed in the most magnificent fashion against the proposal of the honorable member for Coolgardie. The honorable member for Barrier assured the Treasurer of his support with a true protectionist's vote in order that all the newspaper proprietors might be treated alike; but that offer was not deemed satisfactory. It must be admitted that when the Treasurer voted in favour of a duty on news paper, he appeared to be about the most dissatisfied man in the chamber. If the Committee determine to adopt a fixed in preference to an *ad valorem* duty, I trust that it will be made to apply both to this item and to the next. I am satisfied that a satisfactory ink is being produced in Australia, and I am prepared to extend to it a reasonable measure of protection. But not a tittle of evidence has been forthcoming to warrant us in discriminating in favour of the large newspaper proprietors.

Mr. FULLER.—I rise to a point of order. I wish to draw attention to the fact that the honorable member for Melbourne is not at present in the chamber.

The CHAIRMAN.—Does the honorable member think that that is a point of order?

Mr. FULLER.—In view of the notice of motion which the honorable member for Melbourne has given, I do.

The CHAIRMAN.—It is no point of order.

Mr. FRAZER.—I am innocent of the reason which prompted the honorable member for Illawarra to interrupt me. I do

not quite appreciate the connexion between printing and stencilling inks and the presence of the honorable member for Melbourne in the chamber. Personally, I do not intend in connexion with Tariff legislation to discriminate in favour of any section of the community. It appears to me that the Government proposal is a most flagrant attempt to confer an advantage upon the printer who imports ink in large quantities, as against the individual who imports it in small quantities because his needs are small. In view of the magnificent and sustained appeal which the Treasurer made yesterday, when he declared that he was absolutely opposed to anything that might even be considered a discrimination, he should, in common fairness, adopt the principle which he then advocated in respect of this item.

Mr. PALMER (Echuca) [3.34].—I intend to vote in favour of extending equal treatment to every employer engaged in the printing business. A little episode occurred last night, and I wish to say, as a matter of personal explanation, that I was extremely anxious that nothing should be done which would confer an advantage upon the metropolitan newspaper proprietors, as compared with their country brethren. I believe that in a full Committee the vote would go in favour of the country press. Had a division been taken last evening, however, I am satisfied that it would have gone against the country press. It was for that reason that I voluntarily left the chamber. I might have been seen walking out of the vestibule arm-in-arm with the honorable member for Capricornia. I absolutely deny the suggestion that I was forcibly detained outside the chamber. In regard to the item immediately under consideration, it is incumbent upon me to do all that I possibly can to prevent Tariff discrimination in favour of the city press. I shall therefore vote for the lowest possible rate of duty.

Mr. TUDOR (Yarra) [3.37].—When this item was being discussed this morning, many honorable members were labouring under a misapprehension. Indeed, I believe that a majority still imagine that it relates to news printing ink. As a matter of fact, it does not. It relates to printing and stencilling inks, *n.e.i.*, news printing ink being specifically mentioned in the next item. The honorable member for Capricornia has stated that printing and stencilling inks can be purchased for 3d. per lb.

Mr. ARCHER.—I said that the ink used by the large printing firms can be purchased for that amount.

Mr. TUDOR.—As a matter of fact, it cannot. The ink with which we are now dealing is known as letterpress ink and lithographic and printing ink, and is used in connexion with the better class of printing.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—It is the ink that is used in country newspaper offices.

Mr. TUDOR.—The honorable member for South Sydney and the honorable member for Hindmarsh, who are practical printers, declare that that is not the case.

Mr. CROUCH.—What about the inclusion of the words, "and in packages of not less than 1 cwt." in item 355?

Mr. TUDOR.—The Treasurer has promised to eliminate those words, but I am not sure that in so doing he will be taking a wise step. I hold in my hand the catalogue of an English firm, which quotes the cost of the various classes of ink with which we are now dealing. As regards black letterpress inks, the prices per dozen lbs. run as follow:—Poster from 4s. to 12s., jobbing from 9s. to 18s., book work from 12s. to 30s., and blue-black from 18s. to 60s.

Mr. ARCHER.—The honorable member is not quoting the prices of news printing ink.

Mr. TUDOR.—I am quoting the prices of ordinary printing and stencilling inks, which come under this item, whereas news printing ink comes under the next item. If we take the other colours of printing ink, which are admitted by every one to be more expensive, we find that the price of red runs from 12s. to 36s. per dozen lbs., blue from 3s. to 7s. 6d. per lb., magenta, maroon, and others from 3s. 6d. to 10s. per lb., and cobalt 30s. per lb. The prices of the inks vary, and that is the reason why a differential duty has been proposed. I believe that had this information been known to honorable members generally last night there would not have been a misunderstanding, and we should not now be dealing with the duty on the ink which is used by the newspapers in the electorate of the honorable member for Capricornia. I am just as anxious as any one to safeguard the interests of small country newspapers. I suppose that more country newspapers are printed in my electorate than in any other, because all the supplements for the country press of Victoria are printed there.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—Is printing or stencilling ink made here?

Mr. TUDOR.—The better class of ink is made in Melbourne. Within half a mile of this building the honorable member can procure locally-made ink up to 10s. per lb. The colours and the oils are imported, and bear a duty. The proposal of the Government is only fair to the makers of the higher classes of ink. I suggest that the Committee should agree to the proposal of the Government regarding this item, and deal with the question of news printing ink on the next item.

Mr. MAHON (Coolgardie) [3.43].—In view of the growth of illustrations the ink industry will expand rapidly. It ought to find occupation for a large number of persons. I was not in the Chamber when the honorable member for Capricornia was speaking, but I understand that he is under the impression that this item deals with the ink used by newspapers.

Mr. ARCHER.—I can only tell the honorable member that, under this item, proprietors of newspapers are paying a duty equal to 100 per cent. on the ink which they use in printing them.

Mr. WATSON.—They do not use this kind of ink in printing their newspapers.

Mr. MAHON.—A newspaper publishing illustrations, such as those I hold in my hand, would use the ink which is covered by this item, but not an ordinary newspaper. I hope that the Government will adhere to the duty on these inks, which are fairly expensive and can be made here. Their manufacture already gives employment to a large number of persons, and promises to provide additional employment. There is not the slightest reason why the duty should be lowered if the Government mean to give any encouragement to the industry.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The honorable member hopes that they will stick to the duty of 6d. per lb. on this ink.

Mr. MAHON. I do, as it is not a one-man industry. The ink is made in Melbourne, Sydney, and other places throughout Australia.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I thought that the honorable member did not believe in high duties.

Mr. MAHON.—I do not call this a high duty.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—It is over 100 per cent.

Mr. MAHON.—The honorable member is making a mistake.

Colonel FOXTON.—Not at all. Here is a receipt for the duty, showing that it is equal to 98 per cent. on the value of the article.

Mr. MAHON.—That may be for an inferior class of ink.

Colonel FOXTON.—That duty was paid on the ink used in printing the *Rockhampton Bulletin*.

Mr. MAHON.—Everything that is used in Queensland must, apparently, be allowed to come in at a low duty.

Mr. ARCHER.—The point is that, with the exception of writing ink, any ink costing over 3d. per lb., no matter whether it be printing, news printing, or other sort of ink, will come in under item 354.

Mr. MAHON.—All the inks to which the honorable member refers are expensive.

Mr. ARCHER.—Some of them cost over 3d. per lb.

Mr. MAHON.—The duty is not excessive. As one who knows something about this business, I urge the Government to stick to this duty.

Mr. WILSON (Corangamite) [3.46].—Unfortunately, I was not present this morning when that regrettable incident took place which prevented this item from being dealt with. As I had been travelling all day, I paired with the honorable member for Moreton, and went home. I understood at the time that he was in favour of allowing ink to come in at a lower rate, but whether he meant the ink covered by this item, or the ink covered by the next item, I cannot say definitely. It is certain, however, that the proprietor of a small newspaper has had to pay a duty equal to 100 per cent. on the ink which he has imported under item 355, and which has cost him more than 3d. per lb. There is no getting away from that fact.

Mr. McDUGALL.—But, according to the honorable member's argument, the duty is always passed on to the consumer.

Mr. WILSON.—The honorable member ought to have sense enough to know that in the case of newspapers a duty cannot be passed on, except, perhaps, to the advertiser. The reader certainly cannot be charged 1½d. for a penny newspaper. I know that the honorable member is an authority on some questions connected with newspapers. For instance, he has published a series of his verses in the newspapers.

Mr. PAGE.—No fear, he did not publish them.

Mr. WATSON.—They were very good verses, anyhow.

Mr. WILSON.—If that is the honorable member's view, I make him a present of the verses.

The CHAIRMAN.—Will the honorable member address his remarks to the item?

Mr. WILSON.—I submit, sir, that my remarks are entirely relevant, because the item deals generally with the question of printing ink, and, incidentally, with ink slinging. Of course, the particular kind of ink that is "slung" when one is writing prose or verse is a writing ink.

Mr. PAGE.—The honorable member should try his hand with it.

Mr. WILSON.—Some day I may write an ode to the honorable member for Maranoa.

Mr. PAGE.—I hope not.

Mr. WILSON.—But I trust that the honorable member will have gone to his last resting-place before I do. Otherwise my verses would soon drive him there. I think that the Treasurer ought to allow the item to be recommitted in order that the Committee may be able to express an opinion as to whether the duties of 6½d. and 6d. per lb. should not be left out with a view to fixing an *ad valorem* duty. The Minister might very well agree to *ad valorem* duties of 30 and 25 per cent. Does he want to impose a duty amounting to 100 per cent. upon ink that is used by newspaper proprietors in small country towns? A letter in my possession proves that a man in a country town has actually paid duty amounting to 100 per cent. I presume that he did not import ink to drink it. He bought it to use in his office. This and the next item place those who use ink at under 3d. per lb. at a decided advantage as compared with those who use ink at over 3d. If the Treasurer will allow the item to be recommitted, whatever *ad valorem* duty is imposed by the Committee we will willingly accept.

The CHAIRMAN.—The Committee has already decided to leave in the words which the honorable member desires to have struck out.

Mr. WILSON.—There was a regrettable incident at about 2 o'clock this morning which proved that there was not a quorum present when a division was taken.

Mr. WISE.—There was.

The CHAIRMAN.—The honorable member must not discuss that point.

Mr. WILSON.—The item was not dealt with when there were a sufficient number of

honorable members present to decide the duty properly. I wish to secure an opportunity for a full Committee to express an opinion as to whether a fixed or an *ad valorem* duty should be imposed. With that object I move that the item be recommitted.

The CHAIRMAN.—The honorable member cannot move to that effect at this stage.

Mr. WATSON (South Sydney) [3.54].—There has been a good deal of talk amongst honorable members about placing small and large newspapers on the same footing. It appears to me that remarks of that character in relation to the present item indicate a false assumption. Whether the duty should be 6d. per lb. or 30 and 25 per cent. *ad valorem* is a question quite apart from the assumption that the duty as proposed differentiates between small and large newspapers. It does nothing of the sort. News printing ink, whether used on a rotary machine by the proprietor of a large newspaper, or on a Wharfedale machine by the proprietor of a small newspaper, is just the same class of news ink.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—It is possible to use a lower quality of ink on stereo than on straight type, as the honorable member ought to know.

Mr. WATSON.—As long as it is employed on a letterpress machine, the same class of ink can be used for the printing of a small or a large newspaper.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—All the large newspapers stereo. They do not print from type.

Mr. WATSON.—That does not make any essential difference.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—Yes; it does.

Mr. WATSON.—When I speak of letterpress, I mean the term to include stereotype matter. Of course, in jobbing work, and in printing illustrations, a better class of ink must be used, as well as a better class of paper, whilst there must be more careful machining. It is impossible to work at the same speed when doing such work as the illustrated portion of the *Australasian* or the *Sydney Mail*, or in printing a newspaper like the *Bulletin*, as in printing an ordinary newspaper. Good ink must be used, and there must be careful machining. But a country newspaper and a city newspaper can use the same class of ink for letterpress work. The universal practice of the proprietors of country newspapers, so far as my knowledge of their methods

goes, is to order their ink from one or other of the printers' furnishing houses like Cowan and Company, or Wimble, who import in large quantities. The newspaper proprietors do not import directly, but buy their ink as they want it. It is not worth their while to import. In fact, it is only the largest newspaper proprietors who bother to import directly.

Mr. MCWILLIAMS.—The honorable member knows that the duty will be passed on to the man who buys.

Mr. WATSON.—Quite so; I am quite aware of that. But so far as the question of the packages is concerned, the rate at which the small newspaper men will get their ink will not be affected.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Why should we have a duty amounting to 150 per cent. for the cheaper ink, and only 25 per cent. for expensive ink?

Mr. WATSON.—The honorable member has put the case in the wrong way. The lower duty is on the cheap ink, that is merely used for newspaper purposes; but the superior class of ink is used for jobbing and for printing illustrations and special work. Inks must be over a certain value before the extra duty is imposed.

Mr. WILSON.—Thirty people at least have had to pay 6d. per lb. on ink costing 3d. per lb.

Mr. WATSON.—Just so.

Mr. ARCHER.—For newspaper purposes.

Mr. WATSON.—I have not heard of a newspaper proprietor who pays 3d. per lb. for newspaper ink. They may use it for jobbing purposes, but for newspaper purposes, I have not heard of such a case.

Mr. WILSON.—I can prove it to the honorable member.

Mr. WATSON.—I should say that the honorable member's friend is a very foolish man if he uses ink at 3d. per lb. for that purpose.

Mr. MCWILLIAMS.—The honorable member for Yarra quoted a case.

Mr. WATSON.—That was in relation to special ink for jobbing purposes.

Mr. FRAZER.—If we can make the expensive inks in Australia, can we not make the cheaper classes?

Mr. WATSON.—We might be able to do so, but not very readily. News printing ink, in order to be dutiable at the lower rate, must be invoiced at less than 3d. per lb. in the country of origin, and since it is sold in Melbourne and Sydney at 3½d. per lb. after payment of

freight and other charges, it should not be difficult to import it at less than 3d. per lb.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—This duty is 6c. per lb., not 6d. per cwt.

Mr. WATSON.—That is so; but some printing inks are very expensive, and it would be an easy matter to deceive the Customs Department as to their value. Manufacturers of ink in Australia, of whom there is quite a number, have to pay a fairly heavy duty on some, at all events, of their raw material.

Mr. ARCHER.—They have not to pay a duty of 100 per cent., like that imposed upon this ink.

Mr. WATSON.—It is not 100 per cent.

Mr. ARCHER.—I shall prove that the duty is more than 100 per cent.

Mr. WATSON.—I prefer to be guided by my own knowledge of the trade, rather than by any statement on the part of others. Ink used for news printing purposes will come in under item 355.

Mr. ARCHER.—That is a mere assertion.

Mr. WATSON.—I happen to know a little about the printing trade, and I have no hesitation in making this statement. Printing ink manufacturers in Australia have to pay a duty of 6d. per gallon on linseed oil, which at present is not being produced in any quantity in Australia.

Mr. ARCHER.—We do not grudge them a duty of 30 per cent. and 25 per cent. on the finished article.

Mr. WATSON.—I do not think that those duties are sufficient in the case of the better classes of ink. The possibility of arranging invoices is such that printing inks have been known to come in at rates far below their true value. The statement that this proposal will be an unfair handicap on country newspapers is utterly without foundation. I do not care very much whether a fair *ad valorem* or a fixed duty is carried, but I do not think that a duty of 25 per cent. will be sufficient.

Mr. SPENCE (Darling) [4.5].—I feel confident that had the Government in framing the Tariff put all inks in the one item, the position would have been different. There would certainly have been a great hubbub raised outside, for there is a very distinct difference between inks used even for the rougher classes of job-printing and ordinary news printing ink. It would appear that the honorable member

for Corangamite has a friend who has been buying high-class job printing ink.

Mr. WILSON.—No; he purchased the ink for printing a newspaper.

Mr. SPENCE.—Apparently he has purchased for that purpose ink generally used for job printing. I do not know why we should disarrange the Tariff because some one has been so foolish as to use high-class job printing inks for newspaper printing purposes.

Mr. ARCHER.—Did not the honorable member say last night that it would be just to impose a level duty?

Mr. SPENCE.—I supported the imposition of a fixed as well as an *ad valorem* duty, saying that the Customs officers could not determine the true value of printing inks. There are some inks which even an amateur would recognise as being of high quality, and to those the *ad valorem* duty, as being the higher of the two duties, would apply.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—If that is the whole trouble, let us try a lower instead of a higher duty.

Mr. SPENCE.—I understand that the fixed duty has been passed.

Mr. WILSON.—No.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—It was decided last night that there should be a fixed duty.

Mr. ARCHER.—On a minority division.

Mr. SPENCE.—Then I hope the Treasurer will stand by his proposal. It is asserted on the very best authority—and I think that the statement will be supported by officers of the Department—that it is difficult to assess the true value of job printing inks.

Mr. ARCHER.—I understand that the Customs officers deny the statement. Has the honorable member obtained his information from the Department?

Mr. SPENCE.—No; but I think it will be borne out by the Department. It is necessary to have a fixed duty to keep out the cheap rubbish.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The honorable member does not seem to recognise that the Government propose an *ad valorem* duty on both items.

Mr. SPENCE.—I am supporting the line as it stands. These inks will be subject to an *ad valorem* duty as well as a fixed duty, and whichever is the higher duty will have to be paid. Printing ink of first class quality is being made in the Commonwealth, and we should give the manufacturers the protection that other industries have secured. The honorable

member for South Sydney has clearly shown that news printing ink is altogether different from that used for job printing purposes; and I fail to see how the Tariff could have been better framed to give full consideration to all parties concerned. There is nothing to complain about. It may be that some one has been called upon to pay duty under the wrong item—that some one has paid the higher duty on news ink—but such a mistake is not likely to be made very often.

Mr. ARCHER.—Nevertheless, it is done.

Mr. SPENCE.—The honorable member seems to know of a case, but I do not think that any one else does. Most practical printers will say that these two inks are used for different kinds of work. Printing ink made locally does good work. I know an establishment where tons of Australian ink are used, and it gives every satisfaction.

Mr. STORRER (Bass) [4.12].—As we had a long discussion on the subject of inks at the last sitting, and honorable members seem to have pretty well made up their minds, I hope that the debate will not be prolonged. The Minister has agreed to omit the limitation regarding packages of not less than 1 cwt., and he is also inclined to accept a compromise which I suggested, making the duties 5d. and 4½d. per lb. I shall vote for those rates.

Mr. MAHON (Coolgardie) [4.13].—I have a suggestion to make which, if adopted, will, I think, meet the case put by the honorable member for Capricornia and others. It is to substitute the figure 6d. for the figure 3d. in item 355.

Mr. ARCHER.—Why not impose the same duty on all printing inks?

Mr. MAHON.—I am going more than half way to meet the honorable member. He complains that certain ink is dutiable under item 354 at over 100 per cent. *ad valorem*, but if the alteration which I suggest is made, such ink will be dutiable as news printing ink invoiced at under 6d. per lb. The proposed alteration should be acceptable to all parties.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [4.15].—I think that the suggestion of the honorable member for Coolgardie does not meet the difficulty. It assumes that items 354 and 355 deal only with such printing inks as are used for country newspapers. Does the honorable member propose the omission of the words "and in packages of not less than 1 cwt."?

Mr. CROUCH.—The Minister has agreed to the omission of those words.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Notwithstanding what has been said by the honorable members for South Sydney and Coolgardie, one of whom was formerly engaged in the setting of type, and the other in reporting for newspapers, those whose business it is to sell ink take a different view. A well-known firm, which deals largely in this commodity, has written to me on the subject in these terms—

Please bear in mind that all inks used by the larger newspapers come out in big casks, varying from 3 cwt. to 4 cwt., and it is really a different kind of ink to that used by the smaller newspapers; it is what is called Rotary Ink, and is used for printing newspapers on the big rotary machines—altogether different to that used by the smaller newspapers on their flat-bed machines. The majority of the newspapers in Australia use the stiffer ink, and it is invariably sold to them in tins varying from 12 lbs. up to $\frac{1}{2}$ cwt. tins or packages. The smaller newspapers could not take large packages because it would take them so long a time to use it up, and dust and dirt gets into the ink and spoils it—hence their reason for getting the small packages.

The average price the smaller newspapers pay for their ink is over 3d. Under the proposed item they would have to pay—according to my reading of this item—a duty of 6d. per lb. for British-made ink. Assuming, therefore, they are paying 4d. per lb. now for their ink, it would cost them to use this British-made ink 10d. to 10d. per lb.

Mr. CROUCH.—Does not that letter speak of the average price of ink as 4d. per lb.?

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Between 3d. and 4d. per lb.

Mr. CROUCH.—Then the proposed amendment would meet the firm concerned?

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The firm in question desires that the ink which we are now considering shall be reduced in duty, so that the country newspapers may not have to pay too highly for it. They cannot use the inferior ink which is used in connexion with the large rotary machines in the offices of the big metropolitan dailies. I hope that the duty will be reduced.

Mr. ARCHER (*Capricornia*) [4.20].—We have had a great deal of what is assumed to be expert evidence from certain members of the Committee who have been connected with the printing trade. I do not know in what capacity they were connected with it, but admittedly some of them have not been connected with the trade for many years, and it is quite possible that important changes may have taken place in the meantime. However that may be, I have facts to bring before the Committee

which absolutely refute many of the statements that have been made. The proprietors of a certain newspaper—and though I have authority to do so I need not mention the name unless honorable members desire it—have in bond 2,000 lbs. of ink invoiced at 3d. per lb., of which they have not yet been able to get possession because of this duty of 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ d. per lb., which is equivalent to an impost of 213 per cent. I ask the Minister to say whether that statement is not a fact.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not know. I never heard of it.

Mr. MAHON.—I should say that it is an error.

Mr. ARCHER.—I can say that it is a fact.

Mr. WATSON.—How can the honorable member say for what purpose the ink referred to is to be used?

Mr. ARCHER.—It is intended to be used for the printing of the *War-Cry*.

Mr. WATSON.—The proprietors of the *War-Cry* do a lot of jobbing printing.

Mr. ARCHER.—I think I can take the word of the people who imported the ink as to the purpose for which it was imported.

Mr. MAUGER.—They should use ink made in Australia.

Mr. CROUCH.—Is it imported from Japan, or where?

Mr. ARCHER.—I do not know where it was imported from. It is what is called the “news” quality of ink, and I should like to ask the honorable member for South Sydney to say whether that is not the quality of ink commonly used for the printing of newspapers.

Mr. WATSON.—Yes, it is.

Mr. ARCHER.—This ink is invoiced at 3d. per lb., and those who have imported it cannot get it out of bond unless they pay a duty of 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ d. per lb. on it. That fact completely justifies the stand honorable members on this side have taken in this matter. I know the proprietors of other newspapers complain that they cannot get the ink they require without paying a duty equivalent to anything from 100 per cent. up to 250 per cent. That is a gross injustice, but I have little hope that the Minister will be prepared to recommit the item.

Mr. CROUCH.—The proposed amendment will meet the honorable member's objection.

Mr. ARCHER.—It might to a certain extent, but in the first place I say that the duties are too high; in the next place I do

not believe in fixed duties at all; and in the third place, if we are to do anything in this matter, we should in the next item strike out the weight limit, which I understand the Minister said last night he was prepared to do.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I was prepared to do that last night.

Mr. ARCHER.—It is only the proprietors of very big newspapers who can afford to import this ink in large quantities, because if it has to be kept for any length of time it deteriorates in value. I have mentioned a fact which cannot be disputed—that an ink imported for the purpose of printing a newspaper cannot be got out of bond except on the payment of duty representing 233 per cent. on the invoice price.

Mr. HUTCHISON (Hindmarsh) [4.25].—The matter referred to by the honorable member for Capricornia has no bearing upon the first item. But I should like to say that I think no great hardship is done to the proprietors of the *War-Cry* when it is remembered that they might have procured the ink they require right on the spot.

Mr. CHANTER.—The subscribers to their newspaper are here.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—That is so. I shall be very glad if in the future, as a result of the duty, they are obliged to look inside the Commonwealth for their ink as well as for their pennies. That would be only a fair thing, and, in fact, it is the whole purpose of the duty to bring that state of affairs about. Those who say that the more highly-priced inks are required for the printing of country newspapers know nothing about the business.

Mr. ARCHER.—That is a silly, wild, statement to make.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—I have been connected with the printing trade for over thirty-five years; and as an employer in the trade for many years I have used a good deal of Australian ink.

Mr. ARCHER.—The men who are importing ink have also been in the trade for thirty-five years, and are in it still.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—I have used ink imported from the Old Country, and I have also used Wimble's inks. I have found Wimble's cheap inks good enough for the printing of newspapers, and equal to what I could get abroad for the same purpose. I was not, of course, in a big way of business, and if I required a small quantity of ink of a certain quality I had to pay a little more for it; but the ordi-

nary news ink is imported in large quantities even by small printing concerns. It would be absurd to use a first-class ink for the printing of a newspaper.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—Would the honorable member use the same ink on a stereo., that is used only once, as on type that is used for over twelve months?

Mr. HUTCHISON.—Very often.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—Then the honorable member does not know much about the business, no matter how long he has been in the trade.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—We could not expect good work with cheap ink on poor paper. The quality of the paper must be taken into account; and good rolled paper would be required on which to produce illustrations effectively. I should be inclined to favour the amendment of the honorable member for Coolgardie; but I think the recommendation of the protectionist section of the Tariff Commission, 6d. per lb., or 25 per cent., whichever is higher, is a reasonable one. There are extraordinary variations in the prices of inks. I have here a price-list from T. Bigsby and Son, of London, in which quotations are given for what purports to be first-class coloured inks. I find that ultramarine blue is quoted at 1s. for letterpress ink and 1s. 6d. for lithograph ink. I maintain that that is pure dumping. I have here also the price-list of Slater and Palmer, of London, which was referred to by the honorable member for Yarra. Their price for ultramarine blue is 5s. for letterpress ink, and 6s. for lithograph ink of the best quality. They quote prices for another quality of ink of the same shade—letterpress 3s. 6d., lithograph 4s. 6d. per lb. I can defy, not merely any Customs officer, but any printer or even any ink manufacturer, to tell me, on seeing printing done by a first-class printer on first-class paper with a first-class machine, whether the price of the ink used was 1s. 6d., 3s. 6d., or 4s. 6d. per lb. We can produce all the inks we require in Australia if we give our local manufacturers sufficient protection. I am sorry that the recommendation of the Tariff Commission was not adopted. I think in the circumstances it would be better to leave this item as it stands, and to fix the duties on the next item at 5d. and 4½d.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I am prepared to do that.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—We should do what we can to assist an industry that has

already been established in the Commonwealth, but which would be destroyed if the views of honorable members opposite were given effect to.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [4.31].—We have had a very long debate on this matter last night and to-day. I think it is my duty to stand by the duties as proposed, and to carry them or duties as nearly their equivalent as possible. I admit that those who have been nearly all their lives intimately connected with the working of newspapers should know something about what is necessary. The duties set out in the Tariff have been proposed at the instance of those who are supposed to know what they are talking about.

Mr. ARCHER.—The manufacturers of ink.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Indeed, no. I think all parties concerned were consulted by the Comptroller-General, and I believe there was no objection urged against the proposal made in the Tariff. I wish to point out that this proposal emanated in the first place from the A section of the Tariff Commission.

Mr. ARCHER.—From the manufacturers again.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—No, from the evidence.

Mr. ARCHER.—Of the manufacturers. The consumers never had a say.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I should not like to say that. As I have never had much to do with ink-slinging, I do not profess to understand the technical details connected with this question. But I could not accept the proposal made last night, as it would involve practically the remission of the duty altogether.

Mr. ARCHER.—Even though the Department had no objection.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not know whether the officers of the Department had any objection to the proposal last night or not. I had to be guided by the Tariff before me; and although the honorable member might have thought there was something personal in what happened, as a matter of fact it was not so, and I was merely standing by the duty proposed by the Government on recommendations made by experts. I am, however, glad to have heard the debate to-day, and am quite prepared to accept suggestions from those who know something of the subject.

Mr. ARCHER.—That is why we wished to have the matter postponed until to-day.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—That was not the reason which actuated honorable members; but I have no wish to refer to last night's proceedings when to do so might give rise to heated feeling. There must be a mistake somewhere, because the honorable member for Capricornia has stated several times that the *Rockhampton Bulletin* purchases this high-class ink for its ordinary printing, whereas I am advised that it is used for only very high-class work. The magnificent work in a little catalogue which I held in my hand just now—one of the best I ever saw—was done with very high-class ink. Honorable members who have expert knowledge of this matter assure me that if I amend the next item by raising the invoice value mentioned in it from 3d. to 6d. per lb., it ought to obviate all the objection that has been taken to this item.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—No, it will not.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—At any rate, I am quite prepared to take that course. The honorable member for Capricornia must not imagine that I desire to injure or interfere with country newspapers, but all the information that I have from experts is that my proposal would not have that effect.

Mr. ARCHER.—Not if the invoice price is raised from 3d. to 6d., and the cwt. limit, which is just as important, is also struck out.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not think there is much in that.

Mr. ARCHER.—There is a great deal in it.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I was agreeable to do it early this morning. If the honorable member had not rushed away in such a hurry, he would have heard me say so two or three seconds afterwards.

Mr. ARCHER.—I could not get the Minister to speak.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I was anxious to get to the end of this division, and therefore did not say much. No matter what I said, the honorable member would have argued that I was wrong. He must admit that the honorable members for South Sydney, Hindmarsh, and Coolgardie, who have spoken to-day, know what they are talking about. They all support the duty which has been proposed by the Government, and recommended by the Tariff Commission.

Mr. ARCHER.—With the alteration of the invoice value in the next item from 3d. to 6d.?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Yes. I hope the debate will not be greatly prolonged. I shall be quite prepared when we reach the next item to do what I have said. I ask honorable members to allow this item to pass, because we have a great deal of work to do. If honorable members will make reasonable progress I have no desire to keep the House sitting until the small hours of the morning. It is not a good thing to do, but I have been forced into that position in order to get a certain amount of work done. If the work is got through, I want the House to rise at a reasonably early hour to-night, meet to-morrow, and probably finish the whole Tariff, because we are near the end of it. With a solid determination on the part of honorable members to achieve that result, I think we can do it without sitting into the small hours. I have here a letter from Messrs. R. Collie and Company, who state—

We give the quantities of news ink, purchased from us, by some of our clients, country newspapers, who draw all their supplies from us:—

Cornish R., "Star," Woodend, 3 x 1 doz. lbs., at 6d.

Boardman, A. F., "News," Sunbury, 2 x 1 doz. lbs., at 6d.

Ward, G. W., "Times," Horsham, 2 x ½ cwt., at 4½d.

Allen, R., "Leader," Talbot, 2 x 28 lbs., at 4d.

Rossiter Bros. and Co., "Standard," Yarram, 2 x ½ cwt., at 5d.

Rossiter Bros. and Co., "Star," Leongatha, 1 x 1 doz. lbs., at 6d.

Rossiter Bros. and Co., "Mirror," Foster, 1 x 28 lbs., at 5½d.

Robertson and Co., "Mail," Castlemaine, 2 x 1 cwt., at 4d.

We could give many more similar instances.

That shows that extraordinary prices are not charged for news ink, and that those newspapers are using the Colonial article in preference to the imported. It also proves that country newspapers, if they so desire, can get their news ink made here instead of purchasing the imported. I only received that letter this morning, and I quote it because it shows that the ink is being made here, and is used exclusively by a number of country newspapers.

Mr. WILKS.—The same firm complain about the tax on the raw material.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I believe they do. I understand that the tax on the raw material checks to some extent the profitable local manufacture of news ink.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [4.42].—While the Minister is adjusting—I believe fairly satisfactorily—item 355, he is still retaining excessive duties on this item. I believe that what the Minister proposes to do regarding news printing ink will be sufficient.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—If the newspaper proprietors choose, they can get a good deal of printing ink under the next item as news printing ink.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—No, because it must be news printing ink.

Mr. FISHER.—If it is invoiced for job printing it will be charged 6½d. a lb. What an imposition!

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The honorable member for Coolgardie says that news printing ink cannot be distinguished from other printing inks. I will accept him as an authority, but we have to deal with the Tariff as it stands.

Mr. MAHON.—The word "news" ought to come out of the next item. I shall move accordingly.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—My objection to the duty of 6½d. proposed by the Minister on this item is that, as a large proportion of the inks come in at between 6d. and 1s. per lb., it will be over 100 per cent. on the 6d. inks, while it will be over 50 per cent. on the 1s. inks. Those are exceedingly high duties.

Mr. FISHER.—Where is the justification for the composite duty proposed?

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—There should not be a composite duty. The Minister said himself that he did not like them, and we have struck them out so far.

Mr. MAHON.—How would the honorable member meet the difficulty that the Customs officer could not tell the value of the ink, and could not check the invoice, whether it was a 1s. or 6d. ink?

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—That remark raises a difficulty as against *ad valorem* rates. I believe the Department can check the invoices in this as well as they can in other cases.

Mr. FISHER.—They can do it as easily as in the case of the quantity of wool in certain goods.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—If that difficulty arises with *ad valorem* rates, we are thrown back on to fixed rates, but both *ad valorem* and fixed rates are proposed by the Government in this item. The Department have first of all to charge the fixed duty, and then have to make its application subject to a value which they have to check.

Then they have to submit the importation to another assessment—*ad valorem*—for every rd. per lb. upwards. Consequently, they must use the *ad valorem* system. While I object to the alternative duty, my principal objection to the item is the excessive rates which I have pointed out. I shall support the amendment to make the duty 4d. per lb., which even then will mean 66 $\frac{2}{3}$ per cent. on 6d. inks, and 33 $\frac{1}{3}$ per cent. on 1s. inks.

Mr. MAHON.—Would it not be better to go straight for *ad valorem* duties?

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I think so, but we cannot do so now after the tangle we got into this morning, when a motion to that effect was rejected.

Mr. CARR (Macquarie) [4.49].—The local ink is, in most cases, from my own experience, better than the imported at the price. So far as higher-class inks are concerned, we can get the locally-made article at a lower price than the imported, and of equal value, while it has the distinct advantage that there is no deterioration. There is no surface caking, as the ink is got fresh from the mixer. We are justified, from every point of view, in imposing a duty on imported inks. There is very little risk of undue advantage being taken of the duties proposed, because there are several firms engaged in the manufacture of ink locally. I have it on the authority of at least one manufacturer in Sydney, that he is well satisfied with the present duties, without increasing prices, as he can now retain his present market.

Mr. FISHER (Wide Bay) [4.51].—Nothing could be more satisfactory than the statement by the honorable member for Macquarie, that the inks made here are of good quality, and a credit to Australia. The point is, however, that a composite duty may penalize certain inks. An *ad valorem* duty would have been much more acceptable. As to the Customs officers discovering whether high-quality inks are introduced at the lower rate, there will be no more difficulty than there is in discovering whether cotton goods are being brought in as woollen goods. In either case, the services of an analyst has to be obtained.

Mr. CARR.—The higher quality inks are nearly always done up in small packets.

Mr. FISHER.—That is so. I have both seen and purchased them. The honorable member for Coolgardie intends to move an amendment to omit the word "news," and that is quite proper, because

so long as it remains we can do nothing; the inks must be described as job printing, and so forth, of certain colours and qualities. In my opinion a composite duty is mischievous, and always leads to trouble.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [4.53].—I have listened to the arguments on both sides very carefully, and, I hope, with a fair and open mind; and I have not heard the scheme of duties submitted by the Commission successfully challenged up to the present, except in one detail. This was referred to by the honorable member for Coolgardie, who has proposed to increase the invoiced amount in item 355 from 3d. to 6d. That amendment will, I think, enlarge the area of the *ad valorem* rate, and meet most of the difficulties suggested. I should like to point out to the honorable member for Wide Bay that the fixed duty, or an *ad valorem* duty, whichever is the higher, cannot be described as a composite duty in the accepted sense of the word. A composite duty is a combination of duties—that is a duty, plus a duty—whereas the duty under discussion is an alternative duty, which is justified in certain cases. The higher fixed duty of 6d. per lb. is intended to operate on low-grade inks which it might be difficult to analyze and classify, and which must cause the Customs officers difficulty in checking. A firm generally includes in its orders various grades of ink, low grade, medium, and high grade; and the evidence given before the Commission shows that the average price is about 2s. 6d. per lb. The fixed duty of 6d. is intended to operate on the average as represented by the 2s. 6d. per lb.; and it is not fair to say that it will mean 100 per cent. The *ad valorem* duty is intended to operate when the inks are above the average I have just mentioned. The fixed duty of 6d. per lb. might be infinitesimal in the case of high-class inks, worth from 5s. to 6s. per lb.

Mr. ARCHER.—Is it not a fact that 75 per cent. or 80 per cent. of the inks used are of the lower value?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—Not in reference to the item in which the fixed duty is imposed, and which is intended to cover the superior grades of ink. The lower classes of ink averaging from 3d. to 5d. per lb. are brought under the *ad valorem* rate in item 355. The portion of the report of the Commission having reference to this matter may be found on page 322 of volume 6, and is based on the

evidence of Mr. R. Collie, the Melbourne manufacturer, whose proposals were supported by a Sydney manufacturer. The Tariff Commission considered that those proposals embodied a fair and reasonable scheme, which distributes over various grades of inks a certain incidence of taxation according to quality and value. If we had a common standard it would be complained that we were taxing the poor and cheap inks as highly as the superior inks. So far as I am concerned, I have not received any complaint from printers in my electorate about the duties, and I believe that the great fuss and noise is being made, not by printers, but by the Melbourne importers.

Mr. ARCHER.—That is absolutely incorrect so far as I am concerned.

Question.—That after the figures “6½d.” the words “and on and after 10th December, 1907, per lb. (General Tariff) 4d.” (Mr. ARCHER’s amendment), be inserted—put. The Committee divided.

Ayes	26
Noes	31
			—
Majority	5

AYES.

Archer, E. W.
Brown, Thomas
Brown, Tilley
Cook, Joseph
Edwards, R.
Fisher, A.
Forrest, Sir John
Foxton, Colonel
Frazer, C. E.
Fuller, G. W.
Glynn, P. McM.
Hedges, W. N.
Johnson, W. E.
Knox, W.

Livingston, J.
McWilliams, W. J.
Page, J.
Palmer, A. C.
Poynton, A.
Sinclair, H.
Thomson, Dugald
Wilks, W. H.
Willis, Henry
Wilson, J. G.

Tellers:

Bowden, E. K.
Liddell, F.

NOES.

Batchelor, E. L.
Carr, E. S.
Catts, J. H.
Chanter, J. M.
Chapman, Austin
Crouch, R. A.
Deakin, A.
Ewing, T. T.
Foster, F. J.
Groom, L. E.
Harper, R.
Hutchison, J.
Irvine, Hans
Lyne, Sir William
Mahon, H.
Maloney, W. R. N.

Mathews, J.
Mauger, S.
McDougall, J. K.
Quick, Sir John
Salmon, C. C.
Spence, W. G.
Storrer, D.
Tudor, F. G.
Watkins, D.
Watson, I. C.
Webster, W.
Wise, G. H.
Wynne, A.

Tellers:

Cook, Hume
Thomson, John

PAIRS.

Hughes, W. M.
Thomas, J.
Smith, Bruce
Reid, G. H.
Fowler, J. M.
Fysh, Sir Philip
Kelly, W. H.
Atkinson, L.

Bamford, F. W.
Coon, J.
Sampson, S.
Hall, D. R.
Fairbairn, G.
O’Malley, King
Kingston, C. C.
Irvine, W. H.

Question so resolved in the negative.

Amendment negatived.

Amendment (by Mr. STORRER) proposed—

That after the figures “6½d.” the words “and on and after 11th December, 1907, per lb. (General Tariff), 5d.” be inserted.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [5.4].—I hope the honorable member will not press the amendment. When I said that I would agree to a duty of 5d. there was no idea of making the invoice price 6d. in the next item. I should like the duty to remain as it is in order to preserve the symmetry of the Tariff. I have agreed to everything that those who understand the business think is necessary, and the arrangement seems to be acceptable to the Committee.

Question put. The Committee divided.

Ayes	26
Noes	30
			—

Majority 4

AYES.

Archer, E. W.
Bowden, E. K.
Brown, Thomas
Brown, Tilley
Edwards, R.
Fisher, A.
Forrest, Sir John
Foxton, Colonel
Frazer, C. E.
Fuller, G. W.
Glynn, P. McM.
Hedges, W. N.
Johnson, W. E.
Knox, W.

Livingston, J.
McWilliams, W. J.
Page, J.
Palmer, A. C.
Poynton, A.
Sinclair, H.
Storrer, D.
Thomson, Dugald
Willis, Henry
Wilson, J. G.

Tellers:

Liddell, F.
Wilks, W. H.

NOES.

Bamford, F. W.
Batchelor, E. L.
Carr, E. S.
Catts, J. H.
Chanter, J. M.
Chapman, Austin
Coon, J.
Crouch, R. A.
Deakin, A.
Ewing, T. T.
Foster, F. J.
Harper, R.
Hutchison, J.
Irvine, Hans
Lyne, Sir William
Mahon, H.

Maloney, W. R. N.
Mathews, J.
Mauger, S.
McDougall, J. K.
Quick, Sir John
Salmon, C. C.
Tudor, F. G.
Watkins, D.
Watson, J. C.
Webster W.
Wise, G. H.
Wynne, A.

Tellers:

Cook, Hume
Spence, W. G.

PAIRS.

Hughes, W. M.	Groom, L. E.
Fowler, J. M.	Fairbairn, G.
Fysh, Sir Philip	O'Malley, King
Reid, G. H.	Hall, D. R.
Atkinson, L.	Irvine, W. H.
Kelly, W. H.	Kingston, C. C.
Smith, Bruce	Sampson, S.
Thomas, J.	Thomson, John

Question so resolved in the negative.

Amendment negatived.

Amendment (by Mr. WILSON) put—

That after figure "6d.," the words "and on and after 11th December, 1907, per lb. (United Kingdom), 4d.," be inserted.

The Committee divided.

Ayes	27
Noes	31
			—
Majority	4

AYES.

Archer, E. W.	Liddell, F.
Atkinson, L.	Livingston, J.
Brown, Thomas	McWilliams, W. J.
Brown, Tilley	Palmer, A. C.
Cook, Joseph	Poynton, A.
Edwards, R.	Sinclair, H.
Forrest, Sir John	Thomson, Dugald
Foxton, Colonel	Wilks, W. H.
Frazer, C. E.	Willis, Henry
Fuller, G. W.	Wilson, J. G.
Glynn, P. McM.	Wynne, A.
Hedges, W. N.	<i>Tellers:</i>
Irvine, Hans	Bowden, E. K.
Johnson, W. E.	Page, J.

NORS.

Batchelor, E. L.	Mathews, J.
Carr, E. S.	Mauger, S.
Catts, J. H.	McDougall, J. K.
Chanter, J. M.	Quick, Sir John
Chapman, Austin	Salmon, C. C.
Crouch, R. A.	Spence, W. G.
Deakin, A.	Storrer, D.
Ewing, T. T.	Thomson, John
Fisher, A.	Tudor, F. G.
Foster, F. J.	Watkins, D.
Harper, R.	Watson, J. C.
Hutchison, J.	Webster, W.
Knox, W.	Wise, G. H.
Lyne, Sir William	<i>Tellers:</i>
Mahon, H.	Bamford, F. W.
Maloney, W. R. N.	Cook, Hume

PAIRS.

Thomas, J.	Coon, J.
Fowler, J. M.	Fairbairn, G.
Reid, G. H.	Hall, D. R.
Hughes, W. M.	Groom, L. E.
Kelly, W. H.	Kingston, C. C.
Smith, Bruce	O'Malley, King

Question so resolved in the negative.

Amendment negatived.

Item agreed to.

Item 355. News Printing Ink, invoiced at under 3d. per lb., and in packages of not less than 1 cwt., ad val. (General Tariff), 30 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 25 per cent.

Mr. MAHON (Coolgardie) [5.19].—I move—

That the word "News" be left out.

I think that my proposal will meet the views of a number of honorable members opposite, who have objected to the high rate of duty that certain printing inks will have to pay under item 354.

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment (by Mr. MAHON) proposed—

That the words "under 3d." be left out, with a view to insert in lieu thereof the words "6d. and under."

Mr. WILSON (Corangamite) [5.20].—The vote which has just been taken means that a printing ink invoiced at 8d. per lb. will be required to pay a duty of 6d. per lb. Similarly, an ink which is invoiced at 1s. per lb. will be subjected to an impost of 6d. per lb. That means that there will be a duty of 50 per cent. on the ink.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The honorable member cannot debate that item, as it has been passed.

Mr. WILSON.—I am only making a comparison between the two items. I think that instead of using the expression "invoiced at 6d. and under per lb.," as desired by the honorable member for Coolgardie, it would be better to use the expression "invoiced at 1s. and under per lb.," and the article would then come in at 30 and 25 per cent., according to the country of origin. I move—

That the amendment be amended by leaving out the figure "6d.," with a view to insert in lieu thereof the figure "1s."

Question—That the figure "6d." proposed to be left out stand part of the proposed amendment (Mr. WILSON's amendment of Mr. MAHON's amendment)—put. The Committee divided.

Ayes	35
Noes	20
			—
Majority	15

AYES.

Bamford, F. W.
 Batchelor, E. L.
 Carr, E. S.
 Catts, J. H.
 Chanter, J. M.
 Chapman, Austin
 Coon, J.
 Crouch, R. A.
 Deakin, A.
 Ewing, T. T.
 Forrest, Sir John
 Foster, F. J.
 Hedges, W. N.
 Knox, W.
 Lyne, Sir William
 Mahon, H.
 Maloney, W. R. N.
 Mauger, S.

McDougall, J. K.
 O'Malley, King
 Page, J.
 Palmer, A. C.
 Quick, Sir John
 Salmon, C. C.
 Spence, W. G.
 Storrer, D.
 Thomson, John
 Tudor, F. G.
 Watkins, D.
 Watson, J. C.
 Webster, W.
 Wise, G. H.
 Wynne, A.
Tellers:
 Cook, Hume
 Hutchison, J.

NOES.

Archer, E. W.
 Atkinson, L.
 Bowden, E. K.
 Brown, Thomas
 Brown, Tilley
 Cook, Joseph
 Edwards, R.
 Foxton, Colonel
 Glynn, P. McM.
 Irvine, Hans
 Johnson, W. E.

Liddell, F.
 Livingston, J.
 Poynton, A.
 Thomson, Dugald
 Wilks, W. H.
 Willis, Henry
 Wilson, J. G.
Tellers.
 Fuller, G. W.
 Sinclair, H.

PAIRS.

Fairbairn, G.
 Groom, L. E.
 Hall, D. R.
 Harper, R.
 Kingston, C. C.
 Mathews, J.

Fowler, J. M.
 Hughes, W. M.
 Reid, G. H.
 Fysh, Sir Philip
 Kelly, W. H.
 Smith, Bruce.

Question so resolved in the affirmative.

Amendment of the amendment negatived.

Mr. WILSON (Corangamite) [5.29].—There seems to have been a mysterious misunderstanding when the last division was taken. Many honorable members were not aware of what the actual question was, or what the effect of their vote would be. The honorable member for Coolgardie wants to bring all printing ink invoiced at 6d. and under per lb. under an *ad valorem* duty of 30 or 25 per cent., according to the country of origin, so that all European or American inks invoiced at 6½d. per lb. would have to pay a duty equal to 100 per cent.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—No.

Mr. WILSON.—The Treasurer cannot get away from that fact. If ink is invoiced at 6½d. per lb. in Europe or America, and the duty is fixed at 6½d. per lb. in the general Tariff, it will be taxed at the rate of 100 per cent.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—That is when it is invoiced at over 6d. per lb.

Mr. WILSON.—Does the honorable gentleman admit that the duty will be equal to 100 per cent.?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not say that it is 100 per cent.; but the ink would have to pay the fixed duty.

Mr. WILSON.—If the ink is invoiced at 6½d. per lb., and the duty is 6½d. per lb., what is the rate per cent.? Honorable members who voted on the other side in the recent division voted for a duty of 100 per cent. For instance, the honorable member for Swan, who is supposed to be in favour of moderate duties, the honorable member for Echuca, the honorable member for Balaclava, the honorable member for Kooyong, and the honorable member for Fremantle, voted for a duty of 100 per cent. on this article.

Sir JOHN FORREST.—The honorable member should not abuse his friends.

Mr. WILSON.—I want to show the honorable member what he has been doing.

Mr. HEDGES.—What is the question before the Chair, sir?

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. BATCHELOR).—The honorable member is not in order in discussing at length the votes of honorable members in the recent division.

Mr. WILSON.—I want those honorable members to realize that they have done a very serious thing.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN.—That has nothing to do with the proposal now before the Committee.

Mr. WILSON.—I intend to move that the amendment of the honorable member for Coolgardie be amended by substituting the figure "9" for the figure "6."

Mr. WISE.—I rise to a point of order. Has not the Committee decided that the rate 6d. per lb. shall stand?

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN.—It is not competent for the honorable member for Corangamite to move that the invoiced rate be 9d., as the Committee has decided that 6d. shall stand part of the item.

Mr. WILSON.—My belief was that it was competent in Committee for an honorable member to move a higher figure than that decided upon. With all respect to you, sir, I should like to know whether there is no way of moving to that effect?

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN.—The honorable member has no opportunity of proposing the omission of a figure which the Committee has determined shall stand.

Mr. WILSON.—That puts honorable members who want to vote for an increased

invoice rate in a very awkward position. The matter is one of considerable importance.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN.—I cannot allow any discussion on the point.

Mr. WILSON.—If the decision of the Committee is irrevocable I suppose I can do nothing, but I had a great desire to increase the invoice rate under this item and so reduce the duty, which will be a very heavy impost on those who are using printing inks in the country districts.

Mr. WYNNE (Balaclava) [5.37].—The honorable member for Corangamite has referred to a certain vote given by me. What I voted for was to assist newspaper proprietors in the country districts. I was advised that if we made the invoice standard 3d. per lb., as the printers of small papers in the country do not import in bulk, they would have to pay a higher rate of duty. I understand that the amendment of the honorable member for Coolgardie raising the exemption from 3d. to 6d. allows printers of country newspapers to get their material in at the same rate of duty as is paid by the proprietors of the large newspapers in the big centres. That is what I voted for. I did not vote for anything like 100 per cent, but to reduce charges in favour of those who are not able to carry on their business on the large scale on which businesses are conducted by persons in the populous centres.

Amendment agreed to; words "6d. and under" inserted.

Amendment (by Mr. MAHON) agreed to—

That the words "and in packages of not less than 1 cwt." be left out.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 356 (Writing ink and ink powders) and item 357 (Ceramic transfers for pottery) agreed to.

Item 358. Kindergarten materials prescribed by departmental by-laws, ad val. (General Tariff), 5 per cent.; (United Kingdom), free.

Mr. POYNTON (Grey) [5.40].—I understand that a considerable quantity of these kindergarten materials are not imported from the United Kingdom, but from foreign countries. They are used principally in schools, and the duty of 5 per cent. would have the effect of increasing their cost. I therefore move—

That after the words "5 per cent.," the words "and on and after 11th December, 1907 (General Tariff), free," be inserted.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [5.41].—I find that a large proportion of these goods come from Germany.

Mr. WILKS.—Germany is the home of the kindergarten system.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The item is not an important one, and I do not intend to detain the Committee about it. I will consent to the amendment.

Amendment agreed to.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 359 (Paper patterns) agreed to.

Item 340. Pens, n.e.i., without holders or not including holders, ad val. (General Tariff), 5 per cent.; (United Kingdom), free.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I move—

That the following new paragraph be inserted:—"360B. Inkstands, fountain pens, pencils n.e.i., and rulers, ad val. (General Tariff), 30 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 25 per cent.; and on and after 11th December, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 5 per cent.; (United Kingdom), free."

When we were dealing with item 353A, I agreed to take out several articles which under that item would have been dutiable at 30 per cent. and 25 per cent., and promised to put them in a separate item dutiable at 5 per cent. under the General Tariff, and free as regards the United Kingdom. I am now carrying out that promise.

Proposed new paragraph agreed to

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That the following new paragraph be inserted:—"360C. Academy Boards, ad val. (General Tariff), 30 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 25 per cent.; and on and after 11th December, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 5 per cent.; (United Kingdom), free."

Item 361. Maps, except those of Australia or any part thereof; and Charts n.e.i., ad val. (General Tariff), 5 per cent.; (United Kingdom), free.

Mr. PAGE (Maranoa) [5.46].—Why is Mr. SALMON proposed to except maps of Australia from the duty thereof? It appears to me to be a most peculiar thing that it should be proposed to allow the maps of every other country in the world to come into Australia free when we make an exception of the United Kingdom, whilst we, in which we live, and maps of the country we are proud of which we are all proud of Australia can

Mr. SALMON.—Maps of Australia can be printed here.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—They are being printed here; and we in Australia truer and can print maps of Australia elsewhere. better than they are printed to be a good

Mr. PAGE.—That seems to be a good reason.

Item agreed to.

Item 362 (Globes geographical, &c.) agreed to.

Item 363. Parchment, cut and uncut, ad val. (General Tariff), 5 per cent.; (United Kingdom), free.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Moreton) [5.48].—What is the difference between the parchment dealt with in this item and vegetable parchment which we dealt with last night under item 352?

Mr. SALMON.—This parchment is made from skins, and is used for legal documents.

Mr. SINCLAIR.—I do not object to the item.

Item agreed to.

Item 364. Photographs sent by friends and not for the purpose of sale, free.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [5.49].—I ask the Committee to negative this item.

Mr. PAGE (Maranoa) [5.50].—When the Treasurer proposes to leave out an item I begin to be suspicious. Why is he proposing to take this course? Surely the Committee will not consent to it without an explanation.

Mr. JOHNSON.—And the Government whip told us that these things would be free.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I did not say so.

Mr. PAGE.—I do not think that this is a reasonable proposition, and I hope that the Committee will refuse to negative the item.

Mr. JOHNSON (Lang) [5.53].—I am glad that the honorable member for Maranoa has unearthed this scheme on the part of the Treasurer. When I inquired what would be the effect of the Treasurer's proposal, the honorable member for Bourke told me that it was intended to include this item in another one and still make it free.

Mr. HUME COOK.—And I stand by that statement.

Mr. JOHNSON.—If that be so, why negative this item under which photographs not for sale will be free. The Treasurer, when I referred to the statement made by the Government whip, disclaimed any responsibility for it. This looks very like an attempt by a circuitous method to render certain photographs liable to a heavy impost.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [5.56].—This is a dreadful proposal to make! As a matter of fact, I intend to include these photographs in item 407,

and when we reach that item I shall propose to strike out the words "n.e.i." appearing after the word "photographs" and to substitute the words "on Australian subjects." I shall also propose to strike out the words "post-cards (sensitized, with or without letter-press)." The effect of those amendments will be to make free all photographs and post-cards that do not deal with Australian subjects. Our desire is to protect the local photographers—to cause photographic work relating to Australia to be carried out here.

Mr. PAGE.—I do not mind that.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—If a friend in the Old Country sends a photograph of himself to the honorable member it will come in free.

Mr. PAGE.—But I think that the item as it stands is satisfactory.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—No; the re-arrangement is necessary, and I hope that the honorable member will not object to it.

Mr. WILKS (Dalley) [5.59].—I hope that the Treasurer's proposal will not be agreed to. The reason given for the proposed alteration seems an absurd one. Does the Minister suggest that his dear old friend Lord Tweedmouth, desiring to send him a photograph, would come to Australia to have it taken in order to encourage an Australian industry? The wording of this item is very dangerous; many a man has got into trouble through having a photograph "sent by a friend."

Mr. PAGE.—On the understanding that these photographs will be free under another item I shall not press for a division.

Item negatived.

Item 365. School and Drawing Slates; Slate Pencils; and School Colours in boxes, ad val. (General Tariff), 5 per cent.; (United Kingdom), free.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [6.0].—I move—

That the words "and school colours in boxes" be left out.

These school colours are free under item 329.

Amendment agreed to.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 366. Stay Paper and Stay Cloth, gummed on one side, in rolls cut to a width of not more than one inch, ad val. (General Tariff), 30 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 25 per cent.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [6.1].—I move—

That the words "one inch" be left out, with a view to insert in lieu thereof the words "two inches."

I also propose to move that the duties be reduced to 25 per cent. and 20 per cent. Stay paper and stay cloth are cut in Australia. It has been ascertained, however, that in order to defeat the object of this duty—the encouragement of the local industry—stay paper cut just a shade over an inch in width is being imported, and escapes the duty. To meet that attempt to evade the duty we propose to make dutiable all stay paper up to 2 inches in width.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN (Indi) [6.3].—In this case we have an enormous jump. Under the old Tariff the item was free, and the protectionist section of the Tariff Commission also recommended that it should be free.

Mr. SALMON.—What was the recommendation of the free-trade section of the Tariff Commission?

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—We have been told over and over again that no reliance can be placed in the comparative tables placed before us so far as the statements regarding the recommendation of the free-trade section of the Commission are concerned. I do not know why misleading information should be supplied, but I am not prepared to have too much faith in the honesty of some honorable members who are whirling this Tariff through the House. We should have some explanation of the Minister's action in proposing a duty of 30 per cent., when this material was free under the old Tariff, and the recommendation of the Tariff Commission was that it should remain free.

Mr. J. H. CATTS (Cook) [6.6].—I wish to move to make the item free. I have samples of the article here, which I ask the Minister to look at. It is used for binding in the making of paper boxes, and is not made in Australia.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—My expert advisers inform me that it is made in both Melbourne and Sydney.

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—It is made chiefly by the Stein Machine Company; those who make the machines manufacture the paper and cloth as well, which, I am told by persons in the trade, are not made in Australia. The samples which I produce are from Mr. Firth's card-board factory in Sydney, and were imported. The Minister proposes to put a duty only on stay cloth cut to a width of not more than 2 inches, which I take it would allow it to be imported in bulk free.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [6.9].—It is proposed to make stay cloth of not more than 2 inches in width dutiable because hitherto an attempt has been made to evade the duty by making it a little over an inch in width. However, as the item is not an important one, and I do not wish to waste time in connexion with its discussion, I shall be willing to agree to a duty of 5 per cent. in the general Tariff, making the article free if imported from Great Britain.

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—It should be free wherever it may come from.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—All these items are in the same category, and therefore I think that we should impose a duty of 5 per cent. in the general Tariff and make the importations from the United Kingdom free.

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment (by Mr. J. H. CATTS) proposed—

That after the words "30 per cent.," the words "and on and after 11th December, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 5 per cent.," be inserted; and after the words "25 per cent.," the words "and on and after 11th December, 1907 (United Kingdom), free," be added.

Mr. BOWDEN (Nepean) [6.13].—As this article is imported wholly from America, the preference to Great Britain amounts to nothing. It is cut for an American machine which is used here under a royalty, those who use it contracting themselves to buy their material from the makers of the machine. I therefore move—

That the amendment be amended by leaving out the words "ad val. (General Tariff), 5 per cent.," with a view to insert in lieu thereof the word "free."

Amendment of the amendment negatived.

Amendment agreed to.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 367. Licht-pausrohpapier, ad val. (General Tariff), 5 per cent.; (United Kingdom), free.

Mr. J. H. CATTS (Cook) [6.15].—I move—

That the words "and leatherette" be inserted after the word "licht-pausrohpapier."

Mr. HUTCHISON.—What is leatherette?

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—A kind of paper used in bookbinding.

Mr. PAGE (Maranoa) [6.15].—The Treasurer should tell us what licht-pausrohpapier is.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—It is a photographic material.

Mr. PAGE.—Surely it can be made in Australia. Will the honorable member

for Batman say that it cannot, and that he is not able to produce a sample from one of his pockets? If Victorians are ready to admit this article free, it certainly cannot be made here.

Mr. JOHNSON (Lang) [6.17].—Licht-pausroh papier is practically the same thing as surface-coated paper; but it is a blue paper, used by architects for tracings and plans.

Mr. CROUCH (Corio) [6.18].—It seems to me that leatherette is an imitation leather which it may be dangerous to admit, because it may be used for boots. We have already been shown boots made virtually of paper.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I am informed that it is used mainly for bookbinding.

Mr. HARPER.—Yes.

Mr. CROUCH.—Then the Minister must take the responsibility.

Mr. LIDDELL (Hunter) [6.19].—It seems to me that probably leatherette was used in the boots shown by the honorable member for Batman the other night. It seems the sort of material that could be used to imitate leather, or alligator skin, in which case the honorable member for Lang should know something about it. As, according to the Treasurer, the effect of admitting an article free is to make it expensive, I shall vote for the amendment.

Mr. PAGE (Maranoa) [6.20].—As the honorable member for Batman will not, on this occasion, defend the Victorian manufacturers of boots, I must do so. I can assure the honorable member for Hunter that boots made in Victoria are not made of leatherette, but of leather.

Amendment agreed to.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 368. Books n.e.i., Prospectuses and Catalogues (other than trade) n.e.i., free.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) proposed—

That after the letters "n.e.i." line 2, the words "and all printed matter n.e.i." be inserted.

Mr. WYNNE (Balaclava) [6.22].—It has been suggested to me that in this item we should include newspaper supplements not type set. I am advised that that would not affect any printing industry in the Commonwealth. Honorable members are aware that the Christmas issues of many of the newspapers contain supplements to which a lithographed picture is attached. I think

such pictures should be admitted free, and I, therefore, move—

That the amendment be amended by inserting after the letters "n.e.i." the words "including newspaper supplements not type set."

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [6.23].—I cannot accept the amendment. It would benefit only a few wealthy newspaper proprietors, whilst it is well known that these supplements can be produced here.

Mr. WYNNE.—I am told they cannot.

Mr. WATSON (South Sydney) [6.24].—Coloured supplements, the work of Australian artists, lithographed and printed by the three-colour process, are produced in Australia, and I see no reason why their production should not be protected.

Mr. MCWILLIAMS.—Do we produce coloured supplements without some letterpress on them?

Mr. WATSON.—The lettering can be done either before or after they are imported. Usually the only letterpress on the supplements are the words at the head of the sheet, "Supplement to" such and such a journal, with the title of the picture underneath. Some very fine supplements are being produced in Australia to-day; and I do not see why we should not encourage the artistic sense in the community. The *Town and Country Journal* and the *Sydney Mail*, for instance, usually issue a coloured Christmas supplement, and these are produced in Australia. If we decided that such coloured supplements should be admitted free, an inducement would be given to people to look outside the Commonwealth for them.

Mr. HUTCHISON (Hindmarsh) [6.26].—I object to the proposed amendment. Splendid pictures are taken at Mildura, and are then sent to Germany to be printed as post cards, and really what the honorable member for Balaclava desires is that we should have all our coloured supplements made in Germany.

Mr. WYNNE.—I do not desire that.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—That will be the effect of the amendment, because these supplements can be produced more cheaply in Germany than anywhere else. If it is the object of the honorable member to encourage German as against British and Australian artists, I am not with him.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [6.27].—I suggest to the honorable member for Balaclava that these coloured supplements can be more appropriately dealt with under item 416—Pictures, n.e.i.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—That is where I intend to deal with them.

Mr. WYNNE.—If the Committee is against my amendment it does not matter whether I move it upon this item or upon another.

Amendment of the amendment negatived.

Amendment agreed to.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Division XIV.—Vehicles.

Item 369. Bicycles, Tricycles, and Similar Vehicles, n.e.i., and Frames thereof, whether partly or wholly finished, each or ad val., whichever rate returns the higher duty (General Tariff), £5 5s. or 30 per cent.; (United Kingdom), £5 or 25 per cent.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [6.28].—Before we adjourn for dinner I wish to inform honorable members that I consider the specific duties proposed in connexion with this item are very high, and I propose to strike them out. I intend to move that the duty shall be 30 per cent. in the general Tariff and 25 per cent. on imports from the United Kingdom.

Sitting suspended from 6.29 to 7.45 p.m.

Mr. WILKS (Dailey) [7.45].—This is one of a group of items upon which the composite method of fixed and *ad valorem* rates is proposed by the Treasurer.

Mr. HUME COOK.—The Treasurer has just announced that he will strike out the fixed duty.

Mr. WILKS.—I hope he will do the same with all the other items in the group. If he does, it will facilitate business, shorten debate, and enable him to land in port all right to-morrow. If he does not, I am afraid that the items will provoke a long discussion. I do not feel inclined to debate this item on the question of the *ad valorem* rate, but I wish to express the hope that throughout the rest of the Tariff, in all instances where the alternative method has been adopted, the Treasurer will drop the fixed and adhere to the *ad valorem* rate.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The honorable member must not expect that.

Mr. COON (Batman) [7.47].—I hope the Treasurer will not allow the fixed duty to be struck out. The *ad valorem* rate proposed will have no effect at all. Bicycles are being dumped here at £5 apiece. The Tariff Commission went into the question, and their work should be recognised in connexion with this all-important industry. In Victoria alone there are over 1,000 men engaged in the bicycle trade. Why should we allow the foreigner to dump his bicycles

here as he has been doing? In 1905 bicycles to the value of £263,626 were imported. If the fixed duty is taken off, the cheap bicycles now in bond will be on the market to-morrow or the next day. Why should this protectionist House allow goods that in other countries are charged 40 and 50 per cent. to come in here at a duty of 25 per cent.? No reason has been given for removing the fixed duty. There is every reason why it should be retained. It was recommended by the protectionist section of the Tariff Commission, which included the honorable member for Bendigo, Senator McGregor, and ex-Senator Higgs.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—They recommended 25 per cent. as well.

Mr. COON.—And they also recommended a fixed duty of £5.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Why such an enormous taxation on the cheaper bicycles?

Mr. COON.—It is not an enormous taxation. The cheaper bicycles should be kept out, as they are dangerous to ride. Why should we allow our markets to be flooded with cheap bicycles that people in other countries will not use? The local bicycle industry ought to be encouraged.

Mr. WILKS.—Do they pay big wages in the industry?

Mr. COON.—Yes. There are a number of small men making bicycles all over Australia. They should receive some consideration. A duty of 25 per cent. on a £5 bicycle will be only about 25s. That will not prevent that class of machine being dumped here. This is another case where a protective Tariff has been the means of reducing the price of an article. Previous to bicycles being made here, the cost of a machine was as high as from £25 to £30. The price has been considerably reduced, and now a proposition is put forward which will practically mean wiping out the industry. The men who are making bicycles here have been given to understand that they will get some protection.

Mr. STORRER.—The price was reduced without the £5 duty.

Mr. COON.—It was, but since the imposition of that duty the industry has progressed and improved. It is only under such a duty that it can hope to succeed. Why should it not receive the protection which it asks for?

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Asks for?

Mr. COON.—Yes, or which the people ask for. If the £5 rate is retained it will be the means of reducing the price

of the better class bicycle, and of preventing the foreign trader from dumping his cheap goods into Australia. We can make bicycles here. Honorable members opposite, times out of number, have asked how many men are employed in an industry, and whether we can make an article here. In this case we are making bicycles here complete, and equal to any made in any other part of the world. When that is so, let us impose a duty which will prevent the foreign bicycle from coming in at all.

Mr. JOHNSON.—No part of the machine, except the tyres, is made here.

Mr. COON.—I do not say it is all made here. Perhaps there are certain parts that are not made here, but there is no part that cannot be made here if the opportunity is given. If we allow cheap shoddy stuff, that people in other parts of the world will not use, to be dumped into Australia, we will never make anything.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [7.53].—The answer to the honorable member for Batman, who, of course, knows all about the intricacies of bicycle manufacture as of every other industry by this time, as the Committee has been made painfully aware during this long Tariff debate, is that bicycles are not made here. They are at the most assembled here. The parts are not made in Australia, and in all probability will not be for many years to come, no matter what duties are imposed upon them. Are we therefore to impose these inordinate rates for the mere sake of taxing out bicycles, and making them dearer to the public? That is the only question that we have to ask ourselves. This is no strangled industry. It has never begun to be an industry in Australia, so far as the *bona fide* making of bicycles goes. All that happens is that the parts are imported and put together. I have no doubt the honorable member for Batman would call that a very elaborate process of manufacture. If he relies upon the Tariff Commission to buttress up his case, he will find small comfort there, and small encouragement for the vigorous propaganda which he seems to be waging on behalf of the local bicycle makers. Only two makers gave evidence before the Commission. I should like to hear from the Chairman of that body their reason for proposing an exorbitant duty of £5, with an alternative of 25 per cent. It seems absurd on the face of it that £5

should be regarded as the equivalent of 25 per cent. *ad valorem*. There is no relation between the two. Upon a highly-finished machine, £5 might possibly be equivalent to 25 per cent., but on the cheaper bicycles it means 100 per cent. and over in many cases.

Mr. MALONEY.—On one of the bicycles sold in England for 25s., it would be 400 per cent.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I should think that a bicycle sold at 25s. would be a danger to life and limb. There is no doubt that the machines are made very cheaply in places where their manufacture has been specialized, and where the output and the market are very large. We can never hope to equal the skill developed from the specialization of the industry in those parts of the world. We have therefore to depend upon the parts which are sent out from the Old Country. As all that is done here is to assemble the parts into the completed machine, it is the height of absurdity even to suggest these extraordinary high duties. The Minister will, therefore, do well to strike out the fixed, and leave only the *ad valorem*, rate. So far as I can ascertain none of the witnesses before the Commission advocated an increase in the duty on bicycles. One individual said that he would not object to an increase from 20 to 25 per cent. on the finished article.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—But he also wanted free bicycle parts.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—He wanted the duty on the parts reduced to 10 per cent.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—We did not propose that.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Since parts are not manufactured in Australia, that strikes me as a most reasonable request. I could understand the honorable member for Bendigo recommending a duty of £5 per bicycle if the parts were being made here, but they are not, and may not be made here for a generation to come. I do not know what the honorable member could have been thinking of to submit this recommendation. I should like to hear him explain it. I point out to the honorable member for Batman that the process of putting the machines together is neither elaborate nor costly. I was speaking just now to a gentleman who is a practical mechanic, and here are the charges in the business for the putting together of these machines: To put together

a complete machine costs only 12s. for labour. If they put together three, the cost is brought down to 11s. per machine, and if they put six together they do it for 10s. each. That is the whole labour cost for assembling the parts of the machine.

Mr. TUDOR.—The honorable member is quoting the figures for building the frame, and not for putting the other parts into it.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The cost of the process of assembling the parts into the completed machine is 12s. per bicycle.

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—That is absurd.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The honorable member should not say so until he hears the complete statement. There are additional charges of 9s. per machine for enamelling, and 1s. per machine for nickelling. Thus we have a total of 22s. for building each machine.

Mr. TUDOR.—But the wheels have yet to be taken into account.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—That is so, and for that 2s. 6d., as labour cost, is provided.

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—I have paid £10 for a pair of wheels made in Australia.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Was that the result of the present duty?

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—No, it was long ago.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The honorable member is speaking of the complete cost of the wheels to the purchaser, whereas I am referring to the cost of the labour involved in putting the parts together after they have been imported. I am told that the total cost of labour in putting the parts together is from 22s. to 24s.

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—If the honorable member goes to buy a bicycle he will find that his figures are wrong.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Let me repeat that I am speaking of the labour cost. It will be seen that the duties originally suggested were outrageous, and that those now indicated are still exceedingly high. I hope the Treasurer will consent to put these duties much lower than 30 per cent. and 25 per cent. on the complete machine.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—If the duties be *ad valorem*, I shall propose 35 per cent. and 30 per cent.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—My suggestion is that the old duties were sufficiently high.

Mr. WATSON.—The duties on the parts are too high in relation to the completed article.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Then let us reduce the duties on the parts instead of imposing such enormous duties on the completed machine. That is all that the bicycle builders asked for when they gave evidence before the Tariff Commission; they stated that if the duties were made 10 per cent. on the parts, and 20 per cent. on the finished machine, they would be sufficiently high for all protective purposes.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—The duty on the unfinished parts was only 10 per cent. under the old Tariff.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—That was so in the case of some of the parts, but other parts were charged 15 per cent. and 20 per cent. All they ask is that parts shall be made uniformly dutiable at 10 per cent., without any increased protection on the finished article; but the Treasurer proposes to increase the duty on the latter to 35 per cent. and 30 per cent. Parts will not be made here for many years to come, and, therefore, the impost is simply an exorbitant revenue duty.

Mr. TUDOR (Yarra) [8.5].—These duties have been the subject of much criticism in the press. We have learnt, many of us for the first time—from the honorable member for Bass, I believe—that eight bicycles, valued at £1 each, were landed at Launceston, and that, instead of a few shillings, the duty amounted to £40. Then a gentleman from Queensland, when the Tariff was introduced, asked that he might be allowed to unbrazed imported frames, as the brazed frames were not worth as much as the amount of the duty. The honorable member for Parramatta has read out figures relating to the labour cost, but, as I said in relation to the printing ink duty, very few honorable members can make themselves cognizant with the whole details of any industry. According to the honorable member for Parramatta, 12s. is the labour cost of brazing the frame together.

Mr. HEDGES.—A very big price!

Mr. TUDOR.—That is what is called the building of the frame. The honorable member for Parramatta admitted, however, that there was the enamelling, together with the building of the wheels and other charges. Some few years ago I endeavoured to ascertain by a question in the House addressed to the Minister of Trade and Customs the invoiced prices of various imported bicycles, and it was found that, just as in the case of gramophones, typewriters, cash-registers, and so forth,

on which there is either very little duty or no duty at all, the price at which they were invoiced was very small in comparison with the price at which they were sold to the public. It may safely be said that at least three-fourths of the bicycles used in Victoria have been built or put together within the State.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—There was scarcely any protection under the old Tariff.

Mr. TUDOR.—But under the old Victorian Tariff there was protection. In New South Wales, on the other hand, where there was no protection, not one-fourth of the bicycles in use in that State are built there. If the bicycle industry had not been firmly established under the old Victorian Tariff, there would not have been half the people employed in it that there are to-day. It is not my intention to discuss the decision of the Victorian Wages Board in the cycle trade, though I disagree entirely with it in fixing the wages too low. That the Wages Board made a mistake is no reason why the duty on bicycles should be largely reduced; and I am very sorry to learn from the Treasurer that he has decided to abandon the fixed rate. It would be a good idea on the part of the Customs authorities to periodically publish in the *Government Gazette* a list of the prices at which goods are invoiced when imported. If we could learn, for instance, that bicycles, which, when complete, are sold for £10, £11, £15, and even as high as £30, were invoiced at less than £5, the public would realize the profits made by those engaged in importing.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The parts must be coming in cheap if bicycles are being made here.

Mr. TUDOR.—As to that, if the Treasurer has decided to reduce the duties on the finished article, he ought certainly to reduce the duties on the parts. I take it that the protectionist section of the Tariff Commission, when they made their recommendations, had in view the duties on the parts as well as the duty on the finished machine. When the honorable member for Batman was speaking, the honorable member for Lang interjected, "Are any of the parts made here?" In reply, I may say that, with the exception of the tyres, I do not think that the parts are made here to any extent, although some may have been made by a few ingenious mechanics in their spare time. I guarantee that not 5

per cent. of the bicycle manufacturers in Great Britain make their own parts, but that they buy them from various firms, who have made a speciality of that branch of business, there being three or four standard parts turned out such as the B.S.A., the Edie, and one or two others. But those manufacturers of parts are now endeavouring to monopolize the whole of the cycle business at Home; and those of us who take an interest in trade saw recently what happened in America when a firm there tried to do precisely the same. I have here a copy of a letter originally sent to the Minister of Trade and Customs from the Melbourne representatives of the Canadian Cycle and Motor Company, which, I believe, is the Massey-Harris Company. The letter is as follows—

A petition requesting an additional increase in the General Tariff on bicycles and component parts thereof having within the past week been laid before you by a section of the bicycle trade we desire respectfully to protest in the strongest manner against their requests. As you are already aware, this company employs none but British workmen in its manufactures, and having a large vested interest throughout the Commonwealth, is, we claim, entitled to some consideration. When we thoroughly understood that the ultimatum of the Government was higher protection, we immediately set about a complete reorganization of our business. We are now receiving from Canada bicycle frame parts in the rough in exactly the same way as English importations. We have installed an up-to-date erecting and assembling, as well as an enamelling and nickel-plating plant, and now have working nearly twice the number of men formerly employed at bicycle building.

This company admit that they now employ twice the number of people that they employed three months ago, when this Tariff was introduced; and, being anxious to have the duty reduced on the finished machine, they are evidently indifferent about throwing a number of those people out of employment.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—Have they increased the prices on their machines locally?

Mr. TUDOR.—I do not think the prices have been increased by a single shilling since the duty was imposed, though I cannot speak definitely, except in the case of Victoria. A fixed duty ought to be imposed in order to prevent the dumping of machines in Australia. I know that complete bicycles, which in the trade means bicycles minus tyres, saddles and chains, have been landed on the wharf at Melbourne, all charges, including duty paid, for less than £3.

It might be said, therefore, that the duty proposed is exorbitant, but, as a matter of fact, that is nothing like the fair value of the machines; and it is in order to prevent the dumping of surplus stocks at the end of the season that the Tariff Commission, and subsequently the Government, adopted the duties proposed. Honorable members have said that the local builders of bicycles merely assemble the parts after the frame has been built. Of course, any person with ordinary common-sense could put the parts together if he only possessed a little mechanical knowledge. But I do not think that he could braze a machine and fit it up entirely unaided.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—Our bicycle builders do any amount of brazing work, and some of us could do it.

Mr. TUDOR.—Some honorable members who possess mechanical skill might possibly be able to do that sort of work. Of course, I realise that the Government having abandoned the fixed duties which appear in the schedule, it is hopeless for any honorable member to fight for them. I believe that by acting as they have done the Ministry have struck a heavy blow at many men who have equipped their shops with the appliances necessary for the building of machines from imported parts. Honorable members may have noticed that one of the standard makers of bicycle parts has recently increased the price of those parts. I have received, from a gentleman in the country, a letter which emanated from an exporter of bicycles in England. In it the writer points out that English manufacturers would be able to beat the Customs authorities even if the fixed duties which appear in the schedule were retained. He declared that British manufacturers did not contemplate losing the Australian trade. Personally, I want to see our own people retain as much of that trade as possible, and that result cannot be achieved if we agree to the proposal of the Treasurer.

Mr. GLYNN (Angas) [8.18].—I am very glad that the Treasurer has proposed the abolition of the fixed duties in respect of this item. I hold in my hand an invoice which gives the average value—exclusive of any charges—of thirty-six bicycles which are at present in bond. The value is set down at £5 9s. 6d. each. The total consignment is valued at £197 3s. 6d. So far from these machines having been dumped, I am informed that the price I have mentioned is a fair one for a good article. The

charges upon the consignment added to the duty amount to £207 9s. 3d. They work out as follows—f.o.b. charges £2 1s. 3d., cost of packages £5 5s., freight and primeage £8 16s. 11d., duty at £5 each £180, landing charges at 6s. per ton £1 8s. 11d., insurance, exchange, interest, &c., £9 17s. 2d., or a total of £207 9s. 3d. on a declared value at the port of exportation of £197 3s. 6d. These charges are equivalent to a tax of £5 each upon machines which are exported for £5 9s. 6d. each. The old duty upon that consignment, instead of amounting to £180, would have amounted to £43 7s. 6d. The protectionist section of the Tariff Commission recommend a duty upon this item of 25 per cent. We must not seriously regard the alternative duty of £5 per machine recommended by that body. As the honorable member for Yarra suggested, it was framed with a view to prevent dumping. Now, assuming that a consignment of bicycles were invoiced at £1 each or a little over, instead of a duty of 25 per cent. being charged upon them—which was the rate assumed by the Commission to be necessary for protection—the Customs authorities would have power, under the original proposal of the Government, to penalize the importer of these dumped machines by imposing a duty upon them of £5 each. That is a very large power to place in the hands of a Minister, because by an arbitrary assessment of value upon a mere allegation that dumping was taking place he would be able without the importer having a right to appeal to charge a duty of £5 per machine. This is a power which ought not to be granted to him. I say, therefore, that the true duty recommended by the protectionist section of the Tariff Commission was 25 per cent., and I do not think that we shall be acting wrongly if we adopt that rate.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—That was the rate recommended upon high-class bicycles.

Mr. GLYNN.—It was the rate recommended without any qualification whatever. I am assured that £5 9s. 6d. per machine represents the fair value of a good bicycle, and that it is the true import price is shown by the invoice to which I have alluded. Under the circumstances, I think that we might very well accept the recommendation of the protectionist section of the Tariff Commission, and grant preferential treatment to the imports from the United Kingdom. That the duties originally scheduled

were too high is evidenced by the fact that the Government are prepared, without debate, to accept, in lieu thereof, 35 per cent. under the general Tariff and 30 per cent. under the Tariff for the United Kingdom. Under the circumstances, I think that the Committee might agree to 30 per cent. and 25 per cent. respectively, and I shall move accordingly. Thirty per cent. would represent an increase of 10 per cent. upon the old rate of duty. If any further concession is to be made to the bicycle industry—and we ought to recollect that there is a very large section of the public who use bicycles as a part of their implements of trade—I suggest that it should take the form of a reduced duty upon the parts.

Mr. BATCHELOR (Boothby) [8.25].—It has been said that bicycle-building in the Commonwealth merely consists of assembling the parts and undertaking the brazing, nickelling, and enamelling of the machines. Of course, in some cases alterations are made in the design of the bicycles, and the tubes are cut by those who import them. Generally speaking, however, the tubes are cut to length. If there were a chance of the industry of manufacturing the parts being established in Australia, I should be very pleased to assist in imposing a reasonable duty upon those parts, because it would be an industry worth encouraging. But, as has been already pointed out, the parts are all standardized, and there is not much probability that in the near future these parts will be made in the Commonwealth. They are imported chiefly from the Birmingham Small Arms Factory. The Government have certainly done the right thing in abandoning the fixed duties of £5 and £5 5s. originally proposed. As has been pointed out by the honorable member for Parramatta, the cost of the work done here upon a single machine amounts to about 24s. So that to levy a duty of £5 or £5 5s. upon each bicycle would be utterly ridiculous. The figures quoted by the honorable member for Parramatta correspond almost exactly with those supplied to me by a bicycle builder in Adelaide.

Mr. HUGHES.—Does the cost quoted by the honorable member cover the enamelling?

Mr. BATCHELOR. — Yes. The enamelling costs about 9s. per machine. Seeing that we are not likely to go in for the manufacture of bicycle parts, I should prefer to make the duty upon bicycles 30 per cent. under the general Tariff and 25

per cent. under the Tariff for the United Kingdom, and to lower the rates upon the parts to 10 per cent. and 5 per cent. respectively. The imposition of a small duty might encourage the manufacture of some of the parts locally. Our best course, therefore, is to levy the duties which I have indicated upon bicycles, and to reduce the rates upon the parts at any rate to 10 and 5 per cent., if not to abolish them. There does not seem to be a sufficient reason for a duty as high as 10 per cent. on the parts which cannot be made here, at any rate for a few years. The only reason which the Treasurer has given for increasing the duties on the finished article up to 35 and 30 per cent. is because he has duties of 15 and 10 per cent. on the parts. It seems to me that the better method would be, instead of increasing the total cost of the article to the user, to reduce it by making the duties on the finished goods 30 and 25 per cent., and the duties on the parts 10 and 5 per cent.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [8.31].—Seeing that the Treasurer has decided to abandon the fixed duties, I do not wish to argue the question at any great length. The reason which induced the A section of the Tariff Commission to propose the fixed duties was that they should operate on a large number of cheap, unserviceable, and dangerous bicycles, some of them being as low in value as £2, £3, and £5. We realized that *ad valorem* duties of 25 or 20 per cent. on such goods would be practically inoperative.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—One can get a good, sound machine for £5.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—We did not desire to give protection by proposing the fixed duties, but to assist in keeping out undesirable bicycles. I am sorry that the Treasurer has seen fit to abandon the fixed duties, because I know that in this Tariff no proposition has worked more effectively and successfully than have those duties. I know that they have had the result of stimulating the bicycle-making industry in various parts of Australia. I have seen letters in the press and telegrams from all parts congratulating the Government upon imposing duties which are so effective and successful in their operation. However, the Minister is responsible, and I do not intend to fall out with him. This industry seems to present scope for large development and expansion. In Victoria there are no less than

a thousand persons employed in the repairing and making of bicycles, motor cars, and motor cycles. I do not know the number in other States, but I feel deeply impressed with the possibilities of the industry. An idea of those possibilities may be gathered from the fact that during the last two or three years bicycles and motor cycles to the value of over £250,000 have been imported. That shows that there was a wide area of trade for a good sound protective duty to operate upon. And these fixed duties were undoubtedly the most effective and operative part of these proposals. The deputy leader of the Opposition has challenged my reply regarding the work and labour involved in this industry. I think he said that it cost only 12s. or 13s. to assemble or put together the various parts of a bicycle.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—No; 24s.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—Of course, the amount that is spent locally in building a bicycle depends upon whether finished or unfinished parts are utilized. If the parts are finished, no doubt the work involved is not so great as would be the case if the parts were unfinished. But it is claimed that in building a bicycle out of imported unfinished parts every cycle manufacturer in the Commonwealth gives at least thirty-six hours' employment to Australian workmen. That is an incentive to manufacturers to build factories, and provide plant locally made or imported, giving work to a considerable number of men in the production of bicycles.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—What does the honorable member mean by unfinished parts?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—I refer to parts which require local treatment such as enamelling, brazing, filing down, and fitting. The putting together of the parts of an unfinished bicycle gives four days' work, at about £2 a day, to local labour. Let us now consider the class of work that is involved. The deputy leader of the Opposition has said that it simply means the fitting together of some parts. If honorable members will listen to an extract from our report they will get an idea of the process—

When the component parts, unfinished, are imported, and made into complete machines in Australia, the following work is done locally, namely:—Cutting and fitting all tubing and parts together, brazing same, filling same, nickel-plating, enamelling the frames, front forks, back stays and wheel rims with three or four coats of enamel, placing the same in ovens for

the purpose of rendering the enamel hard and solid, thereby being less liable to chip and peel off, decorating frames with fancy transfers and names, and other ornamental work. The bicycle frame is then ready for the assembler to take in hand the fitting of other parts, such as tyres, chains, pedals, cranks, bearings, handle bars, and saddle pillars, to make the cycle complete. We were of opinion that the most effective way of encouraging the industry was by substantially increasing the duty on finished bicycles and frames, as well as by placing on the free list certain bicycle tubes.

Mr. PAGE.—Will the honorable member now give us a little information about the wages paid to the men who manufacture the bicycles here?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—I certainly am in favour of the employes being paid fair and reasonable wages, and I am happy to inform the honorable member that a Board with full jurisdiction to deal with these matters has been investigating and giving awards.

Mr. PAGE.—Does the honorable member consider 27s. 6d. a good wage for a man with a wife and five youngsters?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—That is notorious sweating with which I, like the honorable member, have no sympathy. We do not want that, and I believe it is the desire and intention of the owners of bicycle factories, if these duties are imposed, to give their workers good and substantial wages.

Mr. MALONEY.—They will not get any new protection if they do not.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—Quite so. I have explained the reason why the fixed duties were recommended, and that was practically to check the importation of dangerous, unserviceable, and cheap machines. And with reference to high class and expensive machines, the *ad valorem* duties of 30 and 25 per cent. were intended to operate.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The honorable member does not believe in making bicycles too readily available to poor persons?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—I believe that the imposition of these duties would not increase the prices of the bicycles made or put together in Australia.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The honorable member has just said that his object is to try to keep them out.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—I have said that my object was to keep out the dangerous rubbish; but the exclusion of that would

rather tend to encourage the local production of superior machines. I know as a fact that the local manufacture of bicycles has resulted in a great decline in the prices of them to the general public. I remember the time—and it is only a few years ago—when I gave £32 for an ordinary bicycle, but to-day I could buy the same machine in Bendigo—perhaps, a better one—for £15 or £20, simply owing to local manufacture and competition.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The prices of bicycles have fallen all over the world.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—If this trade were in the hands of bicycle importers there would be a great danger of the prices being raised to the old standard, whereas the local manufacturer of them has undoubtedly tended to bring down the cost, and the public have had an advantage thereby. I hope that the Minister having given way on the fixed duties does not intend to go below 35 per cent. I hope that he will accept the invitation of the free-trade party and lower the duties on the parts both finished and unfinished. That to some extent would be a slight compensation to local manufacturers for the removal of the fixed duties.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [8.40].—I am surprised at so much heat being imported into this discussion. I felt that the fixed duties of £5 5s. and £5 were very excessive, and I do not care who says the reverse. On looking through the Tariffs of other countries, I found that bicycles were not subjected to a fixed duty but to an *ad valorem* duty. In Victoria under its old Tariff there was a much lower *ad valorem* duty than ours, and in New Zealand, Canada and the United States of America there is an *ad valorem* duty.

Mr. KING O'MALLEY.—Forty-five per cent.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Yes.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—We are getting very close to that.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Canada has a duty of 35 and 30 per cent., while New Zealand has a duty of 20 per cent. Under the old Victorian Tariff it was 10 per cent., and under our old Tariff it was 20 per cent. If the consensus of opinion in all those countries is in favour of an *ad valorem* duty, I conceive that I cannot go far wrong in following their example. I am as

anxious as is any one to see a good duty imposed on any article which we can and do make. With regard to bicycles some honorable members have said that they would rather have a fixed duty of £1 than an *ad valorem* duty. Let us see how it would work out. Suppose that I get the Committee to agree to duties of 35 and 30 per cent. A bicycle is imported worth £3, and that will have a duty of £1 upon it even at that very low estimated value.

Mr. HUGHES.—No one can produce a bicycle in this country for £3.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not think so. I am sure that honorable members will give me credit for trying to deal with this matter in a practical way. We cannot do better than adopt the method which has been pursued all over the British Dominions and in the United States. I think myself, despite what has been said, that duties of 35 and 30 per cent. are very good rates indeed. Those who are interested in this industry ought to be very well satisfied, and think themselves lucky to get such duties. That is the feeling that I have.

Mr. WILKS.—The honorable gentleman is giving us a free-trade speech.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—There is nothing free-trade about me.

Mr. PAGE.—A duty of 35 per cent. is not free-trade.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not think I am going very far wrong in proposing these duties.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—What is the honorable gentleman going to do in reference to parts?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The suggestion which has been made in reference to parts strikes me as being a good one. I have not been able to ascertain what is necessary, but by the time we reach the item dealing with parts I shall be able to make a statement, explaining what reduction I intend to move, if any. I firmly believe in leaving a good margin between the duty on the bicycle and that on parts. Probably a reduction of the duty on parts will make this duty more acceptable to those who are complaining at present. I move—

That the figures "£5 5s." and "£5" be left out.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS (Robertson) [8.48].—The Treasurer appears to be

slipping away from his high protectionist principles. He originally proposed a duty of £5, and now he comes down to one of 10s. He really does not seem to know where he is. The honorable member for Bendigo tells us that bicycles can be brought to this country for a mere bagatelle, and that it was because of the importation of these weak and dangerous machines that he proposed a fixed duty. But the honorable member evidently forgot that these inferior machines can be imported in parts and made up here, when they can be sold more cheaply than the good machines, with which they compete. It seems to me, however, that this item does not merit so much discussion as has been devoted to it. If we make the duty high, and the parts are put together here, and it only costs 24s. to put them together, it seems to me that there will be no demand for complete imported machines. The freight alone would make it almost prohibitive to import them as compared with the cost of putting together the parts here. The honorable member for Bendigo has told us that it takes a man thirty-six hours to put a machine together. The honorable member for Parramatta says that it costs 24s. to put a machine together. The honorable member for Boothby also says that the cost of building a bicycle from imported parts is 24s., and he speaks as a practical man. Evidently, if it takes thirty-six hours to construct a machine, and the wages paid are 8d. an hour, that works out at 24s. If the Committee wish to do something for the benefit of the industry, they should give it the parts free. Then it will flourish, and locally-built machines must take the place of importations. Therefore, when we reach item 375 I shall support the proposition that parts be admitted free, so that all the bicycles required in Australia may be made in the country. There is no advantage in importing machines if they can be put together in Australia. We have been told that bicycles are dumped into Australia. It is a remarkable thing that I never get any of these goods dumped into my back-yard. I never have a chance of buying dumped goods. But a few years ago I looked into a bicycle factory at Coventry, England, where the best machines in the world are made, and the head of the firm told me that they could have sold 5,000 more machines during the year if they had had time to make them. I have never yet heard of an up-to-date machine being dumped into any country. It is the out-of-date

Mr. Henry Willis.

machine that will be dumped, to get rid of it. This story about goods being dumped into Australia is a mere fiction, and I hope that the Committee will not be induced to believe it. However, I am more interested in item 375 than in that under consideration. I should like the duties to be made as low as possible. Whether we make the duty high or low on this item, however, it will not make a bit of difference, so long as we make the duty on parts low.

Mr. PAGE (Maranoa) [8.54].—We hear a great deal from the Melbourne and suburban members about locally-produced bicycles. In fact, it appears that in every electorate around Melbourne there are bicycle factories. In South Melbourne there seems to be one in every back yard. But while a good deal has been said about the necessity for protecting the industry, only one or two honorable members have pleaded the cause of the consumer.

Mr. WATSON.—How much did the honorable member pay for his Australian-built machine?

Mr. PAGE.—I paid £20 for it. If I want a good machine I know that I have to pay a fair price for it. Shoddy machines are made in Melbourne just as freely as they are imported. Enamel covers a multitude of sins in the bicycle trade. No one knows that better than the honorable member for South Sydney. The best bicycle I ever rode in my life was his, and it was an imported machine.

Mr. WATSON.—That was a good while ago.

Mr. PAGE.—I never rode a better machine, and I have ridden a few and travelled a good many miles on them. In my electorate nearly every man you meet who is not "waltzing Matilda" rides a bicycle. At every station to which the shearers go there is a shed for the bicycles. Many men are now giving up the ordinary machine and going in for the motor cycle. As in some cases they have to ride 70 and 80 miles a day over a bush road, their interests ought to be taken into consideration as well as those of the manufacturers in Melbourne, Sydney or Brisbane. But I have not heard the honorable member for Bendigo say a word in the interests of the men who have to buy these machines. The honorable member's anxiety appears to be limited to what can be got for Victoria. The arguments used with regard to the bicycle trade strike me as *really* very

curious. As soon as those engaged in it prove that their industry is in a flourishing condition some honorable members are prepared to protect them. The industry was flourishing in New South Wales under free-trade, and even in Victoria in the palmy days of protection there was a duty of only 10 per cent. Now, however, under the Deakin Government, and with a New South Wales protectionist Treasurer, we have proposed a duty of 35 per cent.

Mr. WILKS.—Yesterday the Treasurer wanted a duty of £10 per machine.

Mr. PAGE.—He has seen the error of his ways since then. Now, what about the wages paid in this industry which the honorable member for Bendigo is so anxious to protect against the cheap imported article? The "reputable employers section" of the Victorian Factories Act limits the power of the Wages Boards to fix rates of wages to those paid by the average employer in the trade. The wages paid to-day in the bicycle trade are higher than those fixed by the Board. I shall state what the wages fixed by the Board are. I ask the Committee whether it is fair, reasonable and reputable to expect a man with five children to live in Melbourne on £1 7s. 6d. a week? A foreman bicycle-maker, who must be a mechanic, has had his wages fixed at £2 8s. per week. That is considered sufficient for the man who bosses the show. I pay a boundary-rider more than that for sitting on a horse and riding round my fences. The assemblers of bicycle parts get £1 12s. per week, filers £1 8s., persons engaged in building, turning, and fitting, or who are employed in addition thereto at other branches of the trade, get £2 os. 6d. This is the industry the honorable member for Bendigo is raving about. I say that if it cannot afford to pay better wages than these the sooner it is wiped out the better, in order that the men at present engaged in it may be able to turn their attention to some more profitable employment. Repairers get £1 15s. per week. Wheel builders £1 8s. 6d., and all other adults engaged in the industry £1 7s. 6d. Apprentices, who are unlimited, get from 5s. to 25s. per week, and improvers, who are allowed in the ratio of one to one or two adults, two to three adults, and one for every additional adult, get from 5s. to 28s. per week, according to experience. I have heard the honorable

member for Melbourne Ports, where the majority of these bicycle shops are to be found, say times out of number that if he had his way he would wipe out an industry that could not pay better wages than these. I desire that the workers engaged in the industry, and the people who buy and ride bicycles, as well as the people who build and sell them, should get some of the benefit conferred by the protection proposed. We know that many of these bicycles are made of tin tubes. A man in Rockhampton wanted to sell me a bicycle which he said would carry a ton. He gave me a trial, and I brought it back to him like a concertina. This was a Colonial-made bicycle, and it is clear, therefore, that the remarks of the honorable member for Bendigo about cheap imported bicycles should not carry much weight. I am pleased that the Treasurer has seen fit to abolish the fixed duties proposed. It rests now with the Committee to decide what the *ad valorem* duties shall be. I have no wish to crush the local bicycle industry. I am prepared to vote for a reasonable duty for its protection, and if, under the old Victorian duty of 10 per cent. the industry could be carried on, those concerned in it should be satisfied with a duty of 25 per cent., for which I am prepared to vote.

Mr. MALONEY (Melbourne) [9.7].—I feel sure that the arguments of the Chairman of the Tariff Commission will have great weight with the Committee. I hope that if the fixed duties are removed the honorable member's colleagues on the Tariff Commission will in another place be successful in reintroducing them, or at least in providing for a fixed duty of £3 3s. on each machine. The object is to prevent the introduction of very cheap and worthless bicycles. I have seen bicycles advertised in the London press as low as £2 10s., £2 2s., and even £1 5s. If the parts of such machines were sent out here no self-respecting local manufacturer would use them. He would have to consider his good name, and in the interests of his business he could not afford to put such rubbish into a machine. We know that a certain amount of enamel will cover a great many faults, and worthless bicycles are imported which in appearance look spick and span.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—If bicycles of that stamp locally made broke down they would

be sent back to the manufacturer, and he would have to repair them.

Mr. MALONEY.—And the man who bought such a bicycle from the local manufacturer would not be likely to go to him again. I have had some experience in connexion with bicycles. In 1892 I was offered a bicycle for £20, but I did not purchase it. The bicycle I have in use at the present time cost £12. I have ridden it for a couple of years, and it is as good as the one for which I was asked £20. Within the last three months I was offered a bicycle, which was better than the one I have got, for £10. The reduction in the price has, in my opinion, been due to the operation of the present Tariff.

Mr. WILSON. — No; the price of bicycles has fallen all over the world.

Mr. MALONEY.—If the honorable member will compare the price of locally-made tires with the price charged for imported tires, he will find that the locally-made article is cheaper than the imported article. In the same way, as the result of the operation of the duty and the extended manufacture of bicycles in the Commonwealth, they can be sold now at less than the price asked for imported machines. I suppose the Government will carry the proposal to abolish the fixed duties of £5 and £5 5s.; but I suggest that they should be replaced by a fixed duty of £3 3s., to prevent the introduction of cheap and worthless bicycles. Bicycle parts, which cannot be manufactured here, should be admitted free, and if that is done, the assemblers of the parts in the Commonwealth will be given a sufficient margin of protection for their work, and will have no reason to be discontented.

Mr. HUGHES (West Sydney) [9.11].—The present proposal of the Treasurer is not calculated to help this industry to flourish and pay decent wages. Every time the honorable gentleman departs from the admirably-prepared Tariff put in front of him he gets into difficulties, and makes statements which are not corroborated from outside sources. Two kinds of bicycles are imported: Those that are good and those that are no good. Those that are no good, and that really describes them, are imported at an invoice price of from £3 to £5. I have known an individual obtain a bicycle from a Coventry firm landed here at £5, and we can assume that the purchaser of a large number of these machines would get them for very

much less. A duty of 30 per cent. would represent about £1 10s. on such a machine, and under that duty it would cost landed in Australia £6 10s. at the outside. How is a local manufacturer to pay decent wages if he is to make a bicycle for £6 10s.? I do not know how it is to be done. I have known bicycles to be sold for 22s. 6d., and all I can say is that if a manufacturer pays his workmen decent mechanics' wages, he cannot turn out a bicycle for 22s. 6d. I have never made bicycles myself, but I have done metal work, and I know that a bicycle could not be turned out at the price mentioned. I point out that if a specific duty of £5 were imposed on a machine invoiced at £5, the effect would be to keep such machines out. A man who desires an imported machine wishes to have a first-class bicycle, which would be sold at about £20, and the duty of £5 would not put the machine beyond him. A duty of £5 on the lower-priced machines would prevent their sale, and the market would thus be kept for the local manufacturer, and if he could make a better class of machine so much the better. However, when the Treasurer has formed a base mercenary alliance with the Opposition, there is nothing left for a free-trader like me to do but to follow him. I very much regret that one by one the old landmarks are becoming submerged in this chamber. We find honorable members making speeches in support of free oregon, and then proposing a duty of 6d. per 100 superficial feet, and afterwards declaring that they do not care a "continental" how things go. If we intend to do anything for this industry, we should give it such protection as will enable the local manufacturers of bicycles to pay decent wages.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. GLYNN.—Shall I be in order in moving now that the rate of duty be 30 and 25 per cent. ad val.

The CHAIRMAN. — The honorable member will see that those are the rates in the schedule.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [9.14].—As the fixed duties have been struck out, I ask the Committee to increase the ad val. rates to 35 and 30 per cent., which will, I think, be low enough. I wish to move—

That after the words "30 per cent.," the words "and on and after 11th December, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 35 per cent.," be inserted.

The CHAIRMAN.—As the Treasurer has indicated his intention of moving an amendment to increase the rates of duty, the honorable member for Angas will now be in order in moving the amendment which he indicated.

Amendment (by Mr. GLYNN) proposed—

That after the words "30 per cent." the words "and on and after 11th December, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 30 per cent.," be inserted.

Mr. BATCHELOR (Boothby) [9.18].—I shall vote for rates of 30 per cent. and 25 per cent. on bicycles, and subsequently for rates of 10 per cent. and 5 per cent. on parts, which will give a sufficient margin to local makers.

Mr. WILKS (Dalley) [9.19].—For the purposes of future reference, I wish to direct attention to the fact that the honorable member for Angas, notwithstanding that he is a free-trader, has moved the imposition of rates of 30 per cent. and 25 per cent. I shall, of course, vote for the lowest duty proposed; but I wish to emphasize the fact that other free-traders besides myself are not too rigid to be unable to vote for a 30 per cent. duty at times.

Mr. GLYNN (Angas) [9.20].—The honorable member may think himself rather smart, but the rates which I have proposed are lower than those which the Minister has moved. I did not move for lower rates, because it would have been futile, and I wished to save time.

Question—That after the words "30 per cent." the words "and on and after 11th December, 1907, 30 per cent." be inserted—put. The Committee divided.

Ayes	31
Noes	22
			—
Majority	9

AYES.

Archer, E. W.
Batchelor, E. L.
Brown, Thomas
Brown, Tilley
Cook, Joseph
Edwards, R.
Forrest, Sir John
Foxton, Colonel
Frazer, C. E.
Glynn, P. McM.
Hedges, W. N.
Hughes, W. M.
Irvine, Hans
Irvine, W. H.
Johnson, W. E.
Knox, W.

Liddell, F.
Livingston, J.
Mahon, H.
McWilliams, W. J.
Page, J.
Palmer, A. C.
Sinclair, H.
Storrer, D.
Thomas, J.
Thomson, Dugald
Willis, Henry
Wilson, J. G.
Wynne, A.
Tellers:
Atkinson, L.
Bowden, E. K.

NOES.

McDougall, J. K.
O'Malley, King
Quick, Sir John
Salmon, C. C.
Tudor, F. G.
Watkins, D.
Watson, J. C.
Wise, G. H.

Tellers:

Cook, Hume
Thomson, John

PAIRS.

Fuller, G. W.
Poynton, A.
Kelly, W. H.
Wilks, W. H.
Fowler, J. M.
Smith, Bruce
Reid, G. H.
Fysh, Sir Philip
Spence, W. G.

Deakin, A.
Mathews, J.
Kingston, C. C.
Webster, W.
Fairbairn, G.
Sampson, S.
Hall, D. R.
Harper, R.
Bamford, F. W.

Question so resolved in the affirmative.

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment (by Mr. GLYNN) agreed to—

That after the words "25 per cent." the words "and on and after 11th December, 1907, 25 per cent.," be added.

The CHAIRMAN.—It will not be necessary, in the circumstances, to put the amendment moved by the Treasurer.

Item further consequentially amended, and agreed to.

Item 370. Children's Cycles, ad val. (General Tariff), 25 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 20 per cent.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [9.28].—I move—

That the word "Cycles" be left out, with a view to insert in lieu thereof the word "Tricycles."

The item as it stands enables cycles of all kinds to be imported at the rates specified, so long as they are suitable for children; but many cycles used by adults are so small in the frame that it is difficult to distinguish between them and cycles for the use of children. The intention is to bring under the item only children's iron tricycles.

Amendment agreed to.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 371. Motor Cycles, Tricycles, and similar vehicles, n.e.i., and Frames thereof, whether partly or wholly finished, each (General Tariff), £10 10s. or ad val. 30 per cent.; (United Kingdom), each £10 or ad val. 25 per cent., whichever rate returns the higher duty.

Mr. PAGE (Maranoa) [9.31].—I desire to know whether the Treasurer will accept on this item the same duties we have imposed on bicycles, namely, 30 per cent. and 25 per cent?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I am forced to consent to such a proposal. It is not because I like it that I accept it.

Mr. PAGE.—I am glad that the Treasurer has agreed to my proposal. By doing so he has saved a good deal of time. I move—

That the words "each £10 10s." and "£10" be left out.

Amendment agreed to.

Amendments (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That the words "or" and "whichever rate returns the higher duty" be left out.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 372. Cycle Tubing and Fork Sides in the rough; Liners, including Bent Tubing not Brazed or Plated, ad val. (General Tariff), 5 per cent.; (United Kingdom), free.

Amendments (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That after the word "Plated" a semi-colon, and the word "Balls," be inserted.

That after the words "5 per cent.," the words "and on and after 11th December, 1907, free," be inserted.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 373. Perambulators and Go-carts, and parts thereof n.e.i., ad val. (General Tariff), 35 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 30 per cent."

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [9.35].—I propose to move that the duty under the general Tariff be 20 per cent. I hope that no argument is necessary to convince the Committee of the desirableness of such a reduction. It simply means a return to the old rate of duty.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [9.36].—I trust that the Committee will not agree to such a reduction. I am prepared if the Committee is favorable to reduce the duties to 30 per cent. and 25 per cent.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Make them 25 per cent. and 20 per cent.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Certainly not.

Mr. WILKS (Dalley) [9.37].—This item affects the wealthy classes of the community not so much as it does the poorer sections. Perambulators and go-carts are used mostly by the middle and poorer classes, for our wealthy citizens have other means of conveyance for their infants. I am surprised that a Government which proposes to expend £200,000 to encourage immigration is prepared to impose a prohibitive tax upon the perambulators and go-carts of the rising generation.

Mr. STORRER (Bass) [9.38].—We have already agreed to a duty of 35 per cent. on

furniture, and I fail to see why we should differentiate between furniture and perambulators. The Government proposal is a very fair one.

Mr. PALMER (Echuca) [9.39].—We have imposed a duty of 25 per cent. on children's tricycles, which are mere toys, and I do not think we should impose duties of 35 per cent. and 25 per cent. on go-carts and perambulators, which are infinitely more important and useful.

Amendment (by Mr. JOSEPH COOK) put—

That after the words "35 per cent." the words "and on and after 11th December, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 25 per cent.," be inserted.

Question put. The Committee divided.

Ayes	23
Noes	30

Majority	7
----------	-----	-----	---

AYES.

Atkinson, L.	Johnson, W. E.
Batchelor, E. L.	Liddell, F.
Brown, Thomas	Livingston, J.
Brown, Tilley	Page, J.
Cook, Joseph	Palmer, A. C.
Edwards, R.	Sinclair, H.
Forrest, Sir John	Thomson, Dugald
Foxton, Colonel	Willis, Henry
Frazer, C. E.	Wilson, J. G.
Glynn, P. McM.	Tellers:
Hedges, W. N.	Archder, E. W.
Irvine, Hans	Bowden, E. K.

NOES.

Bamford, F. W.	McDougall, J. K.
Carr, E. S.	O'Malley, King
Chanter, J. M.	Quick, Sir John
Chapman, Austin	Salmon, C. C.
Coon, J.	Spence, W. G.
Ewing, T. T.	Storror, D.
Foster, F. J.	Thomas, J.
Groom, L. E.	Thomson, John
Harper, R.	Tudor, F. G.
Hughes, W. M.	Watkins, D.
Hutchison, J.	Watson, J. C.
Irvine, W. H.	Wise, G. H.
Knox, W.	Tellers:
Lyne, Sir William	Catts, J. H.
Maloney, W. R. N.	Cook, Hume
Mauger, S.	

PAIRS.

Fuller, G. W.	Deakin, A.
Fysh, Sir Philip	Crouch, R. A.
Fowler, J. M.	Fairbairn, G.
Reid, G. H.	Hall, D. R.
Kelly, W. H.	Kingston, C. C.
McWilliams, W. J.	Mahon, H.
Poynton, A.	Mathews, J.
Smith, Bruce	Sampson, S.
Wilks, W. H.	Webster, W.

Question so resolved in the negative.
Amendment negatived.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) proposed—

That the words "and on and after 1st December, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 30 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 25 per cent.," be added.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [9.46].—I congratulate the Committee on admitting children's tricycles, which are playthings, at 20 per cent., and taxing perambulators at 30 per cent.

Amendment agreed to.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 374. Perambulator or Go-cart Body and Under-gear. each (General Tariff), 5s. 3d.; (United Kingdom), 5s.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) proposed—

That the words "and on and after 1st December, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 20 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 15 per cent.," be added.

Mr. TUDOR (Yarra) [9.48].—I think the Committee have made an error regarding this and the last item. The words "and parts thereof" should have been transferred from the last item to this, and "perambulator and go-cart body" should have been in the other item, both items carrying *ad valorem* duties. I believe that certain parts of these vehicles are not made here. There was a great discussion in the press when the Tariff was introduced as to whether the under gear was or was not made here. I am not sure now whether it is made here or not, but at any rate the parts should not be dutiable at as high a rate as is the finished article.

Mr. MAUGER. — "Tiger" Gardiner makes them.

Mr. TUDOR.—I believe that Councillor Gardiner, of North Melbourne, does make some parts of perambulators. If this item is made dutiable at a lower rate than the previous one, I suggest that the Treasurer should make inquiries and, if he finds that there is an anomaly, have it rectified in another place.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [9.50].—The honorable member for Yarra spoke to me about this matter during the last division. I did not know before that there was likely to be an anomaly, but I will take action, either here or in another place, to transfer "parts" from the previous item to this item, if I can possibly do so.

Amendment agreed to.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 375. Cycle parts plated, brazed, enamelled or permanently joined (including chains); Cycle Accessories and Parts thereof, including Cyclometers, Steel Trouser Clips, Steel Toe Clips, and Bands, Parcel Carriers, Inflators, Inflator Clips and Connexions, Bells, Saddle Covers, Tool Bags, Repair Outfits, and the like, ad val. (General Tariff), 25 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 20 per cent.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [9.51].—I wish to leave out "chains," and insert "rims"; and before "saddle covers" to insert "saddles and."

Mr. TUDOR (Yarra) [9.52].—The Minister should omit "chains." They were specifically mentioned as being free in the last Tariff. Even in Great Britain very few firms are engaged in making them. It is specialized work, and they should be included in the next item at a lower rate of duty.

Mr. PAGE (Maranoa) [9.53].—I hope the Minister will strike out cyclometers, which are not made here. This will be only a revenue duty on them. They should be put on the free list.

Mr. BATCHELOR (Boothby) [9.54].—There is no pretence that a number of articles in this item are made here or are likely to be made here.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I intend to propose duties of 15 and 10 per cent.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—That will be purely a revenue duty on necessary parts which are not made here, and which should come under the next item. I refer particularly to chains, cyclometers, and inflators. The rest of these articles can be made here.

Mr. GLYNN (Angas) [9.55].—I believe that chains in the length are free, but that these chains are taxed as accessories at 20 per cent. I am informed by an importer that that is the way the Tariff is administered. Consequently, if we desire to make chains free it will be necessary to alter this item to read "not including chains," rather than to strike out the words "including chains."

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I propose to put chains into the next item, at a duty of 5 per cent. and free.

Mr. GLYNN.—Striking them out of this item would not necessarily make them free.

Amendments (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That the word "Chains" be left out, and the word "Rims" be inserted.

That the words "Cyclometers" and "Inflators" be left out.

That the words "Saddles and" be inserted before the words "Saddle Covers."

That the words "and on and after 11th December, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 15 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 10 per cent.," be added.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 376. Cycle Parts, n.e.i., including Steel Bars for the manufacture of Rims; also unplated parts, namely, Ball Heads, Bottom Brackets, Lugs, Fork Ends, Bridges, Sprocket Wheels, Balls, Nipples, Spokes, Washers, n.e.i., and Valves for Tyres, ad val. (General Tariff), 15 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 10 per cent.

Mr. TUDOR (Yarra) [10.1].—I suggest that the word "unplated" be struck out, and "unfinished" substituted before the word "parts." If the Treasurer makes inquiries amongst his officers, he will find that the word "unplated" in this connexion caused endless confusion in the Department. Any part which had the least bit of plating on it had to fall under a higher duty; and I do not think that is the desire of the Committee.

Amendments (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That the word "unplated" be left out, with a view to insert in lieu thereof the word "unfinished"; that the word "Balls" be left out; that before the word "Washers" the word "Spoke" be inserted; that after the word "Washers" the comma be left out, with a view to insert in lieu thereof a semicolon; that the letters "n.e.i." be left out; that before the word "Valves" the word "all" be inserted; that after the word "Tyres" the words "Chains, Cyclometers, Speedometers, Inflators, Hubs, and Pedals" be inserted.

Amendments (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) proposed—

That after the words "15 per cent." the words "and on and after 11th December, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 5 per cent.," be inserted.

That after the words "10 per cent." the words "and on and after 11th December, 1907 (United Kingdom), free," be added.

Mr. BATCHELOR (Boothby) [10.7].—I think that the word "unfinished," inserted on the suggestion of the honorable member for Yarra, is not at all suitable, in view of the fact that these are all finished parts, though some of them may be unplated. The whole object of admitting these parts free will be defeated if the word "unfinished" be allowed to remain.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—We cannot go back.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—Then I should suggest that the Treasurer should arrange for a recommitment, or for the necessary rectification in another place.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 377. Vehicles, viz.:—

(A) Boston Chaises, Dog Carts, Gigs, Tilburys, and other two-wheeled Vehicles on springs or thorough braces, each (General Tariff), £6 12s.; (United Kingdom), £6.

Mr. WILKS (Dalley) [10.10].—Here we have an item with fixed duties only, and I suggest that an *ad valorem* duty ought to be substituted.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—We might take a test vote on this paragraph, as to the whole of the vehicles in the division.

Mr. WILKS.—That might be done. Do I understand that the Treasurer will consent to the striking out of the fixed duties?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—No.

Mr. WILKS.—Then I think the division will provoke some debate, because, in view of previous decisions, uniformity ought to be preserved. I should be quite prepared, in the case of paragraph A, to vote for duties of 30 per cent. and 25 per cent., which would be an increase of 5 per cent. on the old duties.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—In one column only.

Mr. WILKS.—As an argument for *ad valorem* duties, let me point out that if the division be passed as proposed, a sulky which sells at £14 or £15 will pay exactly the same duty as a dog cart worth £70 or £80.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—That is not so.

Mr. HUME COOK.—How many of these vehicles are imported?

Mr. WILKS.—No doubt the vehicle industry has progressed considerably, and there is very little importation; but that only provides a reason why the Treasurer should not propose duties so high. Under the old Tariff, vehicles to the value of £2,500,000 per annum were made in the Commonwealth.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [10.13].—Dog carts, gigs, tilburys, and other two-wheeled vehicles are imported to a larger extent than almost any other kind of vehicles, and are sold at £10, and sometimes less. They are the easiest class of vehicles to construct, and, therefore, an *ad valorem* duty would be of no avail. Some honorable members may think the proposed duty high, but, in my opinion, every one of those cheap articles ought to be made here.

Mr. SALMON.—The imported vehicles rattle to pieces in a few months.

Mr. WILKS.—An £80 dog cart does not rattle to pieces in a few months.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not think that dog carts will come under this item, but under another designation of vehicle.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—They must; there are the words "Dog Carts."

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—However, I should like to test the question whether the duties shall be fixed or *ad valorem*, although, as I have indicated, I am opposed to the latter form of impost. The test might be taken on an amendment to strike out the word "each."

Amendment (by Mr. WILKS) proposed—That the word "each" be left out.

Mr. CROUCH (Corio) [10.15].—I would point out to the honorable member for Dalley that in order to encourage the local production of the raw material of the coachbuilder we have already increased the duties formerly levied upon buggy shafts, varnishes, and quite a number of other articles.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—We have imposed an *ad valorem* rate upon buggy shafts.

Mr. CROUCH.—Yes; and previously they were admitted free, whereas they are now dutiable at 30 per cent. In the same way, bent poles were previously admitted free; but they are now subject to a duty of 2s. 6d. each. The coachbuilders, therefore, do not now occupy the position that they formerly occupied. The cost of their raw material has been increased, and consequently it becomes necessary to increase the duty upon the manufactured article. If we desire to have these vehicles manufactured locally, we should retain the fixed duty proposed by the Government.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [10.19].—It is difficult to know exactly what some honorable members desire in regard to the duties upon vehicles. The honorable member for Corio has purported to speak on behalf of the coachbuilders of Australia. I hold in my hand a request from the coachbuilders of Victoria and New South Wales that the duties levied under the old Tariff should be retained.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—But they desire to have their parts admitted free.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—They do not. They are quite willing that the parts shall be subjected to duty.

Mr. CROUCH.—If they got their parts free they would not require any increase in the duty upon their manufactured article.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—In the circular to which I have referred they de-

clare that they are quite prepared to pay a duty upon a great many of their parts. If there is one industry in the Commonwealth which is able to hold its own against the competition of the world, it is that of the manufacture of vehicles.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Oh, no.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The Treasurer evidently knows nothing whatever about the matter.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I know something about it.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The total importation of vehicles into the Commonwealth for 1906 was valued at £9,509.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The honorable member will find that the imports in respect of other classes of vehicles during that year were valued at £175,451.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The figures quoted by the Treasurer relate to the importation of parts. I am speaking of the value of the completed vehicles imported, and I have quoted the figures supplied by the Customs Department. The total value of the trade, I am informed, is £2,500,000 annually. Our coachbuilders have captured that trade under the old rates of duty.

Mr. MATHEWS.—We had better wipe them out.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—It seems to me that they have already captured the trade. I hope that they will continue to make all the vehicles required in the Commonwealth. But as that they are already doing that; it seems the height of absurdity to increase these duties. The specific duties proposed by the Treasurer are unreasonable. To associate fixed duties with values which are necessarily varying is an act of absurdity. To tax a vehicle which costs £10 at the same amount as one which costs £70 or £80 is perfectly preposterous. I know that fixed duties are very convenient from the Customs stand-point, but that fact should not be permitted to prevent us from doing justice all round.

Mr. MATHEWS.—Let us impose an *ad valorem* rate as an alternative to a fixed duty and charge whichever rate may be the higher.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The honorable member is like a sailing ship, in that he wishes to set his sails to catch every favorable breeze. I trust that we shall abolish the fixed duties in respect of vehicles and revert to the old rate of 25 per cent., which I think will afford the industry ample protection. The official statistics prove that

the industry is able to stand against all competition.

Mr. STORRER (Bass) [10.25].—I intend to vote against the imposition of fixed duties upon vehicles, because I realize that under their operation those who drive the more expensive vehicles would pay the least. I am quite prepared to support an *ad valorem* rate of 35 or 40 per cent. in view of the fact that we have already increased the cost of the construction of these vehicles.

Mr. JOHNSON (Lang) [10.28].—With the exception of the very highest class of vehicles, such as barouches and landaus, and some of the cheaper classes of buggies, there is a very small importation of vehicles into the Commonwealth. The reason is that the foreign vehicles are built too lightly to withstand use on Australian roads.

Mr. WILKS.—And the freight charges are very heavy.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Undoubtedly the cost of importation is considerable, because vehicles take up a large quantity of space. If we compare the importation of vehicles into the Commonwealth prior to Federation with the present importation, we shall find that there has been a tremendous falling-off. From the *Statistical Register* I gather that in 1900 the value of the importations under this heading was as follows:—New South Wales £11,382, Victoria £5,902, Queensland £1,436, South Australia £5,669, Western Australia £1,113, and Tasmania £96, or a total of £25,600. From the Trade and Customs Returns I gather that the imports last year from the United Kingdom were valued at £1,274, those from the United States at £8,117, and those from all other countries at £208, or a total of £9,599. As against this total there were re-exports to the extent of £92, which really reduced the value of the total imports last year to £9,507, as against £25,600 for 1900. In regard to the opinions of the coachbuilders, some evidence which was given before the Victorian Tariff Board is very interesting reading just now. It shows that even so far back as then, when the industry was not in nearly so flourishing a condition as it is in to-day, the coachbuilders did not want any more protection. In fact, many of them complained that the high Tariff was really a source of irritation to them, if it did not indeed involve them in considerable loss.

Mr. MATHEWS.—That is a good old argument, but it will not go down.

Mr. JOHNSON.—It may not go down with the honorable member; but may I remind him that it is evidence given by the coachbuilders themselves?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—What is the name of the witness?

Mr. JOHNSON.—It is a case of not one witness, but several witnesses. I know that if I were to make an *ex parte* statement, it would not make any impression upon the honorable member for Melbourne Ports or the honorable member for Bendigo; but surely they will not refuse to accept the evidence of those who are interested in the manufacture of vehicles.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—It is the evidence of mere assemblers of parts, and not of coachbuilders.

Mr. JOHNSON.—If the honorable member will be patient, he will hear the names of the coachbuilders. On page 61 Mr. Donald McCall, coachbuilder, of Warracknabeal, gave evidence. Probably the honorable member who represents that district may know the witness.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—He wants free parts.

Mr. JOHNSON.—He wants free-trade in the whole industry. He said—

I think that if coachbuilders were not protected at all they could hold their own ground. The coachmaking industry does not require any protection. In New South Wales the coachbuilding industry is one of the most flourishing.

In New South Wales the coachbuilders had not protection to anything like the same extent as in Victoria. This witness also protested against duties on the material used.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—I thought so. He wants free parts.

Mr. JOHNSON.—The honorable member is misrepresenting the matter. Mr. McCall wanted more than free parts. He said the industry itself did not require any protection. He protested against the duty proposed for that reason, and he further protested against the duty on parts.

Mr. SALMON.—Warracknabeal was then represented in the State Parliament by a free-trader; but in this Parliament it is represented by an out-and-out protectionist.

Mr. JOHNSON.—What has that to do with this evidence?

Mr. SALMON.—Everything. It shows the change in public opinion.

Mr. JOHNSON.—It cannot change the sworn evidence. I am not quoting a statement made by any one who was in Parliament, but a statement by a coach-

builder in whose interests the duty was supposed to have been imposed

Mr. SALMON.—That is fifteen years ago.

Mr. JOHNSON.—If the coachbuilders in Victoria could do without the duty fifteen years ago, how much better can they do without it to-day, when the trade is represented to be worth £2,500,000? Surely if they could do without the duty then, they can do without it far better now?

Mr. SALMON.—They were not doing without the duty.

Mr. JOHNSON.—But they wanted the duty removed. At that time they had much greater competition from abroad than they have to-day, the importations having fallen from £25,600 to £9,000 worth. To all intents and purposes the importation of these vehicles has ceased, so that the local makers have acquired practically a monopoly of the trade built up under the old duties.

Mr. MATHEWS.—Marvellous.

Mr. JOHNSON.—These are the bald facts, and there is no getting behind them. Let us see what another coachbuilder said before the Victorian Tariff Board. Mr. William Gibson Hart, coachbuilder and agricultural implement maker, of Rochester, in Victoria, gave the following evidence—

Providing the duties were swept away on all the material you use, would you be prepared to forego all duties on the manufactured article?—Yes, certainly.

You would compete against the outside world without any protective duty?—Well, I believe I could.

Let me now quote the evidence of Mr. John Donnellan, coachbuilder, of Bendigo.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—He wants free parts. He is a very decent fellow, and a good coachbuilder.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Then I presume the honorable member will not contemptuously refer to him as a mere assembler of parts. He said—

I represent the Coachbuilding Society. . . We maintain that the trade is now so restricted, that we have to employ very few hands, because the public demand is for a cheap article, and, owing to the excessive duties, we cannot make that cheap article.

Mark! "owing to the excessive duties"—

The little we can do, the industry will not be a success to us or to the rising generation. The Tariff in Sydney is lower than in Victoria; the consequence is that nearly every one who has a stake in New South Wales has a cart—novelties on wheels that we know nothing of in Victoria, and we cannot produce these here owing to excessive duties.

That is the evidence of a coachbuilder who we are assured by the honorable member for Bendigo is a very decent and reliable man.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—He must have changed his opinion since then.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Let me now take the evidence of Mr. John William Clapham, representing the Victorian Carriage Company, of Melbourne, and appointed by the coachbuilding trade to give evidence before the Victorian Tariff Board—

You think the present duties on vehicles should be maintained?—No; I am prepared, as one of the trade, to submit to a reduction. I would make a reduction of 50 per cent. all round.

Mr. John Stickland, coachbuilder, of Melbourne, gave this evidence—

Do you go in for abolishing the duty on vehicles?—I should think seriously about doing it personally.

Do you agree with the previous witness in reducing them one-half?—Certainly.

Mr. Joseph Donnelly, coachbuilder, of Melbourne, and chairman of a public meeting of the carriage trade, gave the following evidence—

I understand the summing-up of your evidence, and I want to know if it represents the whole of the trade; are materials to be free and vehicles free?—No; I cannot say that represents the trade. I speak individually there. At the meeting, the majority were in favour—sooner than pay a high rate on the materials—of having the goods (vehicles) in free.

I could quote passage after passage to the like effect from other witnesses in the trade all over Victoria, if honorable members desired, but I think that the evidence I have cited is sufficiently convincing to show even the most ardent protectionist that no duty at all is required. The Minister has not given any reason why the old duty should be increased, nor is the increase supported by anything I have seen in the reports of the Tariff Commission. So far as I can learn there has not been any demand for the additional duty. Therefore I shall do what I can not only to oppose the increased duty but to try to get a reduction.

Mr. GLYNN (Angas) [10.40].—I suggest to the Minister that it might save time if a test vote were taken on this line.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—We propose to take a test vote on an amendment to strike out the word "each."

Mr. GLYNN.—I was not aware of the arrangement. But in connexion with that test, it will be necessary for the Minister to make a special provision in the Tariff

Bill. As a rule, when we remove a duty we insert words to the effect that on and after the following day the article shall be free, thus validating what has been done up to that date. But it is now proposed to strike the word "each" out of this line. I hope it will be deleted, but with saving words. If it is deleted, without saving words, those persons who have paid the fixed duty up to to-day can sue the Government for a refund, because we shall not have validated what has been done previously.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—Surely the honorable member does not propose to upset the previous collections?

Mr. GLYNN.—I have pointed out this matter two or three times. We were perfectly safe so long as we provided that on and after the following day the duty should be so much, but what we are asked to do now is to strike out the word "each."

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—But that will be followed by a proposal to insert the words "and on and after to-day," &c.

Mr. GLYNN.—If we only strike out the word "each" it will mean that up to to-day a specific duty of £6 12s. on each vehicle has been wrongly levied. What we ought to do is to provide that up to to-day the duty on each vehicle shall be £6 12s.

Mr. PAGE.—It has been done in this way in the case of several items.

Mr. GLYNN.—Yes, but it has been wrongly done. I believe that if only the word "each" is struck out any importer who likes to sue for the excess duty will be entitled to recover it.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—Is it not a Tariff proposition until it is altered?

Mr. GLYNN.—It is a proposition on which the Government levy a certain duty, trusting to the validation of that act in the Customs Tariff Bill. For that reason we provide that up to to-day the duty shall be so much and after to-day so much, but we are now asked to strike out the word "each."

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—We might insert after "£6" the provision that on and after 11th December the duty be a certain percentage.

Mr. GLYNN.—That is exactly what I have said. What we ought to do is to provide that on and after the 11th December the duty be 25 per cent. If it is put in that way the provision will be perfectly valid. The Act which we shall ass embodying the Tariff will validate

what has been done in the past; but as the proposal stands at present we shall be striking out the basis upon which the specific duty has been levied during the last few months.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN (Calare) [10.46].—We have two points to consider, first whether we will depart from the general principle of this Tariff, and adopt a specific duty in lieu of an *ad valorem* rate; and secondly what the duty is to be. I am glad to know that the attention of the Committee has been centered upon the issue whether we shall adopt an *ad valorem* rate instead of a specific duty. The point raised by the honorable member for Angas may, I think, be met in the way he suggests, or by adopting the suggestion of the honorable member for Dalley, and testing the feeling of the Committee upon the question of eliminating the word "each." If the word is struck out we might insert the provision that on and after 11th December an *ad valorem* rate be imposed. With respect to the question of specific duties, as against an *ad valorem* duty, I invite the attention of the Committee to the fact that practically the decision of the Committee so far has been adverse to the adoption of specific duties. In addition, the coachbuilders themselves who are primarily affected are in favour of an *ad valorem* rate. I find from a circular which they have issued that the Master Coachbuilders and Wheelwrights' Association felt so much interested in this particular matter that, after the trade in Victoria and New South Wales had considered it, they held a conference in Melbourne, with the object of making certain representations to the Minister. I find that they were unanimously in favour of an *ad valorem* duty as against a specific rate. When a previous item was under consideration it was proposed to place a specific duty on shafts, poles, and so forth, but the Committee decided to eliminate the specific duty, and impose an *ad valorem* rate. I think honorable members will be wise in continuing the policy thus initiated in regard to the item under review. The Minister seems to be afraid that a number of importations of manufactured buggies or conveyances of different kinds would enter into serious competition with the local manufacturers if the specific duties were abolished. The best authorities on that point are the manufacturers themselves. In their circular they say that the annual consumption of carriages,

waggon, drays, and so forth amounts to no less a sum than £2,000,000, or, including repairs, £2,500,000 per annum. On that large amount of consumption the imports that entered into competition last year have been reduced to less than £10,000. According to the Minister's returns, the imports for the year 1906 were only £9,500. The honorable member for Lang has informed the Committee that, according to the Commonwealth statistics, prior to the introduction of the first uniform Tariff the importations amounted to something like £25,600.

Mr. CHANTER.—That was because of the free importations into New South Wales.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—The figures were partly, but not wholly, accounted for by the free importations into New South Wales. The total imports into New South Wales were about £11,000 out of a total of £25,000. Since the imposition of the duty of 25 per cent. under the old Tariff, the imports have been reduced down to the very small figure of £9,500 in a total consumption of £2,500,000 per annum. Those figures show how completely the local manufacturers have captured the trade, and that they have nothing to fear from importations on the basis of the old Tariff. The members of the trade who have issued this circular, indicate that they wish to have the whole matter adjusted on an *ad valorem* basis. The circular is signed by F. Skinner, W. H. Stevens, Dan White, F. C. Wilmot, and J. W. Waring, on behalf of the Master Coachbuilders and Wheelwrights' Association of Victoria, and by Mr. G. H. Olding, on behalf of a special meeting of Sydney Master Coachbuilders, held on 23rd August, 1907. Mr. Olding also, I am informed, represented eighteen leading coachbuilders of New South Wales, who do not belong to the association, but who commissioned him to represent their views as being identical with those of the Association. In addition, if the evidence taken before the Tariff Commission be examined, it will be found that testimony was tendered on behalf of the South Australian association identical with the recommendations of the conference. In view of this expert evidence, I trust that, first of all, the Committee will adopt the *ad valorem* method in preference to the specific duty proposed by the Treasurer. The great injustice that will be inflicted by the adoption of the Minister's proposal is that the cheaper conveyances will bear the

same amount of taxation as will the more expensive ones. No distinction is drawn; and that means that the taxation will fall heavier upon those who are compelled to use the cheaper conveyances, such as sulkies, dogcarts, and spring carts, which are generally used in the country districts rather than in the cities, and especially by graziers and settlers, to do their lighter work.

Mr. GROOM (Darling Downs) [10.59].—The honorable member for Dalley asks the Committee to agree to omit the word "each," and to impose a fixed duty. I understand that the honorable member desires first of all to test the principle whether we shall have an *ad valorem* or a fixed duty. His idea, therefore, is to eliminate the word "each," but it governs the whole item, and I point out that to protect the revenue it is necessary to keep the item intact. It would be better to test the question in some other way.

The CHAIRMAN.—I think that the sense of the Committee can be ascertained by the honorable member for Dalley moving to insert the words "*ad valorem*" after the figures "£6." If that be agreed to an amendment can be submitted to the effect that on and after 11th December, the duty be so and so.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment (by Mr. WILKS) proposed—

That after the figure "£6," paragraph A, the words "and on and after 11th December, 1907, *ad val.*," be inserted.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [11.4].—Having heard the arguments on this item, and in view of the decision of the Committee to apply an *ad valorem* duty to bicycles, I feel disposed to vote for the imposition of an *ad valorem* duty in this case. With a view to the speedy settlement of the question, I should be prepared to vote for duties of 35 per cent. and 30 per cent.

Mr. WILKS.—That is what I intend to propose.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [11.6].—Apparently honorable members have made up their minds that we should impose *ad valorem* instead of fixed duties on this item. That being so, it is useless to spend time in further discussing the matter, and I, therefore, propose to move the imposition of duties of 35 per cent. and 30 per cent.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—That will do.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—When the item of bicycles was under consideration I felt, as I feel now, that it would be very much

better to apply specific duties, and I wish the Committee now to arrive at a decision that will cover the whole of the paragraphs in the item with which we are dealing. If the honorable member for Dalley will withdraw his amendment, I shall move in the direction I have indicated.

Mr. MATHEWS.—What is the use of duties of 35 per cent. and 30 per cent.?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—There is no chance of our carrying a fixed duty.

Mr. MATHEWS.—I must admit that in a free-trade House it is hardly worth while endeavouring to do so!

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—When the item of bicycles was under consideration, I was attacked for proposing what I thought the Committee would agree to—the imposition of a fixed duty instead of an *ad valorem* one. It has been clearly shown during this debate that there is no likelihood of our carrying a specific duty in connexion with this item, and, that being so, I shall propose duties of 35 per cent. and 30 per cent.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That after the figure “£6” the words “and on and after 11th December, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 35 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 30 per cent.,” be inserted.

Paragraph, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraph (B). Buggies, four-wheeled Waggon, for carrying goods; Waggon, single or double-seated; Waggon, Express; without tops, mounted on springs or thorough braces, each (General Tariff), £9 18s.; (United Kingdom), £9.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [11.10].—Under the Tariff of 1902 a duty of 25 per cent. was imposed on these vehicles. I, therefore, propose to move duties of 35 per cent. and 30 per cent. in the case of paragraphs B, C, D, and E. I move—

That after the figure “£9” the words “and on and after 11th December, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 35 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 30 per cent.,” be inserted.

Amendment agreed to.

Paragraph, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraph (C). Hansom Cabs; Single and double-seated Waggon; Waggonettes; Four-wheeled Buggies; with tops, each (General Tariff), £13 4s.; (United Kingdom), £12.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That after the figures “£12” the words “and on and after 11th December, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 35 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 30 per cent.,” be inserted.

Paragraph, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraph (D). Omnibuses and Coaches for carrying mails or passengers, each (General Tariff), £27 10s.; (United Kingdom), £25.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That after the figures “£25” the words “and on and after 11th December, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 35 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 30 per cent.,” be inserted.

Paragraph, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraph (E). Barouches, Broughams, Drags, Landaus, Mail Phaetons, Victorias, each (General Tariff), £44; (United Kingdom), £40.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That after the figures “£40” the words “and on and after 11th December, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 35 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 30 per cent.,” be inserted.

Paragraph, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraph (F). All Carts and Waggon (without springs) and Spring Carts and Spring Drays, with two wheels, ad val. (General Tariff), 30 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 20 per cent.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) proposed—

That after the words “20 per cent.,” the words “and on and after 11th December, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 35 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 30 per cent.,” be inserted.

Mr. FRAZER (Kalgoorlie) [11.13].—The protectionist section of the Tariff Commission recommended a lower duty than existed in respect of this paragraph under the old Tariff.

Mr. STORER.—In dealing with the other paragraphs, we have departed from their recommendations.

Mr. FRAZER.—That is so; but for the most part their recommendations were for fixed duties on vehicles, although an *ad valorem* duty was recommended in respect of this paragraph.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—Because we have in this case a generalization of items.

Mr. FRAZER.—The protectionist section of the Tariff Commission must have had good reason for proposing that the old duty should be reduced.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—That may be an anomaly, or the result of a mistake.

Mr. FRAZER.—I must admit that waggon, carts, and drays are largely made in Australia. If the Chairman of the Tariff Commission thinks that a mistake has been made, I will accept his assurance.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. MCWILLIAMS (Franklin) [11.16].—I think that some consideration should

be given to the carter, who under this item will be charged £12 on the ordinary tip dray.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—There is keen competition in the manufacture of these vehicles, and that will keep down prices.

Mr. MCWILLIAMS.—In most of these cases it is the Tariff that regulates prices. I think that 30 per cent. is too heavy a duty to impose on a means of earning a livelihood.

Paragraph, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraph (G). All Carriages or Conveyances, *n.e.i.*, Hand Trucks and parts *n.e.i.* of Vehicles, including Axles and Springs when imported separately, *ad val.* (General Tariff), 35 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 25 per cent.

Mr. WILKS (Dalley) [11.18].—I move—

That the words "including Axles and Springs when imported separately," be left out.

In the old Tariff, axles and springs were dealt with separately, being dutiable at 15 per cent. I do not suggest that we should go back to the old duty, but I am of opinion that in this, as in the old Tariff, we should differentiate between the raw material and the finished article. Carriages and conveyances might well be dutiable at the rate set down, but axles and springs should be taxed at a lower rate. We should give the same treatment to axles and springs as to buggy parts. Axles are imported in halves or "arms," and are welded together and adapted to the various widths of vehicles by the local coachsmiths.

Mr. STORRER.—It would give more work if they were made here.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—It would give more work if the honorable member had to row to Launceston instead of travelling there by steamer.

Mr. WILKS.—Axles are raw material to coachbuilders, who should be able to obtain them as cheaply as possible. There are at least 180 different patterns, and surely no honorable member will contend that we have here factories which can turn out so many patterns. I desire that axles and springs shall be treated in the same way as buggy shafts and parts. Springs come out in bundles, and, of course, the rates which I wish to impose would apply only to bulk importations. As a free-trader, I am going a great way to meet protectionists in what I have proposed.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I have been specially asked by coachbuilders not to agree to this reduction.

Mr. WILKS.—I have not been invited to move this amendment, but I would point out that the right honorable member for Adelaide, a strong protectionist, made a similar differentiation.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—And killed an industry.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN (Calare) [11.23].—In a communication which I have had from a large coachmaker in my electorate, he points out that this item covers a good deal of material used by coachmakers which must be imported. He says that a difference must be made between the raw material of the coachbuilder and the manufactured article, and that a good deal of raw material which was dutiable at 15 per cent. is now dutiable at 30 and 25 per cent. He would like to see the old duty continued, and suggests that this paragraph should be subdivided into three sections, the first dealing with carriages, conveyances, traps, and parts *n.e.i.*, and the second with vehicle parts *n.e.i.* not previously fitted to any vehicle. That proposal is intended to overcome a difficulty experienced under the old Tariff, by preventing the introduction of parts brought in so finished that they had simply to be put together. The third subdivision would deal with axles and arms not welded together, in lots of not less than a dozen each.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—This arrangement might suit his business, but it would injure that of others who make axles.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—Axles are largely imported from America and from England.

Mr. PAGE.—Cannot they be made in Australia?

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—The steel is imported shaped ready for use, and the so-called making consists of turning it into shape. Most of the axles for light conveyances come from America, and those for large vehicles from England. There are only a couple of places in Melbourne where axles are made, and the making is a very little matter. The axle-making industry in Australia is really a small thing, and it would be a serious matter to penalize the coachbuilders of the Commonwealth, in order to protect it. The coachbuilders, in the country districts, at all events, desire to obtain axles and other buggy parts at lower rates of duty than are charged on finished vehicles, so that they may have a sufficient margin to enable them to compete.

against manufacturers abroad. What is required is a difference in the duty imposed on parts which require to be fitted together, chiefly on axles, and the duty imposed on the same parts when imported in a completed vehicle. I hope the Minister will agree to some distinction being made for the protection of manufacturers who import these parts as their raw material.

Mr. BATCHELOR (Boothby) [11.31].—The honorable member for Calare cannot be making his appeal in the interest of the consumer, who would not be benefited by what he proposes, but in the interests of persons who desire that the coachbuilding industry, instead of being an industry for the complete manufacture of vehicles, should be merely one for the assembling of parts of vehicles. That is the very thing we should try to avoid. The manufacture of axles was really one of the strangled industries. Under the legislation of the States it enjoyed a pretty high measure of protection and was well established, but under the 15 per cent. duty of the last Commonwealth Tariff its continuance was endangered.

Mr. WILKS.—There were two factories in Melbourne.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—The plant required is not expensive, and there is no reason why coachbuilders generally should not also manufacture axles. If we give them sufficient protection they will do so, but they are unable to do so with a duty of only 15 per cent. It should be mentioned that as a matter of fact patent axles, though correctly described as such when we were boys, no longer exist, because the patents have run out, and they can be and are being made here.

Mr. WILKS (Dallev) [11.34].—In reply to the honorable member for Boothby, I have only to say that the protectionist section of the Tariff Commission recommended a duty of 25 per cent.

Amendment negatived.

Amendment (by Mr. JOSEPH COOK) negatived—

That after the words "25 per cent.," the words "and on and after 11th December, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 30 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 25 per cent.," be added.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That after the words "25 per cent.," the words "and on and after 11th December, 1907, ad val. (United Kingdom), 30 per cent.," be added.

Paragraph, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraph (H). Parts of Carriages—

- (a) Sets of Wheels (unbored and untired), per set (General Tariff), 33s.; (United Kingdom), 30s.
- (b) Sets of Wheels (bored and tired), per set (General Tariff), 49s. 6d.; (United Kingdom), 45s.
- (c) Under Gear (including Axles, Springs, and Arms), per set (General Tariff), 66s.; (United Kingdom), 60s.
- (d) Buggy Hoods, each (General Tariff), 49s. 6d.; (United Kingdom), 45s.
- (e) Carriage Bodies, in the white, each (General Tariff), 88s.; (United Kingdom), 80s.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That an asterisk be inserted before sub-paragraphs *a* and *b*, with a view to adding an asterisk with a foot-note at the bottom of page 41, reading "A set consists of four wheels."

Mr. THOMAS BROWN (Calare) [11.39].—I hope the Minister will be prepared to accept *ad valorem* duties in this paragraph.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I intend to propose them.

Amendment (by Mr. JOSEPH COOK) negatived—

That after the figures "30s.," sub-paragraph *a*, the words "and on and after 11th December, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 30 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 25 per cent.," be inserted.

Mr. JOHNSON (Lang) [11.42].—I desire to propose a reduction of duty to 30 per cent. in both columns. The Treasurer's proposal is altogether too high.

The CHAIRMAN.—The Committee has already negatived a proposal for a duty of 30 per cent. in the first column.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That after the figures "30s.," sub-paragraph *a*, the words "and on and after 11th December, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 35 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 30 per cent.," be inserted.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That after the figures "45s.," sub-paragraph *b*, the words "and on and after 11th December, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 35 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 30 per cent.," be inserted.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—What is the meaning of the words "bored and tired," in sub-paragraph *b*? I am both.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That after the figures "60s.," sub-paragraph *c*, the words "and on and after 11th December, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 35 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 30 per cent.," be inserted.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [11.46].—Is there any need for such high

duties on buggy hoods? The proposal is absurd. A continuance of this kind of thing would make anybody not only tired and bored, but sick to death. A duty of 35 per cent. is proposed on one of the simplest forms of manufacture, when we have put only 25 per cent. on some of the most complicated forms of manufacture in Australia, requiring the greatest possible skill and ingenuity in construction. I shall propose duties of 25 per cent. and 20 per cent.

Amendment (by Mr. JOHNSON) negatived—

That after the figures "45s.," sub-paragraph *d*, the words "and on and after 11th December, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 5 per cent.; (United Kingdom), free," be inserted.

Amendment (by Mr. JOSEPH COOK) negatived—

That after the figures "45s.," sub-paragraph *d*, the words "and on and after 11th December, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 25 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 20 per cent.," be inserted.

Amendments (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That after the figures "45s.," sub-paragraph *d*, the words "and on and after 11th December, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 35 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 30 per cent.," be inserted.

That after the figures "80s.," sub-paragraph *e*, the words "and on and after 11th December, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 35 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 30 per cent.," be inserted.

Paragraph (1). Motor Lorries and Waggon, ad val. (General Tariff), 35 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 25 per cent.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [11.51].—I move—

That the following words be added to paragraph 1:—"and on and after 11th December, 1907, (a) Bodies for Motor Lorries and Waggon and parts thereof n.e.i., ad val. (General Tariff), 35 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 30 per cent.; (b) Chassis for Motor Waggon and Lorries, ad val. (General Tariff), 5 per cent.; (United Kingdom), free."

None of these chassis are likely to be made here during our time, but the carriage part could, and should, be made in Australia.

Mr. POYNTON (Grey) [11.52].—I am glad that the Treasurer has submitted this amendment; but I suggest that steel stamped panels which are used for the stiffening of the seats, and are made by only one firm in England, should be made subject to the same duty as the chassis. This would encourage the building of the bodies of the car in Australia, which are worth from £30 to £65, according to the style and finish.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [11.53].—I think I have made the most liberal provision. There is already a reasonable protection on bodies, and persons who require these little things might reasonably be expected to pay the higher duty for them.

Amendment agreed to.

Paragraph, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraph (1). Motor Cars, and parts thereof, including tyres when accompanying vehicles, ad val. (General Tariff), 35 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 25 per cent.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) proposed—

That the following words be added to paragraph 1:—"and on and after 11th December, 1907, (a) Bodies for Motor Cars and parts thereof n.e.i., ad val. (General Tariff), 35 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 30 per cent.; (b) Chassis for Motor Cars, ad val. (General Tariff), 5 per cent.; (United Kingdom), free."

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [11.55].—We have already made rubber tires dutiable at 25 per cent. and 20 per cent., and I do not see why they should pay a higher duty if they accompany the vehicle.

Mr. HARPER.—I suggest that the language of the old Tariff be adopted, so as to allow one set of tires in free.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I agree with that suggestion.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not know that even one tire should be admitted duty free.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—That is one question, but there is the other question of charging the higher duty when the tires accompany the vehicle.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [11.56].—It strikes me that if I omitted the words "including tires when accompanying vehicles," then the duty will refer only to the cars, and tires will come under another item.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I do not think that would be so, because the tires will come in as part of the car. I think that the suggestion of the honorable member for Mernda might be adopted.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—If I strike out the words to which I have referred, that will dispose of this duty on the tires, and I can move a sub-paragraph to make them subject to a duty of 5 per cent. and free.

Mr. PALMER (Echuca) [11.59].—The tires on a motor car will come in as part of the car, and be subject to duties of 35 and 30 per cent. As a matter of fact, motor cars are actually being made in Australia at the present time.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Boat motors are being made, but they are not the same.

Mr. PALMER.—I happen to know that complete motor cars are being made at Tarrant's, because I have seen the parts in the rough before they have been put on the lathe.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I will withdraw my amendment, and submit one in an altered form.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) proposed—

That the following words be added to paragraph 1:—"and on and after 11th December, 1907, (a) Bodies for motor cars and parts thereof n.e.i., ad val. (General Tariff), 35 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 30 per cent.; (b) Chassis for motor cars and rubber tyres for one car, ad val. (General Tariff), 5 per cent.; (United Kingdom), free," be added.

Mr. PALMER (Echuca) [12.2 a.m.].—I consider that the manufacturers of motor cars, to whom I have already referred, are entitled to a certain measure of protection. I can assure the Treasurer that the metal used in their construction is cast here. In fact, that everything used in their manufacture is made here.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—If the statement of the honorable member should prove to be correct, I will have the matter adjusted in some way.

Amendment agreed to.

Paragraph, as amended, agreed to.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Progress reported.

SPECIAL ADJOURNMENT.

Motion (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That the House at its rising adjourn until 11 a.m. to-day (Wednesday).

INFORMAL PETITION.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I desire to inform honorable members that my attention has been called to the petition which was presented this afternoon by the honorable member for Kooyong, and which I notice is addressed to the Speaker and members of the Legislative Assembly of Victoria. It deals with Tariff questions throughout, but, as it is wrongly addressed, I have ordered the record of its reception to be read.

use adjourned at 12.5 a.m. (Wednesday).

House of Representatives.

Wednesday, 11 December, 1907.

Mr. SPEAKER took the chair at 11 a.m., and read prayers.

EXCISE TARIFF (AGRICULTURAL MACHINERY) ACT.

Mr. FISHER.—I desire to ask the Prime Minister whether he has noticed in this morning's *Age* a comment by Mr. Justice Higgins, regarding the action of the Government in connexion with the Excise Tariff (Agricultural Machinery) Act? When dealing with an application to the Court, His Honour is reported to have said yesterday—

If the Commonwealth Government were so interested in these applications it could have come forward in previous applications before me, and not allowed trades unions and other parties interested to bear the whole expense of bringing evidence before me to enable me to fix the standards of wages.

I desire to draw the attention of the Prime Minister to that statement of the Judge regarding the want of action by the Commonwealth Government up to date, and to ask if he can communicate to the House and the country its policy regarding matters as they now stand?

Mr. DEAKIN.—The honorable member will recollect that the comment made by the learned Judge—which I, of course, do not criticise in any way—was made in dealing with an application from the Government, while giving reasons why, in his opinion, it could not be complied with. The endeavour of the Government was to secure, as far as possible, a uniform standard, in view of the fact that the decision of the previous Judge of the Arbitration Court had established one standard of wages in South Australia, which, in some respects, differed from his own decision. The learned Judge's comment on our application was that the Government had not been represented on the previous application, with which he had dealt. That is perfectly true, but the Government was not represented at the application on which his predecessor fixed the rate of wages for South Australia, and there was no suggestion at the time that it required to be represented. Of course, the question which my honorable and learned colleague had

then to consider was whether, in view of the judgment by the first President of the Arbitration Court, anything had been discovered showing that it was necessary for the Government to intervene. There seemed to be nothing of that kind, nothing in that first judgment. But a new state of affairs was created by the judgment of Mr. Justice Higgins, which, in the opinion of my honorable and learned colleague, made it necessary for the Government to intervene. I assume that the learned Judge did not consider it within his province, or at all events, within his duty, to comment upon the changed state of affairs following upon his own judgment.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Must it not always be that different Judges will take different opinions?

Mr. SPEAKER.—The honorable member can ask a question later on.

Mr. DEAKIN.—If Mr. Speaker will permit me, I will say, in reply to the inquiry, that the obvious difficulty suggested is one of the chief of those which it is the hope of the Government to meet by fresh proposals. We also realize that so long as the proceedings of Law Courts are conducted in the formal protracted and expensive manner which is required for most of their purposes, their proceedings when they come to deal with matters industrial, some of them relatively small, but all requiring to be treated by the same ponderous machinery, may create a serious situation. Consequently, the proposals of the Government, which probably will be laid upon the table before we rise to-day—my honorable and learned colleague has just informed me that the final revise is expected within half-an-hour or an hour—will show that it is in order to meet that difficulty by other substantive and substituted proposals that the Government is foreshadowing legislation in the near future.

Mr. FISHER.—In the meantime, does the honorable gentleman intend to proceed with the Excise Procedure Bill?

Mr. DEAKIN.—I have already indicated that the Government think that Bill ought to be dealt with by the House before the Christmas adjournment. Of course, we recognise that legal objections may be taken, but we think that they should offer no obstacle, inasmuch as the House cannot finally determine legal questions, especially when there is a conflict of professional opinion.

Mr. FRAZER.—Arising out of the decision of Mr. Justice Higgins, I desire to ask the Prime Minister a question regarding the following statement made by Mr. McArthur to the Court—

It was desired by the Commonwealth Government that the rates of wages should be uniform throughout the Commonwealth.

I wish to know if it is the intention of the Government to establish uniform conditions throughout the Commonwealth, irrespective of the place of manufacture?

Mr. DEAKIN.—The instructions to counsel authorized him to ask the Judge to secure uniformity in the rates of wages so far as was practicable, having regard, of course, to differences in the place in which the manufacture occurred, or to any other circumstances. Of course, every one desires uniformity as far as possible, and that is what counsel was instructed to ask for. I have no doubt that the newspapers take special care in reporting the utterances of a Judge, but when they are summarizing or condensing the arguments of counsel necessarily take much more liberty.

Mr. GLYNN.—I rise to ask the Prime Minister a further question on the subject. I find it rather difficult to understand how a difference of opinion between Mr. Justice O'Connor and Mr. Justice Higgins as to the rate of wages creates a ground of justifiable intervention by the Government, which did not exist when the application was made in Adelaide. I beg to ask the honorable gentleman whether he proposes to take the latest decision in each case as the standard of uniformity, irrespective of the fact that it may be lower or perhaps higher than one previously prescribed?

Mr. DEAKIN.—I am in a difficulty even greater than that of my honorable and learned friend in perceiving what the first statement he made has to do with the question with which he concluded. However, that is immaterial. All I have to say is that, as he is aware, under similar circumstances a later judgment would be reckoned of somewhat more value, even in the same Court, and by the same Judge, than a previous one. Inasmuch as it is not the decision of a higher Court, nor the decision of a numerically stronger Court, the judgment stands.

Mr. GLYNN.—I should like to ask the Prime Minister whether it is not a fact that the Excise Tariff Act 1906, so far from

laying down any rule as to uniformity, provides different methods of ascertaining what are fair and reasonable rates, which may lead to diversity; and that the President of the Court of Arbitration is not bound by the decision of any other Judge sitting as President? That being so, how did the Government expect to be afforded an opportunity to obtain any rule of uniformity that would be obligatory?

Mr. DEAKIN.—In the momentary absence of my colleague, the Attorney-General, I think I am correct in stating that the object of the application to the Court was to obtain the Judge's decision on that and several other matters which enter into cases of this kind. Even an adverse decision may often be a help, in view of the possibility of our making future application in connexion with similar questions.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—Will the Prime Minister state whether it is intended to apply Mr. Justice Higgins' award to all country blacksmiths, and so to place them in the same position as that occupied by large manufacturers of agricultural implements?

Mr. DEAKIN.—The award applies only to blacksmiths engaged in making excisable goods, and not to the trade generally.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—In Tasmania, at all events, practically every country blacksmith is making excisable parts. I wish to know whether those who are making parts that are dutiable under the Act will be brought under its operation?

Mr. DEAKIN.—Those who are making excisable goods must come under the Excise conditions, but under the proposals to be submitted the least possible interference will accrue.

Mr. SAMPSON.—I should like to direct the attention of the Prime Minister to the fact that the feeling amongst the manufacturers is that in signing the guarantee bond, demanded by the Government, they might be signing away their legal rights in respect of any resistance to a subsequent claim for Excise by the Government. If that be so, I should like to ask the honorable gentleman to say what relief the bond demanded from the manufacturers would give them in the meantime.

Mr. DEAKIN.—So far I am not aware of anything in the bond which deprives manufacturers of any legal rights they are entitled to retain in view of the legis-

lation which has been passed. What those legal rights are will very shortly be determined by the Courts.

Mr. PALMER.—I desire to ask the Prime Minister whether it is seriously the intention of the Government to seek to enforce the payment of Excise duty upon harvesters made since the 1st January last, in view of the fact that the Government failed to determine what was a reasonable and fair rate of wages?

Mr. WATSON.—Let them pay what Mr. Justice Higgins has decided are fair and reasonable wages.

Mr. DEAKIN.—The Government were not called upon to determine what were fair and reasonable rates of wages under the terms of the Act in that case. They certainly will enforce the payment of Excise from the 1st January, as far as it is possible to do so.

Mr. PALMER.—Then they are going to do a great injustice.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—I also desire to ask the Minister of Trade and Customs a question without notice. I observe in today's newspapers that it is stated that the Minister is going to take vigorous action at the end of the week in connexion with the harvester Excise. I should like to know why the Minister did not let the House know that he intended to take such action, and why he has not taken the vigorous steps indicated before Parliament is about to adjourn?

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—No delay whatever has occurred. We are simply waiting for the necessary legal formalities to be observed. Instructions have been given to go ahead as quickly as possible, and we shall proceed as rapidly as the necessary legal formalities which have to be observed will enable us to do.

TELEPHONE ADMINISTRATION.

Mr. LIVINGSTON.—I beg to ask the Postmaster-General if he will take into consideration the advisability, with a view to securing further efficiency, of putting all the telephones of the Commonwealth under one head?

Mr. MAUGER.—Many changes are being considered, and that amongst others.

POST OFFICE, GLENFERRIE.

Mr. KNOX.—I beg to ask the Minister representing the Minister of Home Affairs what steps are being taken to start the building of a new post-office at Glenferrie, which, I may say, is greatly needed?

Mr. MAUGER.—With regard to many of these undertakings we have to depend upon the Public Works Department of the State. They have had this matter in hand for some time, and have promised that the plans and specifications will be completed, and tenders called for, about the beginning of January.

PROPOSED TRAINING CAMP AT HEIDELBERG.

Mr. PAGE.—I wish to ask the Minister of Defence a question, without notice. I desire to know whether he has received a reply to a question put by me yesterday regarding the training of citizen soldiers?

Mr. EWING.—I take it for granted that the honorable member refers to the question which he asked with reference to Victorian troops going into camp on Foundation Day. I have made inquiries, and I find that the statements made with regard to the Commandant were not quite correct. The Commandant was sympathetic, but it was a matter of money. He had no power to grant what was desired. It being a matter of money, I brought it under the attention of the Treasurer, and he, seeing that what was desired was a national step in the right direction, and that the amount involved was a small one—only about £50—immediately said that the money would be forthcoming.

PAYMENT FOR SERVICES RENDERED TO STATE GOVERNMENTS.

Mr. SALMON.—In view of the fact that services performed by State officials for the Commonwealth are paid for by the Commonwealth, I desire to ask the Treasurer, without notice, whether he will take into early consideration the possibility of securing payment in cases where the Commonwealth performs services for the States?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I have received information once or twice that such services as the honorable member refers to are performed. I am not quite sure whether some portion of the work done for the States by the Commonwealth is paid for. But the matter is under consideration. We have been trying to work harmoniously with the States in every possible way, and I hope shortly to make an equitable arrangement by which each party, State or Commonwealth, will be able to perform for each other such services as are required.

STRIPPER HARVESTERS.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—I desire to ask the Minister of Trade and Customs a question without notice. In view of the statements contained in this morning's newspapers, to the effect that the remainder of the Tariff is to be put through in one sitting, I should like to know when he will be in a position to inform the House with regard to matters relating to stripper harvesters, namely, the number of imports, the number of exports, and the number of harvester strippers made during the current year? I should also like to know whether that information will be made available before the item to which it relates is dealt with?

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—I shall be very glad to give the honorable member as much of the information that he asks for as we have in the Department. I will at once send across to get it, so that the honorable member may have it when the item to which it relates comes up for consideration.

EXCISE TARIFF (SPIRITS) ACT.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—I desire to ask a question of the Minister of Trade and Customs without notice. I wish to know whether, from an answer given by him to a question of mine last week, it was not understood that the formalities in connexion with the Spirits Excise arrangements would be completed this week, and that he would be able to make a statement to the House on Monday? Are we to understand that the Minister meant Monday next?

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—No; I meant Monday or Tuesday of the present week. I have a memorandum here which shows the steps which have been taken. I may as well read it—

Manufacturers were, by instructions to collector on 19th November, 1907, afforded an opportunity of entering into a bond or undertaking to conform with any decision of Parliament in regard to payment of wages or payment of Excise, provided that—

1. They paid the standard rate of wages on and from 8th November, 1907.
2. They furnished full particulars of all excisable goods on hand on 31st December, 1906, and those since manufactured.

If they complied with these conditions, the collection of Excise would for the present be suspended.

The bond or undertaking was required to be furnished within fourteen days of registered notice calling for same, and particulars of due dates are furnished herewith.

It is proposed in regard to those cases where the bond of undertaking is not furnished—

1. To at once call upon manufacturers to apply within seven days for licence and furnish security under the Excise Act 1901.
2. Where application is not made, to proceed forthwith against manufacturers for penalties.

Appended is a statement showing the number of manufacturers to whom notices were issued, the number who have furnished a bond or undertaking, and the dates on which in each case the undertakings are returnable. In several States they are due now. In all cases they will be due by Monday next.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—The Minister said that he would be able to make a statement on Monday last.

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—These notices have had to be posted to the various manufacturers concerned. I have all the dates here. Legal proceedings will be taken against those who are not disposed to carry out the regulations which have been made, and instructions have been given to the Crown Solicitor to proceed against them. That is all that the Government could do. The delay has not been caused by any fault of ours. Not one day has been lost. Notices have been issued from day to day. But it was impossible to date the fourteen days—the period allowed to the manufacturers—from the day the notices were sent out. They had to be sent to many distant places. The time allowed will, in all cases, have expired on Monday, and then legal proceedings will be taken forthwith.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—I wish to ask the Minister of Trade and Customs whether the result of accidental delays, on the part of officials, will not be that the Government will be unable to take any action until after the House rises for the Christmas adjournment, and whether he thinks in such circumstances the House is being fairly treated?

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—I can assure the honorable member that even had no delay occurred in the issue of bonds legal proceedings could not have been initiated at an earlier date. As a matter of fact, as a reference to the schedule will show, the delay occurred in only one State. Action will be at once taken. The issue of writs must necessarily occupy some time, and no delay that could have been obviated has occurred.

KEROSENE DUTIES.

Mr. PAGE.—I desire to ask the Minister of Trade and Customs a question, without notice. Has his attention been drawn to a sub-leader in the Melbourne *Herald* of yesterday, wherein it is stated that kerosene oil has paid no duty since the introduction of the new Tariff—that the only duty paid in Victoria has been some £7 or £8 on account of ships' stores—although the consumers have had to pay increased prices for their kerosene? Does the Minister intend to do anything in the direction of insuring that the money paid by consumers, and of which they have been robbed, shall be refunded to them?

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—I noticed the paragraph in question.

Mr. PAGE.—It was a sub-leader, not a paragraph.

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—It does not matter whether it was a sub-leader or not. When statements are made in a newspaper, such as the one to which the honorable member refers, we are bound to take notice of them. I have asked for information as to what duty has been paid, so that I may be able to supply it to honorable members. It is, of course, impossible to prevent the Standard Oil Company from raising their price if they like.

Mr. PAGE.—They have been blaming the Tariff for the increase of price.

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—Well, the Opposition have been blaming the Tariff for everything. They blame the Tariff if it does not rain!

Mr. THOMAS.—I wish to ask the Prime Minister, without notice, whether, seeing that the duty has been taken off kerosene, the Government will refund duty paid on that article to those who have paid it? It seems to me that this would be just as fair as the other proposal made.

Mr. DEAKIN.—I take it that the honorable member wishes to enforce a principle, and suggest remedies, but he must be aware that it is not possible to attempt to accept such a proposition.

Mr. PAGE.—Following up the question that I have just put to the Minister of Trade and Customs, I should like to ask the Attorney-General whether there is any means of making these men disgorge the money of which they have robbed the people?

Mr. GROOM.—It is not usual for the Attorney-General to give legal opinions, especially on the spur of the moment, but I may say at once that I know of no procedure to accomplish the object mentioned by the honorable member.

Mr. SALMON.—I should like to ask the Minister of Trade and Customs whether it would not be possible to collect duty on stocks of kerosene in tins held when the Tariff was introduced?

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—That is a matter for the House to determine. I have not the power to do what the honorable member suggests; if I had, I should make those who increased their prices to the extent of the duty pay the duty.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Is not the Minister of Trade and Customs aware that the imposition of a duty on kerosene in tins increased the value of stocks in hand when the Tariff was introduced, and does he not think that if holders had continued to sell at the old rates others would have taken advantage of the enhanced value?

Mr. PAGE.—Surely the honorable member does not believe in the people being robbed?

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I should not be in order in discussing that question. Will the Minister say whether it is not a fact that the imposition of a duty on tinned kerosene made stocks on the market more valuable, since no other supplies could be introduced in tins without payment of duty?

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—Unfortunately, this case is different from others, because there is no competition. I understand that the honorable member for Maranoa and others complain that when the Tariff was introduced those who already had in stock large quantities of kerosene in tins immediately raised the price, although they were not called upon to pay any duty. We are asked whether we cannot take steps to cause a refund of the increased amount so paid. I wish we could. If there were such a means we should avail ourselves of it.

Mr. TUDOR.—Will the Minister of Trade and Customs ascertain whether the Colonial Oil Company, which I understand is a branch of the Standard Oil Trust, has refunded, or promised to refund, to merchants who purchased kerosene from them, the additional price which they charged on the imposition of the duty, and, if so, whether those merchants have pro-

mised to hand over to the Department the amounts so refunded?

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—I am afraid that it is difficult to obtain the information which the honorable member seeks, but I have asked for all the information that can be secured.

Mr. SALMON.—In view of the fact that, as the result of the extra price charged for kerosene in tins, an enormous sum of money has been diverted from the people, will the Prime Minister suggest to importers and distributors the desirability of their handing over to the charitable institutions of the Commonwealth a sum representing the increased prices which they have obtained?

Mr. DEAKIN.—The honorable member himself has probably called attention to his desire in as effective a way as possible. I should be glad if the penalty for non-compliance with his very excellent suggestion were of the kind once described in comic opera—as “something humorous; something with boiling oil.”

COMMONWEALTH OFFICES IN LONDON.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—Can the Prime Minister state whether arrangements have yet been completed for leasing from the London County Council a site for the proposed Commonwealth buildings in London?

Mr. DEAKIN.—‘Py the last mail I received reports of a pathetic speech by the Chairman of the London County Council, in which he complained that the offers of the Commonwealth, so far, have not come up to expectations, but that he does not want to break off negotiations whilst there is a chance of securing so desirable a lessee. It may be owing to that policy that we have not yet received a final answer to our proposal.

CHRISTMAS RECESS.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Is the Prime Minister yet in a position to state definitely on what day the House will rise for the Christmas adjournment?

Mr. DEAKIN.—I can tell the honorable member on what day the House will meet again.

Mr. JOHNSON.—I wish to obtain definite information so that we may make our arrangements.

Mr. DEAKIN.—The honorable member can form as good an opinion as any one. I hope that we shall rise this week; the matter is in our own hands. So long as we

dispose of the business, the sooner we adjourn the better.

Mr. FRAZER.—I desire to ask the Prime Minister, without notice, whether he is yet in a position to make a statement as to when the House is likely to re-assemble next year, in the event of the Tariff being disposed of during the present week?

Mr. DEAKIN.—March 4th is the probable date already indicated.

NEW PROTECTION.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—Is it the intention of the Prime Minister to make, before Christmas, a statement with regard to the new protection?

Mr. DEAKIN.—I hope that a memorandum on the subject will be laid on the table to-day.

PARLIAMENT HOUSE: EXHIBITS.

Mr. LIVINGSTON.—In this huge building there is only one small room to which honorable members can take their friends if they wish to sit down for a few minutes. In view of the fact that this room is at present occupied to so great an extent by large pianos that the typist who was accommodated in the room has had to be moved into the hall, I wish to ask you, Mr. Speaker, whether it is not possible to have the pianos moved into the hall, and the typist again accommodated in the room required by honorable members.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I see no opportunity to make any change during the very few days remaining before the Christmas adjournment.

POST AND TELEGRAPHS: CORRESPONDENCE.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—I wish to ask the Postmaster-General whether he will make inquiries in Sydney and Melbourne as to whether many letters forwarded to his Department by myself and by perhaps other honorable members have not been allowed to remain unanswered, and whether if he finds this to be the case, he will see that the correspondence is attended to before the end of the year.

Mr. MAUGER.—I confess I do not understand the honorable member's question.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—Correspondence with the Department has not been attended to.

Mr. MAUGER.—I cannot admit that, but I will make inquiries. I am quite sure that the whole of the correspondence has been dealt with.

RABBIT PEST: DR. DANYSZ'S EXPERIMENTS.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—I wish to ask the Treasurer a question, without notice, in reference to the experiments carried out by Dr. Danyisz for the extermination of rabbits. I wish to know whether any application has been made by the promoters of these experiments to continue them on the mainland, whether the State Government is favorable or unfavorable to the adoption of that course, and whether the Commonwealth Government has decided on any further action with respect to the matter?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—In reply to the honorable member, I may say that I have noticed from reports in the press that requests are being made to the State Government of New South Wales to allow these experiments to be continued on the mainland. I wrote a private letter on the subject to one of the State Ministers, and I asked the Prime Minister to write to the head of the State Government asking him not to agree to anything of the kind, and to carry out the arrangement made in the first instance by Dr. Danyisz not to attempt experiments on the mainland without the concurrence of the Federal Government. That letter was despatched a day or two ago to the head of the Government of New South Wales, and I am sure that Mr. Wade will give every consideration to such a request from the Prime Minister.

REFUND OF DUTIES.

Mr. JOHNSON asked the Minister of Trade and Customs, *upon notice*—

Will importers be given a refund of duties paid on identifiable goods in warehouse still remaining in their original packages, the Tariff on which has been disapproved by the Committee, and irrespective of whether such duties have been paid under protest or not?

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—The answer to the honorable member's question is as follows—

The duty is fixed by law, and unless expressly provided, no refunds can be given. Any alteration made in the schedule by express wording dates only from the date of such alteration.

TARIFF.

In Committee of Ways and Means
(Consideration resumed from 10th December, *vide* page 7294):

Division XV., Musical Instruments.

Item 378 (Musical Instruments, n.e.i., Musical Boxes, &c.); item 379 (Organs, pipe); item 380 (Metal pipes for pipe organs), agreed to.

Item 381. Pianos, viz. :—

- (A) Grand and Semi-grand, each, or ad val., whichever rate returns the higher duty (General Tariff), £16 10s., 40 per cent.; (United Kingdom), £15, 30 per cent.
- (B) Upright, each, or ad val., whichever rate returns the higher duty (General Tariff), £5 10s., 40 per cent.; (United Kingdom), £5, 30 per cent.
- (C) N.E.I., ad val (General Tariff), 40 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 30 per cent.
- (D) Parts thereof, n.e.i., ad val. (General Tariff), 30 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 20 per cent.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [11.37].—I wish to say shortly in submitting this item that, as a protectionist, in common with the other members of the Ministry, I prefer to protect the manufacturers of pianos in Australia rather than to encourage the large importation of these instruments which takes place from other countries in the world. According to a statement supplied to me, the value of these instruments imported in 1906 was:—From the United Kingdom, £24,856; Canada, £2,265; France, £180; Germany, £205,080; and from the United States, £9,246; or a total value of £241,357. I hold that it is very much better in the interests of our country that that money, or a large portion of it, should be spent in Australia than that it should be sent in the way it was to the countries named. I have some price lists here giving the prices of pianos, f.o.b. at the port of export. I am not sufficiently acquainted with the business to describe the pianos catalogued in each case, but I find these values given in one catalogue of imports—£14 7s. 6d., £14 17s. 6d., £15 7s., £17 11s., £17 19s., £18 8s., £19, and £21 9s. According to another catalogue, these values, f.o.b. at the port of export, are given for another list of pianos—£13 6s., £14 5s., two more at £13 6s., three at £15 4s., others at £17 2s., £20 18s., £18 1s., £6 13s.—that is an organ—£7 12s., and so on. In another catalogue the prices are £15 2s. 6d., £17 1s., £21 19s., £17 11s., £18 5s. 6d.,

and £20 14s. 6d. In still another catalogue the price for a piano is £9 17s. 6d., f.o.b. packing 2s. 6d. extra.

Mr. POYNTON.—What are the names of those instruments?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Honorable members can see the catalogue. The name of the last one is the Aldwych.

Mr. WILKS.—That is a hurdy-gurdy.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—It is nothing of the kind. I hope the honorable member will not try to make fun of the matter. These pianos are imported to Sydney and Brisbane by the following firms—

Pietro Filippo Marich, chief proprietor and managing director of Paling and Company; F. Aengenheyster and Company; Max Wurcker; The Berlin Piano Company; Elvy and Company; Weidemann and Company; and Hess and Company.

The principal importers in Melbourne are—

Kronheimer and Company—

Mr. TUDOR.—The tobacco-trust people?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Yes—

Allan and Company; Hugo Wertheim, Nathan Guckenheimer and Hermann Boenheimer, trading as Hugo Wertheim; M. Brasch and Company; Pianola Company of New York and Berlin; Pfaff Pinschoff and Company; and Levy Brothers and Company.

In Adelaide the principal importers are Wilhelm Kuhnelt, and Marshall and Sons. That is the list of the main importers of the pianos to which I have referred.

Mr. FRAZER.—Who compiled it?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—It is in type, and, I think, every honorable member has had a copy. I have not the slightest idea as to who compiled it.

Mr. PAGE.—They are not the only importers of pianos in the Commonwealth. Why is not the honorable member fair? Why does he not quote the whole of the names? What about Allan and Company? Are they Germans?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I shall not permit the honorable member to bully me. I am perfectly fair. I distinctly mentioned Allan and Company. I object absolutely to Australia being placed under the heel of these importers. If I knew the names of any others I should be glad to give them.

Mr. PAGE.—What is wrong with Allan and Company?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I did not say that there was anything wrong with them. Mr. Allan is one of my greatest personal friends.

Mr. PAGE.—The honorable member is not showing much friendship.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I have to deal with matters from the stand-point of the interests of Australia, and not of individuals. My only desire is to place the particulars, so far as I have them, before the Committee. Our first consideration should be what is best for our own country.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—Does the honorable member think that dear pianos are good for our country?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I think we should give consideration to an Australian industry which, at the present moment, employs 450 hands, and distributes weekly £1,200, and yearly over £60,000.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Did not they do that under the old duty?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I could not say. We should show consideration to those who are spending their money, and giving employment to our own people in the manufacture of pianos.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—What duty is the Treasurer going to stick to?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I hope the honorable member will stick to the duty which I propose.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—The Treasurer does not mean to do that.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do, if I can possibly get it. In a good many cases I have had to accept lower duties where I could not get what I proposed.

The CHAIRMAN.—I must again appeal to honorable members to cease the conversations that are going on.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—The Government whip came here to disturb our corner.

The CHAIRMAN.—The honorable member for Indi is one of the worst offenders. I hope that the continuous conversations will cease, as it is impossible for me to hear what the Treasurer is saying.

Mr. FRAZER.—The Treasurer exploded just now.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—When I am attacked I will hit back. The honorable member for Maranoa imputed unfairness to me.

Mr. FRAZER.—Does not the Minister think that he might take the trouble of ascertaining whether the list of importers which he read is an authentic compilation?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I presume that it is; it has been circulated.

Mr. FRAZER.—There is no signature to it, and no indication as to where it came from.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—If the honorable member thinks it is wrong, it is within his province to show it. But, so far as I know, it is correct. There may be other importers of whom I do not know.

Mr. FRAZER.—I think the question should be decided on its merits, irrespective of the names of the importers.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—If we are to have imported goods I like them to be the goods of our own race and people, but I like still more to see manufactures carried on in Australia. I have no desire to raise any heat in this matter, but simply to give these detailed statements for the information of honorable members. It is my duty to submit the duties as proposed in the Tariff, and I am doing so, as I have throughout, in the shortest possible time. Personally, I have no interest in this matter, excepting in so far as I desire to see as much employment as possible provided within the Commonwealth, and some encouragement given to those who have invested their capital in this industry, so that there may be an opportunity to utilize among other products some of the beautiful woods of Australia.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—How much Australian wood does Beale use?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I cannot say.

Mr. JOHNSON.—None whatever.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I think the honorable member is absolutely wrong. But in piano-making, our timber, fine as it is, cannot be used until sufficient time has been allowed for it to season. I have suggested to the Prime Minister and my colleagues the desirability of obtaining, in every State, a large quantity of our best woods, and having them properly seasoned under Government supervision before they are used.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—A man like Beale could season the woods for himself if he desired to use them.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—And I dare say he does so. Honorable members seem to think that I am making these proposals in the interests of one individual. It is true that I should like to encourage Mr. Beale, in recognition of his enterprise, and the good work he is doing; and, further, I should like to see Messrs. Allan and Co. manufacturing their pianos here instead of importing them.

Mr. WILSON.—Does the Treasurer know that the old firm of Allan and Co. used to manufacture pianos here?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not know; probably I have not been acquainted with the firm so long as has the honorable member. All I can say is that it is a good firm, and that the head of it is one of my personal friends just as Mr. Beale is. It will be seen, therefore, that I have no personal feeling one way or the other; all I desire in the interests of Australia is to give as much encouragement as possible to this industry.

Mr. WILKS (Dalley) [11.55].—We are out for business this morning, with a desire to get through the Tariff as quickly as possible. I am not here to make any appeals for or against either local manufacturers or importers; but I desire, in as few words as possible, to place the position before the Treasurer and the Committee. Time after time we have decided against fixed duties, and I hope we shall strike out the fixed duty in the present instance.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I think that the fixed duty will very likely go.

Mr. WILKS.—That is one thing gained—one big obstacle got over.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—At the present stage, however, I should like to hear some discussion before I move in that direction.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—Why not save discussion by striking out the fixed duty now?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—If I thought it would shorten the discussion, I should do so.

Mr. WILKS. — Personally, I am against fixed duties, but I have no desire to debate the question, beyond saying that the same arguments which apply to other items apply to pianos. I suppose that every honorable member has had supplied to him about enough ammunition, in the shape of information, to last him over a debate for six months; but I hope that that information will not be read out time after time on either one side or the other. If there is a single item which has been well looked after by both importers, agents, and manufacturers, it is that of pianos. I confess that I am now occupied merely as a range-finder, with an effort to have an *ad valorem* duty only. I frankly admit that Mr. Beale's factory is in my electorate; and it is a factory of which we may be proud. We have been told that in this factory there are employed 400 operatives; and I may here say that I have not been

approached by a single worker asking me to assist in the imposition of a higher duty, or indeed, any duty; in fact, not a single artisan in my electorate has approached me on behalf of any industry. This shows that mine is an electorate of robust industries, and that my constituents know their representative well. On the other hand, old friends and school-mates of mine, who are my supporters, and are in the importing line of business, have approached me both by letter and telegram. But these representations have no weight with me—I act on my own responsibility. The manufacturer himself has also approached me; but I have never stated, outside this House, the conclusion at which I have arrived in regard to this duty, because, in my opinion, that decision ought to be arrived at within this Chamber. I have not been asked by a single member how I proposed to vote, and I think it will be admitted that I have never bothered honorable members as to how they are going to vote. My own judgment is that pianos will bear neither a 40 per cent. duty nor a 20 per cent. duty, but will bear duties of 30 per cent. and 25 per cent. That will represent an increase of only 5 per cent. upon the rate levied under the old Tariff in the case of imports from the United Kingdom.

Mr. JOHNSON.—It will mean a 10 per cent. increase. The A section of the Tariff Commission recommended a duty of only 30 per cent.

Mr. WILKS.—It does not matter what they recommended. So far an increase in the old rates of duty has been sanctioned in respect of almost every item in this Tariff. Last night, I found free-trade members moving for the imposition of a duty of 30 per cent. upon vehicles.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Because they could not get anything less.

Mr. WILKS.—I am satisfied that on the present occasion the Committee will not vote for any proposal in excess of 30 per cent. I therefore intend to move—

That after the words "40 per cent.," paragraph A, the words "and on and after 12th December, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 30 per cent.," be inserted.

My proposal means an increase of 10 per cent. in the old rate of duty in respect to the manufactures of Germany. If it be carried, I shall move to insert "25 per cent." in the second column of the schedule so that the old duty as against the Mother Country will be increased by only 5 per

cent. Are we going to fight over a paltry increase of 5 per cent.?

Mr. BOWDEN.—Yes; for days, if necessary.

Mr. WILKS.—My idea is that what we cannot manufacture in the Commonwealth, we should get from Great Britain. I am a preferential trader. I want to give to the Mother Country a preference of 5 per cent. in respect of this item. As the Treasurer has already pointed out, of £250,000 worth of pianos imported into the Commonwealth last year over £200,000 worth were of German production.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON. — What about the users?

Mr. WILKS.—I shall deal with that aspect of the matter presently. So far as grand and semi-grand pianos are concerned, an increase of 10 per cent. under the General Tariff, and of 5 per cent. under the Tariff for Great Britain, would be a small matter. On a piano costing £200 or £300 an additional 5 per cent. is scarcely worth considering. After reading the evidence given before the Tariff Commission, I think that both the importers of pianos and the Australian manufacturer have "a good thing on." I would rather be a semi-grand in Beale's factory than a grand in this Parliament. I do not suggest that Mr. Beale is a philanthropist.

Mr. FULLER.—He poses as one.

Mr. WILKS.—I have not been returned to Parliament to whitewash Mr. Beale, or anybody else.

Mr. FULLER.—The honorable member said that he did not suggest that Mr. Beale was a philanthropist. When he puts the matter in that way he must expect to receive a reply.

Mr. WILKS.—If the honorable member is so small minded as to view the matter from that stand-point, he is at liberty to do so. Nobody can contend that the industry of piano-making is not a healthy one. I do not suggest for a moment that it is languishing. But in view of the fact that other industries have received such a large measure of protection, surely the Committee will not refuse to extend an additional 5 per cent. protection to this New South Wales industry!

Mr. WATSON.—Mr. Beale pays good wages, too.

Mr. WILKS.—Exactly. If anybody can show me that his employes are paid poor wages, I shall not vote for an increase duty.

Mr. WATSON.—Let the honorable member make his proposal 30 per cent. as against the foreigner.

Mr. WILKS.—I should like to see a duty of 35 per cent. imposed upon grand pianos, but 25 per cent. represents my high-water mark as against British productions. Having perused all the evidence, and the statements which have been made in connexion with this matter, I have come to the conclusion that both the importers of pianos and the local manufacturer have a good thing on, and that the users get very little out of either. I admit, however, that piano-making is a good, clean industry, and that the employes of the local manufacturer are well treated. I should not know one of them if I met him in the street, and none of them has approached me, while, so far as the proprietor of the business which has been referred to is concerned, I have stated publicly what I have said to him privately. But as the woollen and other industries are to be protected by duties of 30 per cent. and 45 per cent., it is not too much to give the local manufacturer of pianos an increase of 5 per cent.

Mr. MCWILLIAMS.—Does the honorable member think that that will save Mr. Beale?

Mr. WATSON.—We desire to have other factories established besides his.

Mr. WILKS.—We are fighting, not for Mr. Beale, but for the piano industry in Australia. I am very glad that Mr. Beale's factory is situated in my electorate; but if there is anything in the statements which have been made about his success, an increase of the duty is likely to bring about the starting of other factories elsewhere.

Mr. PAGE (Maranoa) [12.14].—To paraphrase the words of Bret Harte—

For ways that are dark and tricks that are
vain,

The member for Dalley's peculiar.

Mr. WILKS.—I am not the only one who is peculiar.

Mr. PAGE.—The honorable member knows when to come in out of the wet, or when to put up the umbrella.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Ditto.

Mr. PAGE.—I plead guilty to the soft impeachment. But I do not put up the umbrella because of the existence of some industry in my electorate. I have voted for protective duties solely because I thought that they would benefit the workers as well as the manufacturers. I have had

no regard to my personal interests, and have given no consideration to the effect of my votes upon the support I can look for from my constituents. The honorable member for Dalley five years ago spoke very differently in regard to the piano duty, although Mr. Beale's piano factory was then established in his electorate. Although he is the same Billy Wilks, his tone to-day is quite different from that which he employed on the previous occasion.

Mr. WILKS.—I am not the only one. The honorable member has turned a page or two since then.

Mr. PAGE.—I shall be ready to take my gruel when the honorable member gives it to me, as I know he will take his on this occasion. The honorable member for Parramatta once said that it is a pity that the *Hansard* record is not burned, because honorable members' speeches rise up like ghosts, at inconvenient times, to affright them. Let me quote what the honorable member for Dalley said on the 12th March, 1902, speaking on the subject of pianos. His remarks are given on page 10890-1 of Volume VIII. of the *Hansard*—

I would further point out that the piano industry, which has been established by Mr. Beale in Sydney, and in which higher wages are paid than those obtaining in Germany, America, and Great Britain, has been built up without any State assistance.

I contend that the only effect of this duty will be to give an additional bonus to an existing industry at the expense of those who purchase pianos for the purpose of earning a livelihood.

Personally, I favour the imposition of a 15 per cent. rate upon these instruments. In making such an offer I believe that, as a free-trader, I am stultifying myself, but that was the duty which prevailed in South Australia.

Although in 1902 the honorable member for Dalley regarded 15 per cent. as a high protective duty, he now asks for a duty of 35 per cent., notwithstanding that we have it on the authority of an honorable member that the balance-sheets of the last two or three years show that enormous profits are being made by the local manufacturer, and that his business is increasing by leaps and bounds. Is the honorable member for Dalley going to give this gentleman another 20 per cent. bonus?

Mr. WATKINS.—The honorable member for Corangamite would not dare to publish outside the House the balance-sheet to which he has referred.

Mr. WILSON.—I am willing to lay it on the table.

Mr. WATSON.—It may be libellous, and those whom it concerns will have no redress unless it is published without privilege. It should be authenticated in some way, if it is to be laid on the table.

Mr. PAGE.—If it is laid on the table, the Minister or the honorable member for South Sydney can ask the gentleman who is interested in the matter whether it is correct.

Mr. STORRER.—What have we to do with a man's private business?

Mr. PAGE.—The honorable member for Dalley continued—

I make a further appeal to the Treasurer, namely, that in fixing the ad valorem duty he will make it as close to 15 per cent. as possible, seeing that there is only one firm engaged in manufacturing pianos in Australia, and that it will be years before another firm can be in a position to compete.

In 1902 the honorable member thought that 15 per cent. was a high protective duty which would induce other manufacturers to start, but in 1907 he thinks that an additional duty of 20 per cent. is not enough. That is free-trade with a vengeance. He goes on to say—

Beale and Company have been in business for eleven years, and we admire their enterprise and energy; but their business has been conducted in free-trade New South Wales in preference to protective Victoria, and with a duty of 15 per cent. they ought to do very well in the enlarged market presented by Federation.

How can the honorable member reconcile his position in 1902, when he said that a 15 per cent. duty would give ample protection to the piano industry and enable other manufactories of pianos to be started, with the position that he takes up to-day?

Mr. WILKS.—I shall give the honorable member a full and complete answer.

Mr. PAGE.—I shall be very pleased indeed to get the answer. At the termination of that speech the honorable member said that in view of the enlarged market a duty of 15 per cent. was ample, if not more than ample, protection for the industry. I desire now to make a few remarks on what the Treasurer has said with regard to this question. I do not think that the document which he read to the Committee was a fair one. In order to create sympathy with the Australian industry as against the foreigner, he led us to suppose that all the importers of pianos bore foreign names.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I have sent to the Department to obtain a list of the names of all the importers of pianos.

Mr. PAGE.—That is fair, and I am very pleased that the honorable gentleman has taken that step. I have received a letter from B. B. Whitehouse and Company, importers of pianos and organs, Brisbane. I know that it is a reliable firm, and the letter reveals where the Australian piano industry comes in. The Treasurer made a great parade of Beale's pianos being made out of Australian timber, iron, and everything else. But let honorable members listen to what B. B. Whitehouse and Company have to say—

We have just received direct and reliable information from Berlin that all the actions in the Beale pianos are made by F. Iange, of Berlin, who has a standing order from Beale and Company to supply 100 actions per month. Also, that the entire keyboard is made by the United Keyboard Manufacturing Company of Berlin, who also have a standing order to supply 100 keyboards complete and intact per month.

An Australian industry carried on in Germany!

We are sending this information in the hope that it will reach you before the item "pianos" is reached, and that it may be of some service to you.

I hold in my hands a circular, of which, no doubt, every honorable member has received a copy, as it is addressed to the members of the House of Representatives. If its contents be true, then a more diabolical and scandalous thing has never taken place under an Australian Government than is disclosed therein. In my opinion a Select Committee should be appointed to find out the truth or otherwise of a particular statement which has been issued broadcast.

To the Members of the House of Representatives.

Gentlemen,

A circular letter has been distributed by Beale and Company Limited to the members of the House of Representatives, which contains such gross misstatements concerning our firm that in common fairness we ask you to read this reply.

Beale and Company's letter commences—"A letter has been sent to members of the Commonwealth Parliament by a piano importing firm, which letter we reprint below, with answers to the statements made therein."

Soon after the Tariff was introduced our Mr. George Allan met Sir William Lyne and spoke to him about the proposed duties on pianos, stating that they meant the absolute ruin of our trade. Sir William Lyne asked Mr. Allan to make to him any representations as to the unfairness of the duty, and promised consideration. An appointment was afterwards given

by Sir William Lyne, and Mr. Allan waited upon him, and at his request left with him some private memoranda that he (Mr. Allan) had taken for his information in speaking. No copy was given to any member of Parliament or to any other person whatsoever.

I ask the Treasurer to listen particularly to what follows.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The man who sent that statement is a scoundrel, because it is not true.

Mr. PAGE.—Let the honorable gentleman wait until I have finished reading the circular.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I received nothing from Mr. Allan.

Mr. PAGE.—This circular comes from the gentleman who, the Treasurer said, was a personal friend.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not believe that Mr. George Allan sent that.

Mr. PAGE.—Are all the honorable gentleman's friends scoundrels?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not believe that Mr. George Allan sent that.

Mr. PAGE.—But the circular is signed by Allan and Company Proprietary Limited. It is all right, and the honorable gentleman can get it confirmed if he likes.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—All right; let us hear the rest.

Mr. PAGE.—It continues—

By some mysterious means these private papers have evidently come into the hands of Beale and Company.

That is where I think the scandalous conduct occurred. If papers are intrusted to a Minister in strict confidence, and for his use in administering his Department, and he gives them to an opponent in the trade, I think it is one of the most scandalous acts of which any man, let alone the Minister of a Department, can be guilty.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—It is an invention, and an absolute lie.

Mr. PAGE.—I accept the honorable gentleman's statement.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I am astounded that Allan and Co. should make such a statement.

Mr. PAGE.—That is right.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—It is a deliberate lie.

Mr. PAGE.—Well, Mr. Chairman, there is the statement, and I think that, in the interests of the Government and fair play, it should have been made public, and the Treasurer should have been given a chance to have it remedied or otherwise.

Mr. WILKS.—He ought to take action against that firm, anyhow.

Mr. PAGE.—I cannot do any more. I accept his denial.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The statement is untrue.

Mr. PAGE.—I ask any honorable member if he thinks that it is a fair thing for any Minister to do? If the Treasurer says that the statement is absolutely untrue, I am satisfied that Mr. Allan has not a case.

Mr. WILKS.—The Treasurer ought to prosecute him.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I am not quite sure that I will not take action.

Mr. WILKS.—Hear, hear. I think that the honorable member is compelled to do so.

Mr. LIDDELL.—To save his face he will have to take action.

Mr. PAGE.—That is the position in regard to that matter. When I was speaking on the item of wool-scouring machines the honorable member for Dallev told me that a workman in the western districts of Queensland and New South Wales did not cart a wool-scouring machine about in his pocket, nor have one in his home merely for the fun of the thing. I say the same thing with regard to pianos. My constituents do not carry them about in their swags when "pushing the knot" or "waltzing Matilda." The only instruments they have are mouth organs or accordions, which give them all the music they want and are not heavy to carry. But honorable members should think of the people who do want to buy pianos as well as of those who manufacture them. Suppose there are 500 men employed in this industry. Are we going to tax the balance of the 4,000,000 people of this country to keep 500 men employed? But that is the doctrine which we have heard from the honorable member for Dalley. It is not the doctrine which we have been accustomed to hear from him. I cannot for the life of me understand on what principle he can agree to jump from duties of 15 to 35 per cent., when we know that the lower rate is more than ample for the industry.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [12.37].—I am somewhat surprised to learn about the circular which has been read by the honorable member for Maranoa. This is the first I have seen or heard of it.

Mr. PAGE.—Every honorable member got a copy.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—As a rule, I have not looked at the circulars I have re-

ceived; I have had so many of them. I do not remember having received a document of any kind from Mr. Allan. If I had received anything from him, as a friend of his, I should have regarded it as secret, and should certainly not have handed it over to Mr. Beale. Mr. Beale can answer the question as to whether I ever handed him any document. I have had very little conversation with him on the subject at all, and I do not believe that I have ever handed him anything.

Mr. WILKS.—Is it not a fact that the Treasurer is a strong personal friend of Mr. Beale?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I am not an intimate friend of his, though I should not like to say that I am not a friend. I want the honorable member for Maranoa to lay on the table the document to which he refers, because I think it is one of the most iniquitous things I have ever heard of. I am much mistaken in my estimate of Mr. George Allan if he was a party to issuing it.

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—It may be a "faked" thing, like the petition which we had before us some time ago.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I have heard something about a "faked" balance-sheet, too. I know nothing whatever about Mr. Beale's affairs, but I shall certainly take further steps to find out how the impudent circular referred to was concocted.

Mr. JOHNSON (Lang) [12.40].—With regard to the circular which has been made a subject of personal explanation by the Treasurer, I have to say that every honorable member received a copy of it. I suppose the Treasurer, like every one else, received a copy.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I have not seen it before.

Mr. JOHNSON.—It has been in the hands of honorable members for a long time, so that if the statements contained in it are incorrect, there has been ample time to refute them. It is remarkable that they were not brought under the notice of the Treasurer by some one.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I never heard of the circular before.

Mr. JOHNSON.—I understood the honorable gentleman to say that probably by this afternoon some corroboration will be forthcoming as to his statements regarding the accuracy of the assertions in the circular.

Mr. STORRER.—Does not the honorable member accept the Treasurer's statement?

Mr. JOHNSON.—Yes; so far as he is personally concerned, but the firm that is responsible for it is one of very high standing.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—If I chose to divulge private conversations with people on the other side they would be pretty startling.

Mr. PAGE.—I hope the Treasurer will do nothing of the sort.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—But I am not going to do it.

Mr. JOHNSON.—I will not pursue the matter. I intend to propose a reduction in duty on pianos below that proposed by the honorable member for Dalley. At the conclusion of my speech, I shall move to reduce the duties to 25 and 20 per cent. As to the argument of the honorable member for Dalley that because the Committee has increased duties in connexion with other industries, we ought not to refuse to increase the duties on pianos, I can only say that if he has no stronger argument to bring forward than that, he has a very weak case. Are we to understand that Mr. Beale's industry is in such a parlous condition that unless he receives increased protection he will have to close up? It is a fair question to ask why Mr. Beale did not appear before the Tariff Commission, and ask for increased duties? The fact that he did not do so is a sufficient justification for refusing to increase them. Was he afraid of the facts which would be disclosed as the result of cross-examination? He did not even give the protectionist section of the Commission a chance of advocating higher duties, presumably because he was unwilling to disclose the profitable nature of his business, as it would have been disclosed in cross-examination.

Mr. CHANTER.—That is pure assumption.

Mr. JOHNSON.—I have not put it forward as anything but an assumption, but it is a reasonable assumption. A Tariff Commission was specially appointed to investigate such matters. An opportunity was afforded to manufacturers of airing their grievances, and showing why duties should be increased. It was an impartially-constituted Commission, composed equally of protectionists and free-traders for the purpose of sifting the facts relating to all industries that were alleged to be suffering as a result of insufficient protection. The Commission was appointed with Mr. Beale's full knowledge. He knew that it was sitting, and inviting manufac-

turers to give evidence. He was well aware that half the members of the Commission were more than sympathetically disposed to those manufacturers who had a grievance. He knew that the other section of the Commission were quite prepared to listen to reasonable complaints with a view of remedying them. Yet Mr. Beale did not attempt to appear and ask for increased duties. But after the Commission has ceased sitting, he comes to Parliament, and asks for an increase.

Mr. CHANTER.—Why did the Commission recommend raising the duty?

Mr. JOHNSON.—The protectionist section of the Commission recommended that the duty on pianos be £15, or 30 per cent.

Mr. CHANTER.—They must have had good grounds to go upon.

Mr. JOHNSON.—They made recommendations for increases in several instances where no increases were asked for. Time after time they did that. They made recommendations for increases without any evidence at all, and even when the evidence was dead against them, as has been shown from quotations by myself and other honorable members. In any case, the recommendation of the protectionist section was £15, or 30 per cent., whilst the Government propose that the duty shall be as high as 40 per cent. An idea seems to have got abroad that one or two of us have obtained possession of copies of the balance-sheets of Beale and Company for the last couple of years; that we have done so is quite true. Now the statements that the industry is in a very bad way are not borne out by those balance-sheets. A statement has been generally circulated amongst honorable members to the effect that if this firm does not get an increase of duty it will have to close down. I do not know whether that statement will be persevered with now.

Mr. CHANTER.—How did the honorable member obtain possession of copies of the balance-sheets?

Mr. JOHNSON.—Never mind; I got them. Let the honorable member be satisfied with that.

Mr. HUME COOK.—Would the honorable member tell us who supplied them?

Mr. JOHNSON.—No.

Mr. HUME COOK.—Then they are of no value.

Mr. JOHNSON.—They are authenticated copies of the actual balance-sheets vouched for by one whose reputation is

of the highest. Let honorable members contradict the statements which I shall make upon the basis of these balance-sheets if they are wrong. But I will undertake to say that they are not wrong. Singularly enough, although Mr. Beale is asking for these increased duties, he has not produced his balance-sheet for this year, but is apparently holding it back until the Tariff on pianos has been dealt with. One would think that if the industry was in such a condition as to require heavier protection, amongst all the documents and circulars with which he has supplied honorable members, he would have furnished them with an up-to-date statement of his affairs. The first thing he should have done was to show his last balance-sheet, to prove how necessary it was that he should have increased protection. But has he done so? No! Instead of doing that he has endeavoured to hide his balance-sheets. This is a suspicious circumstance, which justifies us in the belief that large as his profits have been for the previous two years in all probability they have considerably increased during the past year. Indeed, I have private information that the increase is a most substantial one.

Mr. CHANTER.—Why is the honorable member afraid to name his authority?

Mr. JOHNSON.—There is no question of being afraid; it is simply a matter of confidence. Here is one of the balance-sheets.

Mr. HUME COOK.—Made in Germany, I suppose.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Like Beale's pianos.

The CHAIRMAN.—I must ask honorable members to cease these constant interjections. It is almost impossible for the honorable member for Lang to be heard.

Mr. CHANTER.—Let him give us his authority.

Mr. HUME COOK.—Did not the honorable member obtain his copy from a German ambassador?

Mr. JOHNSON.—No; I got it from a citizen of this Commonwealth.

Mr. HUGHES.—Is it not a fact that under the Companies' Act balance-sheets have to be published every year?

Mr. JOHNSON.—I believe so. Honorable members can look at the balance-sheets for themselves. They need not take my word nor the word of any other honorable member. They can please themselves

as to whether they believe the statements contained in these documents. But they bear the names of well-known auditors as vouching for their correctness.

Mr. HUME COOK.—Will the honorable member vouch for the accuracy of the one that he has there?

Mr. JOHNSON.—Would the honorable member vouch for the accuracy of every balance-sheet published? I am not speaking here as an auditor.

Mr. HUME COOK.—The honorable member is trying to bolster up a case by means of an alleged balance-sheet without even vouching for its accuracy.

Mr. WEBSTER.—If the honorable member's balance-sheets are like his other statements they are not worth much.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Much or little they, at any rate, are always worth more than those of the honorable member for Gwydir, who is nearly always offensive and inaccurate. Has the honorable member for Gwydir seen these balance-sheets?

Mr. WEBSTER.—No.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Then what is the use of making such a statement? Unless he can show that these documents are not correct it is useless for him to say a word about them. I got them from reliable sources.

Mr. HUME COOK.—Made in Germany.

Mr. JOHNSON.—No; but the honorable member looks as if he had been made in Germany. The honorable member for Maranoa has just proved that the piano parts, all of which the Treasurer said were made in Australia, are mostly made in Germany, and that the local maker has a standing contract with a German manufacturer.

Mr. HUME COOK.—Absolutely incorrect.

Mr. JOHNSON.—It is easy to make such a statement, but difficult to prove it. We know that most of the parts are not manufactured here, with the exception of a few minor parts which Mr. Beale has lately been manufacturing for himself; they must be imported.

Mr. WATKINS.—Do not the Germans do the same?

Mr. JOHNSON.—Certainly; but the Treasurer said that all the parts were made here, and yet we have a statement showing that, as usual, he is not supplied with correct information. A few days ago I put to the Minister of Trade and Customs a question relating to the importation of pianos, and he admitted that an error had been made, the number of pianos imported

into New South Wales having been exaggerated, although their aggregate invoice value was correctly stated. A peculiar feature of the incident is that the corrected figures were voluntarily communicated by the Department to Mr. Beale, but were not furnished to the gentleman who had brought the facts under the notice of the Comptroller-General.

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—The information was sent to that gentleman, and not to Mr. Beale.

Mr. JOHNSON.—The gentleman said that although he made repeated requests for the information, he could not obtain it, but that it was sent voluntarily to Mr. Beale.

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—Such a statement is absolutely untrue.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The honorable member ought to give the name of the man to whom he refers.

Mr. JOHNSON.—He brought the facts under the attention of the Comptroller-General.

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—What is his name?

Mr. JOHNSON.—The Minister knows his name; there is no need to introduce any names unnecessarily into this debate. I wish now to draw attention to a disgraceful circular or hand-bill which has been placed in the lockers of honorable members.

Mr. CHANTER.—It is an extract from a reliable paper.

Mr. JOHNSON.—It is certainly an extract from a newspaper; the question of reliability is another matter.

Mr. CHANTER.—It is a truthful paper.

Mr. WILSON.—Will the honorable member say in this House that the statement is truthful?

Mr. CHANTER.—I say that if it appeared in the newspaper in question it is truthful.

Mr. JOHNSON.—The truthfulness of that paper, I am afraid, must very frequently be open to challenge. This article is a scurrilous libel if it is intended to reflect on Opposition members of this House, and, coming from such a source, we ought to expect that. The circular is an extract from the *Bulletin* of 7th December, 1907, and is headed, "How Hoggenheimer gets in his Fine Work." It reads—

In the German city of Leipzig there is published a piano-makers' trade newspaper, *Zeitschrift für Instrumentenbau*. In its issue of October 11th, 1907, it was announced that the Association of German Piano Makers was to hold a meeting on October 19th to discuss the

increase in the Australian duties on pianos. The council of the association was to be instructed to demand that the Imperial Government should take energetic steps through the Consul-General to get the duty reduced.

It was mentioned that Australia had only one piano manufactory, and it was stated, on the authority of Australian papers, that the pianos it turned out were rubbish. Foreign musicians who have given the pianos excellent testimonials—

The manufacturer secured testimonials, it will be observed, not from Australian, but from foreign musicians—

were attacked in their private and public characters, and charged with having sold testimonials. The Australian legislators who were likely to support the increased duties were declared to be shareholders and corrupt. Following this, there was held in Melbourne a meeting of piano importers, the chief business of which was the raising of a fighting fund to contest the new duties.

Mr. JOHNSON.—The next sentence contains an insinuation that is practically tantamount to a charge of bribery and corruption against honorable members—

Was there any connexion between that meeting in Melbourne and the other one in Leipzig of October 19th, and is German money being subscribed for a lobby campaign against Australian industry?

That is a disgraceful insinuation, which every honorable member should resent.

Mr. WATSON.—The lobbyist is here.

Mr. JOHNSON.—No honorable member has accused Mr. Beale's numerous friends in this House of being influenced by any prospect of financial advancement in their desire to secure an increased duty on pianos, although he and his lobbyists have practically lived in the House for days, if not weeks, past.

Mr. HUME COOK.—Will the honorable member deny that the importers have not paid a lobbyist here?

Mr. JOHNSON.—As I am not in their confidence, I cannot say; but no one has suggested that there has been any attempt at bribery and corruption on the part of the local manufacturer.

Sitting suspended from 1 to 2.15 p.m.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Before the adjournment for lunch I was referring to an extract from the *Bulletin*, which has been circulated amongst honorable members, and which, practically, charges honorable members who are advocating lower duties with being in the pay of a German syndicate that has subscribed funds for the purpose of lobbying against an Australian industry. I was pointing out that this kind of thing

should be resented by honorable members, no matter to which party they belong. I do not care to mention names in these Tariff discussions, but in this case I am compelled to do so, because this business is generally known as Mr. Beale's industry; and I say that the most active and also the most unfair lobbying has been going on for the purpose of inducing honorable members, not to decrease, but to increase, the duty imposed on pianos in the interests of this local manufacturer. Yet no one on this side, so far as I am aware, has yet suggested that there has been anything in the nature of an attempt to bribe honorable members who favour high duties.

Mr. HUME COOK.—Mr. Beale has not had any paid lobbyists here, as the importers have had.

Mr. JOHNSON.—I do not know whether he has or not, but he has lobbyists in addition to being here lobbying all the time himself. I suppose that all lobbyists are receiving a salary for their services. The insinuation, which practically amounts to a charge, contained in the extract from the *Bulletin*, is not that the agents of foreign manufacturers or importers are being paid for lobbying, but that a fund has been established to insure the success of lobbying against the Australian industry. I quote these words from the *Bulletin* article—

Was there any connexion between that meeting in Melbourne and the other one in Leipzig of 19th October, and is German money being subscribed for a lobby campaign against Australian industry?

Obviously that is directed against certain members of the Committee, and I say that any suspicion of influence of that kind being brought to bear upon members of the Committee is much more likely to lie against those who are advocating high duties than against those who are calling for their reduction. But no one has suggested anything of that kind from this side, and it is most unfair that any such suggestions should be made against honorable members who, in the performance of their duties, and in carrying out their pledges to their constituents and honestly trying to carry reductions in the proposed duties, are consistently carrying out their free-trade principles.

Mr. CROUCH.—The honorable member will admit that lobbying can take place without dishonesty, and I see no inference to the contrary to be drawn from the article quoted.

Mr. JOHNSON.—There is an inference of dishonesty to be drawn from the article published by the *Bulletin*, and it has been circulated amongst honorable members in order to influence their votes in favour of increasing the duties on pianos by means of a cunningly-worded base insinuation. That is my objection. This *Bulletin* extract has been circulated in the interests of a certain Australian firm, which is a large advertiser in its columns, in order to influence votes, and I say that that is a most improper proceeding. If I were a protectionist and ever so much inclined to increase duties, the receipt of a circular of this kind, distributed in the interests of the person to be advantaged by the increase of duties, would be quite sufficient to induce me to refuse to give him the increased protection he desired. I resent the circulation of the *Bulletin* extract as an attempt to unduly influence the members of the Committee. Speaking with reference to the piano which Mr. Beale has on exhibition in this building, the Treasurer went into raptures this morning about this Australian industry, and claimed that all the parts of the instrument were made in Australia. But what do we find? On examination of the instrument the fact is disclosed that practically the whole of it has been imported. Almost the whole of the material and the manufactured mechanism of the piano in question has been imported.

Mr. SALMON.—Then what are the men in Beale's factory engaged in doing?

Mr. JOHNSON.—They are engaged merely in assembling together German, French, and Spanish parts of pianos. The honorable member for Maranoa has just reminded me that he read a statement this morning showing that Mr. Beale had a contract with a German firm to supply him with the foundational materials of these pianos.

Mr. WATSON.—All the contract referred to was the key-board.

Mr. PAGE.—And other parts as well—the actions.

Mr. WATSON.—They are admittedly imported.

Mr. JOHNSON.—It should be remembered that the piano which is on exhibition in this building is not the ordinary piano sold to the public, but one which was specially manufactured for exhibition, and yet the action of the instrument is French.

Mr. WATSON.—That is admitted.

Mr. JOHNSON.—The action is the work of a French manufacturer named Schwaudel.

Mr. WATSON.—British piano manufacturers also import French actions.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Yes, but the Treasurer this morning was eloquent in explaining to the Committee that this was an Australian instrument, and that all the materials in it were Australian.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I did not say so.

Mr. JOHNSON.—The Committee certainly so understood the honorable gentleman. He was going into raptures about this Australian industry, and yet we find that this piano might fairly be described as an imported instrument. Even the veneer on it was imported. There is not a particle of Australian wood in it, or at any rate, it is safe to say that there is not sufficient Australian wood in one of these pianos to boil a billy.

Mr. TUDOR.—Does the honorable member say that there is no Australian wood in the piano exhibited?

Mr. JOHNSON.—There is not enough to boil a billy. Here is this great product of Australian manufacture, and when we come to examine it we find that it is composed of parts imported from Germany, France, and Spain.

Mr. WATSON.—It contains nothing imported from Germany or Spain.

Mr. JOHNSON.—The honorable member evidently knows nothing about the matter. This is the great industry we are being asked to preserve—pianos made from imported foreign material. The industry itself was built up with German money. £20,000 of German money was used to start the industry.

Mr. SALMON.—There is something wrong there, because pounds are not used in Germany.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Their equivalent in German money to the extent of £20,000 was put into this industry at the start, and the greater part of it was lost. Our friend, Mr. Beale—and I do not blame him for his enterprise was cute enough to buy the original shares at 5s. each. I am credibly informed that he secured shares in the business worth about £20,000 for £5,000, and that is how the business came into his hands. He was an importer himself. I have letters of his here addressed to Mr. Naumann, who was primarily interested in the business, in which Mr. Beale makes certain proposi-

tions for making a special department for the sale of German lines; the same German lines of pianos which to-day he denounces.

Mr. WATSON.—How long ago was that?

Mr. JOHNSON.—Before Mr. Beale entered upon the manufacture of pianos.

Mr. WATSON.—That is a good many years ago.

Mr. JOHNSON.—It is some years ago, but honorable members should not forget that I am now referring to a great patriot who complains to-day of the wages conditions prevailing in Germany. Yet he was eager to sell German instruments himself. This is what he says in a letter to Mr. Naumann—

However, should you be willing to accept my present proposal—

and the reference is to a business proposal referred to earlier in the letter—

Mr. CROUCH.—What is the date of that letter?

Mr. JOHNSON.—Perhaps the honorable member will permit me to finish the quotation before he interrupts. I will not answer his question until I have finished the quotation. I have already admitted that it was before Mr. Beale bought all the shares in this business, at one-fourth of their value, and began the manufacture of pianos. Although we now find him denouncing German labour conditions, he was then quite willing to sell German goods. I dare say that if he found it more profitable he would not hesitate as a commercial man to do so to-day. I do not blame him for his action as a commercial man, but I do object to his posing as a great philanthropist and patriot when he is merely following his commercial instinct in the endeavour to get as much profit as he can. I should not blame him if he admitted honestly that that is what he is doing—that he is "out for loot," as the honorable member for Dalley would describe it; that he is "on the make," and trying to obtain as large a return as possible from his business as a commercial concern. But when he seeks to pose as a great Australian patriot and philanthropist, anxious to encourage Australian industry purely on patriotic ground and as a matter of sentiment and not purely of business, we have a right to examine the motive springs of his action. I have here a complete translation of a letter

which he wrote to Mr. Naumann, and I make this quotation from it—

However, should you be willing to accept my present proposal, I should, if possible, make arrangements to build up a department in which I would sell cash against delivery, and in which I would mostly sell new German goods.

So that this great Australian patriot and philanthropist wished to make special business arrangements with this German, Mr. Naumann, by which he would be able to sell German goods for cash. This is the great Australian patriot who now denounces German sweating conditions, and all that kind of thing. Let him be a man, and deal with this House on a commercial basis. Let him say, "I am here to make money in the best way I can. If you are willing to let me dip my hands into the public Treasury, to increase my already large profits, I am eager and anxious that you should do so." But do not let him come to this House, and say that he wishes us to impose these high duties because he is a patriot, who desires to encourage Australian industries, when the very piano which he has on exhibition here is composed almost entirely of foreign materials. I have no use for this kind of patriot, though some of my protectionist friends approve his action.

Mr. CROUCH.—What is the date of the letter from which the honorable member quoted?

Mr. JOHNSON.—It is dated 1898, and, as I have already stated, it was written before Mr. Beale entered upon the alleged manufacture of these goods. It shows that he was quite willing, if he found it a better business proposition, to make a special department of the importation of German pianos.

Mr. CROUCH.—Hear, hear.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Then where is his Australian patriotism when he was equally willing to sell German as to sell Australian pianos?

Mr. FOSTER.—Where is the patriotism of any importer?

Mr. JOHNSON.—The point is that he poses as an Australian manufacturer, not an importer of foreign manufactures. Other importers do not pose as patriots, but as commercial men in business to make money. They do not ask this House to give them special facilities to dip their hands into the public Treasury because they are Australian patriots. All that they ask is that they shall be left alone, and permitted to carry on their business. But

this gentleman comes along, and says, "I am a great Australian patriot; therefore let me dip my hands into the public Treasury, and fleece the consumers of these goods to the tune of 40 per cent., and whatever else I can get in addition as profit out of the duty; not to get me out of any difficulty, but to help me to build the great mansion, the foundations of which I have already reared." This is the man who we are invited to believe is carrying on a languishing industry suffering from the operation on an already high Tariff; the man who was afraid to go before the Tariff Commission to ask for increased duties, because he was unable to submit to the cross-examination which he knew must follow. This is the great Australian patriot who puts on exhibition in this building as an Australian piano an instrument nine-tenths of which is of foreign manufacture.

Mr. FOSTER.—That is not true.

Mr. JOHNSON.—I do not know whether the honorable member is reflecting upon my statement. Perhaps he does not know mahogany or walnut when he sees those woods. I know something about woods, and I say that if the honorable member examines the piano in question he will find that it does not contain as much Australian wood as would be required to boil a decent sized billy. Let any honorable member who knows anything about woods examine the piano, and say whether my statement cannot be borne out. With regard to the claim that an increased duty is necessary because this is a languishing industry, I am authorized to state that there is a gentleman in the city who, if Mr. Beale thinks he is going to lose money should he not be given the increased protection for which he is asking, is willing to purchase the whole of his business, and all his assets, and to give him £1 for every one of the shares which he obtained for 5s. each. He will do that without any increase of the duty. He undertakes to establish a factory in Melbourne within the next twelve months, and is willing to put up a bond of £5,000 that he will do it. What has Mr. Beale to say to that? Here is a chance for him to dispose profitably of his business if he thinks he is going to lose. He will get £1 each for every one of those shares for which he paid only 5s.*

Mr. HUGHES.—What is the name of the man who makes the offer?

Mr. JOHNSON.—I have no objection to stating it. It is Mr. Wertheim. All that he stipulates is that the essential pa-

of the instruments which are not manufactured here should be admitted free.

Mr. CROUCH.—It is the best give-away I ever heard in my life.

Mr. JOHNSON.—That is a very inane remark. It is a fair business proposition. Will Mr. Beale accept the challenge? If any honorable member, engaged in a business, thought he was going to lose on it because he did not receive sufficient protection, and had a *bonâ fide* cash offer of that kind made to him to purchase the business from him, and give him three times as much as it cost him for his shares, would he not jump at it? Here is a chance for Mr. Beale if he really believes he is going to lose money.

Mr. SPENCE.—How much commission will the honorable member get on the sale?

Mr. JOHNSON.—I do not know either of the parties. I think I met Mr. Beale somewhere a long time ago, but I have not met any of the gentlemen who are concerned in the other industry. I have never met Mr. Wertheim, and would not know him if I saw him. Whenever messages have been brought to me that some one wanted to see me, I have always asked the messenger if it was about the Tariff, and have absolutely refused to see anybody unless he was a personal friend, or a constituent, because I want to keep my mind free from undue influence in considering the duties.

Mr. CROUCH.—Is not the honorable member in daily consultation with Mr. Max Hirsch?

Mr. JOHNSON.—That is not true, though I meet him occasionally, and do not see any reason to avoid him. He happens to be a personal friend of mine. He is not a piano or other importer or manufacturer, so far as I am aware, so what has that to do with it?

Mr. HUGHES.—Did Mr. Wertheim put that offer in writing?

Mr. JOHNSON.—Yes, it is in writing. I think the honorable member for Koo-yong has the original document.

Mr. HUGHES.—Will Mr. Wertheim get it sealed?

Mr. JOHNSON.—The honorable member can ask those questions of the honorable member for Koo-yong, to whom I have to apologize for referring to the matter. I had intended to let the honorable member deal with it himself. It was really drawn out of me by the nature of the interjections. With regard to the copy of

Mr. Beale's balance-sheet, I have ascertained, by further personal inquiries during the luncheon hour, that it is absolutely authentic.

Mr. WATSON.—Where did the honorable member get it from?

Mr. JOHNSON.—Although I am not at liberty, at present, to disclose the name of the person from whom I received it—

Mr. WATSON.—How does the honorable member know that it is authentic?

Mr. JOHNSON.—Will the honorable member allow me to make my statement first? The balance-sheet is signed, or purports to be signed, by Messrs. F. MacDonnell and A. Forster, as auditors, by Octavious C. Beale, managing director, and Thomas Davidson, secretary. Here I am going to issue a challenge. If Mr. Beale will declare that this balance-sheet is a forgery, and that the signatures of the auditors, himself, and his secretary are forgeries, and give a guarantee that he will prosecute the man who supplied me with the information, I will give that man's name. This balance-sheet was obtained from somebody connected with Mr. Beale's own business. If the names of the auditors are forgeries, those gentlemen will be able to take the necessary action.

Mr. HUGHES.—Are those the original signatures?

Mr. JOHNSON.—No, this is a typed copy of the balance-sheet. I think even the honorable member for South Sydney will admit that that is a fair challenge.

Mr. WATSON.—I do not think it is fair to circulate privately a copy of a balance-sheet of that kind. It should be printed and supplied publicly.

Mr. JOHNSON.—I believe there is a law which compels all registered companies to publish their balance-sheets.

Mr. WATSON.—The honorable member should be aware that that class of balance-sheet is not compelled by the company law of New South Wales to be exhibited.

Mr. JOHNSON.—I do not know whether this balance-sheet has been published or not, but I am assured, on the word of honour of the gentleman from whom I received the information, that it is an absolute copy of the actual balance-sheet itself. He has empowered me to say that if Mr. Beale is prepared to declare that it is a forgery, and that the signatures are forgeries, I can disclose his name.

The CHAIRMAN.—It would be much better if the honorable member would deal directly with the item rather than with the business of Mr. Beale, or anybody else. I have no desire to curtail the honorable member's remarks in any way, but if there is to be a discussion on the actual business transactions of firms, it may be endless.

Mr. JOHNSON.—The argument put forward for raising the duty is that the profits on the manufacture are so small that the persons engaged in it are constrained to come to this House and ask for monetary assistance in the shape of an increased duty. Therefore, the question of whether they are making a profit or loss, as shown by their balance-sheet, is most important, and must have a direct influence on honorable member's votes.

The CHAIRMAN.—I do not wish to curtail the honorable member's remarks in any way, but he was going rather into the personal side of Mr. Beale's business, or that of some other manufacturer. It will be far better for him to deal with the matter directly.

Mr. CROUCH.—Did the honorable member get that balance-sheet from his personal friend?

Mr. JOHNSON.—The honorable member can find out those little things for himself.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Did the honorable member get balance-sheets from the importers?

Mr. JOHNSON.—There was no necessity. The importers are not asking for the privilege of a monopoly. This man is asking for a monetary benefit at the expense of the taxpayers; the importers are not. When a man asks for monetary gain to himself in his business at the expense of the community, it is his duty to show reasons for his claim.

Mr. WILKS.—Why did not the honorable member demand a balance-sheet in the case of every other industry that we have been discussing?

Mr. JOHNSON.—I have said often enough that we should see them. But they are always carefully burned. I do not propose to go into all the particulars of the balance-sheet, but I will lay it on the table of the House, and honorable members can study it for themselves. I propose to make a few comments on it.

Mr. HUGHES.—Is the honorable member going to put it in *Hansard*?

Mr. JOHNSON.—Yes.

Mr. HUGHES.—Then the honorable member had better read it.

Mr. JOHNSON.—If it will be printed in *Hansard* without my reading it out, I should like to save the time of the Committee.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—It ought not to go into *Hansard* without being read.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Then I had better read it. It is as follows—

BEALE & CO. LTD.

Balance-sheet for year ending 30th June, 1905.

Liabilities: Authorized capital, 60,000 shares at £1 each fully paid, £60,000; less 3,285 shares unissued, £3,285—£56,715. Time payment adjusting values account, being 3½ per cent. on £85,884 8s. 6d.—£28,628 3s. 2d. Plant Depreciation Account, 10 per cent. on £4,629 1s. 11d.—£462 18s. 2d.; Debenture Loans, Bank of New South Wales, £16,750; W. R. Hall, £16,250; interest calculated to date, £420 1s. 1d.—£33,420 1s. 1d.; Bank of New South Wales account (unpresented cheques), £404 8s. 9d.; bills payable, £629 7s. 10d.; sundry creditors, £2,907 14s. 9d.; Bank of New South Wales land purchase account, £556 3s.—£37,917 15s. 5d.; profit and loss balance, £2,605 13s. 7d.; total liabilities, £126,329 10s. 4d.

The assets consist of—

Customers' debit balances, piano, £83,845 1s. 7d.; machine, £2,039 7s. 11d.—

Mr. STORRER.—I rise to a point of order. Is it in order, when we are discussing the duty on pianos, the manufacture of which is an Australian industry, to enter into the details of any person's business, when that business is not a public one?

The CHAIRMAN.—I understand the honorable member for Lang is taking up the position that this industry is doing well, and that therefore there is no necessity for an increase of duty. He is trying to show reasons why he has come to that conclusion. If the honorable member were to go beyond the actual question involved in the item he would be going too far.

Mr. JOHNSON.—I will not read all the details, but will give the totals. The other assets consist of merchandise and factory stocks, and materials on hand; cash on hand, and at branches; factory, landed property, and buildings; machinery, plant, and tools; horses, vehicles, &c.; offices and shops, furniture and fittings; patents and trade marks account; and sundry debtors; making the total assets £126,329 10s. 4d. The profit and loss account, which is of more importance, contains, on the one side, items for general expenses, wholesale expenses, discount, interest and exchange, advertising, stationery, bad debts (travellers' deficiencies,

machine, piano, and sundry debtors), auditors' fees, subscriptions, legal expenses, fire insurance, piano fire insurance, and a profit and loss balance of £2,605 13s. 7d., making a total of £36,413 6s. 2d. On the other side of the profit and loss account, appear—"balance from last year, £3,105 13s. 6d.; forfeited premiums, £3,001 8s. 8d." It is a strange commentary on the quality of these pianos that there should be so many forfeited premiums. It does not look as if people particularly appreciated the instruments. In 1904-5, the gross profits on the sale of pianos, over cost of manufacture, as shown under "Merchandise Account—Piano," was £29,549 6s. 6d.

The CHAIRMAN.—I think the honorable member is going quite beyond the question, and that the totals would be quite sufficient to support his argument.

Mr. JOHNSON.—I have just about finished with this part of the subject. To the £29,549 6s. 6d. must be added "forfeited premiums," amounting to £3,001 8s. 8d., being deposits and payments by time payment purchasers who did not complete purchase. This shows the total gross profit to be £32,550 15s. 2d. The net profit shown, after deducting expenditure for sale of pianos, is £2,605 13s. 7d.

Mr. SPENCE.—That is very small.

Mr. JOHNSON.—But it is unduly reduced by the sum written off for possible bad debts under the "Time Payment Adjusting Values Account." This sum was £28,628, while the total amount outstanding was £85,884 9s. 6d., showing one-third written off. The 1905-6 accounts show £3,909 so written off; and, therefore, there must be added to the net profit the sum of £2,500, and also £3,000, which, I am assured, is the salary of Mr. Beale, who is virtually the proprietor, owning practically all the shares. This brings the net profits for 1904-5 up to £8,105 13s. 7d.

Mr. SPENCE.—Are these figures from the balance-sheet, or do they represent the honorable member's comments on the balance-sheet?

Mr. JOHNSON.—They are comments on the balance-sheet. In 1905-6, the gross profit amounted to £43,421 1s. 11d., and the forfeited premiums to £2,734 14s. 4d., showing the total of £46,155 16s. 3d. This is an increase over the preceding year of £13,605 1s. 1d., or nearly 50 per cent. The net profit is shown as £7,323, and to this must be added excessive deduction

for possible bad debts, say, £3,000, and also Mr. Beale's salary, £3,000, showing a total net profit of £13,323, an increase over the preceding year of £5,208, or 67 per cent. I could go further into the figures, but those I have quoted are sufficient to show a large increase of profits in two years—from £8,000 odd to £13,000 odd.

Mr. CROUCH.—The balance-sheet does not show profits of more than 2½ per cent.

Mr. JOHNSON.—If the honorable member picks out the items, he will see that what I say is correct. In 1904-5, on a nominal capital of £56,715, the profits equalled 14½ per cent., and on Mr. Beale's shares, which were originally purchased at 5s., a profit of 58 per cent. The figures make it clear that Mr. Beale received enormous profits out of this industry in the two years I have mentioned; and there is every reason to believe that he has done even better in the year 1906-7. The fact that Mr. Beale has not presented his balance-sheet for this year, or submitted his books to examination, is *prima facie* evidence that he is doing remarkably well.

Mr. CROUCH.—Mr. Beale is not making 3 per cent. profit.

Mr. JOHNSON.—I have already pointed out that there is a gentleman in town who is willing to purchase his business, give Mr. Beale £1 for every share which originally cost 5s., take over all the assets, and, without any increase in the duty, give a bond to the Government to start a piano manufactory within twelve months. The effect of the duties on both pianos and parts, as proposed by the Government, will be to establish Mr. Beale in an absolute monopoly; and I take it that even the most ardent protectionists are anxious to see other factories started. During the last two or three years Mr. Beale has commenced the manufacture of certain parts, though not all, used in the construction of his pianos; and unless parts be made free there will be no possible chance of any one successfully competing with him. I think I have adduced sufficient facts to show that there is no necessity for any increase in the duties; and I invite the consideration of honorable members for a section of the community, who, unfortunately, are too frequently forgotten when Tariff questions are before us, namely, the purchasers. We have had petitions presented to us, signed by 6,000 music teachers, against the imposition of the

duties on pianos, which, to them, are a means of subsistence. Even when prices are low, it is a struggle with many teachers to obtain instruments; and if we unduly inflate values, we shall inflict great disability on a deserving class. In passing, I may point out that the manager of Mr. Beale's factory is a German; so that not only are the parts of the instruments of foreign manufacture, but the management of the business is in the hands of a foreigner, although Mr. Beale complains so much about the competition of German and other manufacturers abroad. I should like to see a piano in every poor man's home; and, bearing in mind the music teachers, I think that pianos ought, like sewing machines, to be made free, as being a means of livelihood. I recognise, however, that there is no possible chance of the instruments being made free, and, therefore, I move -

That after the words "40 per cent.," paragraph A, the words "and on and after 12th December, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 25 per cent.," be inserted.

If this amendment is carried, I shall move to make the duty against the United Kingdom 20 per cent.

Mr. WATSON (South Sydney) [2.56].—It is rather unfortunate, in considering a question of some national importance, that the names of individuals should be introduced. To my mind, it is of no importance whether it is Mr. Beale, Mr. Jones, Mr. Smith, or any other person who engages in this industry. But, as Mr. Beale's name has been mentioned, it is, perhaps, proper to say a word or two, which appeal to me as representing the other side of the ledger from that presented by the honorable member for Lang. In the first place, that honorable member told us that Mr. Beale is posing as a patriot, and claiming special consideration on that ground; but I have not heard Mr. Beale make any such claim in connexion with his business. What he has claimed is that he has established a new industry, so far as Australia is concerned; and I think that he is entitled to every consideration in that regard. Mr. Beale was, as the honorable member for Lang said, at one time an importer of pianos, and, when he carried on that business solely, we cannot blame him for seeking to get the best terms possible from foreign manufacturers. But Mr. Beale thought there was an opening for a local manufacture of pianos, and engaged in the industry. I have no reason politically to

speak one word for Mr. Beale. I understand that attempts have been made to influence some honorable members on the ground that he holds certain political opinions—that some members of the party to which I belong have been approached with statements of what Mr. Beale had said at different times about that party, and so on. In my view, that has nothing whatever to do with the treatment to be accorded to this industry. I dare say if we looked into the matter, we should find that importers hold opinions just as strong as those of Mr. Beale about the Labour Party.

Mr. MAHON.—Importers are not asking Parliament for a subsidy as Mr. Beale is doing.

Mr. WATSON. — The importers ask that Australia may be sacrificed in order that they may exact their pound of flesh from the consumer. We all know that when the importers get the consumer under their thumb they are careful to exact the last ounce that can be got out of him. In justice to Mr. Beale, it ought to be said—whatever his political opinions may be, and I do not know what opinions he now holds in reference to the Labour Party—that during the whole period his factory has been in existence, he has paid the highest wages in the furniture trade. The secretary of the Cabinet Makers' Union informed me some years ago that there was no man employing cabinet makers in Sydney who paid wages approaching those then paid by Mr. Beale. Although the arbitration award recently given in connexion with the furniture trade prescribes certain rates of wages Mr. Beale had been, and still is, paying wages in excess of those rates. I say that he is entitled to credit in that he has always paid good wages to the operatives in the industry in which he is engaged. I know that he has always observed the eight hours system—indeed, his is the only piano factory in the world which is conducted under that system. When the recent arbitration award prescribed a lower rate of wages than he had been paying, he might, had he been of a grasping disposition, easily have attempted to reduce the wages paid by him to that level. But he has not done so. It has been said that Mr. Beale exposes himself to criticism so far as his balance-sheet is concerned, because he is asking for monetary assistance at the expense of the taxpayers.

Mr. WILKS.—Does the honorable member think that 1½ per cent. represents an inordinate profit?

Mr. WATSON.—I do not. I shall, however, refer to that aspect of the question presently. If protectionists admit that the imposition of an increased duty means granting monetary assistance to Mr. Beale at the expense of the taxpayers, then the whole fabric of protection must fall, and we have no right to support it. But I deny at once that any such assistance is involved in the proposal to impose higher duties, and I deny it especially in view of the fact that a scheme has already been put forward for the initiation of what is known as the new protection—a scheme which is intended to protect both the wage-earner and the consumer, and which, I believe, will achieve something in the direction of preventing the consumer from being mulcted in increased prices as the result of the operation of higher duties. Those who hold that the imposition of an increased rate upon pianos will penalize the taxpayers for Mr. Beale's benefit ought not to vote for any such duty, and they certainly ought not to support the new protection, because it is evident that they do not believe that it will prove efficacious. I submit that if the new protection proposals achieve their object by protecting the consumer and the wage-earner alike, Mr. Beale—in the event of increased duties being levied will secure a larger market than he has previously enjoyed, his managerial expenses will be proportionately reduced, and he may thus enjoy an increased profit. But the selling price of his pianos will have to remain what it has been.

Mr. POYNTON.—Is that so?

Mr. WATSON.—I think so.

Mr. THOMAS.—If it be so, I think that fact will influence a good many votes.

Mr. WATSON.—I take it that it is absolutely so.

Mr. ATKINSON.—What guarantee has the honorable member that it will be so?

Mr. WATSON.—I admit that I cannot guarantee it.

Mr. BOWDEN.—It is like Mr. McDougall's guarantee in regard to the price of strawboard.

Mr. WATSON.—That was an instance in which a man did take advantage of an increase of the duty to increase his price to the consumer, and I showed my resentment of his action by pairing against the proposed increase of the duty. But in

the present instance we have an assurance that the price of these pianos will not be increased by the manufacturer, and we also know that we intend to subject all industries to a rigid scrutiny in respect of the prices charged to the consumer, amongst other things. If the price of Mr. Beale's pianos be increased an immediate reduction of the duty would be recommended, and personally I should vote for it.

Mr. POYNTON.—Can it be done?

Mr. WATSON.—As a matter of fact, it is being done in Canada at the present time. If two or three manufacturers are engaged in an industry, and only one is charging the consumer an unduly high price, it follows that the competition of his rivals will reduce prices to their normal level. I admit that where there is only one manufacturer engaged in an industry we are in an exceedingly awkward position. But how are we to increase the number of manufacturers? Shall we accomplish it by lowering the proposed duty? I say, "Let us impose a duty which will make it unprofitable to bring cheap pianos into Australia, and then more manufacturing will spring up, and we shall thus bring about a degree of competition which will maintain prices at a reasonable level."

Mr. WILSON.—The honorable member is now advocating prohibition.

Mr. WATSON.—The honorable member's assumption, like many of his assumptions, is based upon an insecure foundation. We have been told by the honorable member for Lang that an offer was made by Mr. Wertheim to buy Mr. Beale out, and to give him 20s. for every £1 share that he held in his company, but I did not hear any mention made of a guarantee that the industry would be carried on as it has been, or that the existing rates of wages would continue to be paid. According to the honorable member, Mr. Wertheim is so convinced of the enormous profits to be made in the industry that he is prepared to give Mr. Beale 20s. for every £1 that has been invested in it. What does that argue? If such great profits are to be made out of the local manufacture of pianos, why has not Mr. Wertheim already started in opposition to Mr. Beale? Why have not any of the German manufacturers established branch factories in Australia?

Mr. HUGHES.—Because importing is better.

Mr. WATSON.—It is because they can make higher profits by importing pianos made in the factories of Germany, where the operatives work long hours, than they could obtain by undertaking their manufacture in the Commonwealth, and observing Australian conditions as to hours of labour and rates of wages. If they could be assured of these immense profits undoubtedly they would start operations in opposition to Mr. Beale. The golden mine which the latter is said to be working would not be permitted to remain unexploited very long if it really existed. It is because it does not exist—because the industry has been struggling—that capitalists fight shy of it.

Mr. WILSON.—Does the honorable member call an industry which is returning 14½ per cent. a struggling one?

Mr. WATSON.—I wish that the honorable member in his own business would be satisfied with the rate of profit disclosed in Mr. Beale's balance-sheet.

Mr. WILSON.—We have very often to accept a great deal less.

Mr. WATSON.—Very frequently the honorable member is able to get a great deal more. In my view we shall be acting wisely if we increase the old duty upon pianos, in order to insure the establishment of more than one piano factory in Australia. Last year there were imported into the Commonwealth pianos to the value of £250,000, of which £35,000 worth came from Great Britain, and nearly £200,000 worth from Germany.

Mr. GLYNN.—But there were about a dozen classes of pianos imported, and that is a very important point to consider.

Mr. WATSON.—Even making allowance for that fact, it cannot be denied that pianos are mainly imported from Germany.

Mr. POYNTON.—Some of them were good pianos.

Mr. WATSON.—Undoubtedly. But a large proportion of them were not. Upon the table of the House is a catalogue showing that the wholesale price of a certain piano in England was £9 odd. Now, nobody will contend that a decent instrument can be manufactured for that price, even with the aid of cheap labour. The average value of the German pianos imported last year was £19 odd.

Mr. FULLER.—That is not so.

Mr. WATSON.—I prefer to accept the Customs returns, rather than the honorable member's statement.

Mr. MAHON.—I have a return which shows that the average value of the German pianos imported was £23.

Mr. WATSON.—I can assure the honorable member that I have a later return.

Mr. MAHON.—Then the honorable member must have obtained it within the last five minutes.

Mr. WATSON.—I did.

Mr. FULLER.—Will the honorable member allow the Treasurer to make a statement upon that particular point?

Mr. WATSON.—By all means. I repeat that the average value of the German pianos imported into the Commonwealth is about £19.

Mr. FULLER.—I do not think the Treasurer will indorse that statement.

Mr. WATSON.—The original statement of the Customs Department, which it was thought was incorrect, has since been proved to be approximately accurate.

Mr. GLYNN.—The price quoted by the honorable member is the price of the pianos in Germany.

Mr. WATSON.—Yes. But a lot of the pianos imported are of the better class, and consequently the average price of the cheaper instruments would be considerably lower than I have indicated.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Is the honorable member referring to all pianos imported, or merely to the German pianos?

Mr. WATSON.—To the German.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The average value is a little higher than that stated by the honorable member.

Mr. WATSON.—I must admit that there has been some confusion in the Customs Department in regard to this matter, as the result of which it is rather difficult to disentangle the truth.

Mr. FULLER.—The Customs authorities are now satisfied that the average price of the pianos imported into Victoria is a little over £23.

Mr. WATSON.—I was speaking of the importation into the Commonwealth. We all know that the pianos imported from Great Britain are, on the average, of a higher class than those which are imported from Germany.

Mr. GLYNN.—What about the local cost of production?

Mr. WATSON.—We all know that the difference between the cost of production and the selling price is very considerable. That is the result of the system which obtains. The same remark applies equally to sewing machines, harvesters, typewriters,

and in a lesser degree to bicycles. An arbitrary price is fixed for these articles, and that price is determined in a large measure by the cost incurred in canvassing for sales, and by the cost of distribution.

Mr. GLYNN.—That applies equally to the locally-manufactured pianos.

Mr. WATSON.—Quite so. With regard to the imported pianos, while they may be invoiced at £35 each, they may be sold for £70 each, or, under the time-payment system—which has something to commend it, although it involves a huge increase of price—for even more. If we are to have the development of Australian industries which we all desire, we must impose a higher duty upon pianos, as well as on other imported articles. With regard to the production of balance-sheets, I ask those who have cheerfully voted for duties of 35 per cent., why they did not require the production of balance-sheets in connexion with the local industries which those duties were designed to protect.

Mr. MAHON.—Two wrongs do not make a right.

Mr. WILKS.—A balance-sheet should be demanded in every instance.

Mr. WATSON.—There should be some degree of consistency. There was as much reason—no more and no less—for the production of balance-sheets in connexion with those industries as there is for the production of balance-sheets in connexion with the piano industry. We know on the authority of the unions concerned that Mr. Beale pays the highest wages in Australia, but we had not that guarantee in regard to a number of other industries to which we have been reasonably liberal. The agent charged with the putting of the importers' case before Parliament has collected an enormous amount of material—including a speech delivered by me five years ago, in which I said that I would be content with a duty of 20 per cent. on pianos as a compromise—and he has also produced two balance-sheets.

Mr. WILSON.—The honorable member does not mean that he has produced fictitious balance-sheets?

Mr. WATSON.—No. I speak of their production merely as an example of his industry. It is hardly fair, however, that the documents have not been generally distributed.

Mr. KING O'MALLEY.—A man's business secrets have been stolen.

Mr. WATSON.—One naturally does not like the idea of obtaining information of this sort surreptitiously.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Then the honorable member had no sympathy with the effort made in Court the other day to get the balance-sheet of Mr. H. V. McKay.

Mr. WATSON.—I did not see that the production of that balance-sheet was pertinent to the question whether fair and reasonable wages were being paid. Mr. Beale's balance-sheet, if it were necessary to make it public, should have been supplied to every honorable member. But those of us who were suspected of sympathizing, even remotely, with the establishing of the piano-making industry in Australia more firmly have not been given an opportunity to analyze these balance-sheets. I have been able to glance over them only cursorily. They are balance-sheets for the years ending 30th June, 1905, and 30th June, 1906, and do not seem to disclose abnormal profits. No doubt the Committee is sufficiently conversant with business methods to draw a distinction between money so invested that it will continue to return a fixed interest for an indefinite or prolonged time, in regard to which 3 per cent., 4 per cent., or 5 per cent. will be accepted, and money sunk in a business whose earnings will be subject to the fluctuations of the market, and may be reduced by competition. One naturally expects a larger return from a business investment than from an investment in Government debentures. It has become an unwritten law amongst business-men that an enterprise which will not return something like 10 per cent. after making proper provision for depreciation and replacement of plant is not worth touching. If Messrs. Wertheim and Company were induced by a higher duty to make pianos and sewing machines in Australia, they would be a serious competitor to Mr. Beale, whose business, laboriously built up in many years, might disappear in one or two. These balance-sheets, which have been produced by the other side—

Mr. MAHON.—Does the honorable member question their authenticity?

Mr. WATSON.—No; but it cannot be thought that their figures were prepared to produce a favorable impression so far as Mr. Beale is concerned.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—If the honorable member doubts the genuineness of the

balance-sheets, he should not quote from them.

Mr. WATSON.—I do not express any opinion on that subject. For the purposes of my argument, I am assuming that the figures are correct. The authorized capital of the concern is £60,000.

Mr. WILSON.—The shares were purchased at 5s. each.

Mr. WATSON.—The balance-sheet speaks of the shares as each fully paid. It is marvellous how these pseudo-free-traders alter their arguments to meet particular cases. When the last Tariff was under consideration, we were told that we had no right to consider the amount of capital written off by the Ballarat Woollen Mills Company; that we must consider only the new capital, and the dividends paid on it. But now it is alleged that, because Mr. Beale was able to purchase for less than their nominal value some shares which had been fully paid up, the money for which had gone into the business, we should regard the capital as reduced accordingly. Yet the money represented by the nominal value of those shares has gone into the business.

The CHAIRMAN.—I am afraid that the honorable member is entering upon an analysis of the balance-sheets, which I prevented the honorable member for Lang from doing. If I allow the honorable member to make this analysis, I cannot prevent others from following him.

Mr. WATSON.—The honorable member for Bass took exception to the action of the honorable member for Lang in reading the details of the balance-sheets, and you ruled that the latter was trying to show that the industry does not need the assistance of an extra duty, inasmuch as it now pays a sufficient return. I propose to deal with the balance-sheet only so far as may be necessary to establish the position that the industry requires further assistance.

Mr. GLYNN.—Mr. Justice Higgins, in his decision in the harvester case, said that the scale of wages which he would fix would have no relation to the profits made. Therefore, this inquiry is not relative to the question of duty.

The CHAIRMAN.—I do not desire to curtail the remarks of the honorable member for South Sydney, but if he makes a minute analysis of these balance-sheets, the debate may resolve itself into a discussion of the business of Mr. Beale, which is not the question before the Chair.

Mr. WATSON.—I desire only to reply to the statements of the honorable member for Lang. The capital invested in this business is £56,715, being made up of 60,000 fully-paid shares, less 3,285 not issued.

The CHAIRMAN.—The honorable member for Lang quoted one or two items without dealing with the balance-sheet in detail. Directly he commenced to deal with it in detail I stopped him.

Mr. WATSON.—I do not intend to go into detail. There are two factors which determine whether a business concern is profitable—the capital and the net return—and with these I wish to deal. I shall not discuss any of the many other issues raised by the balance-sheet. I do not know if I have the original balance-sheets. Those I have were given to me as copies.

Mr. JOHNSON.—They are vouched for as copies of the original balance-sheets.

Mr. WATSON.—The total capital of the business seems to be just over £90,000, including debentures.

Mr. HUGHES.—Assuming that Mr. Beale got the shares at 5s., instead of at £1, he would make a profit of 5 per cent.

Mr. WATSON.—That does not enter into the matter.

Mr. WEBSTER.—I rise to a point of order, sir. I do not wish to limit the honorable member in his analysis of the balance-sheet, but I desire to know whether it is in order for the Committee to take into its consideration any paper which is not original or authenticated.

The CHAIRMAN.—I have no control over the reading of a paper by an honorable member, so long as it is relevant to the item now under consideration. Beyond that, it is purely a question of taste with honorable members as to what documents they shall, or shall not, read.

Mr. WATSON.—The amount of profit shown for the year ending 30th June, 1905, was only £2,600.

Mr. MAHON.—What was the gross profit?

Mr. WATSON.—The gross profit of a business is what is made before the expenses are deducted, and the suggestion of the honorable member apparently is that it is not fair for Mr. Beale to deduct his expenses.

Mr. MAHON.—Not at all. He loaded up the expenses by crediting himself with a high salary.

Mr. WATSON.—As statements had been made here on that point, I went out of the chamber and asked Mr. Beale about them. Whatever his faults may be in other directions, I have always found him to be a truthful man. He said that it was not true that he was receiving a salary of £3,000.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Is it not stated on the balance-sheet as his salary?

Mr. WATSON.—I have two copies of the balance-sheet, but I can see no reference to the amount of his salary.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Perhaps it may not be given there; I thought it was.

Mr. WATSON.—Mr. Beale expressed his regret that personal matters had been imported into the discussion. He informed me that up to last year he had drawn a salary of £1,000, and that this year he was drawing a salary of £1,500, and not £3,000. It is a small salary for a man who is conducting such an enormous business.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I do not think that the honorable member ought to have mentioned that.

Mr. WATSON.—I agree with the honorable member that such matters ought not to have been introduced. But I submit that when £3,000 had been mentioned as Mr. Beale's salary, I was entitled to put forward his own statement. I wish to make a point in regard to the year ending 30th June, 1906. The honorable member for Lang has said that the profit—not counting Mr. Beale's alleged salary of £3,000—was £13,000. I do not know exactly how he made up that sum.

Mr. JOHNSON.—I gave the items.

Mr. WATSON.—The profit shown in the balance-sheet is £11,232, and if £3,000 be added to that it would come to £14,232.

Mr. JOHNSON.—There were some other matters written off.

Mr. WATSON.—The sum of £11,232 is made up of two main items. The total profit made in the year was £7,323, but to that sum has been added, so far as I can understand the position, the amount of bad debts, on time-payment accounts of previous years, which had been recovered within the year.

Mr. MAHON.—One-third of the whole.

Mr. WATSON.—They anticipated a recovery of what had previously been written off as bad debts to the extent of £3,000. Some honorable members would have that

amount counted in the ordinary profit for the year 1906.

Mr. HANS IRVINE.—It must have been reserved out of the profits.

Mr. WATSON.—I admit that it is a proper thing to bring the sum into the profit account, but not in relation to that particular year. Suppose that in his business the honorable member anticipated two years ago that he would have a certain amount of bad debts, and wrote them off, and that this year the moneys had come unexpectedly to hand, he would not be justified in including them in the profit for the year. He would have to show the recovery of the bad debts as a special item.

Mr. MAHON.—When he prepared his income tax return, he would have to show them.

Mr. WATSON.—It is an abnormal recovery which would not be credited by the honorable member to the current year. It must be shown, of course, for the purpose of income tax, and to ascertain where he was in regard to his capital account, but it should not be credited to the profits of the year to which it was accidentally attached. Therefore we may arrive at this position: that the profit of Mr. Beale's business for the year 1906 was £7,323. I do not think that any one who has a knowledge of business will say that that is too great a profit for a year, or in general relation to business, that it is even a good profit.

Mr. WILSON.—It is a handsome profit.

Mr. WATSON.—If the honorable member were able to get that rental for his land, it would be a good profit, but he knows that there is a wide difference between the return from a land investment and the return from a business. The land will not vanish, and is not likely to depreciate in value very much. But a business which to-day may be showing a handsome profit may disappear entirely next day.

Mr. BOWDEN.—What does the honorable member say to the Metropolitan Gas Company making 15 per cent?

Mr. WATSON.—The gas company is making an abnormal profit, because it charges an abnormal price. It demands twice the rate levied in Birmingham or Manchester. I recognise that honorable members who object to this duty from the free-trade stand-point are fully justified. They want to insure free imports and let every industry take its chance. I do not quarrel with that attitude, although I do not agree with it. But it seems to me

that protectionists have no possible justification for drawing any line of demarcation between the piano industry and any other.

Mr. MAHON.—A few years ago the honorable member said "a duty of 20 per cent. represents very liberal treatment to this industry."

Mr. WATSON.—The honorable member, I see, has got hold of a speech which the importers have been careful to cull out of *Hansard*.

Mr. MAHON.—No; I myself took it out of *Hansard*.

Mr. WATSON.—I saw a typewritten copy of the report which has been circulated.

Mr. MAHON.—I have not seen it.

Mr. WATSON.—An honorable member was good enough to hand the document to me.

Mr. MAHON.—Here is the *Hansard* report of the speech.

Mr. WATSON.—I know the speech by heart. I have read it in a typewritten document, and I do not wish to get away from it in the slightest degree. What I said in 1902 was that the industry had been started without protection, and that 20 per cent., as against no duty, was as much as could be expected for it. The Tariff of 1901-2 was an experiment. We wanted to see how industries would get on with, for the most part, reasonable duties, and if the honorable member for Coolgardie will take the trouble to look up the general speech I made on the question, he will find that I said that, so far as my vote was concerned, I would not sanction high duties in an experimental Tariff, because we wanted to see how things under the new conditions, which no one understood, were likely to work, and I followed that out. Since then we have had an experience extending over five years, and we know that the imports of German pianos have been a constantly increasing quantity.

Mr. MAHON.—That is not correct.

Mr. WATSON.—It is correct.

Mr. MAHON.—No; because, according to the Customs figures, in 1905 the number of German pianos decreased.

Mr. WATSON.—In 1901, when there was free-trade in pianos over a great part, if not the whole, of Australia, there was a sudden jump in the importations. Anticipating a protectionist Tariff, they rushed in their importations for that year.

Mr. MAHON.—At that time there was a protectionist duty in several States.

Mr. WATSON.—The imports of German pianos increased in value from £157,000 in 1902 to £196,000 in 1906.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—How much duty did they pay?

Mr. WATSON.—I have not got that return, but that does not affect the question.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—Yes, it does. Last year they paid £47,000 in duty.

Mr. WATSON.—What has that to do with the point?

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—It is a good slice to pay.

Mr. WATSON.—I do not see how that bears on the question which we are now considering. My statement was that the number, or, rather, the value, of German pianos imported into Australia was increasing. In view of that experience, and our experience of the piano which Mr. Beale has turned out, and which no one will say is not a good average instrument, there is every reason for those who so desire to change their opinion as to the rate of duty which is necessary to protect the industry. I have come to the conclusion, after five years' experience, that there is a need for an increased duty, and I trust that it will be voted.

Mr. WILSON (Corangamite) [3.43].—I am very sorry that there has been so much heat imported into this discussion. I agree with the honorable member for South Sydney that it should be confined to the individual merits of the instruments with which we are dealing under this item. Honorable members have not yet realized, I think, that this is a question of the encouragement of one of the greatest of the arts, and that there is a considerable difference between a boot-jack and a piano.

Mr. WATKINS.—Does the honorable member mean that the Colonial instrument is a boot-jack?

Mr. WILSON.—No; nor do I intend at any time to reflect on the Colonial instrument. The point is that some persons prefer the Australian piano. In my opinion it is a very good instrument, and I do not wish to say anything against it. On the other hand, there are some artists who prefer an American piano or an English piano or a German piano. All those tastes have to be met. Some artists will sing to and play an Australian piano with great pleasure to themselves, but other artists say that it is impossible to do

justice to themselves with anything but a German piano. That is what we have to consider in dealing with this question. How are the public to be best suited?

Mr. SPENCE.—Could we not make a German piano in Australia?

Mr. WILSON.—The honorable member is such an excellent hand at organizing that he might possibly do even that. We have to give the public a fair and square deal. We have to treat Mr. Beale, the Australian manufacturer, fairly. We also have to treat the public fairly. But quite apart from Mr. Beale and the importers of pianos, it is our duty to consider the interests of a large number of people throughout Australia who are making their living by giving instruction in music, and the still larger number who to their own great enjoyment love to listen to music in their own homes. Of those whose interests we have to bear in mind the greater number by far are those who enjoy music at home. It would be a great advantage to the whole of the people of Australia and particularly to our young folks if there were a piano in every house and instruction in music for every child in Australia. Quite apart from the advantage of the instruction itself, it would be an introduction to the gentler arts and a valuable discipline in time and method.

Mr. WATKINS.—Would they not be made much happier if they knew that their pianos were made by Australian hands?

Mr. WILSON.—I think that the majority of people would not care where they got their piano from so long as they had an instrument which gave them pleasure.

Mr. CHANTER.—People are more patriotic than the honorable member gives them credit for being.

Mr. WILSON.—I have no objection to people using Australian pianos if they suit their taste. But to a person who has the soul of music within him there is as much difference between pianos as there is between a Cremona violin and a violin made in Paris.

Mr. SPENCE.—How many people are there in Australia who "have the soul of music within them?"

Mr. WILSON.—A great many, I am proud to say. There are Australians whose musical taste has been developed in this country, and who, when they have gone abroad, have electrified the musical world by their talents. It is very likely that if we were to ask these Australians what instruments they prefer some would mention one piano and some another, and each

would say that the piano which he favoured was the instrument best adapted for displaying his talents. When we are asked to grant an increased duty in favour of an industry we have to look into the details and see whether the demand is justified. If our Australian manufacturer were in a bad way, if his output were declining, if his profits were diminishing, I should say that we were bound to impose an increased duty. But we find on inquiry that the facts are not so. I give our Australian manufacturer every credit for his enterprise and ability. I am delighted to know that he pays in his eight hours factory the best wages in the world.

Mr. WATKINS.—The honorable member should know that it is the only eight-hours piano factory in the world.

Mr. WILSON.—I am delighted to know that his men are working under such fair conditions, whilst he is making such excellent profits for himself.

Mr. HUGHES.—What profit is he making?

Mr. WILSON.—According to the balance-sheet from which quotations have been made by the honorable member for South Sydney, if it be read properly, Mr. Beale's capital is £56,715.

Mr. HUGHES.—What about the loan account?

Mr. WILSON.—The interest paid on the loan account is in a separate item. That wipes out the loan account.

Mr. CHANTER.—Oh, does it! What about redemption? The honorable member is like Micawber—"thank God, that's paid!"

Mr. WILSON.—The redemption will be found accounted for in the capital account, where the shares, for which 5s. each was paid, are put down at face value. There is any amount of redemption in that; as well as in plant, merchandise, factory stocks, material in hand, factory, landed property and buildings, machinery and tools, horses and vehicles, and all the other items included in the balance-sheet.

Mr. HUGHES.—Where is depreciation for factories and buildings provided for?

Mr. WILSON.—The honorable member will find that set out.

Mr. HUGHES.—I cannot find it. Where is it?

Mr. WILSON.—The honorable member has a copy of the balance-sheet before him, and he can show the defects in my argument if he is able.

Mr. HUGHES.—I am still a little deaf, I know; but I am far from being blind, and it is not here.

Mr. WILSON.—This balance-sheet is signed by the managing director and secretary of the company, and it is a properly audited document. It can be sworn to as being a true copy.

Mr. STORRER.—Who made the copy?

Mr. WILSON.—I cannot inform the honorable member.

Mr. STORRER.—It must have been obtained by fraud.

Mr. WILSON.—Oh, no. On the 1906 balance-sheet the profit shown on the original capital is £11,232 os. 5d.

Mr. HUGHES.—How much is that per cent.?

Mr. WILSON.—That is about 19 per cent.

Mr. HUGHES.—What about the previous year?

Mr. WILSON.—In the previous year a smaller profit was made.

Mr. HUGHES.—How much smaller in the previous year?

Mr. WILSON.—There is shown on the profit and loss balance-sheet a profit of £2,605; but honorable members must take into consideration the reserve account, £28,628.

Mr. CROUCH.—That is not profit.

Mr. GLYNN.—The matter is scarcely worth the time which is being devoted to it.

Mr. WILSON.—The only point that I wish to make is that the balance-sheet shows that a reasonable profit has been made under existing conditions.

Mr. HUGHES.—£2,600 is not a reasonable profit.

Mr. WILSON.—There is more than that. The honorable member has not taken into consideration the reserve account, which was set aside in the previous year. During the present year the balance-sheet of the company, if it could be obtained, would probably show a much larger profit. Now I am not objecting to this profit. I am delighted to see that it has been made, and that the factory has been doing so well. I wish it every success in the future. I hope that the business will go on increasing.

Mr. HUGHES.—If the honorable member takes both years, he will find that the profit only comes to 10 per cent.

Mr. WILSON.—That is a very good profit.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. BATCHELOR).—I cannot allow any new matter to be introduced respecting the balance-sheet.

Mr. WILSON.—I had no intention of entering into further details. I have answered the honorable member for West Sydney. The only point which I wish to make about the balance-sheets is that they show that this manufacturer is making a reasonable profit at the present moment under conditions which are a credit to him and to Australia.

Mr. WATKINS.—That is why he is being attacked, I suppose.

Mr. WILSON.—I am not attacking him in any way. I have no interest in Mr. Beale, apart from a desire to see him prosper. I have no interest in the importers apart from a wish to see them prosper. I have a great interest in the people in wishing to see them prosperous and happy; and it is because I think that it is not to their advantage to increase the duty that I am opposed to it. I also wish to show that this Australian manufacturer is increasing his business. In 1903 Mr. Beale advertised in the *Adelaide Advertiser*, "We sell 800 pianos a year in Australia." On the 1st June, 1906, Mr. Carl Johann Vader gave evidence before the Tariff Commission.

Mr. CHANTER.—Yet the honorable member for Lang denied that evidence was given before the Commission in behalf of this industry.

Mr. MCWILLIAMS.—He said "by Mr. Beale."

Mr. CHANTER.—No; by Mr. Beale's company.

Mr. WILSON.—It is a matter of no moment to me what was said by any honorable member. I am here to state the facts as far as I can ascertain them. I shall quote from the evidence of Mr. Vader. Questions 96389-96391—

How many pianos are you turning out?—Last year we turned out 1,500.

Is that your largest output?—We are now increasing it.

Has it been increasing every year since 1900?—Yes.

At the present time, owing to the increased output, it follows that the cost of manufacturing these pianos must be much less than in the years prior to 1903. I am delighted to know that our Australian manufacturer, working under favorable conditions, is increasing his output constantly.

Mr. CHANTER.—And has decreased the price.

Mr. WILSON.—I hope he has. It is to his credit if he has done so. I am not troubling about the price. I am simply showing that Mr. Beale has had a protection which has been ample.

Mr. CHANTER.—Does not the honorable member admit that the consumer has benefited from the decrease in price?

Mr. WILSON.—I have no objection to urge to the way in which the consumer has been treated by Mr. Beale. I have no desire to go into his profits, or into the difference between manufacturing cost and cost to the public. That is a matter between him and the public. He gives the public a fair deal, and the public have a perfect right to buy their instruments from him. Under the previous Tariff, we gave a protection of 20 per cent. to Mr. Beale. Under that protection he has been able to increase his business, to pay and treat his employés well, and to make for himself a reasonable profit. Under these circumstances, I say that we should be doing an injustice to the music-loving public of Australia if we increased the duty beyond that charged under the old Tariff.

Mr. SAMPSON.—If the industry has been such a success, would it not be advisable to increase the duty and conduce to the establishment of a few more such factories?

Mr. WILSON.—The honorable member raises a fresh point. It has been shown that the Australian manufacturer has done well under the old duty. What he has done has been creditable to him as an Australian manufacturer. Why, if he can do so well under these conditions, should not other manufacturers be able to do the same? Shall we secure more competition by the imposition of higher duties? In what way will the public be benefited by them? The honorable member for Riverina said that Mr. Beale had reduced the price of his pianos. If that be so, he is giving the public a fair deal. The people, however, desire to be free to select either an Australian or a foreign-made piano. If they are content to buy an inferior instrument that is a matter of no concern to us; but if they do purchase a foreign-made piano they must pay more for it. We shall not be dealing fairly with the great army of music teachers and music lovers in Australia unless we reduce the duties to such a level that whilst protecting the local manufacturer they will not prevent the public from obtaining a good

imported instrument at a fair price. The circulars that have been issued in reference to these duties display a good deal of enterprise on the part of both sides. I most strongly condemn the reprint from the *Bulletin* which was read this morning by the honorable member for Lang, and which I regard as a gross breach of the privileges of the House. It practically suggests that honorable members who maintain that the duties on pianos should be kept at a reasonable level, and that we should have only a slight increase on the rates under the old Tariff, are subsidized by German pianoforte makers.

Mr. CHANTER.—No one believes that.

Mr. WILSON.—As soon as the circular was mentioned this morning the honorable member was inclined to say that it was true.

Mr. CHANTER.—I had already read it.

Mr. WILSON.—After it had been read I challenged the honorable member to assert in the House that it was true.

Mr. CHANTER.—I said that the authority was truthful.

Mr. WILSON.—The authority was altogether wrong. Any one who asserts that there has been an effort to bribe honorable members to do other than their duty is guilty of a gross breach of the privileges of the House.

Mr. CHANTER.—No one believes that portion of the statement in the circular.

Mr. WILSON.—The honorable member should not have shown a disposition to sympathize with the statements contained in the circular before they had been read to the Committee. Another circular issued by the Australian manufacturer casts a reflection upon an importer. As the Treasurer in very strong language this morning repudiated it, I felt justified in sending for Mr. George Allan, the importer in question, with the object of ascertaining what he had to say in regard to the matter. I made a rough note of his statement and he signed it. My memorandum reads as follows—

Mr. George Allan states that he saw Sir William Lyne in the House by appointment, and had in his hand some typewritten memoranda of argument that he might or might not use in talking to him.

Mr. Allan went on to explain that the Treasurer, who received him very favorably, said—

"You might leave me these memos.," and without any thought he did so. A few weeks afterwards out came Mr. Beale's circular stating that a firm of piano importers had

sent a circular to every member containing the contents of these notes.

Mr. JOHNSON.—That is a nice breach of faith.

Mr. WILSON.—The honorable member must not anticipate what I have to put before the Committee. These private notes had been given to the Treasurer and to no one else. The statement continues—

Mr. Allan sent no circular to anybody, and is unable to explain how this information got into the hands of Mr. Beale. He makes no charge against Sir William Lyne personally—

The word “personally” was inserted at Mr. Allan’s request—

but wishes to know by what leakage Mr. Beale got hold of these private notes.

Mr. CHANTER.—Were they handed to the Treasurer as confidential notes?

Mr. WILSON.—They were at the time.

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—The Treasurer has absolutely denied the statement.

Mr. WILKS.—Then he ought to prosecute Mr. Allan for criminal libel.

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—He will probably do so. Will the honorable member for Corangamite lay on the table the statement that he has just read?

Mr. WILSON.—The honorable member need not worry; I have always been willing and able to substantiate any statement I have made in the House, and as soon as I have read the notes in question they will become the property of the House. I repeat that Mr. Allan makes no charge against the Treasurer personally, but wishes to know how the gist of his private notes passed into the possession of Mr. Beale to be used against him in this fight.

Mr. SAMPSON.—That must be a charge against the Treasurer as a responsible Minister.

Mr. WILSON.—Some one else may have secured the notes or obtained details of them, and have passed them on to the other side without thinking that he was doing any harm. The notes may have left the hands of the Treasurer. I only hope that the matter may be satisfactorily cleared up. Honorable members should consider this question from all points of view.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—And without any regard to individuals.

Mr. WILSON.—Most certainly; we have simply to determine whether or not the Australian manufacturer was sufficiently protected under the old Tariff. I think I have shown that he has been doing very well, and, that being so, we are not justi-

fied in granting him, at the present time, any material increase on the old duties.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [4.13].—The issue of the circular to which the honorable member for Corangamite has referred caused me great astonishment. Whether it was sent to me or not I cannot say, nor had I heard that such a circular was in existence until the matter was mentioned. I had no recollection of having received any private communication from Mr. George Allan; but I at once sent to the Department to ascertain whether there were any official papers relating to the matter. As the result of my inquiries I find that on the 13th September Mr. George Allan left in my hands—confidentially, I presume—the document to which he refers. I produce the document, which, honorable members will notice, has been officially registered in the Department. I had forgotten its existence.

Mr. MAHON.—How did Mr. Beale obtain possession of the notes?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I have not made any statement to him in regard to the document. I also find that another document, containing a great deal of the same information, was sent by Mr. George Allan, presumably to the Comptroller-General. Here are the official documents. That which I received at once passed from my hands into the Department, and was registered. I cannot say where Mr. Beale obtained any information regarding this matter, but I believe that he knows as much about the business as most people in the trade, and could make calculations as to the business done by Mr. Allan or any one else. So far as I am aware, I have never received any private documents from Mr. Allan. If I had done so, I certainly would not have communicated their contents to Mr. Beale or any one else.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Hear, hear; but does not that make the incident the more mysterious?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I know nothing about it. So far as the Department is concerned, I will undertake to say that Mr. Beale never saw these documents. I have so much confidence in the officers of the Department that I will undertake to say further that they never gave Mr. Beale any of the information which they contain; and I do not suppose Mr. Beale ever went to the Department to ask for it.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—He quotes practically the same words in his circular.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I suppose the information could be obtained from other sources. Some of it is contained in another document which I have here in the form of a communication to the Comptroller-General, and the whole of the documents are public.

Mr. FISHER.—They are all records?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Yes.

Mr. FISHER.—The honorable gentleman does not mean to say that the departmental officials make records public?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—No, they did not publish them. The official stamp of the Department is on these documents.

Mr. FISHER.—If there were fifty of them they would all be private.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Yes, but they are all documents in the Department.

Mr. MAHON.—The question still remains: How did Mr. Beale get hold of these documents?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not think he did get hold of them.

Mr. MAHON.—The information they contain is published in his circular.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not know whether it is or not. I never read Mr. Beale's circular either; but it must be remembered that he knows a good deal about the business, and possesses information as to prices, and so on.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—But he quotes from the document referred to.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—He could not quote the exact words.

Mr. SAMPSON.—Are there not other sources from which the information might be derived?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—All I can say is, and I trust honorable members believe me, that in the most straightforward manner I placed these documents in charge of the Comptroller-General. I had forgotten about them, and I could only imagine that if I had received any such documents they would be found in the Department of Trade and Customs. I at once asked the Comptroller-General to send down to the office to find what documents were there. I have just received the documents which I hold in my hand, and they include amongst others the one to which Mr. Allan referred. I am very glad that Mr. Allan has said that he does not accuse me personally.

Mr. ATKINSON.—No one does.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Because I felt very much hurt by what was said. Mr. Allan has been a friend of mine for a considerable time, and, if I may be permitted

to say so, he is perhaps a more intimate friend of mine than is Mr. Beale. I should be very sorry indeed that he or any one else should think that I would betray a confidence. None of these documents were placed in my hands as confidential. I have explained exactly how the matter stands and what I did; and I never saw these documents after they were received until the present time.

Mr. WILKS.—The charge is transferred from the honorable gentleman's shoulders to the Department.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I say that I am quite satisfied that the Department never gave any information, and I expect to find that Mr. Beale never asked for it, although I know nothing of that. All I wished to do was to set the matter straight so far as I am concerned, and to express my astonishment that such a thing should be used.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS (Robertson) [4.20].—The individuals concerned in this business seem to occupy a great deal of the attention of Parliament.

Mr. BAMFORD.—Far too much.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—It seems to me that they are quite beside the question. That they are dealing in pianos is merely an incident, whilst it is our business to legislate for the good of the country, so that commerce can be conducted satisfactorily. That Mr. Beale's business should be seriously discussed in this Chamber seems to me to be reducing the status of this Parliament to that of a debating society. The balance-sheet which has been referred to here only goes to show that under the duty of 20 per cent. Mr. Beale was able to make his business pay. The fact that he made a large sum of money out of his business gives me very great satisfaction, because I hope that all men who embark in a business in Australia will be able to make it pay. But honorable members have only to look at the establishment that is in existence in Sydney to know that the business pays. No man will increase the size of his business premises and engage more employees unless the business he does warrants him in doing so. We have only to consult the circulars sent out by Mr. Beale in the ordinary course of business to know that his output has wonderfully increased, and on that account, from my point of view, he is deserving of some consideration. I am prepared to give him all the consideration he deserves. The instrument which he has

exhibited here must be regarded as a very fine piece of furniture. Whether it is also a fine musical instrument, which satisfies the taste of the public, is a matter with which Mr. Beale is concerned. If the public do not wish to have one of Mr. Beale's instruments, they will not buy it. He charges a very high price for his instruments, about 100 per cent. on cost price, and evidently the public cannot get anything cheaper, or they would not buy them. He gives terms to purchasers, and very long terms, and that proves that his profits must be large. If he made a big profit last year he was fortunate, but he might make a big loss next year. That is all I have to say, so far as Mr. Beale is concerned; but I have something to say about the interests of the general public, who should be considered in all these matters. If an industry can continue to exist without increased protective duties, what more have we to consider? After a long discussion some years ago we decided that 20 per cent. was a sufficient duty to impose, and at that time we had under consideration the duties imposed in the several States and in New Zealand. A duty of 20 per cent. was levied on pianos in New Zealand. We also had under notice the fact that in Canada the duty was 30 per cent.; that Western Australia had fixed duties of £5 and £15; Tasmania a duty of 20 per cent.; South Australia, 15 per cent.; Queensland, fixed duties of £6 and £12; and Victoria, fixed duties of £5 and £15. In New South Wales, where this industry was established, there was no duty, and the industry was paying its way under conditions of free-trade against the world in pianos. The industry had increased its output in competition with the world.

Mr. POYNTON.—Since then it has had the markets of Australia free.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—Since then it has also had the advantage of protection to the extent of 20 per cent.

Mr. GLYNN.—New South Wales is the only place apparently where a factory could be started.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—Apparently the only place where the industry could live was where it could be carried on under conditions of untrammelled commerce and might import free of duty all required to carry it on. It is used as an argument against the Australian instrument that a great many imported parts are used in its manufacture. That is to me a recommendation.

It shows that Mr. Beale is a man abreast of the times, and as a shrewd business man does not hesitate to import what he requires to make his pianos acceptable to the public. He deserves consideration for his endeavour to give people the best he can command. The more parts he imports from abroad the more assistance I shall be prepared to give him. I am prepared to allow him to import these parts duty free. That is a fair proposition to make to him. As he succeeded so well in the past I am unwilling to upset his business, and I am prepared to give him, as regards parts, just what he had in New South Wales and let him compete with the world. If his industry cannot live with the advantage of the free importation of all the parts he requires for the manufacture of his instruments let it do the other thing, and let him go into some other business.

Mr. BAMFORD.—What advantage would it be to him to let him have the parts he requires free of duty?

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—He would have free access to all the parts used in the manufacture of pianos in the Old Country.

Mr. BAMFORD.—It would only put him on a level in that respect with outsiders.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—It would put him on a level with the best English and German makers who use French parts, and if he is given in addition a duty of 20 per cent. on the finished article, which I think he is likely to get, that should serve him excellently. I do not think there is a great deal to debate in this question. All we have heard so far has been a discussion of the business affairs of private individuals. I have noticed that a very large number of people go into the piano business, and when we find persons falling over each other in their effort to get a share in a particular business we may be satisfied that there is a lot of money in it. As a free-trader I should like to have commerce as untrammelled as possible. If we give Mr. Beale the advantage of the free importation of the parts he requires—and I mention his name in this connexion because he represents the industry in Australia—and an increased duty is imposed, I should say that foreign firms would be induced to establish themselves in Australia so as to continue to reap the profits derived from the trade which by their enterprise they have carried on in almost every part of the Commonwealth. However, the matter is one which is of real inter-

to the public, because that a person should have to pay £50 for a piano which could be bought in Leipzig for £20 is a scandal. We should do what we can to reduce the price charged for pianos so that our people may be able to get a good instrument into their houses. I am told that pianos are imported here for £6, and I suppose Mr. Beale could also make cheap pianos. It seems to me that to impose the high fixed duties which the Government propose upon these instruments would injure the trade in Australia and would force our people to use an inferior instrument. There is a piano exhibited in this building which cost in Europe less than £30, and the price paid for it here is just under £60. It is clear that the business of the importation of pianos is thriving in Australia.

Mr. WILKS.—The importers have nothing to complain of.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—No, I should say they are doing very well.

Mr. WILKS.—Yet they say that an increase of 5 per cent. in the duty would ruin them.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—It would not. They are waxing rich throughout the Commonwealth. The name of Mr. Paling is very well known in this business, and it is known that he was a public benefactor, and died a rich man. No one can doubt that there is money in the business.

Mr. BAMFORD.—There is more money in the selling than in the making of pianos.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—My concern is to give our people the best pianos at the lowest possible price, and in that I suppose that the honorable member for Angas and I stand alone. I close by saying that if the Australian industry for the manufacture of pianos is a good one it should continue to exist, and that if it is not it ought to be stamped out.

Mr. GLYNN (Angas) [4.28].—I do not think very much complaint can be urged against the Department in connexion with the documents that have been referred to, unless they were handed to the Minister under a pledge of secrecy.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—There is not a word on these documents to show that they were to be considered confidential.

Mr. GLYNN.—I do not assume that for a moment. Unless they were actually received under a pledge of secrecy, when it would become a matter of personal honour not to disclose their contents, I think there would not be much to complain of if the

Department did disclose to a man like Mr. Beale, conversant with the piano business, the contents of documents upon which the Minister's judgment was to be formed. In my opinion, it would be deplorable if Ministers were to take, without any qualification, private suggestions from those interested in a particular trade.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I can tell the honorable member that I have another document here, strongly advocating the side of these individuals.

Mr. GLYNN.—I hope it is not the custom of the Department to accept, without a check of any kind, memoranda from those interested in any business, in connexion with which it is proposed to impose a duty. A good check would be to allow others who may be competing to see the materials on which a certain suggestion may have been made to the Minister. I felt that some time ago, when I introduced what I regarded as a deputation to the Minister. I left the room when I found that I could not agree with their request. I found that it was not reported afterwards, so that I suppose the interview was really one of those private ones which are in the long run somewhat dangerous. I am afraid, from the heat and force that have been thrown into this debate, that if some of the dead poets were to revisit us, they would find it necessary to recast some of their observations regarding music. When I listened to the verbal encounter of two of our heavy-weights on the other side, I doubted if Shakespeare was right in saying that music could—

... make tigers tame,
And huge leviathans to dance on sands.

or, from the lack of mellowness in the debate, whether Milton might not reconsider his opinion that Orpheus' tones—

Drew iron tears down Pluto's cheek,
And made Hell grant what love did seek.

The debate has been, to some extent, marked by those relieving discords that occur in musical themes, although it has certainly not been remarkable for a too great extension of harmony or melody, or perhaps too great aptness in the matter of point and counterpoint. We have had some figures from the Treasurer as to the total wages paid in an Australian factory, to the enterprise and skill of whose manager I must bear, from what I have read, my humble testimony of admiration. We welcome the enterprise, so long as the ways are not too

devious, of any one engaged in an Australian industry, and if he makes it a success, even if the balance-sheet shows a profit of 15 or 20 per cent., so long as that is not abnormal, there is nothing to complain of, nor does it affect the question of the duty which we should impose, because, if Mr. Beale had the good or bad luck—good from the point of view of the public, although, perhaps, bad from his own—to have many local competitors, I dare say the profits might not be quite so high, although the incidence of the duty upon the general public, or loss to the Treasury, would be just the same. We have to consider what the public have to pay for the alleged benefits conferred on the community by an increase of duty. The Treasurer said that the wages paid were £60,000 per annum. Assuming a consumption of pianos of about 11,000 or 12,000—which, on the figures given before the Tariff Commission is not far wrong—and taking the duty as about £5 on the ordinary piano, multiplying the two, you get £60,000 a year as the duty proposed by the Minister, which amounts exactly to the total wages paid at present by Mr. Beale. I do not say that Mr. Beale gets that sum—but £60,000 a year is a very big outlay at the expense of those who use pianos—nor that Mr. Beale requires the protection it implies, because, according to the evidence, he is flourishing, and his business has increased through his enterprise, ability, and push, by 50 per cent. since 1900. But we are giving away £60,000 per annum for, shall we say, the operatives who are engaged in Mr. Beale's works, and whose case has been put to-day by the honorable member for Dalley. Mr. Beale's output in 1904, according to the Tariff Commission, was 1,500 pianos, and at £5 apiece the total amount that Mr. Beale could get on his present output, out of the £60,000 would be £7,500. I do not know how much of that will go to his operatives. They may get a shilling or two more a week. It would only mean a few shillings a week extra to the men if the whole of it was divided amongst them, and I suppose that Mr. Beale will not give them the whole of it. We know that the men do not get such treatment. That could only be brought about by a very effective form of the so-called new protection, which we have not found yet. But supposing that the men were offered the whole of the £7,500 a

year, surely they would not be so unpatriotic as to take it when it meant an additional price for pianos, which are the little enjoyments of their own class, and which help to alleviate the hardships of their daily life. Surely they are not going to ask for that addition to their wages at an expense to the public, not of £7,000 only, but of £60,000 a year? That is the lesson that I have drawn from the figures given by the Treasurer. We have heard a good deal about encouraging local production. I do not want to say anything about the quality of the local piano. Some may say that its tone is not altogether as resonant as that of some other instruments. I have heard that said, and the same remark may be made about some of the American pianos. But pianos, wherever made, have, though in a less marked degree, that peculiarity which is common to most musical instruments—the timbre depending to a large extent upon proper seasoning, and upon the perfect balance of the parts, so that there is no irregularity or want of consonance in the wave lengths of the strings, and in the particular kinds of woods that are dovetailed one into the other to make up the instrument. To say that that highest skill, which does not come by the sudden application of mathematics to money, but from that indefinable genius which is the result perhaps of prolonged evolution through generations, can be induced by the mere imposition of a 10 or 15 per cent. higher rate of duty, is arrant nonsense. If a mere duty can give the requisite quality in all cases, how is it that there are six or seven different leading classes of pianos in Germany? One performer will not play at a concert on the piano of a particular maker. He prefers perhaps a piano with a greater breadth of tone, ring, and penetrating power, but that piano might be utterly unsuited to another performer, especially if, instead of being one of those acrobatic persons who fill large halls—more pugilists than real artists—he happens to be an artist in the old sense of the word, as it was applied to Liszt's playing. The piano which he would select would be one of softer tone, that would fill perhaps a moderate-sized drawing room. We all have different ears, or perhaps we would not so often shut them to the speeches of honorable members who sit on opposite sides to us. If we try to encourage or confine our choice to purely local production, a long time will elapse before we attain, through varieties of kind, that development

of tone, and peculiarity of shading, which have so much to do with the psychological enjoyment of music, and that have been attained in some of the older portions of the world through the wide field of competition and experience. That is one of the reasons why, whilst desirous of encouraging local skill, and not attempting in any way to impugn the quality of our local product, I am still somewhat of an eclectic in this matter, and desire, as representative of the citizens who may have an interest in buying pianos, to free myself from prejudice, and to be unaffected by any attempt of the Treasurer to impose a duty that will rather limit than extend the power of the public to purchase the pianos that they fancy. There is no doubt that music has a good deal to do with the civilities of life. You can abuse music, and part of the reason for the waning of our enjoyment of it in after-years is over-familiarity with certain tunes. I do not advocate such a wide diffusion of music that every house shall ring with the playing of pianos and the scraping of fiddles, because temperance in this, as in other matters, preserves the power of enjoyment, and when there is too great a dwelling on particular melodies the appetite may, in the words of the poet, "Sicken and so die." But without a judicious admixture of the enjoyment which ordinary minds can get from music, with the harsh conditions of modern life—of which the man with only two or three pounds a week gets his full share—we shall never reach that level of comparative comfort and general culture—using the word in its proper sense—that we all, whether Socialists or not, aim at here. In the interests, therefore, of the 12,000 purchasers of pianos per annum—and I suppose they will be represented by an increasing number each year—I appeal to the Committee not to impose a duty that is beyond, I might say, the necessities—although there is no necessity for an increase disclosed by the evidence given before the Tariff Commission—and that certainly might mean a greater difficulty on the part of men with moderate incomes in buying one of the few solaces of their daily lives. The Treasurer has given us various prices at which pianos can be imported, running from about £9 up to £20. On the corrected estimate of the Customs Department, the average cost, for clearance before duty, of pianos imported from Germany is £23 odd. That is a good export

Mr. Glynn.

price for a piano, and I believe that the local piano does not cost more than that to produce. I have seen estimates of the cost of local production, running from £16 to £23. I have also seen deductions from the figures said to be given by Mr. Beale himself, which indicate—I do not say prove—that his cost of production locally is not greater than the average cost at which pianos can be imported. If that is so, there is absolutely nothing pregnant in the figures quoted by the Treasurer. There is at present a duty of 20 per cent. on pianos, which, with a cost of production of £20, is supplemented by a natural protection of about 50 per cent. *ad valorem*. The lowest cost of importation from Germany that I have seen is about £9, so that, adding that to the incidence of the present duty, there is a pretty effectual protection even with a 20 per cent. rate. In those circumstances, it is uncalled for—in fact, it is a most inexpedient, if not foolish, policy—to ask the Committee, without rhyme or reason, even from the protectionist point of view, and with many counter reasons from the point of view of the revenue and of the general consumer, to put about 50 per cent. more on to a rate of duty which, up to the present, has been marked by increased enterprise and success on the part of the local industry.

Mr. MAHON (Coolgardie) [4.43].—In regard to the leakage of information from the Customs to Mr. Beale, the extraordinary suggestion has been made that he had obtained it by a sort of divination. The honorable member for Wimmera, for instance, suggested that Mr. Beale might have obtained possession of the information in some such way. I intervene at this moment only to show that the words quoted in Mr. Beale's circular are identical in every respect with the memoranda handed to the Treasurer by Mr. Allan in September last, and Mr. Beale's circular reached honorable members about the middle of last month, or a little earlier. Mr. Allan's memoranda consist of four paragraphs. I will read the two documents paragraph by paragraph, alternately, so that their absolute identity may be perceptible to everybody. Mr. Allan's first paragraph is as follows—

It must be understood that the manufacture of pianos presents exceptional difficulties. It is not an ordinary matter of labour and material; but an industry and an art combined. In a piano of musical quality there is an artistic

result which is only obtained after years or generations of experiment.

Now, I shall read the paragraph quoted in Mr. Beale's circular—

It must be understood that the manufacture of pianos presents exceptional difficulties. It is not an ordinary matter of labour and material, but an industry and an art combined. In a piano of musical quality, there is an artistic result which is only attained after years or generations of experiment.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—All I was concerned about was whether the memorandum had been obtained from the Department.

Mr. MAHON.—I do not believe that any honorable member for one moment entertains the idea that the letter was obtained from the Treasurer; but there is a little mystery which I hope the Treasurer will be able to investigate later on. The second paragraph in Mr. Allan's memorandum is as follows—

Even if the importation of pianos is practically prohibited, it is an industry that even those with expert knowledge would be chary of attempting in Australia, owing to the very great uncertainty as to whether the product would be a success.

That is the first sentence of the paragraph; and now I shall read the first sentence in the corresponding paragraph of Mr. Beale's quotation—

Even if the importation of pianos is practically prohibited, it is an industry which even those with expert knowledge would be chary of attempting in Australia, owing to the very great uncertainty as to whether the product would be a success.

Then Mr. Allan proceeds—

The ordinary difficulties of manufacture are enhanced in Australia, owing to the absence of suitable materials, and the want of skilled experts, who would have to be imported at very high salaries, as there is no school or training for such workmen in Australasia.

Now, Mr. Beale—

The ordinary difficulties of manufacture are enhanced in Australia, owing to the absence of suitable materials, and the want of skilled experts, who would have to be imported at very high salaries, as there is no school or training for such workmen in Australasia.

I hope that the honorable member for Wimmera is convinced that this is no accidental resemblance.

Mr. SAMPSON.—I do not say that it is; but it is always hard to trace the source of any information.

Mr. MAHON.—The honorable member does not comprehend my point. The circular of Mr. Allan is the product of Mr. Allan's own brain. How does Mr. Beale's

circular come to be identical, word for word, with a confidential circular sent to the Department?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I made it official at once, and it bears the official stamp.

Mr. MAHON.—As I said before, I do not think that the Treasurer knew anything about this matter.

Mr. WEBSTER.—Who did, then?

Mr. MAHON.—I am not in a position to say. The point raised by the honorable member for Wimmera that the information was received, or hit on, in some accidental way—

Mr. SAMPSON.—That is not my point. My point is that it might have been possible to get the information outside the Department. I do not say that the information was obtained outside the Department; but there may have been pressed copies of the communication.

Mr. MAHON.—It is in answer to the honorable member for Wimmera that I am reading these circulars, in order to show that they are identical, word for word.

Mr. WATSON.—The document may have been obtained outside the Department surreptitiously.

Mr. SAMPSON.—It may have been stolen from Mr. Allan.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The document was in Mr. Allan's own place, and his men may have had access to it.

Mr. MAHON.—The presumption which contradicts the supposition of the honorable member for Wimmera, is that Mr. Beale states in the opening of his circular—

A letter has been sent to members of the Commonwealth Parliament by a piano importing firm, which letter we reprint (in red) herein, with answers to the statements made.

If this information were obtained surreptitiously from Mr. Allan's office I apprehend that the person who took it would also be able to inform those to whom he gave it that it was not issued to members of the Commonwealth Parliament, but was a confidential document sent to the Minister.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not consider it a confidential document.

Mr. MAHON.—I call it a confidential document, because it is difficult to know what other term to apply. At any rate, it was a document not intended for public perusal. Here is Mr. Allan's third paragraph—

Beale's pianos are, so far, most unsatisfactory, and if we are forced into manufacturing it is quite a gamble whether we should succeed

any better. No musicians will use them, although he commands a good sale amongst those who buy a piano only as a piece of furniture. Such reputation as they have is built on advertising alone.

And here is Mr. Beale's third paragraph—

Beale's pianos are, so far, most unsatisfactory, and if we are forced into manufacturing it is quite a gamble whether we should succeed any better. No musicians will use them, although he commands a good sale amongst those who buy a piano only as a piece of furniture. Such reputation as they have is built on advertising alone.

Now we come to Mr. Allan's last paragraph—

If we did succeed, others would have to follow or go out of the business; and it would mean that in a few years the thing would be so overdone that there would be nothing in it for any of us.

And this is Mr. Beale's last paragraph—

If we did succeed others would have to follow, or go out of the business, and it would mean that in a few years the thing would be so overdone that there would be nothing in it for any of us.

A comparison of these paragraphs at once disposes of the contention put forward that the contents of this document were in some extraordinary manner accidentally conveyed to Mr. Beale, and points to the conclusion that it was obtained by methods discreditable to all concerned.

Mr. SAMPSON (Wimmera) [4.54].—The honorable member for Coolgardie has endeavoured to fasten on me a statement which did not come from me. I did not make any accusation, such as that inferred by the honorable member; all I did, when a charge had been directed against the Treasurer, was to ask whether it was not possible for the information to have been obtained from other sources besides the Department. I take it that copies are kept of letters sent to the Department, and some copy of this document may have found its way into other hands. It may have been possible for Mr. Beale to receive this information from some outside source, though I do not say whether he did or did not. If a document of this kind has been surreptitiously obtained from the Department, some one requires to be severely reprimanded. I repeat that all I suggested was the possibility of the information having been obtained outside the Department; I did not say definitely that it had been so obtained.

Mr. KNOX (Kooyong) [4.55].—Every honorable member has, I am sure, made up his mind how he is going to vote, and it is

undesirable to discuss the question at any great length. However, there are one or two points to which no special reference has been made, and to which I should like to call attention. As to the document, to which the honorable member for Coolgardie has called attention, there is nothing to show that, in some way, the information leaked out of Mr. Allan's office. Mr. Allan himself handed me the only other copy which he had typed at the time, and which I have shown to the Treasurer, who, I am very glad to find, has been able to discover the original document in the Department. Mr. George Allan very distinctly desires that no personal reflection should be made on the Treasurer, who, he believes, acted in good faith in the matter. One fact to which I wish particularly to refer is that there have been several petitions presented to us. Although I know that customarily petitions are placed where they are never seen again, those to which I refer are very important, representing, so far as Victoria is concerned, 2,648 teachers of music. It is estimated that throughout the Commonwealth there are over 5,000 people thus employed, and they deserve some consideration, inasmuch as pianos compose their tools of trade, and, as such, should not be made too costly. But there is another aspect of the question to which I desire to draw attention. There has been a series of examinations conducted under the authority of the Trinity College of Music, London, and the Royal Academy of Music; and the candidates presented number thousands. While we have to pay some regard to the piano-making industry, we must not forget those vast numbers of users, whether they use the piano as a means of livelihood or merely as a means of pleasure. This is an aspect which has to be considered, quite irrespective of the merits of the manufactures of the particular firms which have been mentioned. Personally, I think it most unfortunate that there should have been so much reference to one firm; because, in my opinion, the question ought to be considered solely from its utilitarian and commercial point of view. Mr. Beale deserves every credit for the enterprise and ability he has shown in inaugurating this industry, which he did not enter from any philanthropic motives, but with the purely commercial object of making it profitable. It has been shown by the balance-sheet submitted this afternoon,

that Mr. Beale has made a financial success of his enterprise. It has not been made clear as to how that balance-sheet was secured, because it is only recently that the law was passed by which public companies are called upon to produce their statements of accounts. However, the balance-sheet has been made public, and has not been successfully challenged. It is to be regretted that Mr. Beale's balance-sheet for the present year, which might have been placed upon record, has not yet been filed. In the absence of any contention that the balance-sheet is incorrect, we are entitled to conclude that the industry cannot be regarded as a struggling one.

MR. WATKINS.—Would the honorable member be satisfied with the same rate of profit from the Broken Hill mines?

MR. KNOX.—Unfortunately, I have to be satisfied with a return of 3 per cent. I think that the duty proposed by the honorable member for Dalley may be regarded as the highest which this Committee is likely to accept. Of course very much will depend upon the attitude which the Government take up in regard to the duty to be levied upon the various parts of pianos which cannot be manufactured in the Commonwealth, or which cannot be manufactured here satisfactorily. Inasmuch as reference has already been made to the matter, I propose to read the following letter which I have received from Mr. Hugo Wertheim—

Dear Sir,

I am willing to enter into a bond for £5,000 to establish a large piano factory at Melbourne during the next twelve months, provided that the following piano parts be exempt from duty:—Actions, complete or in parts, strings, felts, and felting, hammers, ivories and keys thereto, handles and hinges for pianos, sounding boards in the rough, veneers for pianos in the rough. All these parts have hitherto been free under the Tariff of 1902, and it is of the utmost importance that they remain free. No new maker would otherwise have the slightest chance of successfully competing against the old-established factory of Beale and Company Limited. The reasons are given in my memo. attached hereto. This is such an essential and vital condition that even a higher duty on pianos would offer no inducement to start a piano factory unless the parts mentioned are put on the free list. Mr. Beale has gained his experience during the last fourteen years, an experience which any manufacturer now starting has to gain. During all these years he imported these parts free, and only during the last two or three years has he started making a few of them. To a new maker, this would be impossible for some years also. I am quite satisfied with the late duty of 20 per cent. (would, of course, not object if it were in-

creased to 25 per cent. on foreign pianos), provided the foregoing request be granted.

The gentleman who has made this offer is financially very substantial. He is well known in commercial circles, and therefore his offer may be regarded as a business one which the Treasurer may well take into consideration. He undertakes, if the parts that he has enumerated are admitted free, to start a large piano factory here. We should thus be assured of a healthy competition in the industry. I have also received from a gentleman in this city the following letter—

I should like to point out that the freight and charges on the British piano cost so much more than the German, that it practically puts the British piano out of the market in Australia and Tasmania. The general trade who stock only German pianos have recently inspected and approved of, also ordered, pianos made by my people in London. But without the prospect of a preferential Tariff, the step would not have been taken. The New Zealand Tariff of 20 per cent. British and 30 per cent. foreign works well, and my business and the British piano trade generally in that country is satisfactory, but without a similar preference in this country and Tasmania, I might as well give up my work here. I feel sure you will give this important matter the attention it deserves.

From official figures I gather that the average invoiced price of pianos imported into Australia during 1905 was £19 13s. 7d., though the factory cost of these instruments found in an ordinary dealer's show-rooms would be much higher. A fair average would be from £18 to, say, £50. Taking as an illustration a piano which cost £20 at the factory, the effect of the Government proposals would be to charge duty upon £25 6s., which amount is made up as follows:—Invoiced price of piano £20. cost of packing case £2 5s., charges to f.o.b. London or Hamburg 15s., and 10 per cent. added by Customs £2 6s. A duty of 40 per cent. upon the aggregate of these sums would amount to £10 2s. 5d. Upon a piano costing £35 at the factory, duty would be levied on the following charges: Invoiced price of piano £35, cost of packing case £2 5s., charges to f.o.b. London or Hamburg 15s., 10 per cent. added by Customs £3 16s., or a total of £41 16s. The duty of 40 per cent. in this instance would represent £16 14s. 5d. Upon a piano costing £50 at the factory, duty would be levied upon the following charges: Invoiced price of piano £50, cost of packing case £2 5s., charges to f.o.b. London or Hamburg 15s., 10 per cent. added by Customs £5 6s., or a total

of £58 6s. The proposed duty of 40 per cent. upon this amount would represent £23 6s. 6d. In addition to these charges there has to be added the import charges from factory to Melbourne, consisting of packing case, expenses to f.o.b., sea freight, wharfage, cartage, unpacking and polishing at Melbourne, insurance, buying commission and exchange on draft. These charges amount to an average of from £8 to £10 upon each piano. Under these circumstances, it is clear that the duty upon a piano which is invoiced at £20 would be £10 2s. 5d., and the landing charges £8. In other words, it would cost £18 2s. 5d. to land the instrument in Melbourne without any profit to the importer being added. This is equivalent to a tax of 90 per cent. Similarly, upon a piano invoiced at £35 the duty would be £16 14s. 5d., and the landing charges, say, £9, or a total of £25 14s. 5d., which is equivalent to 74 per cent. Upon a piano invoiced at £50 the duty would be £23 6s. 6d., and the landing charges, say, £10, or a total of £33 6s. 6d., which is equal to 66 per cent. Such duties would mean ruin to the importing houses. They would shut out all the high-class instruments, including large grands, which are generally used for concerts, such as the Bechstein, Lipp, Steinway, Erard, &c. The figures which I have quoted will suffice to show that the industry of piano-making already enjoys a large natural protection, and the proposed duties would fall very heavily upon music teachers and musical students throughout the Commonwealth. These are points to which reference has not previously been made, and, therefore, I think that I am justified in asking the Committee to consider them.

Mr. WILKS (Dalley) [5.12].—During the course of this debate a statement has been made which reflects seriously upon the administration of our Customs Department. A charge of having divulged official information was levelled against the Treasurer, but the leakage has now been sheeted home to the Department of Trade and Customs. I ask honorable members whether they are prepared to let the matter rest where it is. Certainly, I am not content to do so. The Treasurer is to be complimented upon having regarded the information given to him as official, and upon having forwarded it to the proper quarter. An inquiry ought now to be instituted to ascertain why the Customs Department has not regarded that information as sacred.

The Minister of Trade and Customs ought certainly to pursue the matter further, with a view to discover who is at fault. Personally, I intend to ask him a question in regard to it at the earliest possible opportunity. The honorable member for Koo-yong, with others, has been ringing the changes upon Mr. Beale's balance-sheet. It is certainly strange that practically at the end of the Tariff discussion we should have a balance-sheet presented to us by an interested industry. But even that side of the question is not complete, because we have not yet seen the balance-sheets of importers. I appeal to the Committee to say whether such a large increase of the duty as that proposed by the Government should be granted. The honorable member for Maranoa paid a great deal of attention to a poor unfortunate called the honorable member for Dalley. It is not often that any one says anything on behalf of the honorable member for Dalley, but I am going to defend him on this occasion. As a rule he can look after himself. The honorable member for Maranoa said that five years ago the honorable member for Dalley declared that, as a free-trader, he would stultify himself if he voted for a higher duty on pianos than 15 per cent. It is quite correct that the honorable member for Dalley said that. In 1902 he was pledged to his constituents to vote for free-trade, and he adhered to his pledges throughout the big Tariff struggle, whether the industries affected were or were not those of his own electorate. But after that experience, and the experience of subsequent Parliaments, he, fourteen months ago, stated on the floor of this chamber that in future he would know when to put up the umbrella. He had discovered that so-called free-traders were rabid when industries in their own constituencies were not affected, but became protectionists of the deepest dye when such industries were threatened. Accordingly, he said that when next he went before his electors he would put the case clearly before them. He had discovered that the Victorian representatives took care to look after Victorian interests, and he was determined that New South Wales industries should not suffer by any votes which he might give. He did not change his attitude without consulting his electors. The policy which he has adopted has been imitated by a large number of so-called free-traders, which is the most sincere form

of flattery which they could have shown. Some honorable members have changed their fiscal opinions within five minutes. The honorable member for Maranoa has made very wonderful changes since 1902. He has stated that he is willing to vote protection where the industry concerned will give employment. Piano-making is an industry which gives a good deal of employment, but, for some reason, he baulks when asked to protect it, although rumour says that a fortnight ago he was a top-duty man, so far as pianos are concerned.

Mr. PAGE.—According to the honorable member, some members have changed their opinions within five minutes.

Mr. BAMFORD.—The honorable member for Dalley has not made a thorough change yet.

Mr. WILKS.—The honorable member for Dalley must be given time. He has one eye on the squire and one on the fire, to use the words of an old song. If piano-making were a Victorian industry, the moderate protectionists on the Opposition corner benches would have spoken of it as a wonderful industry, employing expert workmen to the number of over 400 hands, and therefore requiring protection. It seems to have made a good deal of difference to them that the industry is a New South Wales one. However, they have declared that they are federalists, and I wish to give them an opportunity to show that they are. But although I am proud of the industry, I refuse to be the phonograph of the man at the head of it, as I refuse to be the phonograph of the importers or their agents. I have received many telegrams from those connected with this business, urging me not to vote for more than a certain duty. But, while I respect my correspondents, I shall act on my own responsibility. So far as Mr. Beale is concerned, I say good luck to him. I am glad that he has charge of such an industry, that the factory is in my electorate, and, better still, that the employes, who are highly skilled, are getting good wages. I am not concerned about the profits he makes. If we ask for a balance-sheet in one case, we should ask for one in every case. If we did that it might be said that we are going in for profit sharing, and the Labour Party might say, "Let us nationalize all these profitable industries." The Committee has voted duties of 35 per cent. and 30 per cent. for the protection of the furniture trade. The moderate protectionists had nothing to say

about the profits of furniture-making. Regarding pianos merely as furniture—the making of them requires much greater skill and care than the making of furniture—the rates I have proposed are lower than the rates on furniture. We also imposed a thumping duty on children's boots, the making of which employs only a few persons. The Minister will, I believe, not insist upon fixed duties for pianos.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I said so this morning.

Mr. WILKS.—These duties were an atrocity.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The atrocity was the recommendation of the A section of the Tariff Commission.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—What atrocity is there in levying a duty of £5 on a £20 piano?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not say that there is any. I merely repeated a word used by the honorable member for Dalley.

Mr. WILKS.—The fixed duty on high-class pianos is £16 10s. The honorable member for Kooyong has complained that under the proposed duties grand pianos will be shut out of the market. That will not affect the public severely. Not more than 2,000 grand pianos are in daily use in my electorate, and there the people are not too well off. The honorable member would put grand pianos on the same basis as the blue used by washerwomen. He wishes to make it appear that if they are shut out of the market the poor will suffer. A grand piano costs from £200 to £250.

Mr. McDUGALL.—Are not those who can afford to buy such pianos legitimate subjects for taxation?

Mr. PAGE.—These pianos may be the means of livelihood to some.

Mr. WILKS.—I cannot believe that the average teacher of music uses a grand piano costing over £200. Reference has been made to the new protection. The leader of the Opposition, an ardent free-trader, is committed to the new protection, and so is the honorable member for Dalley, whose opposition to the old protection has been largely based on the ground that the manufacturers have got the advantage of it, while the employes have been sweated and the public victimized. If this industry receives protection, it must come under legislation requiring the manufacturer to share with his employes, and with the purchasers of pianos. I am willing to make a trial of the new protection. If, with

the possibility of bringing it into force, I were not to persist in fighting the German manufacturers, I should be unquestionably a foreign trader. We have committed ourselves to the policy of preference. We have acknowledged that British enterprise has suffered severely from the competition of Germany. We fear the Germans because of their skill and their commercial acumen, which enable them to undersell British productions in many of the markets of the world. Therefore, we wish to give British manufacturers a preference. In 1906 we imported 1,500 pianos from Great Britain, and 10,300 from Germany, so that there is room for preference here. If they have been sending only 1,500 out of 12,000 instruments, while Germany has been sending 10,000 odd, there is room for at least a preference of 5 per cent. to the Motherland as against Germany. By my amendment I ask for an increase of 5 per cent. on the old duty of 20 per cent. It is a most reasonable request. I am not dealing now with the manufacturing industry, but with the importers. By wire and statement they say, "If a duty of 25 per cent. is levied, the business will be ruined." From the invoiced prices of pianos landed here, and from the values which they have obtained in the open market, we know that they have a bigger margin to work on than the 5 per cent. So far as British goods are concerned, I am only asking the Committee to reduce the importers' margin by 5 per cent. As they have the arrangement of business they can get over that difficulty to a great extent. Their possibility of rearrangement and better management has not yet been exhausted, and an increased duty of 5 per cent. as against British imports is not an insurmountable difficulty to them. So far as Germany is concerned, I only ask for a preference of 5 per cent. to British imports, and an increase of 10 per cent. on the original duty. When we were dealing with the Tariff in 1902, we were contesting a policy for Australia. We were armed with a mandate from the public to frame the Tariff according to our ideas. Free-traders and protectionists took count of the duties imposed on pianos in the various States prior to Federation, and as the result of a long discussion, we came to a compromise of 20 per cent. Since then the politics of Australia have changed remarkably. The last battle in the electorates was not fought on the fiscal question—at any rate in New South Wales. The struggle

Mr. Wilks.

in that State was between Socialism and anti-Socialism, and the question of fiscalism was not presented to the people. Preferential trade was a new idea to which honorable members on this side have subscribed equally as warmly as have honorable members on the other side. I do not believe that more than five members of the House were opposed to the principle. I ask them whether, if Germany is the great competitor that they recognise, an increase of 10 per cent. on the original duty of 20 per cent. is a very great thing after all. When we find the woollen and other industries specialized in Victoria, it is indeed singular to find that a New South Wales industry should be picked out for different treatment. All I ask is that the industry should receive, not such a high protection as was given to Victorian industries, but a slight advance on the old duty. I refuse to act as a phonograph for Mr. Beale. I suppose that he has a very good thing in his business, but I am certain that the importers have a better thing in their business. I have read very carefully their letters, and they have not lacked power to put forward the best side of their case. Both importers and manufacturers are pretty good hands at journalistic work; they excel in the capacity to captivate the readers of their letters. I am pleased that in this debate we have had so few charges and counter charges as regards the importers and Mr. Beale. I am surprised that such keen business men as the importers and their agents, and the manufacturing firm, have allowed their troubles to be dragged in here and ventilated. I am astounded that they have not arranged their differences outside and come to a compromise. But I am not fighting for the manufacturing firm. Just as I find honorable members fighting for the interests of their electorates, so I am fighting for the extension of this industry in my electorate, and I hope that there will be room for competition under this higher duty. The honorable member for Kooyong has said that a person named Wertheim is bursting with anxiety to purchase the business from Mr. Beale. Well, there are 3,000 shares still unallotted. I hope that he will rush them. I do not know anything about that company's business, or profess to know anything about the importers, but I do know a little about human nature. If this business was such a rattling good thing as has been stated, I do not believe that there would be 3,000 shares standing unallotted

very long. If it was a very good thing, then persons would be killed in the crush to secure the shares.

Mr. ARCHER.—Have they been issued for allotment?

Mr. WILKS.—I do not know.

Mr. ARCHER.—Perhaps they do not want the shares taken up.

Mr. WILKS.—I do not know anything about that; but, if Mr. Wertheim, of Melbourne, is prepared to take over the business, and is, as has been stated, such a good patriot, he does not need an increased duty. I am surprised that he has not started in the industry long ago. I have discovered that when an importer, especially in Victoria, gets beyond the point of making a certain profit, he devotes himself to manufacturing. I find that in Melbourne, men have been engaged in both importing and manufacturing. They are not out for an airing, but to make money. I believe that the public have obtained a very good insight into the immense profits which are made out of the piano business. If the importer finds that he is "going under," he will take good care to divert his attention to manufacturing, just as he has done in the woollen, hat, and other industries, and thousands of distributors will be required. Some honorable members have said, "If you carry an increase of 5 per cent., as against Great Britain, and 10 per cent., as against Germany, you will throw thousands of persons out of employment." Let us examine that argument. The only persons who, so far as I can see, would be interfered with, are those who canvass for business and collect the instalments on the time-payment system. In any case, those persons would be employed in exactly the same way, and probably additional employment would be given. I have been in public life for many years, but I have never yet gone to a factory in my electorate to talk politics to the employés. In Victoria, most honorable members, particularly in a campaign, go to large engineering and business establishments, and address the hands.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The honorable member is getting into the fashion of speaking too long.

Mr. WILKS.—I do not want to speak too long; but, according to the honorable member for Maranoa, I spoke too briefly this morning. I admit that the matter does not need to be laboured, but I wish to get this additional duty. In an elec-

tion campaign, I never go near the factories or workshops. If I address the employés at all, I address them as a part of the general public. I speak to them as citizens and electors, but not as employés of a particular firm. I know that my opponents have always visited the workshops and made special addresses to the workmen.

Mr. PALMER.—What has that to do with the question before the Committee?

Mr. WILKS.—I am now dealing with the question from the political stand-point. In the case of smaller industries honorable members have risen here and read letters which they have received from individual electors, urging that a certain duty should be imposed on an article. I have heard them declare that they have visited certain establishments and seen how flourishing they were. I have heard them admit that they visited the Melbourne factories, and that, as the result of their visit, they could advise the Committee to impose a higher duty. I have done nothing of that sort. When they have been aiding, rightly or wrongly, very many of the manufacturing industries, I do not see why the piano-making industry should stand out of the scramble. My reason for taking up that attitude is that it is distinctly a New South Wales industry, and, furthermore, it is carried on in my electorate. I would be recreant to my position if I neglected to put forward some claim on its behalf. The employés are well paid, and I want to see the industry enlarged. To those who say that the imposition of a duty will shut out the imported article, I reply, "Then it is not for Mr. Beale, but for others." I certainly urge the Treasurer to support duties of 30 and 25 per cent., because, in my judgment, he will not get more protection. That cannot ruin the importer, and it will give encouragement to the existing manufacturer and, I hope, to others to go into the industry.

Mr. POYNTON (Grey) [5.40].—I do not intend to occupy much time, because I recognise that the last speaker has spoken twice, and at considerable length.

Mr. WILKS.—Very shortly this morning.

Mr. POYNTON.—I wish to congratulate the honorable member on his zeal. It is an old saying that the convert is most zealous.

Mr. WILKS.—Yes, as we discovered when the honorable member left our party to join the Labour Party.

Mr. POYNTON.—I regret that the debate could not be carried on without introducing the question of nationality. There has been a continuous reference to "German this" and "German that." I come from a State which contains a large number of German settlers, and I venture to say that every one who has been there will admit that they are as good as any settlers we have. From the remarks of some honorable members, one would think that the whole of this business of importing pianos was a German one, but, as a matter of fact we have received petition after petition from all the States. Honorable members will, perhaps, find the names of two or three persons of German nationality attached to the petition for a reduction of the duties. I do not believe in decrying another man's goods. If I employed men as agents, and heard that they were decrying the goods of my opponent, I would get rid of them at once. There has been too much of that sort of thing going on here to-day. There has been far too much appealing to prejudice. The Government have submitted a common-sense business proposition, which represents practically a duty of 50 per cent. on the import value of the pianos. I think it was unfair on the part of the Treasurer to quote the very low-valued pianos, and to state that they were coming from Germany, in face of the fact that the Customs returns show that the average price of the pianos imported into this State was £23 odd, and in the case of New South Wales over £22.

Mr. MATHEWS.—What was the minimum?

Mr. POYNTON.—If one wanted to go into the matter, one could quote an arrangement made, perhaps, at a very low rate. I have it on the best authority that the cost of manufacturing certain pianos, as recorded in the books of the very firm which has been discussed so much, runs from £16 upwards. But the question is: Is it a fair thing to impose such a high duty as is proposed? I am more concerned about the users than about other persons. It is immaterial to me whether it is Mr. Beale or the importers who petition the House.

Mr. McDougall.—How is it that the importers can sell their pianos to the State of Victoria at £36 apiece and to the outside public at £72?

Mr. POYNTON.—I do not know anything about that. I believe that very nearly one-half of the expenses stated in Mr. Beale's balance-sheet each year cover

agents' expenses in selling the pianos. But when an importer delivers directly to a Government he has no expenses to defray other than the home cost and the importing expenses. I am not going to complain about whether the locally-made pianos are good or not. That is all a matter of taste. Every man has his own idea of what an instrument is. Some people will say that a bagpipe makes beautiful music, but I am not very fond of it. What we ought to do is to give a fair and reasonable amount of protection, recognising that protection is the policy of the country, without putting one firm in a position to secure a monopoly. Probably we could not do better than make some of the intricate parts of pianos free, thus giving a chance to other persons to start in the same business. It would be an intolerable thing if any other person commencing to manufacture pianos had to buy his parts from his opponent.

Mr. WATSON.—Could he not make them himself?

Mr. POYNTON.—Mr. Beale has for ten years had the advantage of importing parts free. They are largely made in France and Germany, and even English piano-makers import them. I wish to make it possible for other people to start in this business, and then we shall have that rivalry without which protective duties are so dangerous. Prices will come down as the result of competition. I do not intend to say anything in regard to Mr. Beale's balance-sheets and circulars. The matters relating to them have, I think, been fairly well cleared up, and the sooner we come to a vote the better it will be.

Mr. FRAZER (Kalgoorlie) [5.50].—The question at issue is of sufficient importance to the people of Australia to warrant us in eliciting all the opinions that are available from all sides of the Chamber. I do not know that many votes will be altered as a consequence of views that may be expressed, but the expression of them will lead the general public to understand the reasons that have actuated us in fixing these duties, and will possibly afford an insight into what may be expected in the future. I think that the Treasurer in introducing this matter set a very bad standard for the debate. The question ought to be settled entirely apart from the names of importers. In commenting upon the circular for the contents of which he was, according to his own statement, in no way responsible, the honorable gentleman in my opinion set a

very undesirable example. I have listened carefully to the arguments and facts that have been contributed to the debate, and before proceeding further I can pay this tribute to Mr. Beale—that in all respects he is conducting his factory in accordance with Australian conditions which do him credit and which are advantageous to those whom he employs.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—He does not want to be brought under Excise conditions.

Mr. FRAZER.—I am not concerned in what he wants in that respect. Unless Excise conditions are imposed in connexion with these duties I can assure the Government that a considerable time will elapse before they pass this House. I may as well be pretty emphatic on that point. The piano manufacturing industry was established in New South Wales under free-trade. The statistics as to its development afford useful information to honorable members in making up their minds. It appears to me that, established under free-trade conditions, and developed under a protective duty of 20 per cent. under the 1902 Tariff, the industry has made magnificent strides. Mr. Beale has established himself in every State in Australia, and the pianos that he manufactures are four times as many as they were before 1902. His pianos have met with a large amount of public approval, as is indicated by the demand for them. Under the old duty, Mr. Beale has done remarkably well. As to the recommendation of the Tariff Commission, it appears to me that when any manufacturer went before that Commission and asked for an increased duty, the Chairman was always prepared to recommend it. He has recommended increases in 99 per cent. of cases where they have been asked for. In this case, although a request has been made for an increased duty, there does not appear to be any strong justification for it when we consider the facts of the case. But, unfortunately, in a considerable number of other cases increases have been granted where there was not even the same justification for them as there was in this instance. In consideration of that fact, and recognising the general policy that has been adopted by this Committee in favour of increasing duties, I am prepared to vote for an increase of 5 per cent. in the duty against the country which exports nearly all the pianos to Australia at the present time. In the event of this increase being granted, I believe that not only will

the piano-manufacturing industry continue to flourish, but that it will be demonstrated to the music-loving people of Australia that Mr. Beale's firm is producing a piano that is capable of giving satisfaction to those who use it. We must not, however, overlook the fact that nearly all the music firms of Australia and a large number of music teachers have been almost unanimous in their condemnation of the increase of the duty. I presume that those people are the best judges of a case of this description.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—Oh, no.

Mr. FRAZER.—We may reasonably assume that people who spend their lives in using pianos know something about the tone of an instrument and its durability.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—They do not know anything about the tone of pianos that have not yet been made.

Mr. FRAZER.—In deciding as to the future, we have to be guided by past experience and the insight which we derive from it. In view of the fact that these protests have been made, and on the facts produced. I am not inclined to vote for a larger increase than 5 per cent. against the principal country from which pianos are imported into Australia. There is no reason to believe that the Australian industry will be prejudiced even if we leave the duty as it stands, but, as increases have been granted upon other items, I shall be prepared to vote for a duty of 25 per cent. on the general Tariff and 20 per cent. against the United Kingdom. I might elaborate other points, but it appears to me that there is no chance of affecting votes by prolonging the debate, and I think that the best interests of the country will be served by concluding the discussion as soon as possible.

Mr. HUTCHISON (Hindmarsh) [5.59].—I am glad that at last the honorable member for Kalgoorlie is willing to concede an extra 5 per cent. duty upon an item. But he has furnished the best argument for granting a larger increase than 5 per cent., because he tells us that even under a duty of 20 per cent. only one firm of piano manufacturers has been established in Australia.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Beale's factory was established under free-trade.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—The fact that only one factory has been established in Australia proves to me that the industry is not sufficiently protected. There is an enormous demand for pianos, and a

splendid profit is made out of the trade. I am quite satisfied that if we impose a substantial duty we shall conduce to the establishment of other factories. If any industry should be highly protected, it is that which involves a large expenditure, and consumes a vast quantity of material that can be provided in Australia.

Mr. HEDGES.—What Australian material is used in this industry?

Mr. HUTCHISON.—Iron and wood.

Mr. HEDGES.—Where can we obtain in Australia suitable wood for the manufacture of pianos?

Mr. HUTCHISON.—Queensland produces a variety of timbers suitable for such a purpose.

Mr. MATHEWS.—The piano on view in the north lobby is made partly of Queensland timber.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—And a still greater variety may be secured.

Mr. HEDGES.—What about the veneers?

Mr. HUTCHISON.—Given a substantial duty, we shall have them made here; and we shall have, instead of one struggling pianoforte factory, many flourishing ones. If the tone of Mr. Beale's pianos is not up to the standard, other local firms will quickly produce a superior instrument. What can be done elsewhere can be done in Australia. I have not heard any one complain of the tone of the Beale pianos. As a matter of fact, one musician will say that he would not have a certain make of imported piano in his house, whilst another will tell you that it is the best on the market. I have a Lipp piano which I purchased before Mr. Beale commenced operations, and it is one of the finest toned instruments that I have ever heard. I have also an English piano, which has an excellent tone.

Mr. TUDOR.—What about the bagpipes?

Mr. HUTCHISON.—I am quite willing that a duty should be imposed on them, for I am certain that they too can be made here. The honorable member for Kalgoorlie has clearly shown that an increased duty should be imposed, and I hope that we shall impose duties that will lead to the most effective establishment of the industry.

Mr. HEDGES (Fremantle) [6.3].—Although it is said that pianos are manufactured in Australia, the veneers, as well as the wire, and many parts of the action used in their construction, are imported. If

the public are satisfied to continue to contribute to the establishment of the industry, we may be able, in the course of a century or so, to make complete pianos in the Commonwealth. As a matter of fact, the freights are in favour of the local manufacturer. The duty collected on these instruments in 1906 amounted to £47,421. If the duty be increased to 40 per cent., as proposed by the Government, the annual revenue from this source will amount, on the same basis, to £94,842, whilst a duty of 30 per cent. would yield a revenue of £70,931. This would give us an average yield of about £82,000 from a duty of 35 per cent. That would be far too much to take out of the pockets of the people. It would provide a pension of about £3 per week for 600 men in the trade. It seems to me that it would pay the Commonwealth, instead of fostering the industry by imposing the duty proposed by the Government, to pension off all the hands in the local factory. The proposal that we should contribute so largely towards the establishment of the industry is little short of disgraceful. Even the old duty of 20 per cent. yielded a revenue that would provide a pension of over £3 per week for 300 persons. In other words, those who purchase imported pianos—and we have to remember that these instruments are often bought with the hard-earned savings of the people—contribute to the revenue a sum equal to the wages paid to those engaged in the industry. I do not advocate the free admission of pianos, but I think that it has been clearly shown that the old duty is ample. We have been told that the local manufactory is conducted on splendid lines, that good wages are paid, and reasonable hours observed. If that state of affairs has prevailed under a duty of 20 per cent., why should we increase the duty? I am prepared to vote for duties of 25 per cent. and 20 per cent., and since the industry is now prospering I do not think that we should go beyond those rates. The fact that the public are paying by way of duty on pianos a sum sufficient to provide a pension of over £3 per week for 300 persons in the industry clearly shows that we are paying too much for sentiment. We have not assisted other industries to the same extent, and I hope that the Committee will reject the Treasurer's proposals.

Mr. FOSTER (New England) [6.9].—It is unnecessary for me to discuss this question at any length, for the honorable member for South Sydney has ably stated the

position from the point of view of Australia. I deprecate the attack which has been made upon the Australian manufacturer.

Mr. MATHEWS.—That is nothing new.

Mr. FOSTER.—It is, to say the least, remarkable that there should have been brought forward during this discussion an unsworn balance-sheet of a most doubtful character as to the profits made by Mr. Beale. This is the first occasion on which such tactics have been resorted to during the consideration of the Tariff. I have paid careful attention to the arguments of the advocates of the foreign manufacturer, and have glanced over the circulars and papers which they have supplied to me; but I knew nothing of the balance-sheet in question until it was referred to in Committee this morning. I and others who have been fighting for Australian industries from the outset were denied an opportunity to examine that balance-sheet. That is not fair play. The importers should have either supplied the same information to every honorable member or refrained from distributing any. They ought not to have selected a few honorable members to whom to give special information.

Mr. MAHON.—The honorable member had an opportunity to see the balance-sheet.

Mr. FOSTER.—Not until it was brought before the Committee this morning; I did not receive a copy of it. When I was seeking information I was told that even if a little more protection were granted it would be utterly impossible to establish the industry in Australia; but I find that others have received an assurance that the imposition of increased duties will give rise to plenty of local opposition to Mr. Beale. I feel called upon to vote for the highest duty, with a view to the establishment of the industry on a firm foundation. An honorable member who is opposed to the efforts being made to establish the industry in Australia said he had nothing to say against the quality of Mr. Beale's pianos, and I shall not say a word against the imported instrument. I know that many excellent pianos are being imported, but as a protectionist I am confident that the imposition of increased duties will cause foreign manufacturers to commence operations in Australia. Mr. Beale has not captured the whole market, and there is room for more pianoforte manufacturers in the Commonwealth. Even if Australian woods are not at present largely used in

the local manufacture of pianos, it will be found that we have many timbers which if well dried will be suitable for the purpose. Maryborough pine, as well as Queensland black bean—which is used as a substitute for walnut—red bean and cedar are now being used, and I am proud to know that Lithgow iron is likewise being employed in their manufacture. I would urge my comrades of the Labour Party to remember that this is one of the best industries in Australia. It is at present a New South Wales industry, and I dare say that if these duties be passed Mr. Wertheim will establish a factory in Victoria. I do not wish it to be thought that I am pleading the cause of this industry as a territorial protectionist. I fight for everything that is Australian, and I hope that we shall not lose sight of the fact that splendid wages are paid and reasonable hours are worked in the local factory.

Mr. J. H. CATTS (Cook) [6.14].—I have determined to support the imposition of duties of 25 per cent. and 20 per cent., or an increase of 5 per cent. on the old duty. The arguments advanced in support of increased duties have been based on the contention that we have a huge importation of pianos from Germany. If I found that the products of the cheap labour of other countries were being imported so largely as to render it impossible for the local manufacturer to pay reasonable wages and that the industry was languishing, I should consider that a fair case had been made out for additional protection. But when I find that the local manufacturer is doing exceedingly well, and is paying higher wages than are provided for in the award of the Arbitration Court—

Mr. WATSON.—The honorable member appears to think that that should be sufficient to condemn him at once in the eyes of a labour man.

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—At all events, it shows that this industry is flourishing. In a catalogue which has been handed to me, and which was circulated by this manufacturer, I find the statement made—

"We are preparing to add two more storeys to this huge building. . . . We are now building much larger premises in another part of the factory."

Mr. WATSON.—That was published since the present Tariff was imposed.

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—I do not think that the manufacturer would make the definite statement that he intended to make these

huge additions to his factory before the Tariff was settled. He would not make such improvements on spec.

Mr. WATSON.—He might depend upon a conscientious vote from honorable members returned as protectionists.

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—If the honorable gentleman refers to me, I am here to do what I believe to be right. When I go before my constituents, it will be I, and not the honorable member for South Sydney, who will have to answer for my actions. I hope that every vote that I have recorded on the Tariff will give my constituents as much satisfaction as the one which I intend to record on pianos. I do not take the same view of the manufacture of pianos and other musical instruments as I do of the manufacture of boots. There is an artist's art put into the production of the tone of a piano. Honorable members would not contend that our people should not have the advantage of the musical compositions of great composers like Mendelssohn and Haydn.

Mr. TUDOR.—Could they not be played on an Australian piano?

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—Our rising musical artists are sent to Germany and other countries abroad, to complete their musical studies, because it is admitted that in the older countries of the world the musical art has been brought to a higher state of perfection than in Australia. It is because I believe that there is an artist's art in the production of pianos that I say that if our people desire to have a piano with a tone which comes from Germany, we should not prohibit them from having it.

Mr. BAMFORD.—The honorable member should vote for pianos being admitted free.

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—That does not follow. I am prepared to give sufficient protection to enable the local manufacturer to pay decent wages to his employes, and derive a fair profit from the industry, but when I have done that, I say that, seeing that the production of the tone of a piano is the work of an artist, I have no right, by my vote, to prevent the people of Australia from being able to avail themselves of the best that artists can produce in the musical instrument line. The question has been debated at sufficient length, and I suppose all the evidence that could be submitted on behalf of the importers, as well as of the local manufacturer, has been placed before the Committee. I have read

all that has been published in connexion with these duties, and have listened to every argument that has been submitted. I think I have given more attention to this item than to any other in the Tariff. I have looked in every corner for information, because I desired to give a conscientious vote upon this item. I believe that an increase of 5 per cent. in the duty under the General Tariff will make up to the local manufacturer for some slight increases in the duties imposed in connexion with other items affecting his industry, will also be to some extent a bar against the importation of German pianos; will make the duty sufficiently high to enable the local manufacturer to continue his operations profitably, and at the same time give his employes the benefit of fair labour conditions.

Question—That after the words "40 per cent.," paragraph A, the words "and on and after 12th December, 1907, ad. val. (General Tariff) 25 per cent.," be inserted (Mr. JOHNSON'S amendment)—put. The Committee divided.

Ayes	28
Noes	29
Majority	1

AYES.

Archer, E. W.
Atkinson, L.
Brown, Tilley
Brown, Thomas
Cook, Joseph
Edwards, R.
Foxton, Colonel
Fraser, C. E.
Glynn, P. McM.
Hedges, W. N.
Irvine, Hans
Irvine, W. H.
Johnson, W. E.
Knox, W.
Liddell, F.

Livingston, J.
Mahon, H.
McWilliams, W. J.
Page, J.
Palmer, A. C.
Poynton, A.
Sinclair, H.
Thomson, Dugald
Willis, Henry
Wilson, J. G.
Wynne, A. A.

Tellers.

Bowden, E. K.
Fuller, G. W.

NOES.

Bamford, F. W.
Batchelor, E. L.
Carr, E. S.
Chanter, J. M.
Chapman, Austin
Coon, J.
Crouch, R. A.
Deakin, A.
Ewing, T. T.
Foster, F. J.
Groom, L. E.
Hughes, W. M.
Hutchison, J.
Lyne, Sir William
Maloney, W. R. N.

Mathews, J.
Mauger, S.
McDougall, J. K.
Salmon, C. C.
Sampson, S.
Storrer, D.
Tudor, F. G.
Watkins, D.
Watson, J. C.
Webster, W.
Wilks, W. H.
Wise, G. H.
Tellers:
Cook, Hume
Thomson, John

PAIRS.

Catts, J. H.	Thomas, J.
Forrest, Sir John	Quick, Sir John
Fysh, Sir Philip	Harper, R.
Reid, G. H.	Hall, D. R.
Kelly, W. H.	Kingston, C. C.
Smith, Bruce	O'Malley, King
Fowler, J. M.	Spence, W. G.
Fairbairn, G.	Fisher, A.

Question so resolved in the negative.

Amendment negatived.

Amendment (by Mr. WILKS) agreed to—

That after the words "40 per cent.," paragraph A, the words "and on and after 12th December, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 30 per cent.," be inserted.

Mr. WILKS (Dalley) [6.30].—I propose now to move—that the duty on imports from the United Kingdom should be 25 per cent.

Mr. WILSON (Corangamite) [6.30].—I have a prior amendment to move. I think that there should be a 10 per cent. preference given to imports from Great Britain, and I therefore move—

That after the words "30 per cent.," paragraph A, the words "and on and after 12th December, 1907, ad val. (United Kingdom), 20 per cent.," be inserted.

Mr. DEAKIN.—We offered honorable members to agree to duties of 35 per cent. and 25 per cent., and they would not accept that preference.

Question put. The Committee divided.

Ayes 28

Noes 29

Majority 1

AVES.

Archer, E. W.	Livingston, J.
Atkinson, L.	Mahon, H.
Bowden, E. K.	McWilliams, W. J.
Brown, Tilley	Page, J.
Catts, J. H.	Palmer, A. C.
Cook, Joseph	Poynton, A.
Edwards, R.	Sinclair, H.
Foxton, Colonel	Thomson, Dugald
Frazer, C. E.	Willis, Henry
Glynn, P. McM.	Wilson, J. G.
Hedges, W. N.	Wynne, A.
Irvine, Hans	
Irvine, W. H.	
Knox, W.	
Liddell, F.	

Tellers:

Fuller, G. W.
Johnson, W. E.

NOES.

Bamford, F. W.	Mauger, S.
Batchelor, E. L.	McDougall, J. K.
Carr, E. S.	Salmon, C. C.
Chanter, J. M.	Sampson, S.
Chapman, Austin	Storror, D.
Coon, J.	Thomson, John
Crouch, R. A.	Tudor, F. G.
Deakin, A.	Watkins, D.
Ewing, T. T.	Watson, J. C.
Fisher, A.	Webster, W.
Foster, F. J.	Wilks, W. H.
Groom, L. E.	Wise, G. H.
Hughes, W. M.	
Hutchison, J.	Tellers:
Lyne, Sir William	Cook, Hume
	Mathews, J.

PAIRS.

Forrest, Sir John	Quick, Sir John
Fysh, Sir Philip	Harper, R.
Reid, G. H.	Hall, D. R.
Kelly, W. H.	Kingston, C. C.
Smith, Bruce	O'Malley, King
Fowler, J. M.	Spence, W. G.
Brown, Thomas	Thomas, J.
Fairbairn, G.	Maloney, W. R. N.

Question so resolved in the negative.

Amendment negatived.

Amendment (by Mr. WILKS) agreed to—

That after the words "30 per cent.," paragraph A, the words "and on and after 12th December, 1907, ad val. (United Kingdom), 25 per cent.," be inserted.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I suppose it is not necessary to delete the fixed duties.

The CHAIRMAN.—The Committee must understand that it is not for me to decide what duties can be collected under the paragraph as amended. That is a question for the Department. I have put the amendments in the form in which they have been submitted.

Sitting suspended from 6.38 to 8 p.m.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [8.0].—I should like to know how paragraph A now stands as regards the fixed duties, and if there is any chance of their being operative for purposes of collection?

The CHAIRMAN.—It is not for me to interpret them. I might give an opinion, but that would not make it right or wrong. The item, so far as we have dealt with it, reads—

Pianos, viz. :—

(A) Grand and Semi-grand (General Tariff), each £16 10s. or ad val. 40 per cent., whichever rate returns the higher duty; and, on and after 12th December, 1907, ad val., 30 per cent.: (United Kingdom), each £15, or ad val. 30 per cent., whichever rate returns the higher duty; and, on and after 12th December, 1907, ad val. 25 per cent.

Mr. GLYNN (Angas) [8.1].—There is no doubt that the paragraph as amended is a little ambiguous. That occurred to me at the time when the question was put; but if the suggestion I made last night had been followed, grammatically, there could have been no mistake. That was to put in after the word "duty" the words "up to to-day," and then add "and on and after," &c., the rates agreed upon. No doubt the paragraph is ambiguous as it stands, as it is not clear whether the new *ad valorem* duties refer only to the previously proposed 40 per cent. and 30 per cent., or to both the fixed duties and those *ad valorem* rates. We can clear the matter up in the Tariff Bill, which will be introduced in a few days. That Bill will have to be passed by this House before the Tariff can be sent to the Senate, because we cannot send resolutions up, but must send a Bill. The ambiguity could be easily explained now by a footnote, and, of course, in the meantime the Treasurer would act on the sense of the Committee, which is to collect only the *ad valorem* duties.

The CHAIRMAN.—On former occasions, where a composite duty was proposed, and the Committee made an amendment, the course adopted was to add to the item words which in this case would read as follows:—"and on and after 12th December, 1907, A, grand and semi-grand, *ad valorem* (General Tariff), 30 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 25 per cent."

Mr. THOMAS BROWN (Calare) [8.5].—I think the Treasurer is convinced that the sense of the Committee is against the specific duties.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—There is no doubt about that. I promised to strike them out.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—The only question now is, whether the language used in the amendment proposed by the honorable member for Dalley achieves that object. Before we leave the paragraph, the Minister should make it clear that the specific duties only operate up till to-day, and that after to-day the *ad valorem* rates agreed upon by the Committee prevail. The matter should not be left in uncertainty, to be cleared up later on in a Bill.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [8.6].—I directed attention to the wording of the item as amended, because I had some doubt as to its effect. I was going to move to strike out the fixed duties. The Committee carried the amendment

in the form submitted by the honorable member for Dalley. In order to make the matter absolutely clear, the Chairman might indicate in some way, by a footnote or asterisk, what the Committee meant, or allow the Committee to go back in order to strike out the fixed rates. Whichever course the Chairman thinks advisable, I shall be glad to adopt.

The CHAIRMAN.—I understand that the Committee was desirous of amending the paragraph in the form previously adopted in similar cases; but, that, owing to the amendment having been put in the way in which it now stands, there is some doubt as to its effect. If it is the pleasure of the Committee that I should make the necessary alteration to give effect to the will of the Committee, I will see that that is done.

HONORABLE MEMBERS.—Hear, hear.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [8.8].—I desire to strike out the fixed duties in paragraph B. Perhaps the amendment can be put in the way suggested by the Chairman. I also wish to propose duties of 30 per cent. and 25 per cent.. I move—

That after the word "duty," paragraph B, the words "and on and after 12th December, 1907, B., Upright, *ad val.* (General Tariff), 30 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 25 per cent.," be inserted.

Mr. GLYNN (Angas) [8.9].—I am sorry that the Treasurer could not see his way to propose a lower scale of duties for this class of piano. It is not the expensive class that we have just dealt with. That is evidenced by the fact that the Government originally proposed the much lower specific duty of £5 10s., as against a specific duty of £16 10s. on grands and semi-grands.

Mr. STORRER.—The same *ad valorem* rates were proposed.

Mr. GLYNN.—But the specific duties would have been the operative ones, because the Customs Act obliges the Minister as far as possible to levy the higher duty.

Mr. STORRER.—Why have another debate about it?

Mr. GLYNN.—I rose merely to suggest that, inasmuch as these are the pianos that will be bought by people of moderate incomes, and as we were only beaten by one vote in our effort to obtain duties of 25 per cent. and 20 per cent. on the last paragraph, it would be more gracious and agreeable to the hallowed time upon which

we are just entering if the Treasurer would agree to those rates in this paragraph.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [8.10].—I am terminating the specific duties in this paragraph, and the *ad valorem* rates will have the same effect upon the one class of piano as upon the other, because the duties will be levied according to value. I hope, therefore, that the honorable member will not press his request, because it would be very invidious to make a distinction, and there is no doubt that if I were to reduce the *ad valorem* rates upon these very cheap pianos it would make them still more liable to be imported. I am proposing the same proportion as was agreed to in the last paragraph. I take it that the decision of the Committee on paragraph A was meant to apply to the whole of this item, and therefore I am moving the duties down to that level.

Mr. MAHON (Coolgardie) [8.11].—Before the Treasurer goes further, he ought to inform the Committee what he proposes to do regarding the outside cases of pianos.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I could not deal with that matter now.

Mr. MAHON.—The Treasurer could give some indication now of what he intends to propose, because according to my information the duty upon the outside cases means an addition of practically 5 per cent. to the duties upon pianos.

Mr. WATKINS.—It is the same in this case as in that of every other article.

Mr. MAHON.—Not to the same extent, but whether it is worse or better I shall ask the Minister to express his intention now. I shall not be bullied or put off by anybody here. A good deal of claptrap is being talked about people who vote against these duties wishing to strike at Australian industries. I have as much regard for Australian industries as have those who talk in that way—perhaps a little more. There is a good deal of lip service in this chamber, as in other places. I do not think that it is the people who parade their loyalty at all times that are the most loyal. In the same way, those who talk loudest about safeguarding and standing up for Australian industries are perhaps not the people who on all occasions do the most for those industries. I am going to stand here until the Treasurer is prepared to announce what he intends to do about the duty on the outside cases. If he thinks he is going to get this item through without our having some understanding about that matter, he is making a

mistake. If the cases are to be taxed, it will mean that instead of agreeing to a duty of 30 per cent. we shall really be sanctioning a duty of 35 per cent. I wish to be courteous to the Treasurer, as I have been throughout the Tariff, but I think that I am making a fair and reasonable request. He ought to tell us his intention now, because if the duty on the cases is not removed, it will mean a considerable addition to the cost price of importations. In order that the Treasurer may have an opportunity of making an announcement, I will resume my seat.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [8.14].—The question of outside packages is dealt with in item 444, by which outside packages on fixed duty goods are free, whilst those on *ad valorem* goods are dutiable. The general rule in the case of *ad valorem* goods is that the basis of valuation shall be the whole of the consignment, that is, the contents as well as the package. But I suggest to the honorable member that the most convenient course would be to deal with this matter when we are on the item of packages generally, and when their treatment may be made uniform.

Mr. MAHON.—The Committee might be influenced in regard to this item by the way in which packages are dealt with.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—I apprehend that the Minister will stand by the arrangement that outside packages in the case of *ad valorem* goods shall remain dutiable.

Mr. HANS IRVINE (Grampians) [8.16].—I think the Treasurer might answer the question which has been put to him by the honorable member for Coolgardie. We had a discussion on the question of outside packages when bottles and other glassware were being considered, and a statement from the Treasurer now would expedite business.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [8.17].—It is scarcely fair to ask me to answer a question of this kind before we reach item 444. Hitherto the practice has been to admit free the outside packages of goods subject to fixed duties, but to charge on packages containing *ad valorem* goods; and there seems to be a good deal of reason for adopting that method. If I were asked the question at the present moment, I should be inclined to stand by the proposal as it is; and, in any case, the *ad valorem* duty on the outside package of a piano will not be a heavy charge.

Mr. MAHON.—It means an additional 5 per cent.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—My feeling is to deal with this matter as proposed in item 444. A specific duty is sufficient to cover the whole, but that is not so in the case of an *ad valorem* duty.

Mr. MAHON.—It will mean a 35 per cent. duty instead of a 30 per cent. duty on pianos.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not think so, but I shall make inquiries before we reach item 444; and, if sufficient reason be shown, I may be induced to make an alteration.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [8.19].—I think that the honorable member for Coolgardie very opportunely raises the question before this item is disposed of. As already pointed out, if the outside packages are taxed, it will mean an increase in the duty by 5 per cent.; and, moreover, to tax packages in the case of pianos will be a new departure.

Mr. WATSON.—The taxation has applied all through this Tariff.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I am speaking of the old Tariff wherein packages in which goods are ordinarily imported were, when containing such goods, free. There was a special exemption inserted for the purpose, and there ought to be a similar exemption in the present Tariff, because it seems the height of absurdity to impose a duty on packages.

Mr. WATSON.—Why differentiate between pianos and other goods?

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Because there was a differentiation in the old Tariff.

Mr. WATSON.—I do not think that that exemption applied to pianos only.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I do not object to the exemption being applied to other goods; on the other hand, I think it ought to be applied. I understood that, when we obliterated this duty in reference to the cubic contents of packages containing glassware and so forth, it was intended to free all outside packages.

Mr. WATSON.—I do not think so.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—We did not expect, when the Minister proposed—

Mr. CHANTER.—Is the honorable member in order in discussing item 444 now?

The CHAIRMAN.—The honorable member for Parramatta is quite in order in referring to that item in relation to the question before us.

Mr. CHANTER.—Referring! It is a debate!

Mr. WATSON.—I wish to know whether the honorable member for Parramatta is justified in more than incidentally referring to item 444?

The CHAIRMAN.—I understand that the honorable member is not entering into a discussion of item 444, but only referring to it as related to the covering packages of pianos.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I put myself in order by moving—

That the amendment be amended by inserting after the word "Upright" the words "except outside packages in which pianos are ordinarily imported, when containing such goods."

Mr. W. H. IRVINE (Flinders) [8.22].—I should like to point out the difficulty there is in the amendment which has been moved. It seems to me that the only logical and consistent way to deal with this question is under item 444. One of the difficulties of dealing with it now is that, if the proposed amendment be carried, it will necessarily mean that in the case of paragraph A, which we have already passed, the outside packages must be taxed. That will not only have the effect of singling out paragraph B for special treatment, but will practically mean that two different rates must be charged right throughout the Tariff. We shall expedite business by allowing the whole discussion to take place on item 444; and the fact that the Committee has strongly indicated the opinion that packages should be free, whether the goods be subject to *ad valorem* or fixed duties, will be a strong argument against the imposition of such duties.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [8.24].—I am quite aware of the anomaly that may be created; but my idea is, if the amendment be carried, to regard it as a test vote, instructing the Government to make a similar amendment in regard to other items.

Mr. CHANTER.—A double debate!

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The debate can be stopped in two minutes if the Minister will make a statement as to what his intention is.

Mr. SALMON.—The Minister has made a statement.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The Minister has said that he does not know what he is going to do.

Mr. SALMON.—He has said that he will stand by item 444.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK. — Honorable members will be prepared, I take it, to vote on these pianos the same duties that they voted on the other kind of pianos, if it is understood that packages are free; otherwise some of us will make an endeavour to reduce the duty by so much.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE. — Then, as the honorable member for Flinders has pointed out, the duty on the two classes of pianos will be unequal.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK. — That inequality may easily be corrected afterwards.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE. — I will not recommit for that sort of thing!

Mr. JOSEPH COOK. — If outside packages are to be made dutiable, it will mean that the duties on pianos will not be 30 per cent. and 25 per cent., but 35 per cent. and 30 per cent.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE. — I do not think that the duties will be anything like that.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK. — Can the Treasurer tell me what is the cost of an outside package for a piano?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE. — I am going to find that out before we reach item 444.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK. — I think it is £2 10s. or £3.

Mr. STORRER. — It is 25s.; I have paid for them often.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK. — Other people have paid for them, and they say the cost is £2 10s.

Mr. STORRER. — That is the cost when they wish to "get over" the Customs.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK. — The honorable member is barking up the wrong tree, because, since packages were free, there could be no motive in placing a false value on them.

Mr. STORRER. — The more duty there was to pay on the case, the less duty there was to pay on the piano.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK. — Not at all; they are both taxed. However, I am now simply asking the Minister to indicate what his attitude is.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE. — I do not think I am called upon to do so now. I have told the honorable member that I shall make further inquiries, and be prepared to say what the Government will do when we reach item 444.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK. — But it will be too late then, after these duties have been voted.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE. — Whatever we do on item 444, will apply generally.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK. — But if a duty be placed on the packages, it will increase the duties which have already been voted on pianos.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE. — And so it will be with everything else.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK. — But I take it that when we vote a duty of 30 per cent. we do not desire to see a duty of 35 per cent. collected. I have just been informed that the cost of packages for pianos varies from 27s. to 50s., plus 10 per cent.; and I think we ought to know definitely what duties we are voting.

Mr. WATSON (South Sydney) [8.28]. — When there is an *ad valorem* duty, I do not see how honorable members can object to including the cost of the package. The theory underlying *ad valorem* duties, I understand, is that the value of the goods landed on the wharf in Australia must be the basis of calculation. The value of goods in Timbuctoo or elsewhere, before they are cased and got ready for export, is not the value when they arrive in Australia. Although the principle is that the value of the goods landed in Australia is the value for the purposes of the duty, the Department, for convenience sake, accepts foreign invoices, and imposes an all-round charge for freight and so forth. That plan in some cases works harshly, though in other cases the importers are let off too lightly. When people talk of a duty of 35 per cent. or 20 per cent. they invariably have in their mind the value of the goods when they come into Australia; and, as the goods cannot be brought here without packages, it stands to reason that the value of the packages must be included for the purposes of the Tariff. Only the other day I was talking to a merchant in Sydney in regard to the system of admitting packages containing goods free. He said that while he was disinclined to pay a duty upon packages, the system of levying duty upon them was distinctly in favour of honest trade. He said that there was a disposition on the part of small manufacturers in other portions of the world to inflate the charge for cases, and to reduce the cost of the goods which they contained. I do not say that a large proportion of outside manufacturers do that, but this merchant assured me that some of them do it. He expressed the opinion that from the stand-point of fair trade, it was better to charge a duty upon the packages.

But I do not see why we should differentiate between the packages in which pianos are encased and other packages. We have already decided that a specific duty shall be levied upon bottles which are imported full of spirit. The reason why an *ad valorem* duty was not applied to packages under the old Tariff was that their contents bore a specific duty. In regard to bottles, a difficulty was experienced, because nearly all of them are imported full of spirit. But, in respect of any item which bears an *ad valorem* rate, no difficulty need be experienced. The interjection of the honorable member for Bass, —who as an importer has a good knowledge of business—to the effect that if we allow any packages to be admitted free, we shall open the door to the possibility of the Customs authorities being deceived, and of the fair trader being subjected to unfair competition, has considerable weight with me.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I should like to know how that result could be brought about?

Mr. WATSON.—I thought that I had already explained. It is merely a question of the manufacturer placing a fictitious value on the cases because they would be exempt from duty, and of undervaluing the goods in them, which would be subject to duty.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—Who could do that?

Mr. WATSON.—It is the easiest thing in the world. Let us suppose that a manufacturer in another part of the world charged £100 for a certain line of goods, and that the cost of encasing them amounted to £5. By representing the cost of the casing at £20, the importer would be required to pay duty upon only £80 worth of goods.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—What the honorable member suggests could not be done in respect of piano cases.

Mr. WATSON.—I venture to say that it could.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—It could if the Customs officials were numskulls.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—The idea is an absurd one.

Mr. WATSON.—I prefer to accept the statement of men of experience in the importing line, who say that to their knowledge it has been done, to that of the honorable member. The difficulty in regard to piano cases is that persons in other parts

of the world place a certain value upon them, and we have no means of checking it. We practically have to accept their statement in the invoice. If honorable members care to run that risk, and to subject the honest trader to a disadvantage, they are entitled to do so. But, in my opinion, it is wise to charge duty upon the cases as well as upon the pianos, even if, by so doing, we have to accept a lower duty upon the instruments themselves than we should otherwise have to accept. Personally, I should prefer to accept a lower duty upon goods by about 2½ per cent., than to exempt packages in respect of any form of merchandise. The total sum of money paid to the manufacturer should be the basis of the duty charged.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [8.35].—I should like to add to the testimony which has been given by the honorable member for South Sydney, the evidence of a Customs officer before the Tariff Commission. I sincerely hope that the Government will strenuously resist the amendment of the honorable member for Parramatta, and that it will wipe out the exemption in respect of outside packages in the case of all *ad valorem* goods. That exemption has, undoubtedly, been used by unscrupulous persons for the purpose of defrauding the revenue. I do not suggest that particular importers have been guilty of cheating the revenue by inflating the values of cases, but I am satisfied that some of them have done so.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—Because some of them have done so, the honorable member would punish the lot?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—Section 154 of the Customs Act provides—

When any duty is imposed according to value :—

(a) The value shall be taken to be the fair market value of the goods in the principal markets of the country whence the same were exported, in the usual and ordinary commercial acceptance of the term, and free on board at the port of export in such country, and a further addition of 10 per cent. on such marketable value.

The Customs officer to whom I allude said—

There has been trouble in regard to tanks and baskets in which goods are enclosed, which tanks and baskets have a real market value on importation; but the greatest reason for drawing attention to this exemption is that a dishonest importer will value his cases unduly high in order to reduce correspondingly the goods contained therein, so that he may pay less

duty than the honest dealer. This is a common practice, especially in regard to American goods, and the difficulty is that there is no proper way of checking the value of the cases.

Mr. MAHON.—Who is the witness whom the honorable member is quoting?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—Mr. Smart, the Collector of Customs in Victoria, and Chief Surveyor of Customs—a very reliable officer, who was appointed to give evidence on behalf of the Customs Department. I confess that his testimony was an eye-opener to me. I strongly urge the Committee not to make the exemption proposed.

Mr. MAHON (Coolgardie) [8.40].—I would point out that the statement quoted by the honorable member for Bendigo in regard to the admission of outside packages is merely a confession of incompetency on the part of the officers of the Customs Department.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The honorable member is wrong there.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—They can value the goods within the case, but cannot value the case itself!

Mr. MAHON.—Are we to believe that the Customs officers are incapable of valuing piano cases?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—But piano cases should not be treated differently from other cases.

Mr. MAHON.—Then why did the Treasurer agree to admit tanks free?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Tanks do not come within the same category.

Mr. MAHON.—Are they not used as the outside packages for Cadbury's cocoa? The two cases are absolutely parallel. The honorable member for South Sydney has quoted the evidence of an anonymous witness in regard to this question. But when another honorable member quotes a piece of evidence, he usually wants, not merely the man's name, but his biography, to be supplied. Yet he calmly quotes an anonymous individual, who has evidently cheated the Customs authorities himself, and who, being a thief, imagines that everybody else is a thief.

Mr. WATSON.—That is a violent way of putting the matter.

Mr. MAHON.—It is not more violent than the honorable member himself put it when he applied the term "swindlers" to other people. The idea that a Customs officer is unable to assess the value of a piano case is positively absurd. Could he not measure the timber which it contains, and could not any carpenter tell him how long it would take to put the case

together? When a piano has been removed from the case in which it has been imported the case is valueless to the importer.

Mr. STORRER.—No.

Mr. MAHON.—It is valueless to everybody except Beale, who buys it for about 7s., shaves the name of the foreign piano manufacturer from it, and puts on his own in lieu thereof.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—There is nothing wrong in doing that.

Mr. MAHON.—The importer, who has to pay up to £2 10s. and £3 each for these cases, is obliged to sell them for 5s. or 6s. each to men who retail them to Beale for about 7s. If tanks and casks containing dutiable goods are to be admitted free, I see no justification for refusing to admit piano cases free. Let us know exactly what we are doing. I say that, under the guise of supporting a duty of 30 per cent., we are really being asked to vote for a duty of 35 per cent.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—No.

Mr. MAHON.—The Treasurer is entitled to his opinion, but I hope that he will allow me to express mine, with which a good many honorable members obviously agree. I have no wish to enter into controversy with him. If he desires that a duty of 35 per cent. shall be imposed, let him say so, straight out, and give the Committee an opportunity to vote on the proposal. He has no right to propose a 35 per cent. duty under the guise of a 30 per cent. duty.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [8.47].—I think that this is a matter which should be discussed in connexion with item 444, and I shall not detain the Committee long in regard to it. But I have a few remarks to make in reply to the honorable member for Bendigo. He, reading from evidence, stated that there is difficulty in determining the accuracy of valuations of pianos if the outside cases are not made dutiable, that the valuations of the cases will be increased and the valuations of the contents reduced. Does any honorable member consider that it is more difficult for the Customs authorities to value a piano *cum* case than to value it *ex* case?

Mr. WEBSTER.—It is stated on oath that there is a difficulty.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—We have to use our common-sense in these matters. A Customs officer who says that there is great difficulty in estimating the value of cases says what is absolutely ridiculous.

Mr. MAUGER.—It has been stated that difficulty arises because enhanced values are placed on the cases.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Nothing is so simple to value as a case, because of its nature, and because of the checks obtainable from the entries of other importers.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—It is difficult to obtain the value in the country of origin.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—We have had the greatest difficulty in ascertaining the true value of a great many things. I sent to our representative in America to obtain a valuation there. We could not get it through the Government. They would not give it to us.

Mr. WILSON.—The Treasurer is now referring to harvesters, on which he raised the valuation by 50 per cent.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Yes. He cannot persuade me that there is any great difficulty in checking valuations of cases. The Customs ought to, and do, know the approximate value by measurement in almost every exporting country of the cases which are sent here.

Mr. WEBSTER.—They say that they do not.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—If the honorable member attempted to pass an entry at an under-valuation, he would discover that they do know. They say that they can determine the value of all sorts of complicated imports, and it is absurd to assert that they cannot assess the value of cases much more easily. We have already decided that such outside packages as iron tanks and casks shall be admitted free, and we should not treat wooden piano cases differently.

Mr. SALMON.—It was argued that iron tanks and casks are needed for certain special purposes.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—That was not the whole argument.

Mr. SALMON.—It was the potent argument.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—It may have been with the honorable member, but many other arguments were used by myself and others. Iron tanks and casks are the most expensive outside packages that are used, and they having been made free, cases should be similarly dealt with.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [8.52].—Item 444 does not deal with all outside packages, but only with outside

packages n.e.i. We have already dealt with some kinds of outside packages.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Only where they were specifically named in the Tariff.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—That is so. Piano cases are the simplest of outside cases. I cannot conceive of anything more simple.

Mr. HANS IRVINE.—Nor could any one else.

Mr. SALMON.—An argument the honorable member might employ is that farmers use piano cases for chaff boxes.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—They make very good chaff boxes. The honorable member for South Sydney went into a specious argument to show that, by manipulating the valuation of cases, importers might reduce the duties on pianos. He assumed that the Customs authorities do not possess the rudimentary knowledge of the man in the street, who would know at once what the value of a piano case was.

Mr. STORRER.—When I said that piano cases are worth 25s. each the honorable member replied that they are worth 50s. each.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Piano cases range in value from 27s. 6d. to 50s. each, so that there is no margin for defrauding the Customs to any extent. The Department makes elaborate provision for checking the valuations of imports of every description, and yet we are told that its officers cannot value piano cases. Could there be a more absurd proposition? Piano cases were free under the old Tariff, and we should make them free under this.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—If the honorable member persists in his proposal, I shall not be bound to move a reduction in the duties on parts.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The Minister can please himself in that matter. I shall not be threatened by him. It would not hurt me if he doubled the duty on parts. Apparently, from a spirit of pique and revenge he would increase the taxation of the people. It is time that they knew this. It is time that they knew the motives from which duties are imposed.

Mr. WILSON.—The Treasurer dare not go back upon his promise in regard to parts.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I shall be relieved from my promise if the action which is threatened is taken.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I was going to withdraw my amendment, but, under the circumstances, I shall not.

Mr. GLYNN (Angas) [8.55].—In my opinion, this matter should be contested on item 444. I fail to understand by what authority the duty on outside packages is levied. The validity of the collection of the duty may be challenged by certain merchants, not because it is being levied under resolution, but because section 154 of the Customs Act provides for the levying of duties upon goods, which are defined as separate from packages. There is nothing in the Tariff which says that packages shall be subject to duty; there is only the declaration that outside packages in which goods other than those dutiable *ad valorem* are ordinarily imported shall be admitted free. That declaration does not impose a duty on other packages, it being an incontrovertible rule of law that the subject is not to be taxed except by express words. If it is doubtful under which of two headings an article shall be taxed, it is, according to the Customs Act, dutiable at the higher rate.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—Cases would be taxable as manufactured wood.

Mr. GLYNN.—If they were taxed as wood, the tax would be a ridiculous one, because it would vary in accordance with the value of the contents of the package. There can be no difficulty about valuing outside packages. Mr. Smart says that difficulty as to false values has arisen because the Courts have held that the term f.o.b. in the Customs Act includes the value of the package. But what is to prevent us from saying that in future the value of the package shall not be taken into account?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—We should have to amend the Customs Act.

Mr. GLYNN.—We could insert in either this measure or another the declaration that f.o.b. value does not include the value of the package. Not one package in twenty is saleable here at anything like its cost.

Mr. WILKS (Dalley) [8.59].—I understand that the value of piano cases is about £2 10s. each. Adding the 10 per cent. which the Customs always add, the value is brought up to £2 15s., on which 30 per cent. would come to 16s. 6d.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Discuss the question on item 444. It is not fair to bring it up now.

Mr. WILKS.—It may be too late to bring it up on item 444. A duty of

16s. 6d. on a piano case cannot be advocated in the interests of local makers. Pianos must be imported in cases, and it will not be argued that cases can be made here and sent to Germany. Therefore, the duty must be regarded merely as an attempt to increase the protection granted to the local manufacturer of pianos. It might as well have been said that the proposal to take the duty off casks was an attack on coopers. In my electorate there are very large cooperages, but I did not advocate then that a duty should be placed on casks in order to help the coopers. Now that the duty on pianos has been settled, there will be a rush to take them out of bond, and the cases, which, under normal conditions, can be bought for a few shillings, will be thrown at the Treasurer in about a week. I see no reason to vote for a duty of 30 per cent. on £2 10s., the cost of the case, just as if it were a piano. From a protectionist stand-point, I see no justification for the tax. It is only a roundabout way of increasing the duty on the piano. My high-water mark of protection for pianos was 30 and 25 per cent., according to the country of origin, and I am not going to be seduced into voting for higher protection to piano manufacturers by means of a duty on cases.

Mr. STORRER (Bass) [9.1].—When we dealt with other items nothing was said about the duty on the cases.

Mr. WILSON.—Yes, I brought up the matter on a much earlier item.

Mr. STORRER.—In my opinion, the proper course is to deal with this question on item 444. I do not think it is a correct charge to make on the cases. I know that it has been abused, and, although persons who have made that statement have been accused of being thieves, I may tell the Committee that when I commenced business as a young man offers of that description were made to me, but they saw that I was not a man of that kind. I knew it was wrong, and, therefore, I did not do what they wished. Yet, because I know that it is done, an honorable member has said that a man who makes a statement of that kind has been a thief, or he would not know that it is done.

Mr. MAHON.—I was referring to the informant of the honorable member for South Sydney.

Mr. STORRER.—The honorable member was not aware that I had told that honorable gentleman; he did not know the name of the informant, but if he thinks

that I am a thief, I shall not take any notice of it.

Mr. MAHON (Coolgardie) [9.3].—I understood the honorable member for South Sydney to say that it was a Sydney merchant who gave him that information. I certainly never understood that it came from the honorable member for Bass, and I think that even now he must be making a mistake. But if he thinks that I have said anything that is calculated, even by inference, to give offence to him, I unreservedly withdraw it, and apologize to him.

Mr. STORRER.—I take no notice of it.

Mr. WILSON (Corangamite) [9.4].—The honorable member for Bass has said that no attempt has been made to deal with this question on other items. I may tell him that on an early item I raised the question, and proposed that where the contents of the case should exceed the value of the case, it should be free, and that applies particularly to piano cases. The Treasurer should give an indication to the Committee that he is prepared to consider this proposal favorably when we get to item 444. I have no particular desire to deal with it now.

Mr. CHANTER.—Let us wait until we get to that item.

Mr. WILSON.—If we adopt that suggestion, we may find ourselves in a peculiar position. I believe that there is a majority of honorable members against the imposition of a duty on cases.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—If there is I will be quite prepared to submit to the decision of the Committee. I am not quite sure what course I will take with regard to item 444.

Mr. WILSON.—If the honorable member for Parramatta persists with his amendment, and we take a vote, some honorable members, thinking that it ought to be dealt with in connexion with item 444, may vote against it now, and when we came to that item piano cases would still be made dutiable. That would be an unfortunate position in which to find ourselves.

Mr. DEAKIN.—It would be a very proper thing after this waste of time.

Mr. WILSON.—I think that the honorable gentleman is not right in making that remark.

Mr. DEAKIN.—I think that this is an unpardonable waste of time.

Mr. WILSON.—I entirely disagree with the Prime Minister. This is a matter of very considerable moment, and if he

were engaged in the piano trade he would hold a different view.

Mr. MAHON.—He is here very little.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Let him hold his tongue.

Mr. DEAKIN.—I protest against this unpardonable waste of time.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The time has come for the Prime Minister to behave himself with decency in the Chamber.

The CHAIRMAN.—I must ask honorable members to cease this continuous cross-firing.

Mr. WILSON.—With all respect, I think that the Prime Minister is talking nonsense, because this is a matter of very great importance to those who are connected with the piano trade.

Mr. HUME COOK.—But there is an item on which it can be dealt with.

Mr. WILSON.—We have an indication from the Treasurer that at the present moment his feeling is that he will tax these cases.

Mr. HUME COOK.—The Committee will decide when item 444 is reached.

Mr. WILSON.—Does not the honorable member see that this charge affects the duty on a piano to the extent of from 5 to 7½ per cent.?

Mr. WISE.—Let us settle the matter by a vote.

Mr. WILSON.—I want to have a fair thing done for the piano importers and also the purchasers. It affects them all. When we are proposing to put duties of 30 and 25 per cent. on upright pianos, why should the Treasurer try by a side-wind to increase the duties to the extent of from 5 to 7½ per cent.? The honorable member for Coolgardie was justified in drawing his attention to this important matter. And the honorable member for Parramatta was justified in moving his amendment. The Treasurer would have facilitated business if he had given the Committee a fairly clear indication as to what he intended to do. I think that the whole question should be dealt with on item 444. At the same time, we want the Treasurer to indicate how the cases are to be dealt with before we record our votes on this item of pianos. He must see that if he would only give an answer to our inquiries the business would be proceeded with, and a vote taken as quickly as possible. I have no wish to delay business for a moment.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I ask leave to withdraw my amendment.

Mr. MAHON (Coolgardie) [9.10].—I desire to say a few words before the amendment of the honorable member for Parramatta is withdrawn. I am not going to sit here silently under the taunt that we have been wasting time in discussing this matter. The honorable gentleman who made that interjection is in this chamber so little that he is not in a position to say when the Committee is or is not wasting time. I remind the Committee that a whole day was practically wasted over the item of printing ink, when, if the Government had understood what they ought to have comprehended, a small amendment would have solved the whole difficulty. Instead of occupying an hour on the item, as we have over this matter, nearly a whole sitting was wasted. I reiterate that we have no right to impose this high duty by a side-wind. If it is intended to charge 35 per cent., let us have a proposition to that effect; but if the duty is to be 30 per cent., let it be that rate and no more. The Treasurer knows quite well that, under the *ad valorem* system, the unfortunate importer pays duty as if the case were part of the piano. He knows further that piano cases are sold in this market at 4s. or 5s. each, although they cost the importer on an average £2 5s. In these circumstances, I think that the proposed charge is hardly fair, and that the Treasurer might have given the Committee a more reassuring declaration as to his intention in regard to this item.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [9.12].—The Prime Minister has declared this to be a wicked waste of time. My amendment would not have been moved but for the interruption of the honorable member for Riverina, who, when this matter was being referred to, took a point of order to try to prevent even a mention of it. It was then that I said, "I will put myself in order, sir, by moving an amendment, which I hand to you."

Mr. FRAZER.—I think that the matter ought to be decided now.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—No: I intend to ask leave to withdraw the amendment.

Mr. WISE.—The honorable member is afraid to take a vote now.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Here is an honorable member going on in this way, and the Prime Minister declaring it to be a wicked waste of time. What does he want?

Mr. WISE.—To take a vote.

Mr. CHANTER.—The honorable member recognises clearly enough that the vote would be against him.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—If the honorable member wastes more time we shall get all the blame. Some honorable members on this side have urged that this question should be dealt with on item 444. I remind them that that is the last item in the Tariff, and that honorable members are already going away.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—It will be rushed then, and that is why it is suggested.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—If it is not rushed, the extreme probability is that there will be a number of honorable members away without pairs when the vote is taken. However, to save time, I ask leave to withdraw the amendment.

Amendment of the amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN (Indi) [9.13].—This question ought to be tested now, because, in my opinion, it is a deliberate attempt to increase the duty on pianos which has been passed.

The CHAIRMAN.—Order! Do I understand that the honorable member intends to submit an amendment?

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—I do, sir. This proposal was apparently concocted during the dinner adjournment. We sat for five minutes longer than we ought to have done, and sat illegally, I am told. If the statement made by the deputy leader of the Opposition is correct, we must automatically suspend the sitting at half-past 6 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN.—Order! The honorable member is casting a reflection on the Chair, which he has no right to do. There is no time definitely fixed for the suspension of the sitting to take place. If I so desired I could remain in the chair until 7 o'clock. It is merely a mutual understanding that we suspend the sitting at 6.30 o'clock. Whatever was done after that hour was quite in order.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—I am very glad indeed to have that explanation from you, sir. An attempt is being made by a side-wind to increase the duties imposed on pianos by levying duty on the cases, and I

think the matter should be tested now. Therefore I move—

That the amendment be amended by inserting after the word "Upright" the words "except outside packages in which pianos are ordinarily imported when containing such goods."

Mr. ARCHER (Capricornia) [9.15].—This is undoubtedly an important matter, and I wish to remind honorable members that, in the past, the Government, and especially the Treasurer, have repeatedly expressed a willingness to give way when it has been clear that they could not secure what they wanted, but afterwards, at a late hour, when there has been a very sparse attendance of honorable members, and there has been a chance of forcing a thing through, they have changed their tactics. I had some experience of that treatment in connexion with the item relating to ink. I have no hesitation in saying, from my knowledge of the Treasurer, that if this matter is left over, at some later sitting, the Opposition will be squeezed out, and the honorable gentleman will get his own way. We shall find that we cannot get pairs; we were refused pairs to-day, I understand.

Mr. HUME COOK.—What is that?

Mr. ARCHER.—I understand that some honorable members on this side were refused.

Mr. HUME COOK.—The honorable member should speak about what he knows.

Mr. ARCHER.—I may be wrong.

Mr. HUME COOK.—The honorable member is wrong in this case.

Mr. ARCHER.—Then I withdraw that remark entirely. But we have had over and over again the experience which I have described. I can quite understand why the Treasurer is refusing to give any indication of his intended action. No doubt he hopes to get his own way at a late sitting. We have had experience of treatment of that kind, as I know to my cost in relation to the ink business. I sincerely hope that the opinion of the Committee will be registered when there is a full attendance.

Question.—That the words proposed to be inserted (Mr. TILLEY BROWN's amendment of Sir WILLIAM LYNE's amendment) be so inserted—put. The Committee divided.

Ayes 29

Noes 27

Majority 2

Archer, E. W.
Brown, Tilley
Catts, J. H.
Cook, Joseph
Edwards, R.
Fisher, A.
Foxton, Colonel
Frazer, C. E.
Fuller, G. W.
Glynn, P. McM.
Hedges, W. N.
Hughes, W. M.
Irvine, Hans
Irvine, W. H.
Johnson, W. E.
Knox, W.

Batchelor, E. L.
Carr, E. S.
Chanter, J. M.
Chapman, Austin
Coon, J.
Deskin, A.
Ewing, T. T.
Foster, F. J.
Groom, L. E.
Hutchison, J.
Lyne, Sir William
Mathews, J.
Mauger, S.
McDougall, J. K.

Fowler, J. M.
Forrest, Sir John
Fysh, Sir Philip
Reid, G. H.
Kelly, W. H.
Smith, Bruce
Brown, Thomas

AYES.

Liddell, F.
Livingston, J.
Mahon, H.
McWilliams, W. J.
Poynton, A.
Sampson, S.
Sinclair, H.
Thomson, Dugald
Wilks, W. H.
Willis, Henry
Wilson, J. G.

Tellers:
Atkinson, L.
Bowden, E. K.

NOES.

Page, J.
Quick, Sir John
Salmon, C. C.
Spence, W. G.
Storror, D.
Thomson, John
Tudor, F. G.
Watkins, D.
Watson, J. C.
Webster, W.
Wise, G. H.
Tellers:
Bamford, F. W.
Cook, Hume

PAIRS.

Fairbairn, G.
Crouch, R. A.
Harper, R.
Hall, D. R.
Kingston, C. C.
O'Malley, King
Maloney, W. R. N.

Question so resolved in the affirmative. Amendment of the amendment agreed to. Mr. FRAZER (Kalgoorlie) [9.27].—I understand, Mr. Chairman, that you are now about to submit the question that the amendment, as amended, be agreed to. Do I understand that the apparent oversight which occurred in reference to the previous item has been avoided in this case, and that the fixed duties have been struck out?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Yes. The fixed will cease to be operative after to-day.

Amendment, as amended, agreed to.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That after the words "30 per cent.," paragraph c, the words "and on and after 12th December, 1907, N.E.I., ad val. (General Tariff), 30 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 25 per cent.," be inserted.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [9.30].—With reference to paragraph d, Parts thereof n.e.i., I was induced to make a promise under a wrong impression.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Is the Treasurer going to sneak out of it?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I regret that I did make it; but, having made it—

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—Many a man has made a promise under a misapprehension, and has kept his word afterwards.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not want to hear anything from the honorable member. He is a disgrace to the House.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—I rise to order. I understand that the Treasurer has just said that I am a disgrace to the House.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Did the honorable member hear me say so?

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—I am told that the honorable member made that observation. If he makes such remarks *sotto voce*, he ought to be ashamed of himself.

The CHAIRMAN.—I did not hear the Treasurer make the remark.

Mr. JOHNSON.—I did.

The CHAIRMAN.—If the Treasurer did, I am sure that he will withdraw it. At the same time, I would remind the Committee that it is not right for an honorable member in asking that a remark be withdrawn to use words that are equally offensive. I ask the honorable member for Indi to withdraw the observation he has just made.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—I am quite willing to do so, and expect you, Mr. Chairman, to call upon the Treasurer to withdraw the remark of which I complain.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The honorable member does not know what I said, but I withdraw anything that I did say. When interrupted, I was expressing regret that I had been induced to make a certain promise. Had I known what was going to happen, the position would have been different; but, having made the promise, I intend to adhere to it. I move—

That the words "and on and after 12th December, 1907, Parts thereof under Departmental by-laws, ad val. (General Tariff), 20 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 15 per cent.," be added to paragraph D.

I wish, by inserting the words "under departmental by-laws," to give the Department power to prevent pianos being imported in sections at the lower duty, but, at the same time, to allow parts, as such, to be imported at this rate. I may add that I propose to make the next item free.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [9.34].—Does any sane man believe that pianos could come in as "parts"?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I have made inquiries, and find that this amendment is necessary. Without it, such a thing as the honorable member suggests could happen.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Is that all the departmental regulation will do?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Yes.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The honorable member, surely, knows that it is not.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—It is, absolutely. I have had a conversation with the Comptroller-General in reference to the matter.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Under the amendment, will not the importation of the smallest parts be subject to the departmental by-laws?

Mr. HUME COOK.—No; because this does not apply to them.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The departmental by-laws will relate to every nut, rivet, and screw in a piano.

Mr. HUME COOK.—No; they are dealt with in the next item.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Does the next item include keyboards?

Mr. HUME COOK.—Yes.

Mr. WILKS (Dalley) [9.36].—This is a very wise provision to insert, and is similar to that which we have inserted in regard to the importation of vehicles. The Treasurer fears that in the absence of departmental by-laws, pianos might be introduced in sections under this paragraph, and quickly put together, just as parts of vehicles have been imported and assembled.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS (Robertson) [9.37].—I do not think that the insertion of the words "under departmental by-laws" will accomplish the object which the Treasurer has in view. A person might import separate parts in several different shipments, and in that way, bring in, at the lower duty, a complete piano. To avoid that being done, it will be necessary to keep a record of the importations of different firms.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I questioned the Comptroller-General on that very point, and he said that what the honorable member fears could be prevented.

Amendment agreed to.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 382. Musical instruments, parts of, and accessories:—

Actions in separate parts; Strings; Felts and Felting; Hammers and Ivories; Handles and Hinges for Pianos; Violin, Mutes, and Chin Rests; Holders for attaching to Band or Orchestral instruments, ad val. (General Tariff), 10 per cent.; (United Kingdom), free.

Mr. POYNTON (Grey) [9.39].—I should like the Treasurer to agree to the insertion of the words "complete or" after the word "Actions," so that the line would read "Actions complete or in separate parts."

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—That would never do. It would enable a large part of a piano to be brought in free.

Mr. POYNTON.—I am not suggesting an alteration in what has hitherto been the practice. Under the Tariff of 1902, this was allowed.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—If a man could in this way bring in the frames and the actions, he would have the greater part of a complete piano. I am advised that it would not be wise to accede to the honorable member's proposal.

Mr. SALMON (Laanecoorie) [9.41].—I would point out to the Minister that the comma appearing after the word "violin" should be struck out.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That the comma following the word "Violin" be left out.

Mr. POYNTON (Grey) [9.42].—Would the Treasurer object to the insertion of the words "and keys thereto" after the word "Ivories"?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I have made inquiries, and am informed that this is a proposal to which the Department does not think I should accede. As a matter of fact, keys are made here.

Mr. BOWDEN (Nepean) [9.43].—I propose to move—

That after the word "instruments," the words "Pianola and Æolian Records," be inserted.

I think that these records should come in free.

Mr. HEDGES (Fremantle) [9.44].—I think that it would be better to insert the words "records for mechanical piano players." There are dozens of mechanical piano players, and I fail to see why we should specially advertise any one of them. The records for all these instruments should come in free.

Mr. GLYNN (Angas) [9.45].—The honorable member for Fremantle, as usual, is right. The difficulty can be got over by using the words of item 378, where these things are all enumerated. What is required is that records for "pianolas and other attachments or articles for rendering music by mechanical process" should be

admitted free. I am glad that mutes are being admitted free.

Mr. BOWDEN (Nepean) [9.46].—I accept the suggestion of the honorable member for Angas, and move—

That after the word "instruments," line 7, the words "Pianola, Æolian, and similar Records for rendering music by mechanical process," be inserted.

Mr. POYNTON (Grey) [9.47].—If the Treasurer desires to encourage the manufacture of musical instruments in the Commonwealth, he should also provide that veneers in the rough should be admitted free. I understand that there is only one veneering machine in Australia. I do not think it is right that people engaged in this industry should have to go to a rival manufacturer to get the veneers they require.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—They could get a machine and cut them for themselves.

Mr. POYNTON.—The gentleman who has imported the veneering machine has had the advantage of free veneers and parts in building up his industry. I may say that I have very little hope that the Treasurer will agree to the proposal I make.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—We have already dealt with veneers under the timber duties.

Amendment agreed to

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That after the words "10 per cent." the words "and on and after 14th December, 1907 (General Tariff), free," be inserted.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 383. Military Band and Orchestral Musical Instruments:—

Bassoons; Baritones; Bombardons; Bugles; Clarionettes; Cornets; Cornophones; Cor. Anglais (Wood); Cymbals; Cor. Tenor (Brass); Contra Bassoon (Brass); Doblophones; Drums; Double Bases; Euphoniums; Flutes; Fifes; Harps; Horns, viz., Flugel, French, Koenig Tenor, and Vocal Ballad; Musette; Oboes or Hautbois; Piccolo; Saxophones; Tenor Trombones; Trumpets; Tubas; Triangles; Violins and Violoncellos; Bagpipes, free.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I propose to add to this item "flageolettes not being toys."

Mr. WEBSTER (Gwydir) [9.51].—I have a prior amendment. I wish to move that the last word in this item be left out. Bagpipes should not, in my opinion, be admitted free. I know of no greater injury which the Treasurer has done during the consideration of this Tariff than that which he does in proposing to admit these instruments free. I am prepared to move that the word "Bagpipes" be left out.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [9.52].—I ask the honorable member not to move to exclude bagpipes from this item. There is no music I enjoy so much as the music of the bagpipes, and for the sake of my feelings I hope the honorable member will not persist in his amendment.

Mr. WEBSTER (Gwydir) [9.53].—Out of deference to the musical idiosyncracies of the Treasurer, I am prepared to allow the honorable gentleman to enjoy music which I cannot enjoy, and I shall not move the amendment.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That after the word "Bagpipes," line 14, the words "Flageolettes not being toys," be inserted.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Division XVI.—Miscellaneous.

Item 384. Bags, Baskets, Boxes, Cases, or Trunks, with or without fittings, viz. :—

- (A) Fancy; hand; jewel and trinket; sporting; travelling; picnic; toilet; dressing; glove; handkerchief; collar; and work; satchels; reticules; valises; and companions, ad val. (General Tariff), 35 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 25 per cent.
- (B) Fancy Boxes, containing free goods or goods subject to a specific rate, ad val. (General Tariff), 35 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 25 per cent.
- (C) Fancy Boxes, containing goods subject to duty ad valorem to be dutiable at the same rate as the goods.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [9.56].—Might I suggest to the Treasurer that this item should be made dutiable at the same rate as item 334. Those engaged in the trade make the suggestion because it is not desirable to make a difference of 5 per cent. in the duties imposed upon practically similar articles contained in these two items.

Amendments (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That the word "and," line 3, paragraph A, be left out, with a view to insert in lieu thereof a semicolon.

That after the words "35 per cent.," paragraph A, the words "and on and after 12th December, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 30 per cent.," be inserted.

That after the words "35 per cent." paragraph B, the words "and on and after 12th December, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 30 per cent.," be inserted.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 385 (Baskets, Workmen's) agreed to.

Item 386. Articles n.e.i. for advertising purposes, including all articles otherwise specifically enumerated as free, ad val. 25 per cent.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That the words "and on and after 12th December, 1907—Articles which bear advertisements and which would not otherwise be dutiable at a higher rate of duty under any other heading, including all other articles which would be otherwise free if without advertisements thereon, ad val. 25 per cent.," be added.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 387. Curled Hair and Curled Fibre, ad val., 25 per cent.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [10.1].—There is an increase of duty on curled fibre. Can the Minister say why?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The Tariff Commission recommended the duty on curled hair, and the Department has brought in curled fibre at the same rate.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The Tariff Commission did not recommend a duty on curled fibre.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Let it go. There is nothing in it.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS (Robertson) [10.2].—There is a big trade in curled hair, which is used by upholsterers. The increased duty will be a tax upon the requirements of the people. No reason has been given for it.

Item agreed to.

Item 388. Filters of all kinds and materials, ad val., 15 per cent.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That the words "of all kinds and materials" be left out, and the letters "n.e.i." inserted.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 389. Boats, Launches, and Yachts imported in any vessel, or which have been put out of any vessel off the coast of Australia, and are subsequently brought into Australia, including all fittings, ad val., 20 per cent.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [10.5].—This is an item on which a preference of 5 per cent might well be given. These articles are made in Great Britain.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I will agree to that.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Then, I move—

That the words "and on and after 12th December, 1907, ad val. (United Kingdom), 15 per cent.," be added.

Mr. TUDOR (Yarra) [10.6].—It is not wise to reduce the duty on this item. It would have been better to extend the wording to include other vessels which are

brought out here. Dredges which could have been made locally, have been imported to Victoria.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I am going to propose something about dredges.

Mr. TUDOR.—Certain public bodies in Victoria have been importing dredges for some time past. The Geelong Harbor Trust had a very unhappy experience in the case of two secondhand dredges which they bought at Natal. Unfortunately for those on board, those vessels never reached here. I hope the Treasurer will be able to include dredges in this item, so as to give work for some of our workmen. I hope the honorable member for Dalley will object, on behalf of the ship-builders in his electorate, to the dumping of second-hand boats here.

Mr. WILKS (Dalley) [10.8].—The Treasurer, as a protectionist, should be very careful not to give protection to the outside world instead of to his own country. The principal launches imported are motor launches, the building of which is a great speciality in New South Wales. They are made by a firm whose main business is in my electorate, but this work is done by them in the electorates of the honorable members for Parramatta and North Sydney. Although the Treasurer has accepted the suggestion of the honorable member for North Sydney for a preferential rate, I would rather see the duty remain at 20 per cent. all round.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The Tariff Commission recommended 20 per cent., and I think we shall have to stick to that.

Mr. WILKS.—Twenty per cent. means an increase of only 5 per cent. on the duty in the old Tariff. Engine-fittings, which have to be imported for these vessels, are dutiable now at a certain rate, and why should we allow the finished article in the shape of the vessel itself to come in at a lower duty? Even a duty of 20 per cent. is low.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS (Robertson) [10.9].—No case has been made out in favour of this duty. Launches take up a great deal of room on shipboard, the charge for freight is by measurement, and that makes imported launches very expensive. It is to the advantage of Australian builders of launches to have samples occasionally of the best work of the kind from America, where the industry is very advanced. I hope the duty will not be

made prohibitive. As the freight is so high, we are not likely to be inundated with imported launches.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [10.10].—Under the old 15 per cent. duty, only £1,446 worth of launches were imported last year. During that period, I know that hundreds have been constructed in Australia, a very large number in my electorate. The figures show that there is no danger to the local builders of undue competition from abroad, and in those circumstances the Treasurer could safely take the course to which he assented just now.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I did assent for the moment, but, on consideration, I think I will withdraw that assent.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—What I ask for will be, at any rate, some preference to Great Britain on an item where a preference should be offered. If the Treasurer sees reason to depart from what he said, I am not desirous of holding him to his impetuous statement, but there is no fear of the concession injuring the Australian industry. This is a special line, which Great Britain can produce, and it looks curious that we should not give her a preference.

Mr. MATHEWS.—We can give her a preference by agreeing to rates of 30 and 25 per cent. respectively.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I do not care about that sort of preference. If the Treasurer objects to it, I will not press my amendment to a division.

Mr. MATHEWS (Melbourne Ports) [10.13].—Will the Treasurer make any proposal on this item to stop the importation of dredges by public bodies? If any one ought to support local industries, the members of public bodies should do so. In Victoria, where the settled policy of the people is protection, a number of men who take public positions on bodies like the Harbor Trust and the Metropolitan Board of Works import all they can when they get the opportunity, especially dredges, which could well come under this item.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [10.14].—I should like very much to deal with dredges, but I am afraid the debate which would result would be too long. Another important reason why we should hesitate before taking a step of that kind is that the duty would affect public bodies, and raise the question of taxing

their importations. I do not think the imposition of a duty of that kind would be very popular with the States. We should not allow that consideration, of course, to be paramount, but I should hesitate before making at this stage a proposal which would give rise to a long debate, even if we could get it through at all.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—In order to save debate, I beg leave to withdraw the amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Item agreed to.

Item 390 (Oars and skulls); item 391 (Carpet sweepers, &c.); item 392 (Brushes); and item 393 (Coke), agreed to.

Item 394. Manures, free.

Mr. CHANTER (Riverina) [10.17].—I understand that the Treasurer intends to propose to impose a duty on manures.

Mr. WILKS.—Manures are not an Australian production.

Mr. CHANTER.—I can assure the honorable member that the production of manures is an Australian industry, in which £1,000,000 has been invested in plant in New South Wales alone, and in which, in the same State, £100,000 a year is paid in wages. Those who have invested their capital are penalized to the extent that they have to pay duty on the bags they use, whereas Japanese manures, bags included, are admitted free.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I shall read the sworn evidence on this subject.

Mr. CHANTER.—I am speaking on the authority of the gentleman at the head of the firm in New South Wales to which I have referred. Further, I have myself seen at Yarraville, Victoria, an establishment in which a large number of men find employment. Sulphur is the basis of this artificial manure, and has to be imported from Japan.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—A good deal is imported from Sicily.

Mr. CHANTER.—The information given to me in reference to this industry I have verified, as far as possible, by my own observation. Those interested in the enterprise have to compete with manufacturers abroad, who employ low-paid coloured labour, and send the product here in foreign ships manned by coloured seamen.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Any duty will fall upon the Australian farmers.

Mr. CHANTER.—In reply, I may point out that the Australian farmers, for

whose interests I have the greatest regard, were at one time called upon to pay £6 and upwards a ton for their artificial manures, but now, in consequence of the competition caused by local production, they are supplied at £4 5s. and £4 10s. per ton.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The price has been reduced all over the world.

Mr. CHANTER.—The honorable member must not tell me that, because I have been engaged in farming, and speak with some knowledge. In consequence of the internal competition, Australian farmers are now getting an article equal, if not superior, in quality to imported manures, at a reduced price.

Mr. MATHEWS.—Much of the imported manure has been proved defective.

Mr. CHANTER.—I know from the farmers to which firm they give preference, but I am now merely treating the question in a general way. The Treasurer might well ask the Committee, and the Committee might well agree, to impose duties of, say, 15 per cent. and 10 per cent., in order to give the Australian manufacturers some little advantage over their Japanese competitor. It is true that very little of this manure is from Great Britain, but still a preference might be given in the Tariff. The Australian manufacturer has to pay Australian rates of wages and observe Australian conditions, and it would only be an act of justice to afford the protection I have suggested.

Mr. WILKS (Dalle) [10.24].—These manures were free under the old Tariff, both sections of the Tariff Commission recommended that they should be free, and they appear as free in the Tariff now under discussion. The phosphates, which are the main component, come from Ocean Island, off the north-east coast of Australia, where there is estimated to be something like 12,000,000 tons in natural formation. These phosphates are brought to Australia, and here treated with sulphuric acid, which is produced from imported sulphur.

Mr. MATHEWS.—Some sulphur is obtained from Tasmania.

Mr. WILKS.—Quite so. Many of the workmen, to whom the honorable member for Riverina refers, are employed in turning these phosphates into superphosphates; and it would be protection run mad to impose a duty on an article every ton of which means additional wealth to the whole of the continent. Surely the Treasurer will not abandon the proposal he has made in this

Tariff. Any one can see the farce of suggesting a preference to the United Kingdom, which imports manures from other parts of the world; and if a man were inclined to be a protectionist, such an extreme proposal as that suggested by the honorable member for Riverina would cause him to take alarm.

Mr. HUTCHISON (Hindmarsh) [10.25].—I join with the honorable member for Riverina in asking the Treasurer to put a duty on manures. If I thought that the farmers would be penalized in any way I should not advocate a duty, but the experience in South Australia is quite to the opposite effect. In that State some years ago the whole of the manures used were imported, and the importers, having the field to themselves, charged £7 per ton. This price was so excessive that the Labour Party urged the State Government to do as had previously been done in the case of wire netting—which, by the way, was being imported at £5 or £6 below the price charged to the farmers—and import a shipment of manures. The importers at once came to the Government and said, "If you will not import manures, we will agree to reduce our prices to £5 7s"; and from this it will be seen that they had not only been leaving themselves a large margin of profit, but had actually been robbing the farmers. The imported manures were so badly adulterated that, again, Parliament had to step in; and I assisted to pass a Bill in the State Parliament in order to secure the purity of the article. Then it was discovered that there are plenty of phosphates in Australia. In addition to the plant mentioned by the honorable member for Riverina, there is one at Port Adelaide; but I am assured that the New South Wales plant alone is capable, with the local phosphates, of supplying all the manures required in Australia. The price has been reduced to £4 5s. per ton, and that reduction is due entirely to the operation of the local mills. I feel certain that if we destroy the competition caused by the Australian industry we shall revert to the old conditions. I have no doubt that in some of the States, where there is no preventive legislation, the farmers are suffering from adulteration just as the South Australian farmers suffered. The Treasurer, I think, will admit that it would be only fair to impose a small duty for the encouragement of an industry capable of supplying the requirements of Australia at a fair price.

Honorable members who oppose such a duty do so simply because they have not gone into the matter, and do not know the facts of the case.

Mr. MATHEWS (Melbourne Ports) [10.28].—No one can contend that these manures cannot be locally produced in sufficient quantities, seeing that there are manufacturers sufficiently numerous to turn out more manures than are required in Australia. In 1902 the price was £4 15s., and now it is £4 5s.; and this is due to the fact that the industry has been started in Australia. The honorable member for Indi, and the honorable member for Grampians, both being Victorian members, know how, some few years ago, the imported manures were proved to have dropped below the previous standard. Seeing that we can produce a good article, and that our manufacturers have to pay a duty upon their bags—

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The error of levying a duty upon their bags was pointed out when the item was under consideration.

Mr. MATHEWS.—But I may tell the honorable member that I believe in extending protection to the bag-makers as well as to the manufacturers of manure. I trust that the Treasurer will agree to the imposition of a duty of 15 per cent. or 10 per cent. upon this commodity.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS (Robertson) [10.32].—I am very much surprised to find some representatives of the poorer States of the Commonwealth advocating a proposal to make manures more expensive. In South Australia the use of concentrating manures has revolutionized the farming industry. I speak of that State specially because it is a lean State notwithstanding that it covers such a vast area. If millions of tons of manures were accessible to the farmers of South Australia at a cheap rate, it would become one of our greatest States. I have been told that since the farmers there have been using concentrated manures they have been enabled to make land remunerative which previously would not pay for ploughing. The effect of imposing a duty upon this item must inevitably be to make manures more expensive. In my opinion they are already expensive enough, seeing that the best kinds range in value up to £6 and £7 a ton. We know that in the past the sale of manures was characterized by a great deal of fraud. But there is fraud in every department of trade.

Mr. POYNTON.—Some of the local vendors of manures were the biggest sinners.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—In the more enlightened States, however, legislation has been enacted under which the purchaser of any manure may have a sample of it analyzed, and if it is not up to standard the vendor may be punished. To a large extent this legislation has checked the evil which was previously rampant. I need scarcely point out that within thirty miles of Sydney there is to be found land which is not worth 5s. per acre, but which by the use of manures can be made worth £10 per acre. I shall vote against the proposal to levy a duty upon this commodity, because I know that it would have to be paid by the farmer.

Mr. POYNTON (Grey) [10.36].—I am astonished that a proposition has been submitted to increase the price of manures.

Mr. CHANTER.—No such proposal has been put forward.

Mr. POYNTON.—That is what it means. The imposition of a duty upon manures is advocated only by the representatives of metropolitan constituencies. It is quite true—as has been pointed out by the honorable member for Robertson—that in South Australia we had to enact legislation to prevent the adulteration of manures. But who were the worst offenders in that connexion? Undoubtedly they were some of the local vendors, who were actually digging up soil upon the adjacent islands and selling it as manure. The use of manures has brought under cultivation hundreds of thousands of acres which were previously regarded as worthless.

Mr. GLYNN.—In some cases it has increased the value of land threefold.

Mr. POYNTON.—Yes. I maintain that under this Tariff the farmer is already called upon to pay more than his fair share of taxation. I am astonished that the honorable member for Riverina, who is a farmers' representative, should endeavour to penalize that class more than it has already been penalized. What benefit will the farmer derive from this Tariff? He has to compete in the markets of the world, and he cannot work eight hours a day.

Mr. MATHEWS.—The poor farmer again!

Mr. POYNTON.—It is all very well for the honorable member to exclaim, "The poor farmer again!" but I could trundle a wheelbarrow over his constituency. Before a duty is imposed upon manures, I shall have to be removed from the chamber.

Mr. CHANTER.—What does the honorable member mean by that statement?

Mr. POYNTON.—I mean that this proposal will never be carried whilst I am able to stand upon my feet in opposition to it. Who has recommended the imposition of a duty upon manures? Have not both sections of the Tariff Commission recommended that this commodity should be placed upon the free list? If the honorable member for Melbourne Ports had to submit to half the disabilities to which the farmers upon poor lands are subjected, he would not advocate a proposal of this sort. I represent a State which contains a larger area of poor land—

Mr. MATHEWS.—And poor farmers.

Mr. POYNTON.—I do not know that poverty is a crime. It may be in Port Melbourne.

Mr. CHANTER.—Is the honorable member referring to the farmers who grow half a bushel of wheat to the acre?

Mr. POYNTON.—My statement upon a previous occasion—as will be seen by reference to *Hansard*—was that during a period of ten years, certain farmers in South Australia had not averaged one bushel of wheat per acre. I further stated that that wheat had been sold for as low a price as 1s. 4d. per bushel, and I know that my assertion is true. Realizing the climatic conditions with which agriculturists have to contend in the arid portions of South Australia, the uncertainty of the seasons, and the fact that they are faced with the vermin pest, I should be recreant to my trust as their representative if I did not oppose the proposal under consideration as long as I had breath in my body.

Mr. MATHEWS.—Two can play at that game, and I think I shall be able to last the honorable member out.

Mr. POYNTON.—We shall see. The only reason advanced in favour of a duty being levied upon manures, is the fact that an impost has been placed upon bags.

Mr. CHANTER.—The honorable member assisted to allow of the importation of Japanese bags free.

Mr. POYNTON.—The cry of the cheap labour of Japan is raised upon every occasion that protectionists desire to levy an import duty. They forget that our farmers have to compete with that cheap labour in the markets of the world. The wheat-growers' market is London, and he has already been sufficiently penalized under

this Tariff. There is no free machinery for the farmer. While the man who has a factory is able to obtain his machinery free in many cases, the farmer gets nothing free. If the Treasurer supports this proposition, he will hear more about the matter.

Mr. LIVINGSTON (Barker) [10.46].—I should like the Treasurer to tell the Committee whether he intends to move to make the duties on superphosphates 15 and 10 per cent. If he does, I shall have something to say on the subject. If, on the other hand, he allows manures to remain on the free list, as I hope he will, there need be no more discussion.

Mr. CROUCH.—Would the honorable member agree to a duty of 5 per cent.?

Mr. LIVINGSTON.—I would not agree to any duty.

Mr. CARR (Macquarie) [10.48].—There is a misunderstanding as to what has been suggested, the desire of the honorable member for Riverina being to impose a duty, not on manures generally, but on superphosphates, which are largely worked up in the Commonwealth into a commercial commodity. This duty is asked for because the bags containing the imported superphosphates are imported free of duty, whereas the persons who prepare superphosphates locally have to pay a duty on the bags which they use.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I pointed that out when we were discussing the duty on bags.

Mr. CARR.—In my opinion, the end can best be met by imposing a duty on superphosphates. Superphosphate manures are produced more cheaply in Japan than here.

Mr. WILSON.—We have the cheapest sulphuric acid and rock phosphates in the world.

Mr. CARR.—Yes; but labour is much cheaper in Japan. That, although a misfortune to the Japanese people themselves, gives an advantage to the commercial enterprises of the country. I should like to know whether the Minister is prepared to move in this matter. The amount invested in the industry in the Commonwealth is about £1,000,000, while the wages paid to the men employed in it come to £104,000 a year.

Mr. CHANTER.—The men employed number 800.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—What authority has the honorable member for Macquarie for his statements?

Mr. MCWILLIAMS.—Where is there £1,000,000 invested in this industry?

Mr. MATHEWS.—There are two large establishments in my electorate.

Mr. MCWILLIAMS.—There is not £1,000,000 invested in them.

Mr. CARR.—I have not received valuations from certificated valuers; I speak from information received from proprietors and employes.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The Tariff Commission published sworn evidence by manufacturers which was available to the honorable member.

Mr. CARR.—All the information obtainable in regard to the industry may not have been gathered by the Tariff Commission. It is only when adversity besets industries, as when it besets individuals, that an outcry is raised. Had it not been for the duty on bags we should not have heard the protest which is now being made on behalf of the local manufacturers of superphosphate manures.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—They can, and do, use bags which have been imported free of duty.

Mr. CARR.—That is a reflection on the administration of the Customs Department. The honorable member for Grey has said that the proposed duty will increase the price of manures to the farmers. That is the stock argument of those who are opposed to duties, the legislators who advance it being afraid to move forward. Their policy is one of stagnation and stultification. They fear the consequences of any move forward. We, who advocate the imposition of duties, recognise that there is a certain amount of danger attending it; but the Government have to-night placed before us the outline of a scheme for protecting the workers and preventing the consumers from being victimized. They are in sympathy with efforts to prevent the incidence of protective duties becoming unduly burdensome. I admit that these duties will not create a paradise of cheapness. But cheapness is not everything. If we could get for nothing everything that we want, we should become effete, and decay. A nation that makes its own goods has a manhood of better type than one which makes no such effort. I urge the Minister to do something in this matter.

Mr. GLYNN (Angas) [10.53].—In the district which I represent, the value of the land has, in many places, been increased

threefold by the use of superphosphates. I speak without prejudice in this matter, and only as I am guided by my sense of what ought to be done. There are many large phosphate deposits in South Australia, and, in fact, in my district, and wherever there is an indication of the presence of superphosphate there are persons ready to enter into agreements with the farmers for the right of mining for it. If I were to study my interests as a member, I might favour a duty on superphosphates, because a good many persons in my district are making these into manure, and the price paid for the raw material depends, not only on its quality, but also upon the price obtained for the manure made from it. Some persons have asked me to support a duty, but I do not feel disposed to do so, especially in view of the splendid results which have followed the use of superphosphates in South Australia. There is practically an unlimited demand for superphosphate manures.

Mr. CARR.—And an unlimited supply here.

Mr. GLYNN.—I think that if the importations were stopped, the local production would not meet the demand, so that there is not much fear of injuring those who manufacture superphosphates into manure, if we continue to allow superphosphates to be imported free of duty. I hope that the Government will not add to the burdens of the farmer by imposing a duty on superphosphates.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—A South Australian representative has shown that what was done in that State reduced the price of superphosphates.

Mr. GLYNN.—He said so; but twenty-eight years ago the price of superphosphates was between £4 and £5 a ton, the price of manures ranging from £4 to £15 a ton, according to quality; and Peruvian guano selling at £14 10s. a ton. The fluctuations in the price of superphosphates has not been caused by anything that has occurred in South Australia within the last three or four years.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—A witness before the Tariff Commission said that the prices were about the same thirty years ago.

Mr. GLYNN.—Yes. A duty on this item may shut out manures which may be more useful to farmers than some of those manufactured locally. Rich

deposits of natural manures, like the Peruvian guano deposits, may be discovered.

Mr. CHANTER.—I suggested a duty on superphosphates, not on manures.

Mr. GLYNN.—I thought that the suggestion was to impose a duty on all manures.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I have not moved any amendment. Why do not honorable members vote for the item as it stands?

Mr. GLYNN.—The Treasurer would do better if he told us what he proposed to do, instead of sitting like a sphinx. He has been asked several times what the Government policy is.

Mr. HUME COOK.—It is on the paper.

Mr. GLYNN.—If the Treasurer declares that he intends that manures shall be free, he will stop the debate. We are told by the Government Whip that the Government policy is on the paper.

Mr. HANS IRVINE (Grampians) [11.0].—I should like to hear the Treasurer express an opinion on the suggestion of the honorable member for Riverina.

Mr. LIVINGSTON.—The Government Whip says that manures are to be free.

Mr. HUME COOK.—And honorable members will find that he is right.

Mr. HANS IRVINE.—I ask the Treasurer to tell the Committee whether he intends to adhere to the item of manures as it stands?

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—He does not say so now.

Mr. HANS IRVINE.—Do I understand the Treasurer to say that he intends to adhere to the item as printed?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—No; the question before the Chair at the present time is item 394—"Manures, free." If I make any proposal in regard to superphosphates it will be submitted as a separate item.

Mr. HANS IRVINE.—I hope that the honorable gentleman will not propose a duty on superphosphates, because the farmer does not get much benefit from the prohibitive protection which has been passed.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—That is a matter of opinion.

Mr. HANS IRVINE.—I do not think that the farmer should be taxed any more than he is, and I certainly hope the honorable gentleman does not propose to tax his raw material. He must be aware of the value of superphosphate manures to the farmer. He must know that all over Australia tens of thousands of acres, which

at one time were considered almost worthless, are now made profitable to the farmer simply by the use of those manures. He has been taught how, by scientific farming, fallowing, and manuring, he can produce payable crops, thus finding employment for men and adding to the wealth of the country.

Mr. SALMON.—The proposal is to make manures free.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I want to take a vote on this item.

Mr. HANS IRVINE.—If all manures are going to be free, we will support the honorable gentleman, but if any manures are to be taxed I shall be quite prepared to speak for an hour or so.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I should like to hear the honorable member "stone-walling" for a while.

Mr. HANS IRVINE.—I will do that when it is necessary.

Mr. BATCHELOR (Boothby) [11.2].—I desire to ascertain whether the Treasurer intends to propose or support any alteration in this line. If he will say that he does not intend to support a proposition to impose a duty on manures, I will resume my seat, because I know that with the help of the Government we can carry the item.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—No one else can propose a duty.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—If, however, the Treasurer intends to support an alteration of the duty on manures, I am prepared to speak at some length.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Give him a chance, and then we will see what he intends to do.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—I will resume my seat with the greatest pleasure if the Treasurer wants to get up.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not want to get up.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—I appeal to the honorable gentleman to acquaint the Committee with the policy of the Government on this matter.

Mr. SALMON.—They propose that manures shall be free.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—If that is the intention I am satisfied.

Mr. SALMON.—If every honorable member who represents a farming constituency wants to get up and say that he does not wish manure to be free, we are prepared to listen to him.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—I should be quite prepared to go to a division if I knew

what attitude the Government took. If they do not intend to submit a proposition—

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I have not done or said anything. I have submitted the item to the Committee, and I do not know why the honorable member should suppose that I intend to do anything else.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—I accept that statement as an intimation that the honorable gentleman does not intend to support any alteration of the item.

Mr. KNOX (Kooyong) [11.7].—It is necessary that I should, address the Committee, because it is dealing with a subject in which I am considerably interested, and I prefer not to vote. I, as an individual, am opposed to any effort to impose a duty on superphosphate manures. I have been requested to state that if the Japanese material continues to be imported, as is proposed, the large works which have been started by the companies in Sydney, Melbourne, and Adelaide may be closed.

Mr. CHANTER.—And 800 men will be thrown out of employment.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—Rubbish.

Mr. KNOX.—I am in a position to speak with knowledge and authority. I look at this matter purely from a commercial stand-point. At the present time, fully 1,000 men are employed at the various works. The Mount Lyell Company are engaged in erecting large works in Adelaide, and have erected in Yarraville large works, which have cost nearly £90,000. It must be understood by the Committee that those works must cease operations if there is a large importation of this material at greatly reduced prices.

Mr. HANS IRVINE.—That is not likely to occur.

Mr. KNOX.—I do not know that.

Mr. HANS IRVINE.—But I do.

Mr. SALMON.—The Mount Lyell Company are selling their manure at 5s. per ton less than the value certified to by the Government Analyst.

Mr. KNOX.—That is all to the advantage of the farmers. In Victoria there is a very proper Act under which the value of the superphosphates is regulated, and the companies are now supplying to the farmers a manure superior to the imported article. I am vice-chairman of one company; but the application to the Minister did not originate from that company, but from another direction. I am here to represent

my constituents, and not any private interests, and of course it is not my intention to vote on a question in which I have so prominent a personal interest. But it seemed desirable that the Committee should understand that the companies have not the slightest intention of increasing the cost to the farmer in any way. Such an idea would not be entertained for a single moment. The companies are prepared to give a five years' guarantee that no increase will be made.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—Will they guarantee to reduce prices?

Mr. KNOX.—Why should they do that? I think there is some misapprehension as to the method of manufacture. The sulphuric acid is made from pyrites and sulphur, which can be easily obtained in Japan, and is being sent down to Australia in considerable quantities as well as the superphosphates. The original proposal of the Government was that these manures should be free; but representations have been made to the Treasurer that a labour question is involved, and he has very properly endeavoured to ascertain the feeling of the Committee. He has left himself in the hands of honorable members as to what course should be taken.

Mr. PALMER (Echuca) [11.13].—I understand that the position is that the Treasurer has been asked to agree to the imposition of a duty on chemical manures. He has not definitely agreed. He is very properly waiting to ascertain what the numbers are. It is not often that I venture into the realm of prophecy, but I do venture to say that this question is of such great importance to the material welfare of the Commonwealth that any Government which proposed to impose a duty which might lead to a considerable increase in the price of what is an absolute necessity to the producers would have a very short life. This is one of the matters which exemplify the great difficulty of arriving at anything like a scientific system of protection. Undoubtedly the men who are engaged in producing chemical manures would, under a strictly scientific protectionist Tariff, be entitled to their modicum of protection. There is no getting away from that argument. But we cannot shut our eyes to the obvious, and it is utterly unreasonable to propose that we should tax a material affecting the well-being of the country in the interests of a comparatively few. It would be absolute suicide to do so.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I should like to take a vote on the item as soon as possible.

Mr. PALMER.—Is the Treasurer prepared to express an opinion about it? The question has been raised several times as to whether the imposition of a duty decreases the price of an article. Because the prices of some commodities have been reduced it is argued that that is the result of protection, whereas the reduction of the prices of many articles has been simply due to the improvement of mechanical contrivances.

Mr. CHANTER (Riverina) [11.17].—I should like to reply to a few of the statements made by the honorable member for Grey and the honorable member for Barker.

Mr. ARCHER.—The honorable member's speech will make it necessary for some one else to speak in reply.

Mr. CHANTER.—Very well; I understand that the honorable member is prepared to vote on this matter as on everything else in the direction of giving a preference to the foreigner against his own countrymen. If this item goes through in the manner proposed Australia will be in the disgraceful position of protecting the Japanese against her own manufactures.

Mr. LIVINGSTON.—The Government which the honorable member supports did it.

Mr. CHANTER.—I shall deal with the honorable member.

Mr. LIVINGSTON.—And I will deal with you, too!

Mr. CHANTER.—I am quite prepared to deal with the honorable member either inside or outside the chamber.

The CHAIRMAN.—I must ask the honorable member not to be personal.

Mr. CHANTER.—The honorable member for Barker was personal to me, and I am sufficient of an Australian to hit back if a man hits me; and I hit at once and straight from the shoulder. Let the honorable member make no mistake about that. The honorable members to whom I have referred have posed as the special friends of the farmer. I challenge both of them to show that they ever did more for the farmer or have enjoyed the farmer's confidence for a longer period than I have. I have had that confidence because I have been a farmer myself. I have been the victim of a monopolistic ring which would crush out the last drop of blood in the shape of money from the producer.

Mr. HANS IRVINE.—The manufacturers of chemical manures would soon form a ring if they got a duty.

Mr. CHANTER.—My suggestion to the Minister was not to impose a duty upon all manures, but upon superphosphates.

Mr. WILSON.—That is the most important of all.

Mr. CHANTER.—I am not personally interested in this matter, so that I can speak freely. Is it not important that we should keep in employment the 800 men engaged in the industry in three States?

Mr. WILSON.—Have we not heard the same statement in connexion with every industry?

Mr. CHANTER.—We have heard the statement of an interested party. Is it not natural to conclude that if we slam the door on the Australian manufacturer, and say to him, "We shall compel you to pay duty on the package, but we shall open our arms to the Japanese, and allow him to send in his manures and his packages absolutely free——"

Mr. WILSON.—These bags are absolutely free.

Mr. CHANTER.—They are not.

Mr. WILSON.—They are.

The CHAIRMAN.—I must ask the honorable member for Corangamite to cease interjecting.

Mr. POYNTON.—The honorable member for Riverina helped to impose the duty on bags.

The CHAIRMAN.—The honorable member for Grey and others will recognise that if these interjections are allowed to continue order cannot possibly be preserved.

Mr. POYNTON.—If the honorable member goes on in this way, we shall have to reply.

The CHAIRMAN.—We are in Committee, and if the honorable member for Riverina makes a statement to which any honorable member objects, it can be replied to.

Mr. POYNTON.—I shall certainly reply.

Mr. CHANTER.—This comes with a very ill-grace from the honorable member for Grey, who worked himself into a fury in his defence of the farmers. Surely I, as a farmers' representative, have a right to put my experience against his.

Mr. POYNTON.—What I said must have gone home.

Mr. CHANTER.—No; the honorable member is absolutely at sea as to the requirements of the farmers. The one deduction that he always draws from the

imposition of a duty is that the farmer will have to pay it.

Mr. POYNTON.—My constituents are the best judge of that matter.

The CHAIRMAN.—The honorable member for Grey must cease these interjections.

Mr. POYNTON.—The honorable member for Riverina must confine himself to the truth.

The CHAIRMAN.—If the honorable member will not obey my ruling, I shall have to take some other course.

Mr. POYNTON.—I am not disobeying the Chair.

Mr. CHANTER.—I do not desire to create any ill-feeling.

Mr. POYNTON.—Then keep to the truth.

Mr. CHANTER.—That is insulting.

The CHAIRMAN.—The honorable member for Grey must withdraw the remark.

Mr. POYNTON.—If the honorable member for Riverina says that I do not know what are the requirements of the farmers——

The CHAIRMAN.—The honorable member must withdraw unreservedly.

Mr. POYNTON.—I am not going to withdraw it.

The CHAIRMAN.—Do I understand that the honorable member will not withdraw the remark?

Mr. POYNTON.—When the honorable member for Riverina says that I do not know the requirements of the farmers, he is saying what is not true. When he withdraws that remark, I will withdraw mine.

The CHAIRMAN.—Will the honorable member withdraw the remark?

Mr. POYNTON.—I shall not. I am not going to be bounced by the honorable member for Riverina.

The CHAIRMAN.—I again ask the honorable member for Grey to withdraw the remark.

Mr. POYNTON.—Will you, Mr. Chairman, ask the honorable member for Riverina to withdraw the statement that I do not know what are the requirements of the farmers?

The CHAIRMAN.—I am not going to allow this to continue any further. I name Mr. Poynton for disobeying the ruling of the Chair.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I hope that the honorable member for Grey will not persist in his refusal to withdraw.

Mr. POYNTON.—Why does the honorable member for Riverina make a statement that is not true?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—According to the Standing Orders I am called upon to take a very disagreeable step. I hope that the honorable member will withdraw his remark, and so save me from moving as I must do that he be suspended from the service of the House. I shall be very reluctant to do so, and I ask the honorable member not to force me into such an unfortunate position.

Mr. POYNTON.—In deference to the Chair, I withdraw it. I now ask you, Mr. Chairman, to call upon the honorable member for Riverina to withdraw the statement that I do not know what are the requirements of the farmers.

The CHAIRMAN.—I am sure that if the honorable member for Riverina has made any statement to which the honorable member objects he will withdraw it.

Mr. CHANTER.—I am utterly at a loss to know what statement I have made to which the honorable member could take exception as being personal. If, in the heat of debate, I have made a statement to which he objects I unreservedly withdraw it. No one regrets more than I do what has taken place. The honorable member for Grey, I am sure, will admit that he seems always to throw out a challenge to other representatives of the farmers. I rose only for the purpose of doing what I conceived to be my duty. The honorable member for Grey seems to think that if a duty be imposed upon any article the farmer has to pay for it. I take an entirely different view. I have always held that if by the imposition of a duty on any articles used by the farmer its local manufacture is stimulated and competition created the farmer is benefited. I have proved that the manufacture of superphosphates in Australia has resulted within the last five years in the farmer securing them at 35s. per ton less than he had to pay before. I feel, however, that if we allow things to remain as they are, the 800 men now engaged in the industry in Australia will be driven out of it. Over £1,000,000 has been invested in the industry in three of the States, and last year £100,000 was paid in wages. By penalizing the men employed in the industry we shall take money out of their pockets and put it in the pockets of the importers. The object of free-trade is to place every one on even terms. It was proposed, not merely that the Aus-

tralian manufacturer should compete openly with the foreign manufacturer, but that he should be under penalties in having to pay higher rates of wages, and work under disabilities which did not affect his foreign competitor. Honorable members opposite go further, and say that the article which he requires as a package for the product he manufactures must pay a duty, whilst they are prepared to allow the manure and the package in which it is contained to be imported free from Japan. Honorable members cannot deny that the effect of internal competition in this instance has had the result of reducing the price of the article to the farmer from £6 to £4 5s. per ton.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—Why did not the honorable member help me to have manure bags imported free?

Mr. CHANTER.—I do not think I was present when that item was dealt with.

Mr. SINCLAIR.—Will not the imposition of a duty make bags cheap in Australia in the same way?

Mr. CHANTER.—Honorable members opposite are charging the Australian manufacturer a duty on the bags he requires, whilst they are prepared to let the Japanese manufacturer send his bags into the Commonwealth duty free. My only interest in this matter is to benefit the farmer by keeping local competitors in the field against the imports of the foreign article. I should be blind to his interests if I gave a vote which would have the effect of increasing the price of the article. When competition in the production of any article is removed, the price is increased to the consumer, and if it is maintained the price is kept at a fair level.

Mr. HANS IRVINE.—Let us take a vote.

Mr. CHANTER.—The honorable member for Grampians and I take diametrically opposite views of this question. I am prepared to vote, as an Australian patriot, in favour of the protection of Australian industries.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—And as the farmers' friend.

Mr. CHANTER.—And as the farmers' friend. I have represented farmers for the last twenty-three years in the Parliament of New South Wales and the Commonwealth Parliament. In spite of the efforts of honorable members opposite, with thousands of pounds behind them to prevent my return, the farmers have remained true to me. This is not merely a matter of theory with me. I was farming years ago before the

establishment of the manufacturing industries, brought into being by the protective Tariff of Victoria, and for the implements I used I had to pay 100 per cent. more than the price for which they can now be obtained in the Commonwealth. I admit the value of manures and superphosphates, and wherever I go I recommend their use to the farmers. I need not mention names, but I am aware that time after time, by analysis, farmers have discovered that they have been imposed upon with rubbish in the shape of imported manures, and might just as well have put sand into the soil. Where the manufacture is carried out under local legislation and supervision, the farmer knows that he can get a pure article, which will increase his crop. He wishes that the Australian manufacturer of manure shall continue in existence, and if he were a member of this Committee he would be found assisting the Australian manufacturer to continue his competition against the foreign manufacturers of manures. If honorable members have made up their minds to protect the foreigner, the responsibility is theirs, and not mine. I have pointed out the position, but honorable members opposite, true to their policy, propose to penalize the Australian farmers and protect their "brother Jap."

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [11.39].—If he wishes to curtail the debate, I ask the Treasurer to state what his attitude is upon this item. I have no wish to detain the Committee, but I could show that some statements which have been made are not in accordance with the facts. The honorable member for Riverina has stated that there is £1,000,000 fixed investment in this industry in Australia. From personal knowledge, and also from sworn evidence given before the Tariff Commission, I am in a position to say that that statement is an exaggeration.

Mr. CHANTER.—If the honorable member will not accept my statement, will he not accept the statement of the honorable member for Kooyong, who has asserted that there is more than £1,000,000 in this industry?

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I will accept the statement of the honorable member for Kooyong that £90,000 is invested in his own works. We have the evidence, given before the Tariff Commission, of Mr. Elliott, of Elliott Brothers, of Sydney, one of the manufacturers of this article. He said the output was, roughly, as follows—

bourne, 30,000 tons; Wischer, of Melbourne, 10,000 tons; Wallaroo Copper Smelting Company, of Wallaroo, South Australia, 10,000 tons; Explosives Company, of Braidwood, 4,000 tons; Adelaide Chemical Company—Cuming, Smith and Company—of Adelaide, 10,000 tons; and Elliott Brothers, of Sydney, 10,000 tons; or a total of 74,000 tons." Mr. Cuming, of Messrs. Cuming, Smith and Company, the largest manufacturers in Australia at the time of the giving of evidence before the Commission, was asked—

What capital is invested by these four firms in plant?

And replied—

I cannot speak for the others, but we have about £100,000 invested in this way.

Then, in reply to the question—

Can you give us some idea of the extent of the industry in Australia?—

He said—

I suppose that the works and plants in Victoria would have a capacity to produce 60,000 tons per annum.

His firm produced, according to Mr. Elliott, half of that amount at that date. Their plant represents £100,000, and is one of the finest in Australia. Assuming that all the other plants cost another £100,000, that gives £200,000 for plant for Victoria. The production outside Victoria, according to the evidence of Mr. Elliott, was then about 15,000 tons.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—The output in South Australia alone was 20,000 tons.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON. — I see there is some discrepancy between Messrs. Cuming, Smith's figures and Mr. Elliott's figures.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—Cuming, Smith, and Company include the Adelaide Chemical Works, of which they are the proprietors.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON. — Then that 10,000 tons has to come off. But, taking 30,000 tons as the production of the £100,000 plant, and allowing, say, twice as much as the value of the plant for the whole of the rest of the production, that would give £300,000, and, adding £90,000 for the works of the Mount Lyell Company, as stated by the honorable member for Kooyong, we get a total of £390,000, or, say, £400,000. That is giving an outside estimate. Therefore the statement that £1,000,000 is invested in plant and buildings in this country is much beyond the mark.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—The duty would soon make it £1,000,000.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—We have heard a good deal about imports, and about the destruction that Japan was causing in this industry. The honorable member for Corio asked me if there were imports from anywhere else but Japan. In 1906, according to the Commonwealth Statistician, we imported of superphosphates £110,722 worth from the United Kingdom, £33,070 worth from Belgium, £3 worth from France, £13,739 worth from Germany, £12,116 worth from the Netherlands, £74 worth from the United States of America, and £790 worth from Japan. That shows that our imports from other countries have been much larger than from Japan.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—We imported 484,279 cwt. of rock phosphates from Ocean Island.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—That is the raw material.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—It can be obtained here.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON. — This duty does not give protection on that. If it is cheaper to bring it from Ocean Island, it will still be brought.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—It is not cheaper. We have it here.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON. — If the quality is equal, why do they bring phosphate rock from Ocean Island and Christmas Island?

Mr. HUTCHISON.—Because they want an outlet for their stuff. They will bring it in at any price, as they have cheaper labour.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON. — That is a reason why no duty should be imposed. Phosphate rock is the raw material. Neither the Minister nor the honorable member for Riverina proposes a duty on it. The phosphate rock is taken from those islands not only by Australia but by Japan. It has to go up to Japan, and then to be brought back again after being manufactured. There is a tremendous natural protection in that alone, and the effect is shown by the small quantity of imports last year from Japan. It is also stated in the sworn evidence of one of the witnesses that thirty years ago he sold superphosphate at about the same rate—£4 5s. It is now a little more—I think about £4 7s. 6d. I do not wish to delay the Committee, but the Government are forcing a

discussion. I have a great deal more than this to say, but I should like to know from the Minister—

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I have asked for a vote on manures, and there is nothing but talk. I have not proposed anything with regard to superphosphates. Let the Committee pass the item "manures," and I will say what I am going to do.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Then we will debate it out, even if we stay here till Saturday night.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—When I propose it, it will be time to debate it.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON. — These things are sprung upon the Committee without notice at the last moment.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I have not sprung any proposal on the Committee.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Will the Treasurer let me say what he did? The honorable member for Riverina suggested that the Treasurer should propose a duty, and the honorable gentleman said, across the table, that he was in favour of a duty if it could be carried.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I did nothing of the kind; I did not say a word.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The Treasurer must excuse me; but he did do so.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I have not communicated to any one what I am going to do.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The Treasurer stated that he favoured a duty.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I have not been on my feet.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Quite so; but the honorable gentleman spoke across the table to myself.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Nonsense!

Mr. FRAZER.—If the honorable member for North Sydney will sit down and permit a vote to be taken, we shall see who favours a duty.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—But if I sit down in order that a vote may be taken, honorable members opposite will debate the question. As to the bags, the duty can only apply to a special sort, the great bulk of the manures being put up in ordinary bags which come in free. I pointed out at the time that it was not fair to single out manure bags for duty. However, the position is so manifest that the trouble can easily be remedied in another place.

Mr. MATHEWS (Melbourne Ports) [11.54].—I hope the Committee will vote against this item being free.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—I hope the Committee will not do so.

Mr. MATHEWS.—I am sorry to hear that interjection from an honorable member who professes to be a protectionist. Like the honorable member for Grey, I am speaking for those I represent, and in my electorate there are two very large manure factories, together with two or three smaller ones. In spite of the fact that the local industry has brought down prices, we have honorable members who are wedded to free-trade refusing to give a chance of employment, and doing what they can to stop the development of manufactures in Australia. If the farmers' representatives could see as far as the ends of their noses, they would realize that if the local industry be crushed, the importers will at once raise prices. Here we have an industry that has not been fostered, at any rate, by the Commonwealth Parliament. We have been told by the honorable member for North Sydney that there is not £1,000,000 invested in the industry, and he has supported his statement with extracts from the evidence taken before the Tariff Commission. The honorable member forgets, however, that that evidence only related to the actual factories, and that, apart from the factories themselves, there is subsidiary employment, such as is afforded in bringing the material from Tasmania and other places. I should say that in reality there is more than £1,000,000 invested in the industry taken as a whole. I am determined to see that the honorable member for Grey, in his blindness, does not damn and starve 500 or 600 men with their families in my electorate; and I appeal to protectionists to support me. Of course, I do not expect support from honorable members who were returned in other States as protectionists, but who, when an opportunity is presented to foster industries in a way that would do the farmers no harm, trot out all sorts of evidence they know is not correct. Never yet has an attempt been made to impose a duty on a manufactured commodity, but honorable members have voted against it because it did not in any way benefit their own electorates. I am not surprised at free-traders voting against such duties; but when we have the honorable member for Boothby, who calls himself a protec-

tionist, but who never casts a protectionist vote except for the benefit of his own electorate—

Mr. WILSON.—This is disgraceful!

Mr. MATHEWS.—The honorable member for Corangamite is another who pretended at the last election to be a protectionist, but who has never cast a protectionist vote in this chamber. I urge protectionists to vote against this item being left free, in order that it may be put under some other heading as dutiable.

Mr. BATCHELOR (Boothby) [11.59].—After the wild attack made upon me by the honorable member for Melbourne Ports, may I say that I do not think that in my electorate there is a single manufacturer of any dutiable articles? When the honorable member accuses me of voting for protectionist duties only when my own electorate is interested, he is very much "at sea." May I say that some ten years ago I assisted considerably for two or three years in developing the manure industry in Australia. I took action in the direction of securing the payment of a bounty for the discovery of phosphatic rock. No reason has been assigned for the imposition of a duty upon manures. No request has been made by those interested in the industry, and the fact that they did not take the trouble to appear before the Tariff Commission is pretty conclusive evidence that it is not in need of any adventitious aid. The fact is that for some years after the introduction of mineral manures into Australia the entire trade was in the hands of the foreigner. But with the establishment of the local industry, Australian manures have superseded imported manures.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—The importations from Japan are increasing.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—Last year, out of a total importation of manures valued at nearly £400,000, only £790 worth came from Japan.

Mr. MATHEWS.—But the importation from Japan has increased enormously during the present year.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—The honorable member is afflicted with a Japanese scare. He has already attacked protectionist members of the Committee because they are not smitten with the same disease.

Mr. MATHEWS.—The honorable member is not a protectionist.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—The honorable member is more than a protectionist.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Oh, stop it.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—I will not submit to personal attacks without replying to them. When I am charged with being influenced only by a regard for my own constituency, I do not intend to remain silent. The Treasurer could have stopped this discussion an hour ago—

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—That is not a fact, and the honorable member has no right to make the statement. If the debate had not been continued by honorable members upon one side of the chamber, it would have been continued by honorable members upon the other side.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—The Treasurer knows very well that had he definitely stated that the Government would not support this proposal, some speeches which have been delivered would not have been made.

Mr. WILSON.—The Treasurer put up the honorable member for Riverina to move an amendment.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I did nothing of the kind.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—It seems to me that when an honorable member proposes the imposition of a duty upon an article which appears in the free list, it is the business of the Treasurer to explain to the Committee the attitude of the Government towards it. Certainly such a course of action would tend to curtail debate. I see no reason why a duty should be levied upon manures. The local article is superseding the foreign article—

Mr. MATHEWS.—That is not correct in respect of the present year.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—The consumption of the local article is increasing.

Mr. FULLER.—The sworn evidence given before the Tariff Commission is to the effect that it can be sold at a lower price than the imported article.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—One of the difficulties surrounding the present position is that the local manufacturers have to pay a duty upon their bags. When I pleaded that jute, manure, and gypsum bags were not made in Australia, and therefore ought to be admitted free what was the position taken up by the honorable member for Melbourne Ports? Was he a supporter of this industry? Certainly not. He voted for the duty. I have no desire to labour this question. If the Government had chosen to give an early "lead" in this matter I am satisfied that the debate would have been very much curtailed. Even now, if the Treasurer will declare that they do not

intend to support the proposal of the honorable member for Riverina, there will be no need to prolong discussion.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [12.9 a.m.]—For two hours or more we have listened to a debate which has been encouraged by the Treasurer.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—That is not correct.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The Treasurer deliberately told the Committee that he wanted honorable members to express an opinion upon this proposal before he made up his mind in regard to his attitude towards it.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The honorable member is making a mis-statement.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I am making a statement which I heard fall from the Treasurer's own lips. If ever there was a wicked waste of time this debate is one.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Whilst the honorable member is speaking.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I am about to make a few remarks upon the proposal to levy a duty upon manures.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Oh, let the item go.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The Treasurer himself has encouraged this debate. More than an hour ago he said that he wanted to ascertain the mind of the Committee upon this proposal.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—What I said across the table was that I wanted to hear what the honorable member for Kooyong was about to say.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I will sit down at once if the Minister will say what he proposes to do. Does he intend to tax manures? If so, I shall have a few remarks to make on the subject.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I am not going to do anything.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Why could not the Minister say that two hours ago?

Mr. LIVINGSTON (Barker) [12.13 a.m.]—I asked the Treasurer, an hour and a half ago, if he intended to impose a duty on superphosphates. That is a matter of vital importance to South Australia, whose output of wheat is trebled since superphosphates came into use. The honorable member for Riverina, whose own district is suffering so much this year, should be glad that we are having a good season. He said that the honorable member for Grey did not know what the farmers want, but no man in Australia knows

more about the needs of the farming community than does the honorable member for Grey.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—Did he explain what brought down the price of manures?

Mr. LIVINGSTON.—He had not the chance. The honorable member for Riverina accused me of interjecting and annoying him.

Mr. MATHEWS.—So the honorable member did.

Mr. LIVINGSTON.—I did not. I have never done anything to annoy any one since I have been a member. The honorable member for Riverina told me that I could have it out outside; but I do not settle my disputes in that way.

Mr. MATHEWS.—The honorable member challenged the honorable member for Riverina.

Mr. LIVINGSTON.—No. The other day the Treasurer sprung a surprise on us in regard to the duty on sheep dips, and to-night he was going to spring a similar surprise with regard to a duty on manures.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Nothing of the kind.

Mr. LIVINGSTON.—Had the Treasurer treated the Committee fairly, we would have helped him. He has allowed two hours to be occupied over a matter which he could have settled in five minutes.

Mr. CARR (Macquarie) [12.16 a.m.].—I presume that if the Committee decided that manures generally should not be free the Government would be compelled to impose a duty on them. That I do not want. But the Minister will not tell us what he proposes to do with regard to superphosphates.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The honorable member knows perfectly well that I do not intend to do anything.

Mr. CARR.—I did not know that. Had the Minister said so earlier, the discussion might not have lasted so long. Those of us who desire a duty on superphosphates would be foolish to vote against manures being made free, unless we had the assurance of the Minister that he would propose a duty on superphosphates only. I cannot understand his attitude.

Item agreed to.

Item 395 amended to read as follows, and agreed to—

Rope, Cordage, and Twines, n.e.i., including cordage with metal core; macrame twines; fleece thread; brushmaker's and mattress twine; roping,

seaming, and shop twines; and halters, and other articles, n.e.i., manufactured from cord or twine, ad val., 25 per cent.

Item 396. Fishing Nets and netting therefor, ad val., 20 per cent.

Mr. JOHN THOMSON (Cowper) [12.22 a.m.].—As fishing nets are tools of trade to a very deserving and poorly paid class, I propose to ask the Committee to insert after the word "therefor" the words "fishing hooks and floats for fishing nets" with a view to subsequently moving that all these articles be made free.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The honorable member need not discuss the matter, as we are prepared to make them free.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [12.23 a.m.].—Before the honorable member submits an amendment for that purpose, I want the Committee to insert after the word "fishing" the words "and rabbit."

Mr. MATHEWS.—Why does the honorable member spring this amendment on the Committee?

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I have not sprung the amendment on the Committee, because I have already spoken to the Minister on the subject.

Mr. MATHEWS.—The honorable member has sprung it on the Committee. We are not allowed to do that sort of thing.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—It is understood that fishing nets are to be made free. There is a recent Australian patent for the destruction of rabbits. It is said to be a very good and effective patent. I do not know whether it will prove so or not.

Mr. MATHEWS.—Why does the honorable member want to remove the duty?

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I cannot say everything at once. I can only utter one word at a time. Fishing nets are not made in Australia, because the demand is not sufficient to justify the cost of erecting the large machines which are essential to their manufacture. It is intended to substitute fishing net for the galvanized wire-netting which is now used to form the races to rabbit-traps. There is a patent for using fishing net for that purpose. If fishing net is made free, and it was known that it was intended to be used for rabbit trapping, the Customs officers might say that, inasmuch as it was not to be used for fishing it was dutiable.

Mr. MATHEWS.—I would not give away a point to the Opposition. They will not give away one point to us.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I do not know what is the matter with the honorable member, who, instead of being his usual genial self, is very grumpy. This netting is a tool of trade to the rabbit trapper, and if it is made free to him, he can increase his income considerably. I move—

That the words "and rabbit" be inserted after the word "Fishing."

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I accept the amendment.

Mr. MATHEWS (Melbourne Ports) [12.27 a.m.].—I never like to be petulant. When protectionists endeavour to save an industry from being wiped out, honorable members on the other side get up and say that our amendment has been sprung on the Committee, and all sorts of insinuations are thrown out. My advice to the Treasurer is to beware of every suggestion which comes from the other side. When they want to alter or lower a duty, everything is supposed to be right and proper, but when we want to make an alteration, we are accused of underground engineering. We on this side, ought to give the members of the Opposition a dose of their own medicine. Whenever we endeavour to make an alteration which would be beneficial to those carrying on manufactures, we are opposed by members of the Opposition, and our actions are misconstrued. I hope that, until the Tariff is disposed of, the Treasurer will not accept any amendment from that source.

Mr. STORRER (Bass) [12.29 a.m.].—I hope that the Treasurer will accept this amendment which, I may mention, has not been sprung upon the Committee, because I received a communication on the subject two or three weeks ago. I think it is quite right that the article should be made free, and I intend to support the proposal.

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment (by Mr. JOHN THOMSON) agreed to—

That after the word "therefor," the words "Fish hooks; Floats for fishing nets," be inserted.

Amendment (by Mr. CROUCH) agreed to—

That after the word "nets," the words "and lines," be inserted.

Amendment (by Mr. JOHN THOMSON) agreed to—

That the words "and on and after 12th December, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 5 per cent.; (United Kingdom), free," be added.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 397. Yarns—

(A) Jute, Hemp, and Flax, ad val., 10 per cent.

(B) Wool, n.e.i., ad val. (General Tariff), 10 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 5 per cent.

(C) Coir, free.

(D) N.E.I., including Hose Yarn (General Tariff), 5 per cent.; (United Kingdom), free.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [12.34 a.m.].—I move—

That after paragraph B, the following new paragraph be inserted:—

(BB) Cotton yarn, ad val. (General Tariff), 15 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 10 per cent."

I have had samples sent to me showing that there is an industry of an important character for the manufacture of cotton yarn in Queensland. I was very much surprised to find to what an extent it is being manufactured. That is why I propose to give the industry some amount of protection, without which it cannot be successfully carried on.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN (Indi) [12.36 a.m.].—As we are dealing with yarns, I may as well point out that we have been "yarning" since morning. I suggest that it is about time that we should adjourn. We could very well dispose of the remaining items in the Tariff to-morrow.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—I think it would be well to have from the Treasurer an announcement as to his intentions. If he intends that we shall sit on, I am prepared to help him.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I propose to go right through the Tariff.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—What does the Treasurer mean by "right through?"

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not think that we can deal with harvesters to-night, but we can dispose of all the other items.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [12.39 a.m.].—We have now been sitting for fourteen hours, and honorable members opposite support the Treasurer in his intention that we shall continue sitting until the Tariff is disposed of. The welfare of the country does not seem to be a consideration that appeals to them. It is at all events a secondary consideration with them. The remainder of our work upon the Tariff might just as well be done to-morrow.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—We have a great deal to do to-morrow.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Would it not be a fair thing for the Treasurer to take the Committee into his confidence?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I may have to consider to-morrow whether it is necessary to recommit a few items.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—That means that we are to get through the Tariff to-night and begin again upon it to-morrow.

Mr. POYNTON (Grey) [12.40 a.m.].—Can the Treasurer state whether or not cotton yarn is being spun in Queensland?

Mr. SINCLAIR.—It is.

Mr. POYNTON.—I have been informed that it is not.

Mr. PAGE.—Any quantity of it is now being spun in Queensland.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I have seen it being spun there.

Mr. POYNTON.—A duty of 15 per cent. on cotton yarn must affect a number of industries, and before asking the Committee to impose it the Government should have satisfied themselves that cotton yarn is being spun in Australia. I feel some anxiety in this regard, because cotton yarn is one of the raw materials of the woollen mills of Victoria. During the debate on the woollen items evidence was adduced that the woollen mills, more particularly in this State, largely import cotton yarn. The imposition of this duty may therefore seriously affect the woollen industry. The honorable member for Fremantle mentioned that the value of our imports of cotton yarn amounted in one year to over £70,000. Nearly the whole of that importation was consumed in Victoria.

Mr. CROUCH.—Is this sarcasm? The honorable member has no woollen mills in his electorate.

Mr. POYNTON.—I am speaking more particularly in the interests of the Castle-maine woollen mills. I wish to keep free one of the raw materials of the woollen industry.

Mr. STORRER. — Which the honorable member says is cotton.

Mr. POYNTON.—Yes. I am sure that the honorable member for Bass will sympathize with my object, because the Tasmanian woollen mills turn out a pure article. I should like to know how many hands are employed in spinning cotton in Queensland. The imposition of this duty may throw out of employment hundreds of men who are now engaged in the woollen industry. We cannot get away from the evidence that cotton is the principal raw material of some of the Victorian woollen mills.

Mr. WEBSTER.—It is the foundation of the woollen fabric.

Mr. POYNTON.—It is; and I trust that the Treasurer will seriously consider this question.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Farramatta) [12.50 a.m.].—If the Minister will give no explanation of the item, we might as well take things leisurely. We have already decided that cotton piece goods shall be free.

Colonel FOXTON.—Hence the necessity for the duty now proposed.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—If the duty had been retained on cotton piece goods, I should not have proposed this item.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—But does not the honorable gentleman think that some explanation is due from him? Without any explanation, the Treasurer submits new items, and the Committee can take them or leave them. If the Minister will explain the object and effect of the present proposal, I shall sit down at once.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [12.54 a.m.].—I did not curtail my remarks in submitting this item out of any discourtesy to the honorable member or to the Committee. The manufacturers of this cotton yarn are getting improved machinery, and as we have removed the duty that was imposed under the old Tariff on cotton piece goods, they might as well close their mills if we do not give them some assistance in the production of yarn. They had invested a good deal of money, and were manufacturing calico and other cotton piece goods of that kind, and the removal of the duty on cotton piece goods hit them very hard.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The removal of a 5 per cent. duty?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—So I am informed. They are devoting their attention now particularly to the development of the manufacture of these yarns, and I think it reasonable that they should be given some support. They have arranged for the planting of 200 or 300 acres of cotton from which to draw their supplies, and I believe some of the land has already been planted.

Mr. PAGE.—The whole of it has been planted.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The object is to supply cotton to the mill for the production of these yarns, and honorable members will see that already an attempt is being made to bring about what we are most anxious to see, and that is the growth

of cotton in Australia. I make this statement in deference to the request of the deputy leader of the Opposition, and if I did not say much in introducing the item it is because I feared that if I did so I might provoke a long debate. I hope that the reasons I have given for the introduction of the item are satisfactory to the honorable member.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [12.58 a.m.].—I want to know what effect the imposition of this duty is likely to have upon the importation of cotton piece goods?

Mr. SINCLAIR.—Cotton piece goods are free.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I am aware of that. It is all very well to say that this proposed duty will lead to the cultivation of 200 or 300 acres in Queensland. But if, at the same time, it is going to affect the importation of £3,000,000 or £4,000,000 worth of cotton materials, it may be a very serious matter.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—It will not affect those materials at all.

Colonel FOXTON (Brisbane) [12.59 a.m.].—I wish to assure the deputy leader of the Opposition that the proposed duty on cotton yarn cannot possibly affect the importation of cotton piece goods. As cotton piece goods are allowed in free, the Ipswich mill, which is the only mill of its kind in Australia, will have to be dismantled so far as the machinery for the production of cotton piece goods is concerned. These yarns, the manager of the mill has explained to me, are used, as the honorable member for Grey has said, in the production of goods which are alleged to be all wool.

Mr. TUDOR.—All really high-class tweeds contain a percentage of cotton.

Colonel FOXTON.—That is so, perhaps, and if this cotton yarn is not produced here, it must be imported for the purpose. I fail to see why, when woollens have been so highly protected, the manufacturers of woollen goods should not be asked to pay a little extra for a small proportion of the raw material they require, which is the product of another industry indigenous to the country.

Mr. TUDOR (Yarra) [1.0 a.m.].—Under paragraph D, yarns n.e.i., including hose yarn, are dutiable at 5 per cent. and free. If by that means hosiery manufacturers can get their cotton yarns in free, the difficulty will be got over. But if they have to pay 15 per cent. for any yarns they import, until the Ipswich mill is ready

to supply them, they will be in a worse position than the spinners of the yarn are in. The latter will get a protection of 15 per cent. and 10 per cent., while the manufacturers of hosiery—the made-up article—will get only 25 per cent. and 20 per cent., which will mean only a 10 per cent. margin, if they start on cotton hosiery.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—Is there any prospect of that?

Mr. TUDOR.—I think there is. That aspect of the case might be taken into consideration.

Mr. HANS IRVINE (Grampians) [1.2 a.m.].—I think the Committee might support this proposal, which is a fair one, although the A section of the Tariff Commission recommended that the article should be free. The Government propose to give a bounty for the production of flax, jute, hemp, and kindred plants, and we might reasonably accept what, after all, is not a high duty. I have received a circular from a number of manufacturers, who, I think, should have that measure of support.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [1.3 a.m.].—I do not object to the duty. I only wish to see what its incidence will be in relation to the huge import of £3,000,000 or £4,000,000 worth of cotton piece goods. If this yarn is merely to mix with wool in the woollen mills, then, as those mills have a high protective duty, they cannot well object to a small rate on the cotton yarn.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. TUDOR (Yarra) [1.4 a.m.].—I presume that the words "hose yarn" in paragraph D mean hosiery yarn. Is it intended that any hosiery yarn, no matter of what material, can be brought in at the low rates proposed for paragraph D?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Yes; that is the object.

Mr. POYNTON.—Is there any necessity for a 5 per cent. duty in this paragraph? These yarns are made largely on the Continent.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—There is a system right through the Tariff of making certain items 5 per cent. and free. I want to put them all on the same footing.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 398. Reaper and binder twine and yarn, per cwt., 5s.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [1.5 a.m.].—Where is the urgency for finishing the Tariff to-night?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—We have a great deal to do to-morrow, irrespective of what we are doing now.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—It is the height of absurdity to ask us to sit all night without giving any reason. Surely honorable members who are trying to assist the Government to close up the business are entitled to know what they are asked to do.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I shall tell the honorable member, if I can, on the adjournment to-night, after I have consulted the Prime Minister, what we propose to do to-morrow.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The Prime Minister will come in, take up the notice-paper, and say, "We might try to get this through, and that through, and the other through," and there we shall be. We are just as wise when he finishes as when he begins. Nothing could be more like a comedy than the proceedings of this Chamber recently.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [1.7 a.m.].—Unless these resolutions are passed to-night, it will be impossible for the Tariff to be printed in time for the covering Bill to be got through on Friday. Personally, I want to get home after Friday.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [1.8 a.m.].—What are we kept up for to-night? We do not know why we should get through the Tariff to-night, or what the Government are going to do when the Tariff is finished.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [1.9 a.m.].—We propose to adjourn as soon as possible. The Bill covering the Tariff has to be brought in, and will probably be discussed. I do not know whether I shall be able to deal with the Manufactures Encouragement Bill, but I have had very pressing telegrams to-day asking me to try to have it dealt with before the House rises. I do not propose to take the harvester duties at present.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Is there to be a long debate on the harvester duties?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—It would not be fair to take them to-night, considering that they have been postponed for a certain purpose, and that the Prime Minister will probably have to make a statement before they are dealt with to-morrow. That ought to be done to keep faith with the House.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [1.10 a.m.].—All I wanted to know was what business the Government were going

to take. Are we to launch immediately to-morrow into a discussion of the new protection?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I cannot tell the honorable member. I am only leading the House in the absence of the Prime Minister.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—Go ahead, we will help you to get the Tariff through.

Item agreed to.

Item 399. Sewing Silks and Twists; and Household, Shoemaking, and Bag-making Threads and Cottons, ad val. (General Tariff), 5 per cent.; (United Kingdom), free.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) proposed—

That the words "and on and after 12th December, 1907, Sewing and Embroidery Silks and Twists; Household Threads and Cottons; Sewing Threads and Cottons n.e.i. for manufacturing purposes; and Saddlers' Twine, Free," be added.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Shoemakers' thread is omitted.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The officers inform me that shoemakers' thread comes under "sewing threads and cottons for manufacturing purposes."

Amendment agreed to.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 400. Unserviceable Cordage, for paper manufacture, pursuant to Departmental by-laws, Free.

Mr. CROUCH (Corio) [1.15 a.m.].—I ask the Treasurer to insert the words "and Rags" after the word "Cordage." Any abuse could easily be stopped by means of the departmental by-laws.

Mr. SALMON.—We ought not on any account permit rags to be imported. It is as much as we can do now to keep out disease, without running further risks in this way.

Mr. CROUCH.—I move—

That after the word "Cordage" the words "and Rags" be inserted.

Amendment negatived.

Item agreed to.

Item 401. Metal Cordage, including Cordage of Metal, with core of other material, Free.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That after the word "Cordage," where it occurs for the first time, the comma be left out.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 402. Copying Apparatus for duplicating typewriting and the like, ad val., 25 per cent.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [1.17 a.m.].—In this case, no duty is recommended by either section of the Tariff

Commission, there appearing under the heading of recommendations by both sections, merely the words, "According to Material." I should like to know from the Chairman of the Tariff Commission what the words mean.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—I suppose it means the material of which the apparatus is made—whether manufacture of metal or manufacture of wood.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—This duty will operate rather severely on a number of people, particularly on females, who have to work very hard in order to make a living by means of this apparatus. Some of the workers, I understand, have to provide their own materials; and I do not think we ought to impose so high a duty.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [1.19 a.m.].—I ought to explain that there was some difficulty about this item, and that it would have come under a higher duty had it not been separately dealt with here. However, I move—

That the words "and on and after 12th December, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 20 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 15 per cent.," be added.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—What is the meaning of the words "and the like." They are very vague and indefinite.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The words mean articles associated with the apparatus. Amendment agreed to.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 403. Fumigators, Atomizers, Odorizers, Vaporizers, and the like, ad val. 20 per cent.

Amendment (by Mr. JOSEPH COOK) agreed to—

That the words "and on and after 12th December, 1907, ad val. (United Kingdom), 15 per cent.," be added.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 404. Cork Mats, Bungs, Rings Floats for fishing nets, and other manufactures of cork n.e.i., ad val., 15 per cent.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That the words "Bungs, Rings, Floats for fishing nets," be left out.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 405. Corks:—

(A) Small corks (up to 8-ounce bottles), per lb., 1s.

(B) N.E.I., per lb., 6d.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That after the word "bottles," paragraph A, the words "Bungs and Rings" be inserted.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [1.24 a.m.].—I move—

That after the figure "1s.," paragraph A, the words "and on and after 12th December, 1907, free," be inserted.

I submit this proposal with a view to subsequently making corks n.e.i. also free. The duty proposed cannot be regarded as a protective duty.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I believe that cork cutting is done within the Commonwealth.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—There is a little. For certain purposes, corks have to be cut, and this provides a certain amount of employment. It did so prior to the introduction of this Tariff. But any industry created under this sixpenny duty would be unprofitable alike to the users of the cork and to the community. It is infinitely better that the corks should be cut in the country of origin. Even if a duty be levied upon this commodity, the bulk of the corks used in Australia will be imported. The proposal of the Government simply represents an endeavour to provide employment which will have to be paid for by the consumers. At one time, there was a considerable duty upon corks operative in Victoria, and yet the amount of cutting done locally was exceedingly small. I quite agree that cork trees can be grown within the Commonwealth. As a matter of fact, I have urged, in another Parliament, that attention should be given to the production of these trees. But I would point out that twenty-five or thirty years must elapse before their bark would be useful for cork making, and that in the interim—if we adopt the Government proposal—we should be levying a heavy tax upon the users of this article.

Mr. MALONEY.—I believe that the cork tree will grow more quickly in Australia than it will in its native home.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—That may be. I do not think that we ought to impose any duty upon this item.

Mr. POYNTON.—The duty has been abolished in New Zealand.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [1.28 a.m.].—I have a memorandum here to the effect that the Department is in favour of substituting a 35 per cent. duty upon paragraph A, which would be slightly lower than the specific duty proposed. If any great opposition is exhibited to this item, seeing that the cork

cutting industry is being carried on here, I propose to take a vote upon it.

Mr. MALONEY (Melbourne) [1.29 a.m.].—If we cannot obtain the duties proposed by the Government, I should like to see slightly decreased rates levied. I would point out that soda-water corks are imported for 1s. 6d. per gross, and that a gross would weigh about 1 lb. The corks for lemonade bottles cost from 8d. to 10d. per lb., whilst the corks for hop beer bottles cost from 6d. to 7d. per lb. Ginger beer bottle corks cost from 5d. to 6d. per lb. It will be seen, therefore, that the duties proposed are a little too high. If the Government cannot carry the proposals in the schedule, I suggest that they should accept a duty of 6d. per lb. upon small corks, and of 3d. per lb. upon corks n.e.i.

Mr. HANS IRVINE (Grampians) [1.30 a.m.].—The honorable member for Melbourne has quoted from a letter forwarded to him by the Aerated Waters Association of Victoria. They say that fewer than twenty persons are employed in the industry, and that they were employed when there was no duty; whereas there are thousands connected with the manufacture of aerated water and kindred trades. I understand that the Minister desires to propose a duty of 35 per cent., which he says is a little less than 1s. per lb., which amounts to a duty of from 40 to 50 per cent. on soda-water corks, of from 60 to 70 per cent. on lemonade bottle corks, of from 70 to 90 per cent. on hop-beer bottle corks, and of from 60 to 80 per cent. on ginger-beer bottle corks. We do not produce corks in this country, and, according to experts, we could not in any case produce them within less than twenty to forty years. Although they have tried to produce corks commercially in America they have not succeeded. The corks supplied to the world come from Spain and the south of France. Under these circumstances a duty on corks is absurd, and I shall vote for the amendment.

Mr. POYNTON (Grey) [1.33 a.m.].—In New Zealand for twenty years they had a duty of 20 per cent. on corks. But in that time not one cork-cutting factory was established. I ask the Minister, if he wishes to avoid a long discussion, to abandon the proposed duty.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS (Robertson) [1.34 a.m.].—The cork elm grows well at

Castlemaine and elsewhere. I saw cork trees growing there twenty-five years ago, and though there were a large number of them, I have not yet heard of the cork industry being established in the State.

Mr. MCWILLIAMS.—Is the bark good?

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—Yes. Trees were imported specially because of their bark, and in all probability are still doing well.

Mr. SALMON.—I have some very good trees growing on my own place.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—But the honorable member has not established the cork industry there. The Castlemaine plantation would not keep a firm going for twelve months in corks. Cork can be grown here, but not in commercial quantities. Therefore the proposed duty is unreasonable, and I hope that the Minister will not insist on it.

Mr. FRAZER (Kalgoorlie) [1.36 a.m.].—I think that the Minister might well accede to the general wish of the Committee. The protectionist section of the Tariff Commission recommended that corks should be admitted free, and I believe that the Chairman of the Commission will vote to make them free.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Then let us take a vote.

Mr. FRAZER.—When a vote is taken under circumstances like the present, the decision come to is often not that which would have been arrived at had honorable members paid attention to the speeches of those who have interested themselves in the subject.

Mr. SALMON.—Does the honorable member think that any one can be got to listen to a debate at this hour?

Mr. FRAZER.—No. Honorable members cannot be blamed for refusing to do so. We have been sitting here now for more than fourteen hours. But, seeing that those who have considered this matter are practically almost unanimously of the opinion that corks should be admitted free, the Minister might well give way.

Mr. STORRER.—The only way to get at the opinion of the Committee is to take a vote.

Mr. FRAZER.—By taking a vote we shall obtain a decision of the Committee, possibly without opinions, and as that is all that can be expected now, I will sit down.

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment (by Mr. DUGALD THOMSON) agreed to—

That after the figure "6d.," paragraph B, the words "and on and after 12th December, 1907, free," be added.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 406. Explosives, viz. :—

(A) Cartridges n.e.i., ad val. (General Tariff), 30 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 20 per cent.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I want the word "filled" to be inserted after the letters "n.e.i."

Mr. BOWDEN (Nepean) [1.42 a.m.].—I move—

That after the word "Explosives," the words "other than explosives for mining purposes" be inserted.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—How can the Customs officers tell for what purpose the explosives are intended to be used when they are imported? I intend to make black powder free.

Mr. BOWDEN.—The honorable gentleman is dealing with fuse and other articles in separate paragraphs.

Mr. THOMAS.—Does the Minister intend to make dynamite free?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—No, sporting powder.

Mr. WATKINS (Newcastle) [1.43 a.m.].—I point out to the Treasurer that if an amendment is not moved to make mining powder free, it will be taxable under paragraph A.

Mr. WATSON.—We cannot make cartridges free.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—No; but I want to add the word "filled" to paragraph A, and to deal with other cartridge cases afterwards.

Mr. WATKINS.—A large quantity of the miners' powder is supplied in cartridges, and its use is prescribed by law.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Paragraph A does not apply to mining powder.

Mr. WATKINS.—Miners' powder is imported in cartridges.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—But this paragraph, when it is amended, will relate to "cartridges, n.e.i., filled." I intend to make cartridge cases and powder free. I do not think that this paragraph applies to the miners' cartridges.

Mr. WATKINS.—So long as it is made quite clear, I do not mind.

Mr. HEDGES.—What the honorable member refers to is compressed powder.

Mr. WATKINS.—I refer to powder compressed into cartridges. I should like

to know under what paragraph the Minister proposes to deal with the miners' powder?

Mr. HEDGES (Fremantle) [1.45 a.m.].—The Treasurer has announced his intention to make paragraph A read—"Cartridges, n.e.i., filled." It is unnecessary to insert the word "filled," because it would not be a cartridge unless it was filled, but merely a case.

Mr. HUME COOK.—Paragraph 1 deals with cartridge cases, and it is necessary to distinguish between the two items.

Mr. HEDGES.—In my opinion, paragraph A is all right as it is.

Mr. BOWDEN (Nepean) [1.46 a.m.].—I understand that all the paragraphs of this item apply to sporting powder and sporting cartridges.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—That is quite right.

Mr. BOWDEN.—I think that the miners' explosives ought to be made free.

Mr. HUME COOK.—That question can be raised on paragraph L, which deals with "Explosives, n.e.i.," which are dutiable at 5 per cent. in the general Tariff, and admitted free when imported from the United Kingdom.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I have just inquired of the officers, and I can assure the honorable member for Nepean that the introductory word "explosives" is all right as it stands.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) proposed—

That the word "filled" be inserted after the letters "n.e.i."

Mr. BOWDEN (Nepean) [1.48 a.m.].—I still think that the word "cartridges" will include the miners' cartridges, but if the Treasurer will assure me that the miners' cartridges will be included in paragraph L, and not in this item, I shall be satisfied.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I have just been informed that they will be so included.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. WILSON (Corangamite) [1.49 a.m.].—I desire to know whether the Minister intends to propose any alteration in the duties of 30 and 20 per cent. on "Cartridges, n.e.i., filled." The A section of the Tariff Commission recommended a duty of 20 per cent in the general Tariff and 15 per cent. in the preferential Tariff. That is stiff enough.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I will agree to duties of 30 per cent. and 25 per cent.

Mr. WILSON.—I move—

That after the words "30 per cent.," paragraph A, the words "and on and after 12th December, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 20 per cent.," be inserted; and that after the words "20 per cent.," the words "and on and after 12th December, 1907, ad val. (United Kingdom), 15 per cent.," be added.

Mr. FRAZER (Kalgoorlie) [1.51 a.m.].—I should like to hear from the Treasurer some reason for his proposed departure from the recommendation of the A section of the Tariff Commission in regard to cartridges. The Commission evidently went fully into the question, because they have made a recommendation in regard to the preferential duty, which they have rarely done in regard to any other item in the Tariff. If the Treasurer has any reason why we should depart from that recommendation I should be glad to hear it. Otherwise I shall vote for duties of 20 per cent. and 15 per cent.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [1.54 a.m.].—I was talking a few days ago to a cartridge manufacturer in Sydney. He told me that if duties of 20 per cent. and 15 per cent. were adopted as recommended by the A section of the Tariff Commission whilst the parts were made free he would be able to get along very well. We ought to have an explanation why the Commission's recommendation has not been adhered to.

Mr. THOMAS (Barrier) [1.55 a.m.].—Under the Kingston Tariff it was originally proposed to make the duty on cartridges 20 per cent., but Parliament made them free. There was no preference idea in those days. Now, however, the Government profess to be anxious to grant a preference to the United Kingdom. I am quite prepared to vote with the Government in favour of a duty of 20 per cent. against the world in general with a preference to the United Kingdom. That ought to be sufficient.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I will accept the amendment.

Amendment agreed to.

Paragraph, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraph B. Fireworks, ad val. (General Tariff), 35 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 25 per cent.

Amendment (by Mr. STORRER) proposed—

That after the words "35 per cent.," paragraph B, the words "and on and after 12th December, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 30 per cent.," be inserted.

Mr. THOMAS (Barrier) [1.57 a.m.].—Does this item relate to the fireworks purchased by children?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—All kinds.

Mr. THOMAS.—If it applied only to children's fireworks I should be prepared to vote for duties of 50 per cent. or 60 per cent.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Why?

Mr. THOMAS.—I should like to see their importation prohibited, and would even prohibit their manufacture in Australia.

Mr. WILSON (Corangamite) [1.58 a.m.].—Honorable members should recollect that this item affects the magnificent pyrotechnical displays which are sometimes arranged for the delight of the public. I shall support the amendment of the honorable member for Bass.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I will agree to that.

Amendment agreed to.

Paragraph, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraph C. Fuse n.e.i., per coil of 24 feet or less and in proportion for any greater quantity, per coil (General Tariff), 14d.; (United Kingdom), 1d.

Mr. TILLEY TROWN (Indi) [2.0 a.m.].—This item constitutes another tax upon the mining community. I consider that safety fuse at all events should be free. It was free under the old Tariff. I have received a communication which indicates the position. There are only two factories in Victoria which make fuse, one at Footscray and the other at Bendigo; and only about thirty-three people, mostly girls, are employed. The duty will mean taxation amounting to something like £8,000 per annum, and for the sake of an industry employing thirty hands the Government propose to subject the mining industry to still another disability. I move—

That after the figures "14d." and "1d." paragraph C, the words "and on and after 12th December, 1907, free," be inserted.

Mr. FRAZER (Kalgoorlie) [2.1 a.m.].—This paragraph, although not of great importance, so far as the value of the industry to which it relates is concerned, is of serious consequence to those engaged in mining. There is probably no item in the Tariff to which we should give more careful consideration than one relating to fuse for underground mining. We all know of the perils of the mining industry, and, unhappily, are familiar with the fatalities associated with it. A restriction of the

choice of fuses may possibly jeopardize the lives of many miners, and, for that reason, we should give special attention to this question. The evidence seems to indicate that fairly satisfactory fuse has been produced in Australia; but the imposition of this duty has enabled the local manufacturers to unduly penalize the mining industry. I would suggest to the Treasurer that he would save time by agreeing to reduce the duties to $\frac{3}{4}$ d. and $\frac{1}{2}$ d. per coil.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—I am agreeable to that.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Very well.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment (by Mr. FRAZER) proposed—

That after the figure " $\frac{1}{4}$ d.," paragraph C, the words "and on and after 12th December, 1907, per coil (General Tariff), $\frac{3}{4}$ d.," be inserted; and that after the figure " $\frac{1}{4}$ d.," the words "and on and after 12th December, 1907, per coil (United Kingdom), $\frac{1}{2}$ d.," be inserted.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [2.4 a.m.].—The Treasurer is not treating me fairly, as, notwithstanding the assistance I have given him in passing the Tariff, he has abandoned the Government proposal. The manufacture of fuse is a Victorian industry, and is carried on in my own electorate.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I was not aware of that.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—If the Minister has given way to the request made by the honorable member for Kalgoorlie, he is not doing justice to the protectionist section of the Tariff Commission, whose recommendations I am here to sustain. I am sorry that I agreed to help the Government to carry on late to-night if, as the result of late sittings, duties are to be reduced, without fair consideration, by the consent of the Treasurer. Quite a number of honorable members are prepared to support the recommendation of the Commission and the duties originally proposed. I protest against the action of the Treasurer in giving way as he has done. The manufacture of fuse was exhaustively inquired into by the Commission, the protectionist section of which recommended a duty of 1d. per coil. The Government went one step further, and proposed duties of $\frac{1}{4}$ d. and 1d. The evidence before the Commission showed that the abolition of the Victorian duty placed the production of fuse in Australia in a very precarious position, and that but for the appointment of the Commission to inquire into the condi-

tion of threatened and strangled industries, the factories in Australia would have been closed.

Mr. BOWDEN.—How many are there?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—There are two factories, one in Footscray and one in Bendigo.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—They employ thirty hands, consisting for the most part of women.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—I am surprised that a representative of Victoria should attack a Victorian industry. The Commission was positively assured that the local factories had been struggling and fighting a big trust, in the shape of Nobel and Company, which has thrown down the gauntlet, and has deliberately told the Australian manufacturers that it intends to have the whole of the Australian market or nothing. They have cut prices so low that the local factories have been unable to make the business pay.

Mr. FRAZER.—How does the honorable member reconcile that statement with the fact that they have raised the price by 1s. 6d. since the imposition of these duties?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—When the old Victorian duty was abolished Messrs. Nobel and Company reduced prices to such an extent that the local factories had to sell below the cost of production. Their representatives candidly admitted that they desired a duty to enable them to carry on their business. They frankly said that if the importers raised their prices to the extent of the duty imposed they would also be forced to do so, but that otherwise they would be unable to do so. The inference is irresistible that the importing firms first raised their prices and that the local manufacturers did likewise. After all, if they did they merely brought up the price to the normal level at which the local manufacturers were able to make both ends meet, whilst the Victorian Tariff was in operation. I would remind honorable members in the Labour Party that the two factories in Victoria are carried on under the Wages Board system, and are subject to periodical inspection by factory inspectors. They provide excellent accommodation for their employes, and extend to them the very best treatment. It is stated that they recognise the eight hours' system and pay good wages. The rates of wages paid here are much higher than those prevailing in England and on the Continent. We cannot expect the

production of fuse any more than the production of any other commodity in Australia under Australian conditions to be as cheap as it is in England or on the Continent. If there has been a slight increase in the price—which I do not admit—it may be justified by the fact that the local factories have to comply with the strict conditions imposed by the State industrial laws. For the safe conduct of mining operations, there can be no doubt that it is necessary that the best fuse should be used. I have in my hand a report from Mr. Hake, the Chief Inspector of Explosives in Victoria, which was furnished to me specially, in order that I might read it to the Committee when this item came up for discussion. Amongst other things, he says—

One important advantage of a local fuse factory is that the fuse is manufactured and issued direct to the mines in a fresh condition, long storage and exposure to extreme variations of temperature being avoided.

Mr. HEDGES.—That is an argument in favour of the consumption in Victoria of fuse manufactured in this State.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—It is an argument in favour of its production in Victoria, where it can be transferred to other parts of the Commonwealth within a very short time after it has been manufactured, as against the importation of fuse manufactured abroad. Another argument used by Mr. Hake is that the production of fuse should be promoted as one of the elements and features of national defence, because, in all probability, on the outbreak of hostilities, fuse would be declared contraband of war, and oversea supplies would be liable to seizure. I use that as an argument to show that we should not allow these local fuse factories to be wiped out. The Tariff Commission had the assurance of the representative of the Bendigo factory, in which over £20,000 has been spent, that unless this duty were imposed in order to level up prices, the factory would have to be closed, and all the hands turned adrift.

Mr. WILSON.—We have heard that statement about every factory in Australia.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—I would remind the honorable member for Corangamite that this is a Victorian industry.

Mr. FRAZER.—Otherwise we should not have this special pleading in support of it.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—I have fought for industries in Western Australia, in Queensland, and in the other States as well as for

Victorian industries, and I feel that I am justified in fighting for this industry, which is the only one specially identified with the Bendigo district. I shall think it very unfair if protectionist members of the Committee vote against this duty. As regards the price of fuse, I venture to say that if the local fuse factories were closed up, as I have every reason to believe they would be, as a result of the rejection of this duty, Nobel and Company, and the continental fuse-makers, having a monopoly of the market, would charge the mining companies what they thought fit for their fuse, and the price, instead of being reduced, would go up. I say that since fuse has been manufactured in Australia the average price has gone down, and the mining community has had the benefit of a better, as well as of a cheaper, fuse.

Mr. FRAZER.—The price soon went up 18d. a dozen after this Tariff was announced.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—It went up to a normal figure. Surely the honorable member does not desire that those employed in fuse factories in Australia should be sweated, or that the manufacturers should have to carry on the industry at a loss. They are carrying on at a loss at the present time.

Mr. WATSON.—What increase upon the old duty does the honorable member propose?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—Under the Victorian Tariff the duty was 1d. per coil. The Kingston Tariff when first introduced contained a proposal for the same duty. I think it would mean an increase of about 20 per cent. If this small duty is not agreed to for the protection of an industry in which over £20,000 has been expended on one factory at Bendigo and over £10,000 on another at Footscray, the probability is that those factories will be closed up, and the mining companies must take the consequences. I appeal to protectionists in the Committee not to desert me on this item. I can appeal to labour members especially to support an industry which pays the very best wages. On this subject I can quote from the report sent to me by Mr. Hake, who visited the Bendigo factory. He says—

I found on my first inspection that the factory was established on the right lines, and carefully conducted from the point of view of safety to the workpeople engaged in the

factory. Improvements in the factory for the better safety of the workpeople have been gradually extended since 1890. Many of these, although not required under the Act, have been carried out by the proprietor on his own initiative and at his cost. In my opinion, the factory compares favorably with any fuse factory in the world both as regards precautions taken to prevent accidents and the general efficiency of the machinery.

Mr. FRAZER.—And this was done under free-trade.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—Not at all. This factory was established under the Victorian Tariff of 1d. per coil. Since its establishment Nobel and Company have appeared in the field in competition with the local factories, and they have proclaimed their deliberate design and intention to acquire a monopoly of the market for fuse in Australia. I warn the Committee, and mining members especially, that if this duty is reduced the disaster caused by the closing up of the local factory will overtake them, and they will regret the day they voted against the proposal I make.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [2.16 a.m.].—I regret very much to hear the extravagant language used by the honorable member for Bendigo in regard to this matter. I must say that I was not aware of what he has said with respect to Nobel and Company, nor was I aware that there was a fuse factory in his own constituency. I thought that the duty proposed was rather high. I find that, as the honorable member for Bendigo has said, the duty under the Victorian Tariff was 1d. per coil of 24 feet. In Queensland, New South Wales, and South Australia, fuse was free. In Tasmania there was a duty of 20 per cent. imposed, and in Western Australia the article was free.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—There were no factories in the other States.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not wish to take from this industry a fair measure of protection. I have had to decide the matter as best I could, and the honorable member for Bourke informed me that he thought a certain duty would be carried.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—The honorable member did not consult me about it. Was that fair?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not know whether he did or not. He told me that a certain duty would be carried, and I did not wish to delay the Committee. I did not know the honorable member for Bendigo felt so keenly on the matter.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—I do feel keenly in the matter, and I have helped the Treasurer in many difficult situations.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The honorable gentleman never said a word about the matter to me.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—I did not think the honorable gentleman was going to abandon the duty he proposed.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I had no information at all from the honorable member in regard to the matter. After looking at the duties imposed under the States Tariffs, I thought that the duty proposed was a high duty. It may be that present conditions are different from those which existed when the States Tariffs were in operation, but I do not think the honorable member for Bendigo has been quite fair in blaming me for agreeing to a proposal which seemed to me to be a reasonable one. I was informed some hours ago that there would be a fight over the duty on fuse.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—Who told the honorable gentleman that?

Mr. BOWDEN.—I did.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—Is the honorable member for Nepean the boss of the Committee?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I wish to tell the honorable member for Bendigo what happened, because I do not want him to feel that I deserted him in any way.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—It looked like it.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The honorable member was not fair or just. I am not going to take that sort of statement from him. Whilst I thank him for helping the Government in the way that he has done, I will not submit quietly to attacks such as he made on me just now. I must have some discretion in the conduct of business.

Mr. THOMAS.—Was the honorable member for Bendigo supporting you because he thought you were right, or merely because he thought he could get a concession for a Bendigo industry?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I will not cast that reflection on the honorable member, but he should know that the honorable member for Barrier, the honorable member for Coolgardie, the honorable member for Nepean, and one or two other honorable members, came to me about this matter, and that caused me to ascertain what the duties had been in the past.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—Did any protectionist member ask the honorable member to abandon this proposal?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not know that he did; but I have to use my own discretion, and sometimes I must act quickly. I felt that the honorable member for Bendigo was very unfair to me.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—I think the honorable member was unfair to me.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—If the honorable member had said a word to me about it, I should have known exactly what his views were.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—I did not think it necessary to ask the Treasurer to support his own Tariff.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE. — I have had several times to agree to reductions, but in this particular case, when I found out that Victoria was the only State that had a duty of 1d. per coil, that one other State had a duty of 20 per cent., and that in the case of all the others the article was free, I began to think that this duty was high. I am quite prepared to test the feeling of the Committee on a division. I regret the honorable member for Bendigo has shown so much heat as to the action I took.

Mr. HEDGES (Fremantle) [2.22 a.m.]. There are many sides to this question, and the honorable member for Bendigo has made a great mistake in stating the case as he has done. This duty strikes a heavy blow at the mining industry. During 1906 1,214,206 coils of fuse were imported into Australia. A duty of 1d. per coil on that would have amounted to £5,000. The Tariff Commission actually recommended a duty on powder and tape, which are the principal raw materials from which fuse is made.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—We recommended that for the protection of other industries.

Mr. HEDGES.—There is no consistency in that attitude. If the Commission had recommended free powder to make cheap fuse, there would have been some sense in it. But I fail to see how the Commission could recommend a duty on powder and then expect the mining industry to get cheap fuse. Fuse of the very best quality is essential for mining. The chief mining of Australia is not carried on in Victoria, but in the other States. Why should we in other States be taxed so that a little fuse can be made in Victoria? The proposition which the Treasurer has accepted is sensible, and, in the best interests of Australian mining, although, perhaps,

not altogether of Victoria, but we are here to legislate for Australia, and not for any particular State.

Mr. HUTCHISON (Hindmarsh) [2.27 a.m.].—This is not a South Australian industry; but I am entirely in accord with the honorable member for Bendigo. I am surprised that the Minister has agreed to such a reduction. It is strange that honorable members calling themselves protectionists should be so anxious to destroy one of the best paid industries that we have. The honorable member for Fremantle said that the duty on the total imports last year would have meant £5,000. The object of the Tariff is to allow people to escape the duty by purchasing the local article.

Mr. HEDGES.—The local article has gone up by more than the duty proposed.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—The honorable member for Bendigo explained how that happened. The Nobel Company has only been doing what has been done in many other cases—dumping and undercutting, in order to destroy the local industry, to secure the whole field to itself, and then put the price up to a much higher figure. If any honorable member can show that it is dangerous to use the fuse made by these two Australian factories, it will be an argument for reducing the duty.

Mr. THOMAS.—It is very good fuse.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—If we are able to make good fuse, as the honorable member says, the people of Australia ought to use that and no other. This is a well-paid industry. We have had too few of that kind, a large number paying good wages only under compulsion. I am prepared to give a fair measure of protection to every well-paid industry. The Minister said that he gave way because there were no duties in the States, except in Victoria and Tasmania. That is no argument at all. The reason that there was no duty in any of the other States except those named was that an impost would have been a handicap to the miners in those States. Under the circumstances, it was thought better to leave fuse free, so as to bring it into competition with the fuse made in the Old Country. I am prepared to support the honorable member for Bendigo; and I hope every good protectionist will do the same. I have, without any protest, agreed to reductions that I thought altogether unjustifiable, in view of

the evidence given before the Tariff Commission; but this is a reduction to which I cannot consent. I hope the honorable member for Bendigo will adhere to the duties proposed in the Tariff.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—Certainly; I shall divide the Committee on the question.

Mr. CROUCH (Corio) [2.32 a.m.].—I think the attitude of the Treasurer towards the honorable member for Bendigo is very regrettable. The honorable member made a very proper request that this industry, being a Victorian industry, and in his constituency, should be considered.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The honorable member did not make that request to me.

Mr. CROUCH.—But the Treasurer replied as though the honorable member for Bendigo had made some improper demand when he objected to the extinction of this industry. On the other hand, when the honorable member for Kalgoorlie made a request, the Treasurer, in order to save time, and himself some trouble, at once agreed to reduce the duty; and, in view of the fact that the honorable gentleman did this without knowing anything of the Victorian industry, he deserves some blame.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I never expect anything but blame from the honorable member, rightly or wrongly!

Mr. CROUCH.—In this case, I think the Minister is rightly blamed. When we ask the reason for the Minister's attitude, we find that he has ascertained that before Federation, Victoria was practically the only Colony in which there was protection in this connexion. It was because of that protection that Victoria was the only Colony in which there was a fuse factory; and I am glad that the honorable member for Bendigo intends to divide the Committee on the question. We ought to remember that the wages paid in this industry in Victoria are double those paid in England; and that in itself is sufficient justification for a duty. Any one who knows the methods of importers, and especially the Nobel Company, realize that, if the Victorian industry were extinguished, the mining industry, instead of gaining, would lose, because prices would be at once raised, with a view to wiping off the losses caused by the local competition. The miners of Ballarat, Bendigo, Blackwood, and other places are only too glad to have this Victorian factory in operation, because it means to them better and cheaper fuse. As a matter of fact, this Australian industry, by means of its safer product, is a

protection to the Australian miner; and it is most unfortunate that the Minister should agree so readily to a suggestion which may lead to its extinction. I trust that the honorable gentleman will be convinced by the arguments of the honorable member for Bendigo, and, at least, agree to duties of 1½d. and 1d.

Mr. FRAZER (Kalgoorlie) [2.36 a.m.].—I am surprised at the debate which has followed the attempt of the Treasurer to do what is fair in reference to this item; also at the opinion which has been expressed that the extinction of the industry will follow a reduction of the duty. When this item was discussed on the passing of the last Tariff, Parliament distinctly refused to make this article dutiable; but the result has not been the wiping out of the industry.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—The evidence given before the Commission was that the industry has had a precarious existence.

Mr. FRAZER.—Does the honorable member suggest that those who conduct this industry have turned philanthropists, and are carrying it on in the interests of the mining propositions of Australia! We know that if they were not making a profit they would not continue the enterprise. The honorable member for Corio has told us that this is one of the well-paid industries of the country.

Mr. CROUCH.—What I said was that the wages paid are double those in England.

Mr. FRAZER.—I find from the Victorian Factories Inspector's report that of the male employes, there is one at the magnificent wage of 5s. per week, three at 7s. per week—

Mr. CROUCH.—Does the honorable member say that these employes are men?

Mr. FRAZER.—I did not speak of men, but of males. However, I can give the ages of the employes if the honorable member insists. There is a boy of thirteen, who ought to be at school, and he is paid 5s. a week. There are three lads of fourteen years of age, who are in receipt of 7s. per week, and nine, of fifteen years, who get 9s. 6d. per week.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—That is more than women are paid in some factories.

Mr. FRAZER.—If this is one of the well-paid industries of the Commonwealth, the Lord save us from the poorly-paid industries. In order to encourage the manufacture of fuse, it is proposed to levy a tax of £6,000 per annum upon the mining industry, which does pay decent wages to

men. I find that there are fifty-nine males employed in the fuse industry at an average wage of 38s. 1d. weekly. The wages of the females in the industry range from 9s. 6d. to 16s. 8d. Altogether, there are 171 hands engaged, at an average wage of £1 os. 8d. per week. I hold in my hand communications from the Secretary of the Miners' Union of Western Australia, and from the Chamber of Mines there, to the effect that, taking advantage of the increased duty proposed, Messrs. Bickford and Smith, of Bendigo, immediately increased the price of the locally-manufactured fuse from 4s. 6d. to 6s. per dozen coils.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [2.44 a.m.].—In reply to the honorable member's remarks, I merely wish to say that I have been informed by several honorable members that the course which I have adopted on the present occasion has had the effect of preventing fuse from being placed upon the free list.

Mr. COON (Batman) [2.45 a.m.].—I congratulate the honorable member for Kalgoorlie upon his excellent free-trade speech.

Mr. FRAZER.—Congratulations from the honorable member are not a recommendation.

Mr. COON.—The production of fuse is a Victorian industry. It was established here in 1871, when a 20 per cent. duty was operative. Before long, however, it was found necessary to substitute a specific duty of 1d. per coil. What did the foreign manufacturer do? He dumped his inferior fuse into this State to such an extent that the Government found it necessary to increase the duty to 1½d. per coil. I should like honorable members to recall the number of accidents which resulted from the use of imported fuse at the period of which I am speaking. When the industry was first established in Victoria, the price of fuse was 1s. per coil, but it has since been reduced to 7d. per coil. A little while ago, tenders were called for the supply of fuse to the Broken Hill mines. What happened? Although the price of the imported article was 8s. 6d. per dozen coils, a firm at Footscray which tendered to supply the fuse at 6s. 4d. per dozen coils was beaten by an importing firm which desired to get hold of the market.

Mr. THOMAS.—What was the name of the importing firm?

Mr. COON.—I do not know. In Germany, the duty upon fuse is 1s. 4d. per

dozen coils, and in the United States it is 30 per cent. I regret that the Treasurer should have practically agreed to take off the duty proposed the moment he was approached by a free-trader in the person of the honorable member for Nepean. The honorable member for Kalgoorlie then moved a reduction of the duty by 100 per cent., and the Treasurer consented to accept his proposal without even putting up a fight. I do not intend to allow any Australian industry to be wiped out if I can prevent it, and if the honorable member for Bendigo divides the Committee upon this question I shall be found supporting him.

Mr. SALMON (Laanecoorie) [2.50 a.m.].—I am sorry that so much heat has been imported into the consideration of this proposal. I regret that the Treasurer should have made the premature announcement which he did. I am sorry that he did not follow the usual course of allowing at least some discussion.

Mr. STORRER.—He knew that he could not get more.

Mr. SALMON.—If he had told us that I should not have complained. With regard to the item itself, I remember the discussion in the Victorian Assembly in 1895, when a duty was agreed to which allowed the manufacture of fuse to be successfully carried on in this State. Until fuse was manufactured here, mining was carried on in many districts at great risk, and there are men who to-day bear the marks of wounds received from the use of faulty fuse. Those who have been associated with mining districts, as I have been from my birth, must have been struck with the immunity from disaster of recent times compared with the frequency of accidents in the old days. Nothing gives a greater shock to the community than a large mining accident. To-day is the twenty-fifth anniversary of the greatest mining calamity that we have had in Victoria—that which took place at the Australasian Mine, Creswick. I am firmly convinced, of my own knowledge, that what has been said as to the probable effect of the reduction of the duty in closing the works in which fuse is made locally is absolutely correct. As a corollary there will be an increase in the price of fuse. Those who pose as the friend of the miner, and wish to lessen the chances of accidents, will find that they have been sharpening a sword against themselves, and placing the industry

in the hands of that great monopoly, the Nobel Company. Honorable members seem disposed to give a certain amount of encouragement to the mining industry, but in this instance they are grasping at the shadow and losing the substance. I would remind those who seem to have forgotten their protectionist principles that the way to keep down prices is to stimulate healthy competition. Without competition there must be monopolies, combinations and rings for the plundering of the consumer. Those who wish to assist the mining industry by giving a cheap fuse, and to maintain a subsidiary industry, will vote for a reasonable duty on this item. By doing so they will make the miners and timber getters of the country, who desire cheap fuse, independent of makers on the other side of the world who in the past have not been considerate of their wants.

Mr. THOMAS (Barrier) [2.55 a.m.].—It is only fair to say that the Treasurer agreed to duties of $\frac{3}{4}$ d. and $\frac{1}{2}$ d. because he felt that, if he did not, the item would be made free. I am anxious that the making of safety fuses should be carried on in Australia, but as the honorable members for Batman and Bendigo have told us something of the history of the industry here, I wish to add a little more. For the facts which I am about to relate I am indebted to a speech made by the honorable member for Bendigo, when in the first Parliament he endeavoured to retain a duty on fuse which had been imposed by the Victorian Parliament. Under the Victorian duty a man named Perry commenced to make fuse at Bendigo, and he made a very good article. Messrs. Bickford, Smith and Company, the large English makers, offered to buy him out, but he would not sell because he was making a fair thing. Very little manual labour is employed in the making of fuses, most of the work being done by machinery.

Mr. FRAZER.—With the help of girls.

Mr. THOMAS.—Yes. When Perry refused a second offer, Messrs. Bickford, Smith and Company threatened that if he would not sell they would crush him out. They showed him that they had ten factories, and that they could afford to run one of them without making a profit in order to compel him to sell. I mention this case because we have heard of what the Nobel Company will do if the proposed duty is not imposed. The outcome was that Mr.

Perry had to sell his factory to Bickford, Smith and Company, a Cornish firm.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—Do we not want English firms to establish factories in Australia?

Mr. THOMAS.—I am not objecting to that, but merely stating that the Bendigo factory is practically a branch of that Cornish firm. It cares very little whether we impose a duty or not, because, in those countries where a duty is imposed, it establishes a factory and secures the profit. I admit that a certain amount of labour is employed in the production of the fuse, but the profit goes to the firm. It sends out no fuse unless it is of a first-class character. I am not anxious that the factories at Bendigo and Footscray should have to "shut down," and, therefore, I am prepared to support duties of $\frac{3}{4}$ d. and $\frac{1}{2}$ d. per coil. We are told by the honorable member for Laanecoorie that if they did cease to exist, there would be no competition, because Nobel and Company enjoy a monopoly. Nobel and Company, and Bickford, Smith and Company are fighting one another, and that fight would not cease merely because the Bendigo branch of the latter firm was closed. I am anxious to see the business carried on in Australia, especially by Perry and Company, who, I think, were treated badly by Bickford, Smith and Company. I have nothing to say against the Bendigo fuse, because, in my opinion, it is very good. If I thought that with duties of $\frac{3}{4}$ d. and $\frac{1}{2}$ d. per coil the local factories would have to close, I should be prepared to give them a little more protection; but I do not think it is necessary. I ask the honorable member for Bendigo to say how much manual labour goes to make a coil of fuse?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—They pay £5,000 a year in wages.

Mr. THOMAS.—I believe that the labour cost is considerably less than $\frac{1}{2}$ d. per coil, and I consider that if we give the makers a protection of $\frac{3}{4}$ d. and $\frac{1}{2}$ d. per coil, we shall give them ample protection, and put them in a position to produce good fuse and pay decent wages.

Mr. SPENCE (Darling) [3.7 a.m.].—In my opinion, the Treasurer has offered a very fair compromise. He has given some consideration, though not a great deal, to the mining industry. Mr. Perry informed the Tariff Commission that when all his machines were in full work, he had employed twenty-three hands; but that then

he had only eleven. On the question of profits, he said that he was only selling at a slight profit, and that when it turned to a loss he would shut down. Fuse was then on the free list, and, therefore, the statement that he was working at a loss is not proved. He said he was selling at only a slight profit, but he made no reference to a loss.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—I was referring to the Bendigo factory.

Mr. SPENCE.—At this factory, although there was not full work, they were able to sell at a profit, even without a duty on the imported article. In answer to question 99402, Mr. Timson said that he estimated the proportion of the cost of fuse represented by labour at not more than $\frac{1}{2}$ d. per coil, or at about 10 per cent. of the value of the finished article. In his evidence, Mr. Perry said that the fuse was made by machinery as nearly perfect as could be, although the same kind of machines had been in use since 1870. He stated that there was so little labour employed, that $\frac{1}{2}$ d. per coil was estimated to cover the labour cost. Mr. Burgess said that he was selling fuse "at very near cost" in the northern markets of Australia, and was not getting the profit there which he obtained in Victoria. That, he added, was due to the keenness of foreign competition; the market had either to be met or lost. He could only compete in Western Australia by taking the price of the market there. Regarding the New Zealand trade, Mr. Perry said that he got a better price in that Colony than in Victoria. These quotations show that the statement that the manufacturers will close up, and especially if we place fuse on the free list, are not substantiated. I admit that the Victorian fuse has a very good name. Some of the imported fuse is not so good; but, generally speaking, the fuse that is used in Australia is of good quality. The reason why so many accidents do not occur in the use of fuse nowadays is not so much on account of an improvement in the article as because the supervision is better, and more responsibility is placed upon the men and the bosses. The compromise proposed is a very fair one. The protection proposed to be afforded to the makers will give them a larger market and more profit, whilst the mining industry will not be heavily burdened.

Mr. CROUCH (Corio) [3.13 a.m.]—Shall I be in order in moving that the item be postponed?

The CHAIRMAN.—The honorable member can move to that effect.

Mr. CROUCH.—Then I move—

That the item be postponed until after the consideration of item 152 (stripper harvesters).

I think we ought to have the Prime Minister present when we come to a vote on this important matter. Probably no honorable member knows more about the subject than the honorable member for Bendigo, and he realizes how important the industry is, but we should have the Prime Minister present to express the views of the Government concerning it, especially as he represents a mining constituency. In reply to the remarks of the honorable member for Kalgoorlie, I should like to say that the wages paid in the fuse industry are not so low as he sought to convey. The report of the Victorian Factories Inspector, for the year ended 31st December, 1906, shows that thirty-five men employed in the industry received an average of 53s. 10d. per week.

Mr. FRAZER.—I quoted those figures.

Mr. CROUCH.—I do not remember that the honorable member did, though I accept his statement. I have looked through the figures for eighty-three trades in Victoria, for which average wages are given, and I can find only four instances in which higher wages are paid on an average than 53s. 10d. per week.

Mr. HEDGES.—What does the honorable member know about fuse?

Mr. CROUCH.—The miners in my electorate use considerable quantities of it. I do not suppose that the honorable member for Fremantle has a miner in his constituency, and probably all that he knows about fuse has been learnt from seeing a little of it on the wharves at Fremantle.

Mr. HEDGES (Fremantle) [3.18 a.m.]—I will not suffer the remarks of the honorable member for Corio to pass without challenge. I suppose I have bought and used more fuse than any other member of this House. I always buy the best quality of fuse, and have never had an accident. The statements that have been made about the inferior quality of imported fuse are so much silly twaddle. There is no danger in using fuse, except, perhaps, when it falls into the hands of a person as inexperienced as the honorable member for Corio. Otherwise it is quite harmless. A representative of

Bickford, Smith and Company stated before the Tariff Commission that unless they were allowed to charge more for their fuse the extra duty would be of no use to them.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—Because they had been selling at a losing price.

Mr. HEDGES.—Was not Australia going ahead in mining before Bickford's started to make fuse in Victoria? As a matter of fact, the price has been increased since the extra duty has been imposed. I hope the Committee will decide to give Australia fuse at a reasonable price to the advantage of one of the biggest industries that we have.

Question—That after the figures "1½d.," paragraph c, the words "and on and after 12th December, 1907, per coil (General Tariff), ¾d." be inserted; and after the figure "1d." the words "and on and after 12th December, 1907, per coil (United Kingdom), ½d.," be inserted (Mr. FRAZER'S amendment)—put. The Committee divided.

Ayes ... 30

Noes ... 19

Majority ... 11

AYES.

Archer, E. W.
Batchelor, E. L.
Bowden, E. K.
Brown, Thomas
Catts, J. H.
Chapman, Austin
Cook, Joseph
Ewing, T. T.
Foxton, Colonel
Frazer, C. E.
Groom, L. E.
Hedges, W. N.
Johnson, W. E.
Liddell, F.
Livingston, J.
Lyne, Sir William

Mahon, H.
McWilliams, W. J.
Palmer, A. C.
Poynton, A.
Sinclair, H.
Spence, W. G.
Storror, D.
Thomas, J.
Thomson, Dugald
Thomson, John
Willis, Henry
Wilson, J. G.

Tellers:

Atkinson, L.
Cook, Hume

NOES.

Carr, E. S.
Chanter, J. M.
Coon, J.
Foster, F. J.
Hutchison, J.
Irvine, Hans
Maloney, W. R. N.
Mathews, J.
McDougall, J. K.
Page, J.

Quick, Sir John
Salmon, C. C.
Sampson, S.
Tudor, F. G.
Watson, J. C.
Webster, W.
Wise, G. H.
Bamford, F. W.
Crouch, R. A.

Question so resolved in the affirmative.

Amendments agreed to.

Paragraph, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraph (D). Powder, sporting, per lb. (General Tariff), 4½d.; (United Kingdom), 4d.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That after the figures "4½d.," the words "and on and after 12th December, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 5 per cent.," be inserted; and after the figure "4d.," the words "and on and after 12th December, 1907 (United Kingdom), free," be inserted.

Paragraph, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraph E. Wads for cartridges, ad val. (General Tariff), 25 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 20 per cent.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That after the words "25 per cent.," the words "and on and after 12th December, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 5 per cent.," be inserted; and that after the words "20 per cent.," the words "and on and after 12th December, 1907 (United Kingdom), free," be inserted.

Paragraph, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraph F. Caps, Percussion, ad val. (General Tariff), 5 per cent.; (United Kingdom), free.

Mr. CHANTER (Riverina) [3.31 a.m.].—I ask whether the Government do not propose on this item to accept the recommendation of the free-trade section of the Tariff Commission. They recommended a duty of 10 per cent. I think the Government should follow their recommendation, and that free-traders in the Committee should be true to their principles, and support that recommendation.

Paragraph agreed to.

Paragraph G. Cartridges, Military, ad val. (General Tariff), 5 per cent.; (United Kingdom), free.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That the word "Military" be left out, with a view to insert in lieu thereof the words "for military purposes."

Paragraph, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraphs H (Detonators); I (Cartridge Cases, empty, capped or uncapped); J (Fuse cotton)—agreed to.

Paragraph K. Fuses, Electrical, ad val. (General Tariff), 5 per cent.; (United Kingdom), free.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That the word "Mining" be inserted before the word "fuses."

Paragraph, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraph L (Explosives, n.e.i.) agreed to.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [3.34 a.m.].—I move—

That the following new item be inserted to follow item 406 :—

406A. On and after 12th December, 1907—Carbon bisulphide, ad val. (General Tariff), 15 per cent.

This amendment has been recommended to me by the Department. The information I have is that almost the whole of the carbon bisulphide that is used in Australia is made here. I wish to have a protective duty on the article, in order that the whole of it may be made here.

Mr. SAMPSON (Wimmera) [3.35 a.m.].—Before this item is passed, the Committee should be satisfied that carbon bisulphide can be manufactured in Australia.

Mr. SALMON.—It is commercially manufactured here, and has to compete under great disadvantages with the imported article.

Mr. SAMPSON.—This article is on the same footing as wire-netting, as it is used for the wholesale destruction of rabbits. It is a poison which is placed in the rabbit burrows, and is also used for dissolving phosphorus and other material used for the purpose of rabbit destruction. Unless it is shown that the article is being produced locally as cheaply as it can be imported, I shall vote against the item.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [3.37 a.m.].—If the honorable member for Wimmera had time to make inquiries, he would find that what I have said is absolutely correct. I know a person who uses a lot of this carbon bisulphide, and every bit of it that he buys is made in Australia.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—What is the value of the article?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I bought some when I was last in Tasmania; but I cannot just now remember what price was charged for it. Armstrong and Company, of Sydney, are agents in New South Wales for the supply of the article, and they also manufacture it. I think that it is manufactured in Melbourne as well.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I asked the value in order to know what the duty would amount to.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I bought some of the article in Tasmania because the carbon bisulphide manufactured in that State was said to be very good. The Australian

article is better than the imported article and can be carried and mixed without danger.

Mr. WILSON.—It must be strange bisulphide if it can be carried without danger.

Mr. SAMPSON.—It is an explosive.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I know as well as honorable members opposite what it is, because I have used it over and over again. There is not very much of this article imported, and the local article is preferred by those who use it.

Mr. WILSON (Corangamite) [3.39 a.m.].—The Minister has given no justification for the insertion of this new item.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I would sooner that honorable members rejected it at once than that they should waste time over it.

Mr. SALMON (Laanecoorie) [3.39 a.m.].—I wish to tell honorable members that this preparation is made in Australia in connexion with the industry for the manufacture of manures. I hope that professing protectionists will not say that it is too late to insert a new paragraph, but will consider the proposal on its merits. A very small duty is asked for, for the sake of an industry which is well worth considering.

Mr. HANS IRVINE (Grampians) [3.41 a.m.].—The Treasurer should not propose a new line at this stage. Rabbits are worse this year in Victoria and New South Wales than I have seen them during the last fifteen years. Many farmers use bisulphide of carbon to kill them.

Mr. BATCHELOR (Boothby) [3.42 a.m.].—I would feel disposed in ordinary circumstances to vote for the Treasurer's proposal, but I am afraid to agree to propositions trotted out at the last minute, lest we put ourselves in the same position as we did the other night in the case of muriate of ammonia. We put a duty on that, although it was previously free, and now there is trouble all over the Commonwealth.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I have not heard a word about it.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—The Treasurer will hear it shortly. I have been inundated with letters. Muriate of ammonia is one of the principal ingredients in galvanizing, and the duty is a severe blow at the galvanized-iron industry.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—If they can convince me of that, I will see whether I cannot repair the error in some way.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—That instance shows how difficult it is to make up one's mind on proposals of this kind put forward without notice. I do not know whether bisulphide of carbon is made here or not. It was alleged that muriate of ammonia was made somewhere in Australia, but, so far as I can find, that is not so.

Mr. WILSON (Corangamite) [3.44 a.m.].—The Minister is taking an unreasonable course. This chemical is used very largely for dissolving rubber. I cannot say definitely whether it is made here or not. In the days of my apprenticeship, it was all imported. It is highly explosive, and its fumes are very dangerous. It is used largely throughout the Commonwealth for the destruction of rabbits.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I am not going to have a long debate about it.

Proposed new item negated.

Item 407. Cameras and Magic or Optical Lanterns, including lenses and accessories; Lantern Slides; Photographic Sensitized Films and Paper; Photographic Mounts; Photographic Backgrounds (mounted or unmounted); Photographs n.e.i.; Postcards (sensitized with or without letter press); Postcards (finished, with letter press); Powdered Magnesium; Sulphite of Soda; Metabisulphite of Soda; Metabisulphite of Potash, ad val. (General Tariff), 35 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 25 per cent.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) proposed—

That the words "Cameras and Magic or Optical Lanterns, including lenses and accessories," be left out.

Mr. POYNTON (Grey) [3.48 a.m.].—I received a wire yesterday from Sir Langdon Bonython asking me to endeavour to have stereoscopic views placed on the free list.

Mr. SALMON.—The Government intend to do that.

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) proposed—

That the letters "n.e.i." be left out, with a view to insert in lieu thereof the words "of Australian subjects."

Mr. WILSON (Corangamite) [3.52 a.m.].—I am not interested in this particular amendment, but I am interested in lantern slides; and I desire to show why they should be placed in the same category as photographs. Lantern slides of Australian subjects, which can be made here, ought to be dutiable, but lantern slides representing other places ought to be free.

Mr. SALMON.—Nine-tenths of the slides used in Australia are made here.

Mr. WILSON.—Suppose a lantern slide of Niagara Falls were required?

Mr. SALMON.—It can be made here.

Mr. WILSON.—I think not, except from a copy of a photograph; and we know that such a copy does not produce as good a slide as that made from an original negative. There are innumerable lantern slides which cannot be made here, or are not made here; and the proposed duty seems to me an excessive tax on an amusement of the people. I ask the Treasurer to withdraw his amendment, with which I think most honorable members are in agreement, in order to permit me to include lantern slides of Australian subjects.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—In order to save discussion I ask leave to withdraw my amendment temporarily.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment (by Mr. WILSON) proposed—

That after the words "lantern slides," the words "of Australian subjects" be inserted.

Mr. SALMON (Laanecoorie) [3.58 a.m.].—If this amendment be carried a great deal of work now done in the Commonwealth will be done elsewhere; and slides of all but Australian subjects will be admitted free. Over 80 per cent. of the lantern slides used in Australia are now made here; and I speak from considerable experience. The ordinary method of preparing slides of foreign pictures is to obtain a photograph from any part of the world, take a negative of it, and from that negative prepare the slide.

Amendment negated.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That the letters "n.e.i." be left out, with a view to insert in lieu thereof the words "of Australian subjects."

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That the words "Postcards (finished, with letter press)" be left out.

Mr. WILSON (Corangamite) [4.3 a.m.].—I desire some information in regard to powdered magnesium. This is an article which is largely used in connexion with flashlights.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—It is being made at Port Melbourne.

Mr. WILSON.—I do not think that it is manufactured in Australia. Of course, I am aware that magnesium is imported into the Commonwealth, and that the powdering is done here. That, however, is a very

different thing from manufacturing powdered magnesium. I move—

That the words "Powdered Magnesium; Sulphite of Soda; Metabisulphite of Soda; Metabisulphite of Potash," be left out.

Mr. MAUGER.—Those articles were subject to a duty of 20 per cent. under the old Tariff.

Mr. WILSON.—Not all of them.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. TUDOR (Yarra) [4.5 a.m.].—I ask the Treasurer to consent to the words "nitrate of silver and chloride of gold" being added to this item.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—All right.

Mr. TUDOR.—Then I move—

That after the word "Potash," the words "Nitrate of Silver and Chloride of Gold" be inserted.

Mr. WILSON (Corangamite) [4.6 a.m.].—Nitrate of silver and chloride of gold are not largely made in the Commonwealth.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—They are made here.

Mr. WILSON.—I have made nitrate of silver and chloride of gold myself in small quantities. But, as the honorable member for Laanecoorie must know, the best chloride of gold is imported.

Mr. SALMON.—I do not know it. I use the stuff which is made at Abbotsford.

Mr. MAUGER.—Why, Mr. Cliff, who belongs to the Working Men's College, makes these things.

Mr. WILSON.—A small quantity may be produced in Australia; but certainly not sufficient to supply our demands. The proposal of the honorable member for Yarra would have the effect of taxing an important industry to an abnormal extent.

Question.—That the words "nitrate of silver and chloride of gold" (Mr. TUDOR's amendment) be inserted—put. The Committee divided.

Ayes	24
Noes	15

Majority	9
----------	-----	-----	---

AYES.

Bamford, F. W.
Batchelor, E. L.
Carr, E. S.
Catts, J. H.
Chanter, J. M.
Chapman, Austin
Coom, J.
Crouch, R. A.
Ewing, T. T.
Foster, F. J.
Groom, L. E.
Lyne, Sir William
Maloney, W. R. N.

Mathews, J.
Mauger, S.
Page, J.
Salmon, C. C.
Sampson, S.
Storrer, D.
Tudor, F. G.
Watkins, D.
Wise, G. H.

Tellers:

Cook, Hume
Thomson, John

Archer, E. W.
Cook, Joseph
Foxton, Colonel
Hedges, W. N.
Irvine, Hans
Johnson, W. E.
Livingston, J.
Mahon, H.

NOES.

Palmer, A. C.
Poynton, A.
Sinclair, H.
Thomson, Dugald
Wilson, J. G.
Tellers:
Bowden, E. K.
McWilliams, W. J.

PAIRS.

Kingston, C. C.
Hall, D. R.
O'Malley, King
Frazer, C. E.
Hutchison, J.
Webster, W.
Deakin, A.
Fairbairn, G.
Harper, R.
Fisher, A.
McDougall, J. K.
Quick, Sir John
Watson, J. C.
Spence, W. G.

Kelly, W. H.
Reid, G. H.
Smith, Bruce
Fuller, G. W.
Brown, Tilley
Liddell, F.
Wilks, W. H.
Fowler, J. M.
Fysh, Sir Philip
Edwards, R.
Glynn, P. McM.
Willis, Henry
Thomas, J.
Hughes, W. M.

Question so resolved in the affirmative.

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment (by Mr. JOSEPH COOK) put—

That after the words "35 per cent.," the words "and on and after 1st December, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 25 per cent.," be inserted.

The Committee divided.

Ayes	15
Noes	23

Majority	8
----------	-----	-----	---

AYES.

Archer, E. W.
Cook, Joseph
Foxton, Colonel
Hedges, W. N.
Irvine, Hans
Johnson, W. E.
Livingston, J.
Mahon, H.

Palmer, A. C.
Sampson, S.
Sinclair, H.
Thomson, Dugald
Wilson, J. G.
Tellers:
Bowden, E. K.
McWilliams, W. J.

NOES.

Batchelor, E. L.
Carr, E. S.
Catts, J. H.
Chanter, J. M.
Chapman, Austin
Coom, J.
Crouch, R. A.
Ewing, T. T.
Foster, F. J.
Groom, L. E.
Lyne, Sir William
Maloney, W. R. N.

Mathews, J.
Mauger, S.
Page, J.
Salmon, C. C.
Storrer, D.
Thomson, John
Tudor, F. G.
Watson, J. C.
Wise, G. H.
Tellers:
Bamford, F. W.
Cook, Hume

PAIRS.

Brown, Tilley
Brown, Thomas
Wilks, W. H.
Edwards, R.
Fowler, J. M.
Forrest, Sir John
Fuller, G. W.
Fysh, Sir Philip
Glynn, P. McM.
Reid, G. H.
Kelly, W. H.
Liddell, F.
Smith, Bruce
Willis, Henry

Hutchison, J.
Spence, W. G.
Deakin, A.
Fisher, A.
Fairbairn, G.
Watkins, D.
Frazer, C. E.
Harper, R.
McDougall, J. K.
Hall, D. R.
Kingston, C. C.
Webster, W.
O'Malley, King
Quick, Sir John

Question so resolved in the negative.

Amendment negatived.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That after the words "35 per cent.," the words "and on and after 12th December, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 30 per cent.," be inserted.

Amendment (by Mr. JOSEPH COOK) proposed—

That after the words "25 per cent.," the words "and on and after 12th December, 1907, ad val. (United Kingdom), 20 per cent.," be inserted.

Mr. WILSON (Corangamite) [4.22 a.m.].—I appeal to the Minister to preserve the preference of 10 per cent. which he proposed when he submitted this item. The duty in the general Tariff has just been reduced from 35 to 30 per cent., and I suggest that the duty in the preferential Tariff should be reduced to 20 per cent.

Mr. STORRER.—What we have been doing right through has been to give a preference of 5 per cent.

Mr. WILSON.—We have given a preference of more than 5 per cent. in some cases.

Amendment negatived.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That the following new item be inserted:—

407A. Cameras and Magic or Optical Lanterns, including lenses and accessories, ad val. (General Tariff), 35 per cent., and on and after 12th December, 1907, 5 per cent.; ad. val. (United Kingdom), 25 per cent., and on and after 12th December, 1907, free.

Item 408. Photographic accessories, rubber, not being integral parts of cameras, ad val. (General Tariff), 30 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 20 per cent.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) proposed—

That the word "of" be inserted after the word "accessories."

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta [4.25 a.m.]).—I should like the Treasurer to explain what photographic accessories are?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The cloths and things which do not belong exactly to the camera.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Does the honorable gentleman mean the black covering which is put over the camera?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Yes, and other things.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The honorable gentleman is actually proposing to put a duty of 30 per cent. on the black cloth which is put over the head of the photographer. Could absurdity go further?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—It includes the rubber article, too.

Mr. WILSON.—The only objection is that the duty proposed is too high.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—In order to bring this item into unison with other rubber items, I shall ask the Committee to reduce the duty from 30 to 25 per cent. in the general Tariff.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I suppose that I ought to be thankful to the honorable gentleman for that small mercy.

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That after the words "30 per cent.," the words "and on and after 12th December, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff) 25 per cent.," be inserted.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 409. Photographic Dry-plates and Negatives, ad val. (General Tariff), 5 per cent.; (United Kingdom), free.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [4.29 a.m.].—I want the Treasurer to explain to me what a dry-plate is. I think that he ought to voluntarily explain these articles to the Committee. Apparently, he knows only enough to tax them.

Mr. SALMON (Laanecoorie) [4.30 a.m.].—These goods paid 15 per cent. under the old Tariff. They are being manufactured in the Commonwealth. No evidence with regard to them was given before the Tariff Commission, but since the Commission took evidence the largest manufacturers of photographic dry plates in the world have made arrangements to establish a factory in the Commonwealth. Under these circumstances, I ask the Minister to consider whether duties of 25 per cent. and 20 per cent. should not be imposed.

Mr. TUDOR (Yarra) [4.31 a.m.].—We charge the manufacturers of photographic dry plates on their glass and their gelatine, but we propose to make the finished article free when imported from the United Kingdom. Surely that is a mistake.

Amendments (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That after the words "5 per cent.," the words "and on and after 12th December, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 20 per cent.," be inserted; and that after the word "free," the words "and on and after 12th December, 1907 (United Kingdom), 15 per cent.," be added.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 410. Prepared Plates for Engravers and Lithographers, ad val. (General Tariff), 5 per cent.; (United Kingdom), free.

Mr. MAHON (Coolgardie) [4.35 a.m.].—There seems to be no reason why engravers' plates should not be prepared in the Commonwealth. This is purely a city industry, and we have been taxing country industries in all directions. Surely engravers and lithographers are entitled to pay something on some of their requisites, especially as we have taxed the country printer on everything he uses except his paper.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—What duty does the honorable member ask for?

Mr. MAHON.—I think that these plates could stand a higher duty than 5 per cent.

Mr. JOHNSON.—If there is to be a higher duty there will be considerable debate.

Mr. CROUCH.—Are these plates made in Australia?

Mr. MAHON.—I cannot say that they are, but they ought to be made here. There is nothing difficult about their preparation. However, if an amendment would lead to discussion I shall drop the suggestion.

Item agreed to.

Item 411. Smoking Pipes n.e.i. and Cigar and Cigarette Holders and Accessories; Smokers' Requisites, including cases, Tobacco Pouches, Smokers' Sets, Boxes, Match Stands, Ash Trays, Smokers' Lamps, Cigar Stands and Lighters, ad val. (General Tariff), 30 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 20 per cent.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [4.37 a.m.].—Surely the Minister does not mean to adhere to these high duties on tobacco pipes and smokers' requisites?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Luxuries.

Mr. WILSON.—What? Smoking a luxury? It is an absolute necessity!

Mr. MAHON.—Duties of 25 per cent. and 20 per cent. would be quite enough.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Very well.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That after the words "30 per cent.," the words "and on and after 12th December, 1907 ad val. (General Tariff), 25 per cent.," be inserted.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 412. Clay Smoking Pipes, per gross, 1s.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [4.39 a.m.].—I am surprised at this item. We are actually proposing to tax the old clay pipe of the navy at the rate of 1s. per gross. I move—

That after the figure "1s.," the words "and on and after 12th December, 1907, per gross, 6d.," be inserted.

Mr. J. H. CATTS (Cook) [4.40 a.m.].—I think that the duty should be made 1s. 6d. on the general Tariff and 1s. in the second column. There is a clay pipe factory in the electorate of the honorable member for Parramatta, although he does not seem to be aware of it. About 30,000 gross are annually imported, and the competition against the local makers is very severe. We have a manufacturer of clay pipes in Parramatta, and also in Newtown, and I am assured that it is impossible for them, under existing circumstances, to continue to fight against their German competitors. On the other hand, if the duty were increased to 1s. 6d. on foreign imports, and 1s. per gross on imports from Great Britain, I am confident that the industry could be carried on successfully. The manufacturer at Newtown, Mr. Shaw, came from Great Britain some years ago, with the object of establishing the industry in Australia. He started operations in Victoria, and, failing to succeed, went to Sydney, where he has been struggling for some years to make a success of his business. I hope that the Treasurer will adopt my suggestion.

Mr. JOHNSON (Lang) [4.41 a.m.].—This is a proposal by a representative of the Labour Party to increase the price of the poor man's pipe. If the local manufacturers were under a disability, they had an opportunity to appear before the Tariff Commission, and to ask for higher duties. The protectionist section of the Commission recommended a duty of 1s. per gross, and that recommendation was adopted by the Government. Let the Minister stand by the duty originally proposed by him, and I shall refrain from further discussing the matter. If he adopts the suggestion of the honorable member for

Cook, I shall certainly have more to say on the subject.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) proposed—

That after the figure “1s.” the words “and on and after 12th December, 1907, per gross (General Tariff), 1s. 6d.” be added.

Mr. JOHNSON (Lang) [4.46 a.m.]—Will the Treasurer explain why he has proposed this increase?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I object to any one smoking a clay pipe.

Mr. JOHNSON.—It is all very well for the honorable member, who can smoke shilling cigars, to object to clay pipes, but what about those who cannot afford to buy any others? We were led to believe that these were non-contentious items, but the Treasurer has suddenly sprung this proposal on the Committee. If it be pressed just now to a division, he may find himself in a rather awkward position; some of my honorable friends may feel inclined to leave the Chamber. That is what he must expect when he makes such a proposal at this hour of the morning. Why is this increased duty sought by the manufacturers?

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—In order that they may obtain a footing in the market. They are selling now below the price charged by importers.

Mr. JOHNSON.—And how do they propose to obtain a footing on the market? How is this duty going to help them? Do they propose to sell at a still lower rate?

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—The honorable member is absolutely ridiculous.

Mr. JOHNSON.—I object to that remark.

The CHAIRMAN.—The honorable member must withdraw it.

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—I withdraw it.

Mr. JOHNSON.—I propose to read the evidence given before the Tariff Commission by Mr. Frederick Shaw, clay pipe manufacturer, of Wellington-street, North Botany. At page 561 of the Tariff Commission's Minutes of Evidence, honorable members will find the following—

What is your request in regard to the duty on pipes?—I wish a duty of 1s. per gross to be imposed in respect of all clay pipes. For fifteen years I was manufacturing clay pipes in Victoria.

In Melbourne?—Yes. I worked there with a duty of 1s. per gross prevailing for eleven years in respect of all clay pipes, but with the advent of Federation that duty was reduced to the extent of about two-thirds. I have been in

Sydney for about twelve months, having been induced to come over here in the belief that with a little duty prevailing where free-trade previously existed I might be able to work up a business all over the States. My business in Victoria went down after the reduction of the duty.

How many men did you employ in Melbourne?—Five, and I also worked myself.

Was that the greatest number you employed?—Yes; but at that time I was catering only for the Victorian trade. I could not do any business in New South Wales, because free-trade existed here. My object now is to do business all over the Commonwealth.

Were you prospering before the reduction of the duty?—I did very well.

Honorable members will mark that answer. The witness was further asked—

And with the reduction of the duty had you to discharge all your men?—Yes.

Did you sell your plant?—No; I brought it with me.

Why did you bring it to Sydney?—Because, as I have already explained, I thought that as a slight duty had been imposed by the Federal Parliament, I might be able to cut slightly into the trade here, although prior to Federation I could not get in at all.

Mr. CHANTER.—How many men does he employ?

Mr. JOHNSON.—I believe he employs five; and that he does not want more than a duty of 1s. per gross. The honorable member for Cook says that the manufacturer requires the increased duty in order that he may sell a cheaper article; but if he can sell a cheaper article, he does not require an increased duty. I should not be reading the evidence, if I had been able to get from the Treasurer any explanation of the proposal which has been made. I have been forced to look into the evidence given before the Tariff Commission to see what justification, if any, there is for the proposed increase of duty. I might read the whole of this evidence, but I do not want to proceed to extremes. I warned the Treasurer that his proposal was likely to cause discussion.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I did not hear the honorable member.

Mr. JOHNSON.—If that is so, I shall not proceed further.

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That the words “and on and after 12th December, 1907, per gross (United Kingdom), 1s.” be added.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 413. Works of Art, being Statuary* and Paintings, Oil or Water Colours, framed or

unframed, imported for public institutions or purposes under Departmental by-laws, free.

*Statuary means any reproduction of complete figures in marble, clay, cement, metal, or wood, and being a work of art.

Mr. BOWDEN (Nepean) [5.5 a.m.].—I move—

That the words "being Statuary and Paintings, Oil or Water Colours," be left out.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The item covers a great deal more as it stands.

Mr. BOWDEN.—I want to get in carvings, works in china, and many other articles brought in for public institutions or public purposes. The item as it stands is limited to statuary and paintings.

Amendment agreed to.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 414. Works of Art, being Statuary and Paintings, Oil or Water Colours, £5 and over in value, other than those for public institutions or purposes, ad val., 25 per cent. (To be assessed for duty at £5 plus the value of the frame and mounting, if any, and plus the value of the canvas or other material of which such Statuary or Painting is made.)

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That the following words be added:—"and on and after 12th December, 1907—414A. Works of Art, being Statuary, not being less than £10 in value, free."

Colonel FOXTON (Brisbane) [5.10 a.m.].—Such an article as a valuable vase for a museum will not be admitted free under this item.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The Comptroller-General assures me that such a vase will be admitted free.

Colonel FOXTON.—Under what item does it come? I feel sure there must be some mistake.

Mr. SALMON.—Item 413 covers such a case.

Colonel FOXTON.—The footnote contains the only definition, but does not cover the case of a valuable vase, an art cabinet, or a table such as that which stands in the Queen's Hall. It relates only to statuary.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer [5.11 a.m.].—I have given the honorable member my word, so far as I can, that such articles will be admitted free. This item is under Departmental by-law; and if it should prove that there is any mistake, I shall do what the honorable member desires in another place.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 415. (Paintings, &c.), negatived.

Item 416. Pictures n.e.i., ad val. 25 per cent.

Amendment (by Mr. JOSEPH COOK) agreed to—

That after the letters "n.e.i.," the words "including Scripture Cards of all kinds," be inserted.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That the words "and on and after 12th December, 1907, free," be added.

Amendment (by Mr. MAHON) proposed—

That the following new paragraph be added:—

"And on and after 12th December, 1907—(A) Pictures, being Coloured Supplements for Newspapers under Departmental by-laws, per lb., 3d."

Mr. WILSON (Corangamite) [5.19 a.m.].—I cannot see any justification for this amendment. Why should these supplements be charged 3d. per lb.?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The amendment is only in unison with what has already been done.

Mr. WILSON.—For instance, are the coloured supplements of Christmas numbers, such as the *Illustrated London News*, *Graphic*, *Sporting and Dramatic News*, and so forth, to be charged at the rate of 3d. per lb.? If that be the intention, I am afraid there will be considerable difficulty.

Mr. HUME COOK.—Those coloured supplements are sent out in cases and inserted in the publications here.

Mr. WILSON.—They may come through the post with the publications themselves.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Then they will come in free.

Mr. WILSON.—I think they will be charged the duty. In my opinion, it is most undesirable that a duty of 3d. per lb. should be charged on coloured supplements such as I have mentioned. Then there are a good many pictures which are imported in small parcels of twos and threes, such as *Pears' Annual*, which is a source of pleasure to many people. There is no justification whatever for the duty proposed, unless the Treasurer can arrange with the Department that illustrated pictures accompanying journals shall be admitted free.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The Committee have already decided this matter, and I am merely giving effect to a promise which I made.

Mr. WILSON.—I do not know the exact nature of the promise to which the Treasurer refers. If he can assure me that no disability will be placed upon those

persons who receive these coloured supplements, my objection to the item will be withdrawn.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [5.24 a.m.].—The decision at which the Committee previously arrived was that this duty should not be applicable to journals like the *Graphic*. It will be levied only upon illustrated supplements intended for use in Australian newspapers. I had to give a promise to that effect. Where a paper is accompanied by an illustrated supplement, the duty will not be charged.

Mr. MAHON (Coolgardie) [5.25 a.m.].—I could have disposed of the objection of the honorable member for Corangamite in a moment. My amendment is to be applied under departmental by-laws. Consequently, the Department can provide that single copies of illustrated supplements, posted from Great Britain or elsewhere to Australia, shall be exempt from the duty proposed, which shall apply only to those supplements which are printed outside Australia, and which are imported in bulk. The proposal is a perfectly reasonable one in view of the fact that other matter of an almost identical character is subject to a duty of 6d. a lb.

Amendment agreed to.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 417. Undertakers' requisites of all kinds and materials, including immortelle crosses and the like, ad val. 25 per cent.

Mr. WILSON (Corangamite) [5.27 a.m.].—This is an item in which the members of the medical profession are somewhat interested. The duty proposed upon many articles covered by this item is altogether too high. The recommendation of the Tariff Commission in respect of it is "nil."

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—"Nil" means that the Commission did not consider the item, and did not take evidence upon it.

Mr. WILSON.—It means that it should be free. I move—

That the words "and on and after 12th December, 1907, free," be added.

Amendment negatived.

Item agreed to.

Item 418. Wall and Ceiling Parts and Decorations of any materials, n.e.i., ad val., 25 per cent.

Mr. BOWDEN (Nepean) [5.28 a.m.].—I would point out to the Treasurer that the old rate of duty upon this item was 20 per cent., and I ask him to agree to the insertion of that rate in the second column of the schedule.

Mr. BATCHELOR (Boothby) [5.29 a.m.].—I should like to know whether wall and ceiling parts are made in the Commonwealth?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Yes.

Item agreed to.

Item 419. Cotton, Asbestos, and other Packings, including Sheet Asbestos, Yarn, and Cord, ad val., 20 per cent.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That the word "Yarn" be left out.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 420. Asbestos Pipe and Boiler Covering; Asbestos Mattresses for Boilers; Asbestos Millboards, ad val., 20 per cent.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That the words "Asbestos Millboards" be left out.

Amendment (by Mr. JOSEPH COOK) proposed—

That the words "and on and after 12th December, 1907, ad val. (United Kingdom), 15 per cent.," be added.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [5.30].—This is such a small matter, that I hope the honorable member will not press his proposal.

Mr. PAGE.—Why, there are tons of asbestos in Australia.

Amendment negatived.

Item agreed to.

Item 421. Inks and Stains for Leather, ad val., 20 per cent.

Mr. TUDOR (Yarra) [5.31 a.m.].—I wish to know from the Minister whether dressings for leather, which come under item 230, might not also be brought under this item. Would it not be better to make the rates the same for the two items, and strike out this item?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Dressings will not come under this item.

Item agreed to.

Item 422. Articles n.e.i. of Celluloid, Xylonite, Bone, Ivory, Pulp, Papier Maché, Indurated Fibre, or Asbestos, ad val., 25 per cent.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) proposed—

That the letters "n.e.i." be left out, with a view to insert in lieu thereof the words "not included under any other heading in the Tariff."

Mr. PAGE (Maranoa) [5.34 a.m.].—Are any of the articles mentioned in this item made in Port Melbourne?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not know. They are made in the Commonwealth.

Mr. PAGE.—I have here two small celluloid boxes, which are practically identical, but, because one bears the word "trinkets," it has been charged duty at the rate of 35 per cent. while the other is admitted at the rate of 25 per cent. That is an anomaly. Surely the Customs officials can use their common sense in matters of this kind?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Both boxes are dutiable under item 384.

Mr. PAGE.—Surely the Comptroller-General knows how to interpret the Tariff? He has informed me that, because one box bears the word "trinkets," it is dutiable at 35 per cent.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The box bearing the word "trinkets" is dutiable under paragraph A of item 384, as a trinket box, while the other is dutiable as a fancy box.

Mr. PAGE.—Both boxes are made of the same material, but that which bears the word "trinkets" is made dutiable at the same rate as is charged on the most valuable trinket boxes, some of which are worth several pounds, while the other is dutiable at 10 per cent. less. Surely they should be both charged at the same rate? This sort of thing makes it impossible for importers not to commit offences against the Customs law.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—There appears to have been a mistake in this differentiation.

Mr. TUDOR.—Would it not be better to make the duties on celluloid boxes uniform?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I am not going to do that. It is a twopenny-halfpenny thing to bring up in this way.

Mr. PAGE.—Apparently any proposal with which the honorable member does not agree is a twopenny-halfpenny one.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Are these boxes imported from England?

Mr. PAGE.—These articles are imported from the dear old Motherland.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Then they are subject to a duty of 25 per cent.

Mr. PAGE.—That is what I contend; but because one of them bears the word "trinkets" it is brought under item 384, and subjected to a duty of 35 per cent.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The Comptroller-General says that that is not the case.

Mr. PAGE.—He told me differently.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—He has informed me that if it has been done it was owing to a mistake.

Mr. PAGE.—If a mistake has been made, will the Minister see that it is rectified?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I will.

Amendment agreed to.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 423. Surgical Appliances, n.e.i., including Belts, Trusses, Pads, Corsets, Braces, Breast Supports, Vaccination Shields, ad val. 25 per cent.

Amendment (by Mr. JOSEPH COOK) agreed to—

That the words "and on and after 12th December, 1907, ad val. (United Kingdom), 20 per cent.," be added.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 424. Articles imported by or being the property of the Commonwealth, free.

Colonel FOXTON (Brisbane) [5.45 a.m.]
—I move—

That after the word "Commonwealth," the words "or of a State, and imported for use in the Public Works or in the Public Service of such State," be inserted.

Mr. STORRER.—That amendment, if carried, would include all the railway material for the States.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—It would include everything imported by a State Government.

Colonel FOXTON.—Some weeks ago I gave notice of my intention to submit this amendment. Section 114 of the Constitution Act contains this provision—

nor shall the Commonwealth impose any tax on property of any kind belonging to a State.

The Supreme Court of New South Wales has decided—and so far as I know it is the only Court which has dealt with the question that it is *ultra vires* for the Parliament of the Commonwealth to impose Customs duties on goods or property belonging to a State.

Mr. CHANTER.—Will the amendment apply to the seizure of wire-netting in New South Wales?

Colonel FOXTON.—No. At this period of the session I have little hope of carrying my amendment. At the same time, I think it is very desirable that I should state as shortly as I can some of the reasons which have prompted me to submit it. It will be observed that my amendment proposes to limit this exemption to such property of a State as is imported "for use in the public works or in the public service of such State."

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—If the honorable member wants to do that, he had better

propose to shut up the Commonwealth. What is the use of bringing on the proposal at this hour?

Colonel FOXTON.—It is not my fault that we are sitting here at this hour, and that I have to speak now. I have waited here all night, as the honorable gentleman has done, and I have as much right to submit this proposal as he has to submit his. I did hope to be able to do so without any show of temper on his part. One objection constantly raised to any such exemption being given is, that a State might connive with private individuals to enable them to import goods in the name of the State.

Mr. MATTHEWS.—That was done in New South Wales.

Colonel FOXTON.—Nothing of the sort was done there. The declaration under this amendment would have to be made, either by a Minister or by a departmental officer of the State which was importing the material, to the effect that it was for public works purposes. Is it conceivable that any Minister or officer would make such a declaration for the purpose of defrauding the Commonwealth of revenue? The suggestion is preposterous.

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—Would the honorable member also exempt the importations of municipal councils?

Colonel FOXTON.—If the honorable member will move an amendment to that effect, I shall be prepared to give my views on it. Then we come to the question of goods which might be imported by a State for the purpose of being re-tailed or sold to private individuals. Such goods would not be exempt under my amendment, because they would not be property imported for use on public works. So that there again the Commonwealth is protected. One very strong reason why it is desirable that, irrespective of what may be the rights of the Commonwealth under the Constitution, we should adopt such an amendment as this, is that most of the imports of States Governments are on account of such works as railways, which are paid for out of loan money. Let us suppose that a large railway is in course of construction, involving the making of expensive bridges. A great deal of the material required, such as rails, &c., must be imported. Let us suppose that the State pays in duty £20,000. That duty becomes, so to speak, part of the price paid for the material, and is paid out of loan money.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The State could credit the revenue returned to it by the Commonwealth to loan account.

Colonel FOXTON.—At the end of the financial year, £15,000 of that £20,000 would be paid over by the Commonwealth to the State as revenue. Therefore, that would be a means by which the State would convert part of its loan money into revenue, because the £15,000 would go into the Consolidated Revenue of the State as revenue pure and simple. As the honorable member for North Sydney says, it would be possible for the State to re-pay that revenue into its loan fund. But we know what Governments are, and how strong is the temptation to a Government to swell its revenue from every possible source. I venture to say that the circumstances would be very exceptional indeed, when any Government would repay money received from the Commonwealth into loan account by way of recoupment.

Mr. STORRER.—That is purely a State matter.

Colonel FOXTON.—The money would be received as revenue. I do not think that we should assist the States in doing such things as I have described. We should carry out the spirit as well as the letter of the Constitution. A great deal more could be said in favour of the amendment, but I do not wish to detain the Committee at this hour. I undertook to move this amendment and think it my duty to do so. I think that the reasons which I have given are sufficient. In my opinion—and I think my view is shared by a large number of people throughout Australia—it is desirable, whatever may be the powers conferred upon the Commonwealth by the Constitution, that there should be no attempt to strain those powers. By introducing such a provision as this into the Tariff, this Parliament would give an indication that there is a desire, as far as possible, to settle those vexed questions which are now *sub judice*, upon a satisfactory basis, and would show that there is no wish on the part of the Commonwealth to take advantage of the States, or of any possible flaw which there may be in the wording of the section which I have quoted.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [6 a.m.].—I am somewhat surprised that the honorable member for Brisbane should have brought forward this amendment. I take it that if such an amendment

were carried it would strike a very severe blow, if not a death blow, at the Commonwealth.

Colonel FOXTON.—Nonsense!

Mr. BATCHELOR.—The Commonwealth is not so sick as that.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—If there is not going to be a fairly strong vote against the amendment, I must adjourn the House, so that a division may be taken upon it when there is a large attendance. The matter is so important that we cannot risk anything. The passing of this amendment would be nothing short of a disaster to the Commonwealth. The honorable member for Brisbane has referred to the action which the States would, in all probability, take. Let me remind honorable members of what was done in New South Wales, and to a large extent led up to a very vexed case. At the inception of the Federation the Government of New South Wales thought they had the right to import goods free of duty.

Mr. HEDGES.—So they had.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—They had not, and the Court took that view. The Railways Commissioners, with the consent of the Government of the State, imported a lot of material, and supplied it to one contractor to make waggons and other things required for the Department. All the other contracting firms were at once up in arms, because they were precluded from participating in this arrangement. That was the commencement of the trouble in New South Wales.

Mr. HEDGES.—The goods were imported for the State railways.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The Railways Commissioners practically said to the one contractor, "You can have everything that you require for our work free of duty, but all other contractors must pay duty upon their imports."

Colonel FOXTON.—Let us assume that the goods had been required for a Commonwealth railway.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The Commonwealth have a right to collect the Customs revenue.

Colonel FOXTON.—If such a proceeding were adopted in connexion with a Commonwealth Railway Department, would not the contractors be up in arms in the same way?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not think that the Commonwealth would single out a contractor, and give him his materials

If I had anything to do with the

matter, I should call for tenders, subject to the condition that the necessary material would be supplied by the Government. But I have correctly stated what took place in New South Wales.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—That would not be covered by the honorable member for Brisbane's proposal.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Certainly it would. The Customs and Post and Telegraph Departments are at present our only sources of revenue, and if this amendment were agreed to no one would be able to say what loss of revenue we should suffer.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—Does the honorable member think that the Commonwealth ought to take revenue out of borrowed money?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—That is a State matter. I am astonished that an honorable member who has sworn to be true to the Commonwealth should submit such a proposition as this. If ever anything that was absolutely traitorous to the Commonwealth was proposed—

Colonel FOXTON.—I rise to a point of order. The honorable member said that I was traitorous to the Commonwealth.

The CHAIRMAN.—I ask the Treasurer to withdraw the remark.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do so. We are all concerned in preserving the Commonwealth intact.

Colonel FOXTON.—And that is my desire.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—If anything would tend to disintegrate or destroy the Commonwealth, it would be such an action as that proposed by the honorable member. The Government cannot accept such a proposition. I do not know what is the temper of the Committee, but if there is the slightest danger of the amendment being agreed to, I must move that progress be reported, and, if necessary, have a call of the House. It would be most inconvenient to do so, for it would certainly prevent our entering upon the Christmas recess before next week.

Mr. HEDGES.—We do not care if we have to remain here until next year.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—If Western Australia got half a show she would take the whole Commonwealth.

Mr. HEDGES.—Western Australia has to pay 19s., where the other States pay only 9s.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—At present, three-fourths of the Customs revenue is returned to the States, and the Commonwealth has to carry on with a pittance of one-fourth. Probably, this year or next year, the whole of that proportion will be absorbed.

Mr. BAMFORD.—It will all be spent on defence.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Probably. In order to obviate the necessity for reporting progress, I would suggest that the honorable member should agree to the item being postponed until we have dealt with the rest of this division. The issue raised is so important, that I should like an opportunity to consult the Prime Minister in regard to it. I do not wish business to be delayed, and, I therefore, move—

That the item be postponed until the remaining items of the division have been dealt with.

Colonel FOXTON (Brisbane) [6.8 a.m.].—I am only too glad to meet the Treasurer in every possible way. I fully recognise the importance of this question, and am sorry that it should have to be discussed in a thin House at six o'clock in the morning. I am pleased to have the Treasurer's assurance that we shall have an opportunity to deal with it in a full House. I, therefore, agree to withdraw my amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Motion agreed to; item postponed.

Item 425. Articles imported, or purchased in bond, for the official use of the Governor-General, and declared as being for such official use, free.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [6.10 a.m.].—The question of the exemption of articles imported or purchased in bond for the official use of the Governor-General has been a rather vexed one. In all the States there has been some little friction in connexion with this matter, since the Governors have, in every case, accepted their appointment on the understanding that goods which they required for official use would be admitted free of duty. A system has been adopted, which I began first with Queensland, when I found that I could not permit goods required for the Governor to come in free, under which the States Governments have paid duty on them in the ordinary way. As some feeling has existed in connexion with the matter, and it is, comparatively speaking, such a small thing, I think we should place the Governors of the

States in this respect on the same footing as the Governor-General.

Mr. SALMON.—Why not Lieutenant-Governors also?

Mr. BATCHELOR.—And Chief Justices and members of Parliament.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not desire that there shall be a long debate about the matter, and if any serious objection is raised to the proposal, the only thing that might be done would be to extend the privilege to existing Governors, who have been appointed under certain recognised conditions.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The States object to what they consider degrades them as Sovereign States. Their Governors are appointed by the Crown, and the practice so far adopted makes a distinction between them and the representative of the Crown in the Commonwealth.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I propose to put them on the same footing as the Governor-General, and would move—

That the following new paragraph be added:—

- (A) Articles imported or purchased in bond for the official use of the State Governors, and declared as being for such official use, on and after 12th December, 1907—free.

Colonel FOXTON.—I think I might have been permitted to move the amendment of which I gave notice over two months ago.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I beg the honorable member's pardon, I was not aware that he had done so. I am quite willing that he should move the amendment, but I hope he will accept the form which I have just read.

Colonel FOXTON (Brisbane) [6.14 a.m.].—I think I can improve upon the wording of the honorable gentleman's proposed amendment.

Mr. PAGE.—I rise to a point of order. Can a private member move to increase taxation?

Colonel FOXTON.—What I propose is an exemption.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—But its effect would be to increase the burden upon the rest of the community.

Colonel FOXTON.—The Treasurer practically repeats item 425. I think that all that is necessary is to insert after the word "Governor-General" the words "or the Governor of a State"; the item would then read—

Articles imported or purchased in bond for the official use of the Governor-General or of the Governor of a State, and declared as being for such official use—free.

I am prepared to submit my amendment in that form if the Treasurer has no objection.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [6.16 a.m.].—Has the honorable member for Brisbane considered the point that, if the form he proposes were adopted, duties already collected upon these goods required for the official use of the Governors might have to be refunded. Might not that be the reason for the adoption of the form proposed by the Treasurer?

Colonel FOXTON (Brisbane) [6.16 a.m.].—I am obliged to the honorable member for Parramatta for raising that point. But I suggest that the difficulty to which he has referred would arise under either of the forms of amendment proposed. However, the form suggested by the Treasurer might be adopted to meet the difficulty if it were preceded by the words "on and after 12th December, 1907." In view of the objection made by the honorable member for Parramatta, I think that, with that amendment, it would be better that the Treasurer should submit the new paragraph he has suggested.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) proposed—

That the following new paragraph be added:—

- (A) Articles imported or purchased in bond for the official use of the State Governors, and declared as being for such official use, on and after 12th December, 1907—free.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [6.18 a.m.].—I should like to say that I cordially agree with the proposal to exempt the personal importations of the Governors of the States, because they are the direct representatives of His Majesty. They stand in precisely the same relation to the States as the Governor-General does in relation to the Commonwealth. I think it would be only a graceful act to make this concession, and extend to the direct representatives of His Majesty in the States those privileges which they have enjoyed from time immemorial. It seems to me only a proper and a fitting thing to do, and I do not think the amendment should be so drawn as to cover any one but Governors of the States.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I hope there is not going to be any long debate on the question.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—No, we are prepared to reject the proposal straight away.

Mr. J. H. CATTS (Cook) [6.20 a.m.].—I see no justification for granting an increase in the Governor-General's salary by means of an item in the Tariff. Although I have the greatest respect for the representative of the King—

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—It is not increasing his salary. It is what we have been doing all along.

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—It is informing him that if he desires to use English carriages and other such articles he can import them free of duty, instead of using Australian-made articles. I object to the provision.

Question—That the words proposed to be added be so added (Sir WILLIAM LYNE's amendment) put. The Committee divided.

Ayes	22
Noes	14
Majority	8

AYES.

Archer, E. W.
Chanter, J. M.
Chapman, Austin
Cook, Joseph
Coon, J.
Ewing, T. T.
Foxton, Colonel
Groom, L. E.
Hedges, W. N.
Irvine, Hans
Livingston, J.
Lyne, Sir William

Mauger, S.
McWilliams, W. J.
Palmer, A. C.
Sinclair, H.
Thomson, Dugald
Thomson, John
Watson, J. C.
Wise, G. H.

Tellers:

Cook, Huene
Johnson, W. E.

NOES.

Bamford, F. W.
Batchelor, E. L.
Catts, J. H.
Crouch, R. A.
Foster, F. J.
Mahon, H.
Malonev, W. R. N.
Page, J.

Poynton, A.
Storror, D.
Tudor, F. G.
Wilson, J. G.

Tellers:

Bowden, E. K.
Mathews, J.

Question so resolved in the affirmative.
Amendment agreed to.

Mr. BATCHELOR (Boothby) [6.27 a.m.].—I desire to move an amendment to include the Lieutenant-Governors also.

The CHAIRMAN.—The honorable member will have to propose a new paragraph.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—Then I desire to move—

That the following new paragraph be added—

- (B) Articles imported or purchased in bond for the official use of the Lieutenant-Governors, and declared as being for such official use, on and after 12th December, 1907—free.

I move this in all good faith, as every argument that can be advanced in favour of including the State Governors applies to the Lieutenant-Governors. The latter act as *locum tenens* for Governors during their absence, and they receive their appointments, just as Governors do, direct from the King. There is an additional reason why Lieutenant-Governors should be given some consideration, in the fact that they receive no salary, especially when acting for a few weeks, or a few days.

Mr. WATSON.—Sometimes they receive both salaries.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—That may be so in some cases, but generally they do not receive any salary as Lieutenant-Governor, or, at any rate, do not receive salaries commensurate with the position they occupy.

Mr. MALONEY.—The Lieutenant-Governor of Victoria, who acted during Lord Brassey's absence, received £500 a year more than did Lord Brassey himself.

Mr. SALMON.—Lord Brassey was away the whole year.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Let us get to a vote.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—I am speaking seriously, and it is of no use the Treasurer asking me to drop the subject.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I desire to get to a vote.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—It will not do for us to take that attitude. We did so on the last vote, whereas, if we had waited a few minutes, and had had further discussion, there would have been a different result.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—If the honorable member desires, I will postpone the consideration of this item until the end of the division. I do not desire that the Committee should continue to discuss the matter now.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—If the Treasurer will postpone this item until after the consideration of postponed item 424, I am quite prepared to agree to his suggestion.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Very well; I shall do so.

Motion (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) proposed—

That the consideration of item 425 be postponed until after the consideration of postponed item 424.

Mr. MAHON (Coolgardie) [6.34 a.m.].—I should like to hear what reasons can be advanced for the postponement of this

item. So far as I can see all the honorable members here are in full possession of their faculties.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I know that; but some members are complaining that there is only a small attendance.

Mr. MAHON.—Oh, indeed. I consider that the Government were very ill-advised in consenting to this course being taken.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I desire to consult with the Prime Minister, as I have been asked to do.

Mr. MAHON.—If it is understood that the Government are reconsidering the advisability of having this clause in the Tariff at all, that is a good reason for a postponement. We all wish to give them an opportunity to make up their minds.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I certainly shall consult the Prime Minister.

Mr. MAHON.—The Treasurer can count on my opposition to every proposal of this sort.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Surely the honorable member does not object to what I propose to do?

Mr. MAHON.—This proposal will open the door to many serious abuses. It may allow others than the Governor-General and the Governors to have their goods brought in free.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Such goods were free under the old Tariff.

Mr. MAHON.—I doubt whether there was any such provision in the old Tariff for the Governors of States, though there may have been for the Governor-General.

Mr. CROUCH.—I rise to a point of order. Is it possible to postpone an item when it has been partly amended? I understand that rulings previously have been against this course. I may say that I have no objection to a postponement.

The CHAIRMAN.—The honorable member for Corio is quite right in saying that such course is not customary, but, under the exceptional circumstances, I shall, with the leave of the Committee, put the motion.

Mr. MALONEY (Melbourne) [6.37 a.m.].—A vote has been taken on the item, and I desire to know if it is really proposed that it be postponed. If the vote already taken is to be rescinded, and the ground cleared for a full reconsideration of the item I have no objection.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I shall give the honorable member the opportunity he desires to discuss the item later on in the day.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—All that was voted on was an amendment, and there will be an opportunity to vote against the whole proposal later.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [6.39 a.m.].—Some question has arisen as to whether these goods were free under the old Tariff. I find that articles imported by, and for, the official use of the Governor-General, or State Governors, were amongst the special exemptions.

The CHAIRMAN.—I must again point out to the Committee that I do not wish the postponement of this item to be regarded as an ordinary method of procedure. I am taking an exceptional course only with the consent of the Committee.

Motion agreed to; item postponed.

Item 426 (Articles for the use of the blind, deaf, and dumb); item 427 (Uniforms, &c. for foreign consuls); item 428 (Fire Brigade Appliances); item 429 (Minor Articles for use in the manufacture of goods); item 430 (Models of Inventions); item 431 (Collections of Antiquities for Public Institutions); item 432 (Natural History Specimens); item 433 (Passengers' Personal Effects), agreed to.

Item 434. Pictorial Illustrations and Casts and Models for Teaching purposes, when imported by and for the use of Universities, Colleges, or Schools—free.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That after the word "schools" the words "or public institutions" be inserted.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 435. Scientific Instruments and Apparatus (and materials for scientific purposes) for use in Universities, Colleges, Schools, or Public Hospitals, under departmental by-laws, free.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That after the word "Hospitals," the words "or any Public Institution" be inserted.

Amendment by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That the words—"425(A). Machinery specially designed and adapted for use in any University or Public Educational Institution for the purposes of instruction to students only, and any article which has been bequeathed or donated to any Public Institution, on and after 12th December, 1907, free," be added.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 436. Surgical and Dental and Veterinary Instruments and Appliances (not being Furniture), viz. :—

Amputating; Cupping; Dissecting; Examining and Operating; Veterinary; Lint; Gauzes; Bandages n.e.i.; Ligatures; Oil Silk; Poroplastic Felt; Splints and Artificial Limbs and Eyes; Surgical Pessaries; Glass Rectum and Vaginal Tubes; Operation Bags fitted with Instruments; Syringes; Galvano-cautery Batteries and Appliances; Operating Tables; Dressing and Instrument Trays; Accident Emergency Cases; Hot Air Apparatus for legs and arms; X-ray Apparatus except Motors; Snake-bite Outfits; Medicated Wool; Aseptic Paper; Impression Trays; Dental Rubber; Amalgam and Gold Filling-in Pellets or Cylinders, ad val. (General Tariff), 10 per cent.; (United Kingdom), free.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) proposed—

That after the word "Pessaries," the words "except of glass" be inserted.

Colonel FOXTON (Brisbane) [6.45 a.m.].—If the Treasurer's proposal be carried, under what item will the exception which he desires to make fall?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [6.46 a.m.].—The instruments of glass in question will then be dutiable as glassware, n.e.i., under item 253. All these articles, I understand, are being manufactured in the Commonwealth.

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) proposed—

That the words "Glass Rectum and Vaginal Tubes" be left out.

Mr. WILSON (Corangamite) [6.47 a.m.].—I would point out to the Treasurer that the construction of these tubes is a very different matter from the manufacture of an ordinary pessary.

Mr. PAGE.—They are being manufactured in Brisbane.

Mr. WILSON.—I am aware that they can be made in Brisbane if a pattern is supplied, but it might be necessary to send to America or to the Continent to procure a pattern. There are a number of varieties. Therefore, I think that the Minister is ill advised in proposing to omit the words, and, in the interests of the medical profession, I object to it being done.

Amendment agreed to.

Amendments (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That after the word "syringes" the words "except of glass" be inserted.

That after the word "medicated" the words "and absorbent" be inserted.

Mr. CHANTER (Riverina) [6.54 a.m.].—I suggest to the Treasurer that the words "snake bite outfits" should be omitted. They should not be dutiable at 10 per cent.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I intend to make free all the articles mentioned in the item.

Amendment (by Mr. WILSON) agreed to—

That after the word "wool" the words "and surgical dressings" be inserted.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That after the word "rubber" the words "dental allov and cements" be inserted.

Mr. WILSON (Corangamite) [6.57 a.m.].—The dentists wish to be made free rubber dams, pedestal spittoons, hospital furniture, and burrs.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—Rubber dams would come under "dental rubber," which is free.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That after the words "10 per cent." the words "and on and after 12th December, 1907 (General Tariff), free" be inserted.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 437 (Theatrical Costumes, &c.), agreed to.

Item 438 amended to read as follows, and agreed to—

Trophies won abroad and Decorations, Medallions and Certificates awarded, or to be awarded, and sent from abroad to individuals, and Trophies or Prizes sent by donors resident abroad for presentation or competition in Australia under Departmental by-laws—free.

Item 439 (Goods sent for repairs) agreed to.

Item 440 amended to read as follows, and agreed to—

Goods brought back to Australia by the person who was owner, or the legal representative of such owner at the time of exportation, after exportation, without drawback having been paid thereon subject to the provisions of section 151 of the Customs Act 1901—free.

Item 441. Blankets, Rubber or Wool for Printing Machines, Top Cloths for Ruling Machines, Felts for Paper Making Machines, when imported with the machines of which they form a necessary working part, one or more as required for working the machine—free.

Mr. CROUCH (Corio) [7.3 a.m.].—According to the wording of this item, felts for paper-making machines are only free when imported with them. These felts, which are about 90 yards long, cannot be made in the Commonwealth, and, consequently, have to be imported from time to time. It is necessary to release the articles

from the words of limitation in the item.

Therefore, I move—

That the words "felts for paper-making machines" be left out.

If the amendment is made it is my intention to ask the Committee to add to the item the words "and felts and wires for paper-making machines."

Mr. BATCHELOR.—Why does the honorable member include the wires?

Mr. CROUCH.—It is a mere attachment to the machine.

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment (by Mr. CROUCH) proposed—

That after the word "machine" the words "and felts and wires for paper making machines" be inserted.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [7.5 a.m.].—That amendment seems to me to alter the sense with regard to top cloths for ruling machines. Does the honorable member intend that the words "when imported" &c., shall apply to the top cloths for ruling machines?

Mr. CROUCH.—Yes. The felts and wires are not imported with the felt machines, but have to be imported separately, and that is why I want the Committee to insert these words at the end of the item.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Cannot these felts be made at any place in Australia?

Mr. CROUCH.—The paper-making mills tried to make them, but could not as they are 90 yards long. They have to be renewed every six months.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Cannot the felts be made in Victoria?

Mr. CROUCH.—No.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Is there any particular reason why these mills, which are doing well, and enjoying a tolerably high protection, should get all these materials in free?

Mr. CROUCH (Corio) [7.7 a.m.].—When the honorable member for Adelaide was Minister of Trade and Customs he adopted a rule by which these articles were allowed to come in free, and they have come in free since that time. This item is only continuing what is practically the existing law.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [7.8 a.m.].—The question is whether these highly-protected industries ought to get free all the materials they require.

Mr. CROUCH.—I do not think the honorable member will find they are highly protected.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I notice that all these highly-protected manufacturers are the very first to secure any economical aid to their industries. This is another instance of men who ask the Treasurer for the highest possible duties which they can get, and afterwards request to be exempted from the ordinary taxation which other citizens have to bear, and cheerfully pay.

Amendment agreed to

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 442. Scientific Instruments and Apparatus, viz. :—

(A) Instruments for measuring the density of Liquids Solids and Gases; including Hydrometers, Saccharometers, Lactometers, Salinometers, and Barkometers—free.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) proposed—

That after the word "instruments," paragraph A, the words "of other material than glass" be inserted.

Mr. WILSON (Corangamite) [7.9 a.m.].—In my opinion the Treasurer is coming it a little bit too strong in submitting this amendment. In Brisbane there is a man who manufactures all the instruments which are included in paragraph A.

Mr. HANS IRVINE.—Then we must protect him.

Mr. WILSON.—This item, as it is printed, includes scientific instruments of very great accuracy. In some cases the users of such instruments like to deal with the manufacturer in Brisbane, but, in other cases, they want to import them from America or Germany or England. I do not think that the Minister should alter the wording of the item, and so remove such instruments from the free list.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Let the item go. The articles are on the free list.

Mr. WILSON.—Evidently the honorable member is not aware of the fact that the Treasurer has moved to insert the words "of other material than glass" after the word "instruments." All these scientific instruments should be free. To tax them would be to do a great injustice to the scientists of Australia, and to those concerned in schools of mines and laboratories. I do not deny that some of the instruments are made in Australia, and they may be perfectly accurate so far as they go. But a scientist would not be altogether satisfied with the conditions under which they are made in Brisbane. These instruments are of no use unless they are made with the greatest delicacy. The

amendment simply means that only those made of gun metal will be admitted free. I want honorable members to be seized of the facts.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—We do not want facts at this time of the morning. We intend to put on a duty. That is the fact that concerns us.

Mr. WILSON.—If I had not drawn attention to the matter the item would have been passed without any consideration. The Minister really should not press his amendment.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I am going to press it.

Mr. WILSON.—I undertake to say that there are many scientists in Australia who would not think of going to Brisbane for their instruments.

Colonel FOXTON.—Why not?

Mr. WILSON.—Because they would not be satisfied that they were getting instruments that were perfect for their scientific work.

Mr. MALONEY (Melbourne) [7.16 a.m.].—It would be far better to give the gentleman in Brisbane who is making these instruments a bounty than to impose a duty for his benefit. Scientific men are not even satisfied with English-made instruments in many cases. They send to Germany, or to the United States of America for particular instruments for particular purposes. They are certainly not likely to be content with Australian-made instruments when they want to make sure of obtaining the most scrupulous accuracy. It would be regrettable if every dairy in Australia was practically forced to buy a lactometer in which perfect confidence could not be put. What does the proposed duty amount to?

Colonel FOXTON.—Thirty and 25 per cent.

Mr. MALONEY.—I shall have to get one of these instruments and test it.

Mr. PAGE.—They are all on sale.

Mr. MALONEY.—I think that the amendment is due to the energy of the Queensland members. In order that his deductions may be recognised elsewhere, a professor in Australia needs for the purposes of his scientific investigations instruments of the same high grade as those used in the Old World. If an astronomer here were to observe certain nebulae, it would be necessary that the instrument with which he made his observations should correspond with those used in other parts of the world.

Mr. CROUCH.—There must be an absolute standard.

Colonel FOXTON.—The instruments made in Brisbane are standardized.

Mr. MALONEY.—Is it the standard of Berlin, of Paris, or some other part of the world that is observed? In conclusion, I simply desire to know whether the Treasurer intends to insert the words "of other material than glass" in the remaining paragraphs.

Mr. PAGE (Maranoa) [7.24 a.m.].—I was never more surprised in my life than I was when I heard the honorable member for Melbourne speak as he did regarding the industry to which this item relates. When invited by the Treasurer to vote for a duty of 50 per cent. for the protection of a Victorian industry, he has done so without blushing; but when he is asked to vote for a duty for the assistance of a Queensland industry, he immediately begins to talk about the Milky Way, and the standard of Paris, Berlin, and other cities, with a view of showing that the proposed protection should not be granted. When the honorable member can turn a political somersault with such consummate ease, I am satisfied as to his consistency and his ideas of protection.

Colonel FOXTON (Brisbane) [7.26 a.m.].—When I spoke of these instruments being standardized, I meant to convey that the instruments enumerated in paragraph A are made in Brisbane by a highly trained scientific man, who acquired his knowledge in the best manufactories of Europe. He thoroughly understands his business, and has been engaged for years in making the very instruments to which the honorable member for Melbourne has referred. Every scientific instrument that he makes is examined by a Government expert, who must certify to its correctness before it can be offered for sale.

Mr. WILSON.—Is the Government expert competent?

Colonel FOXTON.—I have yet to learn that protectionists, at all events, are not to accept Australian experts in lieu of those on the other side of the globe.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—How many are engaged in the industry in Brisbane?

Colonel FOXTON.—I do not know; it is not a large establishment.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—It is the usual Queensland industry?

Colonel FOXTON.—I am aware that some honorable members are prepared to

taboo an industry the moment it is mentioned that it is carried on in Queensland.

Mr. WATSON.—When we find the honorable member supporting a duty we know that it must relate to a Queensland industry.

Colonel FOXTON.—That is not fair. I have supported the imposition of duties in relation to a large number of industries that are peculiar to Victoria.

Mr. WISE.—Low duties.

Colonel FOXTON.—No; I have supported the Government on various occasions, but I am not, and do not pretend to be, a prohibitionist. I invite honorable members to compare this proposed duty of 30 per cent. with the duties of from 100 to 200 per cent., that have been passed for the protection of Victorian industries. I repeat that every possible precaution is taken to insure the accuracy of the scientific instruments made in Queensland. I should also like to mention that these people do not propose to attempt the manufacture of any of those instruments which are beyond their capacity. They will make only those with which they are thoroughly familiar.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—If this man were to remove to some other country the whole industry would be abolished.

Colonel FOXTON.—No, I presume that some one else would take his place. Why should we assume that the usual consequences claimed for a protective duty would not follow in this case, and that the number of persons engaged in this industry would not be increased?

Mr. SALMON (Laanecoorie) [7.31 a.m.].—I opposed this proposal when it was before the Committee in another form on a previous occasion. I oppose it again for the same reason, that throughout the Tariff we have refrained from imposing duties on purely scientific instruments. It should not be forgotten that a number of these articles are coming every day into more common use, and we wish to encourage their use in the Commonwealth. Many reasons have been given why the proposal should not be accepted, but one which has not yet been mentioned is that the result of prosecutions in the Courts, involving the livelihood, or the liberty of a man, in very many instances, depends upon the accuracy of these instruments.

Colonel FOXTON (Brisbane) [7.35 a.m.].—I should just like to ask the honorable member for Laanecoorie whether he thinks we shall ever be able to make these

instruments in Australia, and; if so, when he thinks we should begin to make them?

Mr. STORRER (Bass) [7.36 a.m.].—When this question was before the Committee in another form, I voted with representatives of Queensland for the protection of this industry. It did matter to me, as a protectionist, if those honorable members voted free-trade on every other question. If men in any part of the world can make any article, there are men in Australia who can make it, if they are given encouragement. When honorable members, in dealing with industries carried on in their own States, talk of the work that Australians can do, and then refuse to protect the work of Australians in other States, they are grossly inconsistent. I am prepared to support a duty upon these articles.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [7.38 a.m.].—I have listened with the utmost amazement to the tirade of abuse directed against the honorable member for Brisbane, and I hope it will teach the honorable member a lesson. We have had some difficulty on this side in bringing the honorable member to reason on fiscal questions. He has supported the Government when their own supporters have left them, and this is the reward he gets. I hope it will induce the honorable member to turn over a new leaf.

Question—That the words “of other material than glass” be inserted after the word “instruments,” paragraph A (Sir WILLIAM LYNE’s amendment)—put. The Committee divided.

Ayes	19
Noes	16
—			
Majority	3

AYES.

Carr, E. S.	McWilliams, W. J.
Chanter, J. M.	Page, J.
Chapman, Austin	Storrer, D.
Coon, J.	Thomson, John
Ewing, T. T.	Tudor, F. G.
Foxton, Colonel	Watson, J. C.
Groom, L. E.	Wise, G. H.
Hedges, W. N.	<i>Tellers:</i>
Lyne, Sir William	Cook, Hume
Mauger, S.	Sinclair, H.

NOES.

Archer, E. W.	Maloney, W. R. N.
Bowden, E. K.	Palmer, A. C.
Catts, J. H.	Salmon, C. C.
Cook, Joseph	Thomson, Dugald
Crouch, R. A.	Wilson, J. G.
Foster, F. J.	<i>Tellers:</i>
Irvine, Hans	Batchelor, E. L.
Livingston, J.	Johnson, W. E.
Mahon, H.	

PAIRS.

Hutchison, J.	Brown, Tilley
Spence, W. G.	Brown, Thomas
Deakin, A.	Wilks, W. H.
Fisher, A.	Edwards, R.
Fairbairn, G.	Fowler, J. M.
Frazer, C. E.	Fuller, G. W.
Harper, R.	Fysh, Sir Philip
McDougall, J. K.	Glynn, P. McM.
Hall, D. R.	Reid, G. H.
Kingston, C. C.	Kelly, W. H.
Webster, W.	Liddell, F.
O’Malley, King	Smith, Bruce
Quick, Sir John	Willis, Henry
Forrest, Sir John	Watkins, D.

Question so resolved in the affirmative.

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That after the word “barkometers,” paragraph (A), the words “of other material than glass” be inserted.

Paragraph, as amended, agreed to.

Amendment (by Mr. WILSON) proposed—

That the following new paragraph be inserted:—“AA. Instruments made of glass for measuring the density of liquids, solids, and gases, including hydrometers, saccharometers, lactometers, salinometers, and barkometers, on and after 12th December, 1907, ad val. (General Tariff), 10 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 5 per cent.”

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [7.49 a.m.].—I hope the Committee will not agree to this amendment. These articles fall under items dutiable at 25 per cent. and 20 per cent.

Mr. SALMON (Laanecoorie) [7.50 a.m.].—If the Government will propose to make the duties 20 per cent. and 15 per cent., I shall support them.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I agree to the suggestion.

Mr. WILSON (Corangamite) [7.51 a.m.].—The honorable member for Laanecoorie only just now advocated that these instruments should be admitted duty free; and to be consistent, he ought to support the lowest impost obtainable.

Mr. PAGE.—The question was then one of protection, or no protection.

Mr. WILSON.—But I regard it as a question of scientific research, and one closely connected with the observation of certain legal formalities in regard to the tests. There is enormous breakage in conveying these delicate instruments from one end of the world to the other; and the duty I propose would give some little encouragement to the local industry.

Mr. SALMON (Laanecoorie) [7.53 a.m.].—The question before us was, whether or

not there should be a duty; and, in my opinion, the decision arrived at by the Committee was a wrong one. But, in view of that decision, I do not feel inclined to vote for the duty proposed by the honorable member for Corangamite. It would simply be a revenue duty; and I declared myself, at the beginning of the Tariff discussion, as against such duties.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [7.55 a.m.].—No doubt these very delicate instruments require to be as mathematically perfect as possible. Industries of this kind do not spring up like mushrooms; and I do not see that the industry in Brisbane could by any possibility supply all the requirements of Australia. In my opinion, a fair duty would be one of 15 per cent. all round.

Mr. WILSON (Corangamite) [7.56 a.m.].—Both the honorable member for Laanecoorie and the honorable member for Melbourne showed that, no matter how high the duty might be, these goods must be brought from abroad; and, therefore, the impost must, to a large extent, be merely revenue producing.

Amendment (by Mr. SALMON) agreed to—

That the amendment be amended by leaving out the figure "10," with a view to insert in lieu thereof the figure "20," and the figure "5," with a view to insert in lieu thereof the figure "15."

Proposed new paragraph, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraphs B, C, and D agreed to.

Paragraph (E). Apparatus for the testing and analysis of milk, wine, and other agricultural products, as prescribed by departmental by-laws—free.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) proposed—

That the paragraph be left out.

Mr. WILSON (Corangamite) [8.5 a.m.].—This is another instance in which the Treasurer proposes to subject to a duty a number of articles which are used in the testing of wines.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [8.6 a.m.].—I would point out to the honorable member that all the apparatus described in this paragraph is being manufactured in Australia. The industry is being principally carried out in Brisbane, where the apparatus has to be subjected to a Government test before it can be delivered by the manufacturer.

Mr. WILSON (Corangamite) [8.7 a.m.].—The Treasurer's explanation is scarcely satisfactory. I repeat that this proposal will have the effect of subjecting to duty apparatus used to test wines in respect of their acidity, their alcoholic strength, and the carbonic acid gas which they contain. Such instruments as acidometers, alcoholometers and eudiometers, are not manufactured in Australia.

Colonel FOXTON.—I will guarantee that they are manufactured in Brisbane.

Mr. WILSON.—The honorable member is prepared to guarantee that any instrument made of glass is manufactured in Brisbane.

Amendment negatived.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Item 443 (Ophthalmic instruments and appliances) agreed to.

Item 444. Outside packages n.e.i., in which goods other than those subject to an ad valorem duty are ordinarily imported, when containing such goods—free.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [8.10 a.m.].—I move—

That after the words "packages n.e.i." the words "including the sole containing package" be inserted.

The amendment will have the effect of making these packages free.

Mr. PAGE.—Will zinc-lined cases come under this item?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Yes.

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That the words "other than those subject to an ad valorem duty" and "when containing such goods" be left out.

Mr. WILSON (Corangamite) [8.13 a.m.].—Two days ago I was informed that the Customs authorities wished to charge 12s. 6d. on what is known as a "dry" cask, in which ironmongery was imported. These casks when empty are practically of no value, and cannot be used as new casks.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—That duty must have been charged before the Tariff was amended.

Mr. WILSON.—No; since then. The rule laid down by the Department was that the exemption relating to casks applied only to casks containing liquids.

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—All full casks are free.

Mr. WILSON.—Whether they contain liquids or dry goods?

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—Yes.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Mr. MALONEY (Melbourne) [8.15 a.m.].—I have here *The Shipping World Year-Book*, in which the principal Tariffs of the world are published. It will be seen that they contain schedules of prohibited goods. St. Vincent, for instance, prohibits the importation of plants, seeds, berries, earth, soil, and vegetable matter used for packing or covering imports from Ceylon, Natal, South India, Mauritius, and the Straits Settlements. Ceylon and Mauritius have similarly drastic prohibitions. I suggest that our prohibitions, most of which are embodied in the Customs Act, should be printed as a schedule attached to the Tariff.

Mr. SALMON.—I support that.

EXCISE DUTIES.

Saccharin and other similar substitutes for sugar, per lb., £5.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That the words "and on and after 12th December, 1907, per lb., £1" be added.

REBATE FOR HOME CONSUMPTION.

Tariff Item 124 (Schedule A). Piece goods of any material when used in the manufacture of Rubber Waterproof Cloth. Rebate, three-fourths of the duty paid.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [8.20 a.m.].—This rebate was allowed under the old Tariff.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—We gave these manufacturers a higher duty.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—It would be $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. now. I propose to rebate three-fourths of the duty paid.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—We increased the duty on waterproof cloth.

Mr. WILSON.—Do I understand that the Minister proposes to insert " $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent."?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—No; I propose to rebate $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.

Mr. WILSON.—Of the duty paid?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—No, three-fourths of the duty paid, which is $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. The Comptroller-General has pointed out to me that it is very necessary to get this alteration made to-day.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Why should these manufacturers get this advantage at all? They are getting a protection of 30 per cent. now.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—No, the duties are 30 and 25 per cent.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—They have got a thumping big protection.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I ask the honorable member to allow the amendment to pass, as it is doing the same thing as was done under the old Tariff.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [8.21 a.m.].—It is quite true that this provision was in the old Tariff, but since then we have given the manufacturers of these goods very much higher protection, viz.:—30 and 25 per cent., and I do not quite see why we should go further and rebate to them three-fourths of that duty. Why should they not be put on the same footing as other manufacturers? Since they have got a protection of 30 and 25 per cent., it seems to me to be absurd to give a rebate of three-fourths of it. Let them be treated like other manufacturers who are subject to competition.

Mr. BOWDEN.—It is only to be done in respect of goods exported.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—That is so.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I think that the Minister should not allow this item to pass.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I shall make further inquiry, and if it should transpire that it is not a proper thing to do, I will see that an alteration is made in another place.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—But why should persons who happen to manufacture waterproof cloth get this advantage over every other kind of manufacture? It is an anomalous item to put in the Tariff. Certainly, it cannot be called a scientific Tariff, when certain manufacturers are singled out for specially favorable treatment. I should like to know the reason for this proposal, and if there is no reason why these manufacturers should be treated differently from any others, it ought not to be done, I think.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Oh, let it go.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Has the honorable gentleman dealt with the other items in this schedule?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Yes, with everything. The leader of the Opposition took exception to them, and at my instance they were struck out.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Why should we have a special schedule in the Tariff for one class of manufacturers? He is a singularly fortunate manufacturer who, after

he has made up imported material, and exported it, is to be refunded three-fourths of the duty paid.

Mr. JOHNSON.—It is worse still, because it is a rebate for home consumption, not for export.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I was told by the Minister that it was a rebate on the exportation of the manufactured article.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Look at the heading—"rebate for home consumption."

Mr. SALMON (Laanecoorie) [8.27 a.m.].—It appears that the object of this item is to place the manufacturer of rubber waterproof cloth in exactly the same position as he was in under the old Tariff.

Mr. BOWDEN.—No, because he has a higher duty.

Mr. SALMON.—The amount of the rebate will be exactly the same as he got before. He will not be put in any better position.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—He will be in a better position if he uses local woollens.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Why should he be singled out for special treatment?

Mr. SALMON.—We have dealt with the raw material of his industry in a different fashion from that which was anticipated.

Mr. WATKINS (Newcastle) [8.28 a.m.].—I am not clear yet about this item. It appears to me that if a man who utilizes piece-goods in the manufacture of waterproof cloth is to get a refund of the duty paid, any body who uses piece-goods for any other purpose should stand in a similar position.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—And if he uses Australian cloth he has a protection of 30 per cent.

Mr. WATKINS.—Seeing that the piece of—

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Oh, I will withdraw the whole thing, and I have a very good mind to withdraw the Tariff too. I withdraw the item. I will not go any further with it.

Mr. SALMON.—It will simply ruin this manufacture.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I am not going to put up any longer with the nonsense I have had here this morning.

Mr. JOHNSON.—It is time that some of these proposals were debated a little more.

Mr. WATKINS.—I decidedly object to the remark of the Minister. I rise to ask why this special treatment is to be given to the manufacturer of rubber-waterproof cloth?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The honorable member was asleep when the information was given.

Mr. WATKINS.—I ask, sir, that that statement be withdrawn, because there is not a word of truth in it.

Mr. WATSON.—It should be withdrawn.

Mr. WATKINS.—Before I vote for this schedule I shall require to know why this industry has been singled out for special treatment.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The Minister has withdrawn it.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Batchelor).—I understand that the Minister is willing to withdraw the item, but the better plan will be to negative it.

Mr. SALMON.—If it is negatived we can not get another opportunity to deal with it, but if it is withdrawn, we can.

Item negatived.

Progress reported.

SPECIAL ADJOURNMENT.

Motion (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That the House at its rising adjourn until 4.30 p.m. this day.

ADJOURNMENT.

TARIFF.—RECOMMITTALS.—MANUFACTURES ENCOURAGEMENT BILL.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [8.33 a.m.].—In moving—

That the House do now adjourn,

I wish to say that immediately the House meets this afternoon a statement will be made as to the course of business. I may also observe that several things have to be done in regard to the Tariff. I have a list of corrections which require to be made. They are merely formal corrections, which are necessary before it can be said that the Tariff is complete. I will request the Clerks to let honorable members have copies of the list, and I ask honorable members to look over the corrections before this evening. Probably we shall be able to deal with them very shortly.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Is the Treasurer going to propose any recommittals?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I say nothing about that. Probably I shall say something when the House meets this afternoon. In the meantime I shall have to consider what is to be done.

Mr. PAGE.—Does the Treasurer intend to propose any recommittals this evening? If so, will he supply us with a list of those which he intends to submit?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—If I can possibly arrange to have necessary alterations made in another place I do not think I shall propose to recommit any items. If I do move to recommit any it must be on the distinct understanding that we are not to have a shower of proposals for recommittals, and so occupy the time of the House for a considerable period.

Mr. BOWDEN (Nepean) [8.36 a.m.].—I wish to inform the Treasurer that I have received a telegram from the Mayor of Lithgow, with reference to the iron works. I will read it—

General feeling here is that early settlement of bonus question by Representatives would facilitate settlement of crisis at iron works.

I wish to know whether the Government propose to deal with the Manufactures Encouragement Bill before we adjourn over Christmas?

Mr. CHANTER (Riverina) [8.37 a.m.].—I wish to ask a question, following on that asked by the honorable member for Maranoa. It has relation to the recommitment of items in the Tariff. I have asked that one item should be recommitted, and I think that every honorable member opposite will be with me in regard to it.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—If we do not propose recommittals of our own, we cannot be expected to vote for those of honorable members opposite.

Mr. JOHNSON. — I have thirty items which I wish to have recommitted, and I shall propose them if one is recommitted.

Mr. CHANTER.—All that I desire to do is to rectify an error, to make discs for ploughs and one or two other agricultural implements free of duty. A mistake was made but it can be easily dealt with. We need not wait until the error can be rectified by the Senate.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

House adjourned at 8.38 a.m. (Thursday).

House of Representatives.

Thursday, 12 December, 1907.

Mr. SPEAKER took the chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

MONOPOLIES AND TRUSTS: KEROSENE DUTY.

Mr. KING O'MALLEY.—I desire to ask the Prime Minister, without notice, whether in view of the complete consolidation of the many trusts and financial combines such as the Coal Vend, Tobacco and Sugar Trusts, Inter-State Shipping Ring and other commercial blood-sucking monopolies organized to plunder the producing masses, the Government will, under the Customs Smuggling Act, seize, confiscate, and sell the products or property of all monopolistic combinations, acting in restraint of trade while in transit between State and State, and thus effectively test the efficacy of the anti-trust law.

Mr. DEAKIN.—So far as I am aware, the present law does not permit us such bold enterprises. Following the question put to me yesterday by the honorable member for Maranoa, I have received the following letter from the Colonial Oil Company—

Dear Sir,—Referring to your remarks in the House yesterday, in regard to the increase in price charged for kerosene oil, on account of the duty of 3d. per gallon, I would say that :—At the time we increased our price, we promised our customers that we would refund to them—provided the duty were not ratified—the excess of price which we charged on all deliveries from free stocks. While we had plenty of free stock at Melbourne and Sydney, our stocks at other ports were small, and we have paid over £8,000 duty. Our promise to our customers holds good.

As I certainly by implication acquiesced in the statement that the company was charging increased prices, although it had not paid duty, and since I had no knowledge that it was intended to make any refund, it is only fair to read this letter.

STANDARD SIZE OF BAGS.

Mr. JOHN THOMSON.—I wish to ask the Minister of Trade and Customs whether, in view of the fact that freight and other carrying charges on maize, potatoes, and such products from coastal and other districts of New South Wales are fixed and charged

at a rate per bag of 240 lbs., and that the farmers hold considerable quantities of that size, he will postpone action to reduce the standard size of sacks to 200 lbs. capacity until they have had an opportunity to rearrange such freight and carrying charges with shipping firms and others on the reduced size?

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—I pointed out to a deputation which waited on me this morning with reference to the standard size of bags that the only action which the Government could take was in relation to the weight of bags for import and export. I showed the members of the deputation a letter from the Premier of Victoria intimating his intention to introduce legislation providing that the standard size of sacks should be 200 lbs. capacity. That standard has been adopted in New Zealand, and the Commonwealth Government have also determined that the weight must be reduced. Ample time will be given to farmers and others to make the necessary arrangements, for there are large stocks of bags in the country, and it is desired to bring about the change without inflicting any injustice. But the one thing certain is that the Government have determined that the present practice of allowing bags to be filled without any restriction as to weight must be stopped, and that the State Government have intimated their intention of taking similar action.

Later.

Mr. BAMFORD.—I beg to ask the Minister of Trade and Customs, in connexion with his reply to a deputation concerning an alteration in the size of wheat bags, which was to come into operation in April next, whether there is any intention to vary the determination?

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—No; I do not propose to alter the determination. A very serious statement was made to me this morning, to the effect that to alter the size of these bags from 240 lbs. to 200 lbs.—an alteration which I am very strongly in favour of—would involve a cost of £7 10s. per annum to a farmer having 500 bags of wheat to ship. I asked the gentleman who made that statement to let me have the figures, because, so far as I can understand, the expense involved in the alteration could not possibly amount to anything of the kind.

[261]

PIANOS : DISCLOSURE OF CUSTOMS INFORMATION.

Mr. WILKS.—When the item relating to pianos was under consideration yesterday, it was alleged that information supplied by Mr. George Allan, of Messrs. Allan and Company, in what had been made official documents in the Department of Trade and Customs, had been improperly disclosed. Will the Minister cause a searching investigation to be made to determine the cause of the leakage, if any?

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—Every inquiry will be made.

NEW PROTECTION : SOCIALISM.

Mr. PALMER.—I desire to ask the Prime Minister how far we are from Socialism, and how much of private ownership will be left to manufacturers and producers if the scheme of new protection, as outlined by the Government, and submitted to this House yesterday, becomes law?

Mr. WATSON.—Is that one of Walpole's questions?

Mr. PALMER.—No; it is a genuine production.

Mr. DEAKIN.—In that respect, at all events, private enterprise flourishes here. Without asking the honorable member for his definition of Socialism, but interpreting it in the ordinary fashion, I contend that the fixing of fair and reasonable wages, under equal conditions, and the assurance of fair prices, even if undertaken by State action, brings us no nearer Socialism, in the Continental sense of the word, than we have ever been. The honorable member will probably say, "It is another form of State interference"; but even our Courts of law, in doing justice as between man and man, interfere for similar purposes with individual freedom on the authority of the State.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE : CASUAL EMPLOYEES.

Mr. MALONEY.—Will the Treasurer take into consideration the position of casual employés in the Government Printing Office who work all night when Parliament is sitting, and arrange to grant them two weeks' leave such as is annually enjoyed by permanent employés?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I cannot say on the spur of the moment what hours are worked by casual employés in the Government Printing Office; but I shall at

once make inquiries, and if it be possible to grant them a holiday, I shall not be against it.

ORDER OF BUSINESS—CHRISTMAS ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. JOHNSON.—As the Prime Minister was unable to give me definite information on the subject yesterday, so that honorable members might make final arrangements for returning to their homes, I wish to ask whether he is yet in a position to make a definite statement as to when he intends that the House shall rise for the Christmas adjournment?

Mr. DEAKIN.—The Tariff appears to have been so far disposed of that without being unduly sanguine I think we can count upon settling it at the present sitting. After it is dealt with, I propose to ask honorable members to take the next two measures on the paper—the Excise Procedure Bill and the Manufactures Encouragement Bill. I hope also, if time will permit, to induce honorable members to consider the Senate's amendments—for that is all we have to do in connexion with the measure—in the Quarantine Bill, in order that its new administration may be got under way, and pressing causes of friction removed.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I hope the honorable gentleman will not persist with that.

Mr. DEAKIN.—I should not have been inclined to ask honorable members seriously to consider the whole of these measures at this date were it not that in each case circumstances have arisen outside and beyond our control which make their passage into law imperatively necessary. In the case, for instance, of the Excise Procedure Bill, the situation with which we are confronted in enforcing the measure now upon the statute-book is such that without this Bill it is doubtful if we can take the effective action called for at the present time. It deals with a real emergency which can be met in a perfectly legitimate way by altering existing procedure, without raising any new principle. In the case of the Manufactures Encouragement Bill, it will be admitted that the closing of the Sandford Iron-works is a matter of importance, not only to New South Wales, but to the whole of the Commonwealth. It might be taken for granted, and in fact I have reason to know that the action taken by the New South Wales Government recently was to some extent affected by the knowledge that

this House had passed the second reading of the Manufactures Encouragement Bill. If we were in a position before we rise for the Christmas adjournment to indicate to the country the form the bounty would take, and the conditions under which it would be payable, the information might have a most excellent effect in the direction of rehabilitating this great enterprise.

Mr. WATSON.—That cannot be finally settled in the absence of the Senate.

Mr. DEAKIN.—That is so; but there would be, at all events, an indication of the feeling of this House which would go a long way in the direction I have stated.

Mr. WATSON.—There would be still room for a good deal of difference of opinion as to details, even though the principle should be accepted.

Mr. DEAKIN.—There are differences as to details. In regard to the Quarantine Bill, honorable members familiar with the papers know that complaints have been exchanged between New South Wales, Western Australia, and Tasmania on matters connected with quarantine. This makes the passage of the measure urgent, because it will be some months after the passing of the Quarantine Bill into law before it can become operative.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I hope the Prime Minister will not persist with it.

Mr. DEAKIN.—At this stage I must bow to the will of the House, but it does appear to me that we ought to deal with the Quarantine Bill.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Will the honorable gentleman say when he hopes to adjourn the House for the Christmas adjournment?

Mr. DEAKIN.—Though the hope is somewhat weaker than it was, I still think we might manage to adjourn on Saturday; but there must be sacrifices on the part of individual members if we are to do so. The practically unlimited freedom which every honorable member enjoys, and exercises according to his own conscience, renders it possible for a few occupying time legitimately to prolong the sittings unduly. It is only by honorable members refraining from the full exercise of their privileges that we can conclude on Saturday. I hope, with their co-operation, that we shall be able to close in time for the Saturday trains.

Mr. JOHNSON.—I should like to ask the Prime Minister, in reference to the Manufactures Encouragement Bill, to which he has just referred, whether he is aware that there is a clause in the contract be-

tween the New South Wales State Government and Mr. Sandford that any Lounty paid in connexion with the industry shall be paid over to the State Government of New South Wales.

Mr. WATSON.—That is in respect only of Government contracts.

Mr. DEAKIN.—I understand that is so with respect to Government contracts; but if the honorable member sees any objection to the provision, there will be a proper time to point it out.

SYDNEY GENERAL POST OFFICE : OVERTIME.

Mr. WEBSTER.—I wish to ask the Postmaster-General, without notice, whether he is now in a position to give the House any information, in accordance with the promise he made a few months ago, with regard to the alleged working of overtime in the Sydney General Post Office?

Mr. MAUGER.—I am not at present in a position to give the honorable member the information referred to. The return called for involves a very large amount of work. I have issued an order that on no account, except in connexion with specially urgent work, is overtime to be worked.

TELEPHONE LINE: SYDNEY AND MELBOURNE.

Mr. McDOUGALL asked the Postmaster-General, *upon notice*—

Whether it is true that the telephone line between Melbourne and Sydney is not earning working expenses and interest on the cost of construction; and, if so, how came the work to be undertaken without the usual guarantee for assumedly non-paying lines being insisted upon?

Mr. MAUGER.—The answer to the honorable member's question is as follows—

No. The telephone line in question, which has only been opened for a period of five months, has so far—allowing for its use as a telegraph line—paid at the rate of over 9 per cent. on the cost of construction, and there is every prospect that by the end of the twelve months, it will have paid not only working expenses and interest on cost of construction, but also cost of maintenance and sinking fund. No guarantee was asked for, because it was estimated that the revenue would more than equal the amount usually required. No guarantee is ever asked under such circumstances.

EXCISE TARIFF (AGRICULTURAL MACHINERY) ACT.

Mr. KING O'MALLEY asked the Minister of Trade and Customs, *upon notice*—

1. Has he seen the judgment of Mr. Justice Higgins, in *Bagshaw's case*, in which the Judge

commented upon the absence of the Commonwealth in McKay's application as showing no desire to protect the revenue, and leaving the Unions to bear the expense of proving that they were not paid fair and reasonable wages?

2. What was the reason for the Government not appearing in McKay's case?

3. Who was responsible for such non-appearance?

4. Has the Government determined what its future attitude and policy is as regards similar applications to the Excise Court in connexion with Excise duty on harvesters and other agricultural machinery?

5. Has the Government determined whether it is its duty to protect the revenue or to obtain fair and reasonable wages for the men?

6. If the Government has failed in its duty in regard to McKay's case, will it take steps to repair any miscarriage of justice caused through its failure?

7. Did the Minister observe the statement of the counsel for the Commonwealth that the Government was not able to obtain the evidence, as the Unions did, as to what were fair and reasonable wages, and seeing the Unions were successful in proving the Government's right to Excise, will the Government indemnify Unions against the expense they were so put to through the admitted inability of the Government to prove the facts?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—In reply to the honorable member's questions, I beg to state—

1. Yes.

2 and 3. It was not considered that the Government had any power to intervene.

4. The Government will be guided by its legal advisers as to the proper course to be taken.

5. The object of the Government is to obtain fair and reasonable wages for the men?

6. If the Government had failed it would have at once repaired the omission.

7. The Government proposes to take into consideration the circumstances referred to.

ALLEGED MANURES COMBINE.

Mr. McDOUGALL asked the Prime Minister, *upon notice*—

1. Whether it is true, as alleged, that the manufacturers and importers of manures have formed a combine with a view to stifle competition and raise prices to the farmers?

2. Is he aware, that since such combine has come into existence the price of superphosphates has been increased by seven shillings a ton, and that the said superphosphates contain 2 per cent. less water soluble phosphoric acid than formerly; also, that the combine has raised the interest on promissory notes due by 1 per cent.?

3. As a manure combine is prejudicial to the best interests of the farmers and gardeners of the Commonwealth, will the Prime Minister use whatever constitutional means he may have to prevent unfair trading on the part of the combine?

Mr. DEAKIN.—I have, so far, been unable to obtain any information on this head, but inquiries will be made. If

the state of affairs to which the honorable member has called attention is found to exist, the Government will endeavour to see whether the facts justify them in taking action.

STRIPPER HARVESTERS.

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—On Thursday last the honorable member for Calare asked me the following questions—

1. How many Stripper Harvesters have been imported into the Commonwealth between the 1st

January and 30th November, 1907, and what was the value of the same?

2. How many Stripper Harvesters have been exported from the Commonwealth during the same period, and what was the value of the same?

3. How many Stripper Harvesters have been manufactured in the Commonwealth between 1st January and 30th November, 1907?

I promised to reply as soon as the information asked for was obtained. I am now in a position to supply the following information in answer to the honorable member's questions:—

State.	Imported.			Exported.			Manufactured.		
	No.	Value.		No.	Value.		No.	Value.	
New South Wales ...	366	15,015	...	—	—	...	Not ascertainable.		
Victoria ...	201	8,659	...	100	6,475	...	do.		
Queensland ...	20	809	...	—	—	...	—		
South Australia ...	121	4,953	...	1	75	...	153	8,475	
Western Australia ...	Information not to hand.								
Tasmania ...	No manufacture and none imported or exported.								

PAPER.

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN laid upon the table the following paper—

Rabbit Destruction.—Dr. Danysz's experiments. Third report on experiments made with the Danysz virus for the destruction of rabbits—by Dr. E. Angas Johnson, and W. J. P. Giddings, honorary Commissioners for the South Australian Government.

Ordered to be printed.

TARIFF.

In Committee of Ways and Means (Consideration resumed from 11th December, *vide* page 7413):

Postponed item 425 as amended). Articles imported or purchased in bond for the official use of the Governor-General and declared as being for such official use—Free.

A. Articles imported or purchased in bond for the official use of the State Governors, and declared as being for such official use, on and after 12th December, 1907—Free.

Upon which Mr. BATCHELOR had moved by way of amendment—

That the following new paragraph be added—

"B. Articles imported or purchased in bond for the official use of the Lieutenant-Governors, and declared as being for such official use, on and after 12th December, 1907—Free."

Mr. BATCHELOR (Boothby) [4.48].—When, a few hours earlier to-day, I moved my amendment upon the Treasurer's proposal, my object was that we should either extend the freedom from taxation proposed to be conferred on the Governors of the States somewhat further down the social scale, or else draw the line at the Governor-General of the Commonwealth. I do not wish to discuss the matter at any length, but, whatever reasons there are, if there be any good reasons at all, for free-

ing the Governors of the States from Customs taxation, must apply with equal force to Lieutenant-Governors. The question as to where we should draw the line becomes very difficult to answer if we once depart from the principle that it should be drawn at the King's representative in the Commonwealth—the Governor-General. Our supply is granted to His Majesty, and it would be a contradiction for the King to be taxed, because all the taxes are paid by the people to the King. Still, that power should not be delegated to all His Majesty's representatives in every case. If we grant that we cannot tax the King, it follows that we should not tax the King's representative, who, so far as the Commonwealth is concerned, is the Governor-General. The States are sovereign, but only in their own spheres. They have no sovereign rights so far as the Commonwealth is concerned. Customs taxation is exclusively a Commonwealth matter, with regard to which it cannot be said that the States have any powers. Therefore, the better plan in these matters is to allow the representative of the King, in Commonwealth legislation, to stand in the same position as the King, and then stop there. Once we go beyond him and bring in the Governors of the States, there is absolutely no halting place, and we must go still further and grant the Lieutenant-Governors freedom from Commonwealth taxation. We should also have to exempt all representatives of the King acting in any small local capacity. Perhaps that can hardly be said to apply to the mayor of a municipality, who represents the citizens, nor to a member of Par-

liament, who represents the people of his constituency. But all persons appointed by the King to act as his representative in any capacity, and to whom he delegates his authority, are equally entitled with the Governors of the States to this privilege, once we go past the Governor-General. As we go down the scale, we find that the King's authority is, in a manner, delegated to the policeman. It would therefore be better to limit this freedom from taxation to the representative of the King in the Commonwealth—the Governor-General. I understand that the Prime Minister proposes to address the Committee.

Mr. DEAKIN.—To address the honorable member.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—I shall be most happy to hear the honorable gentleman.

Mr. DEAKIN (Ballarat—Minister of External Affairs) [4.58].—Although the honorable member for Boothby is perfectly entitled, if he so chooses, to take the line of argument and precedent which he has adopted, or to argue that an inconsistency can be discovered in this proposal or develop his theory of the position which the Governors hold, the reason why I, for one, am anxious that this should be accorded to is that this act will be accepted in the States, and by those affected, as an act of courtesy and civility on the part of the Commonwealth. I put it, so far as I am concerned, on no wider ground than that on this occasion.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—Why did not the Government propose it, instead of leaving it to a private member?

Mr. DEAKIN.—Because the former exemption seems to have been struck out of this list of exemptions under the direction of a previous Minister in some other relation, and, so far as I know, its absence was not noticed until the Tariff was on the table. However, it represents an inconsiderable sum; and I have found when travelling through the States that it is regarded as a significant indication of the attitude of the Commonwealth Parliament towards the States through their chief officers. It was an act of courtesy which, not having been abused, there is no reason to withdraw. Why should we pay the Governors less consideration than has been the custom in the past?

Mr. FISHER.—A kind of Christmas box!

Mr. DEAKIN.—As the honorable member happily says, it would, in present circumstances, be an appropriate Christmas

box. That is the ground on which I am happy to take this opportunity of putting my view. This will be a graceful act of courtesy to the gentlemen affected, and does not necessarily raise important questions appropriate if it had a wider bearing.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS (Robertson) [5.2].—I suppose this is a matter we are not supposed to discuss at any great length; but it seems to me very proper that, if the Governor-General is to receive all his requirements through the Customs duty free, the same privilege should be extended to the Governors of the States. However, my chief purpose in rising is to suggest that the Government representatives in such places as Port Darwin, and in Papua, who have to dispense a good deal of hospitality, should be placed on the same footing as Lieutenant-Governors. I should like to know whether the Prime Minister approves of the suggestion.

Mr. WILKS (Dalley) [5.3].—I do not know the temper of the Committee, but I am altogether opposed to this item; and, in my opinion, the offer of a concession of the kind amounts almost to an insult. I know we are not supposed to discuss the Governor-General, and I do not propose to discuss him as an individual, but to confine my remarks to the office he holds. I have arrived at that stage of life when I have ceased to believe in foolish complimentary language to gentlemen who occupy positions of the kind. The Governor-General has a certain allowance, and if it be not sufficient, after the proper tribute to the Customs has been paid, let it be made larger. The present Governor-General, I understand, takes a kindly interest in Australian manufactures, and is endeavouring to set the fashion in regard to the use of them; and what I now say must not be construed into an attack upon him personally. If we call ourselves a democracy we should see that every citizen contributes fairly to the Customs. Why this exemption? Is it to enable the Governor-General and Governors to obtain more cheaply champagne and other necessities of their official functions? And, by the way, I hold that the Governor-General and the Government should not be called upon to give those entertainments. I know that we are not supposed to discuss these questions; but I see in the Governor-General no more than I do in any other public official. I have not reached that stage of personal idolatry when I feel constrained to worship the

Governor-General, or any other member of the community; and I shall be pleased to see the Committee strike out the item.

Mr. HUTCHISON (Hindmarsh) [5.6].—I am rather surprised that the Government should agree to any differentiation in the case of the Governor-General, the Governor of a State, or any other citizen. We ought to see that those who are placed in responsible offices are paid sufficient salary to cover all charges. I intend to submit an amendment.

Mr. WILKS.—Vote against the item.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—No; the present Governor-General and the States Governors have been brought here under an agreement to receive certain salaries and have the goods imported for their own use admitted duty free. I am willing to respect that contract, though I feel that an arrangement of the kind leaves the door open to all kinds of abuse. I do not mean to say that the Governor-General or the Governor of any State would wilfully abuse such a concession; but the difficulty is that some Governor, coming from the free-trade Old Land, might have a very different idea from ourselves as to what ought to be brought in free. As I say, I would respect present contracts, but provide for a different arrangement in the future. If the salary of a Governor is not sufficient to cover all his expenses, it ought to be increased; but I hope the time is coming when we shall have no imported State Governors, because I see no reason why we should. My amendment will seek to restrict the exemption to the present Governor-General and Governors of the States, placing all future Governor-Generals and Governors on the same footing as ordinary citizens, so far as the Customs is concerned.

Mr. PAGE.—That was passed this morning; the proposal before us deals with the Lieutenant-Governors.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—That makes the position all the worse. If there is any justification for permitting the goods of Lieutenant-Governors to come in free, there is equal justification for extending the privilege to the members of His Majesty's Government, the members of His Majesty's Opposition, and so on, right down the scale to policemen. The position is absurd. We in Australia ought to see that, in regard to taxation, every citizen, from the highest to the lowest, is placed on exactly the same footing.

Mr. WILKS.—I do not think that the Governor-General or any of the Governors thank us for the exemption, but rather that they may regard it as an insult.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—I agree with the honorable member. The representatives of His Majesty are well paid; and I am sure that if the question were put to them, it would be found that they had no desire for any exemption of the kind. I move—

That the amendment be amended by adding the words—"This exemption from payment of duty shall not apply to any Governor-General, State Governor, or Lieutenant-Governor appointed after 12th December, 1907."

Mr. KNOX (Kooyong) [5.10].—I think that the Governors of the States occupy an entirely different position from other public officials who have been mentioned, inasmuch as within a limited period they take away whatever they may bring with them. They are here simply as visitors, and cannot be regarded as citizens of the Commonwealth in the ordinary acceptance of the term.

Mr. WILKS.—All visitors pay Customs taxation whilst they remain here.

Mr. KNOX.—Exactly. But they come here for their own pleasure; whereas the several Governors come as the representatives of the Crown. I am very glad that the Government have agreed not to make any invidious distinction between the position occupied by the Governor-General and that occupied by the Governors of the States, and trust that the amendment will not be pressed. The condition sought to be imposed upon the representatives of the Crown is one which does not obtain in any other part of the British dominions.

Question.—That the words proposed to be added be so added (Mr. HUTCHISON's amendment)—put. The Committee divided.

Ayes	19
Noes	35
<hr/>				
Majority	16

AYES.

Bamford, F. W.	O'Malley, King
Batchelor, E. L.	Page, J.
Brown, Thomas	Poynton, A.
Crouch, R. A.	Salmon, C. C.
Foster, F. J.	Tudor, F. G.
Glynn, P. McM.	Wilks, W. H.
Mahon, H.	Wise, G. H.
Maloney, W. R. N.	
Mathews, J.	
McDougall, J. K.	

Tellers:
Fraser, C. E.
Hutchison, J.

NOES.

Archer, E. W.
 Atkinson, L.
 Bowden, E. K.
 Brown, Tilley
 Chanter, J. M.
 Chapman, Austin
 Cook, Joseph
 Coon, J.
 Deakin, A.
 Edwards, R.
 Ewing, T. T.
 Fisher, A.
 Foxton, Colonel
 Groom, L. E.
 Harper, R.
 Hedges, W. N.
 Irvine, Hans
 Irvine, W. H.

Johnson, W. E.
 Knox, W.
 Livingston, J.
 Lync, Sir William
 Mauger, S.
 McWilliams, W. J.
 Palmer, A. C.
 Quick, Sir John
 Sampson, S.
 Sinclair, H.
 Storrer, D.
 Thomson, Dugald
 Webster, W.
 Willis, Henry
 Wilson, J. G.

Tellers:

Cook, Hume
 Thomson, John

PAIRS.

Fowler, J. M.
 Watkins, D.
 Carr, F. S.
 Hall, D. R.
 Spence, W. G.

Smith, Bruce
 Forrest, Sir John
 Watson, J. C.
 Reid, G. H.
 Fuller, G. W.

Question so resolved in the negative.

Amendment of the amendment negatived.

Later.

Mr. SALMON.—With your permission, sir, and that of the Committee, I desire to make an explanation with regard to the last vote which was taken. I was under the impression that the question then before the chair was the proposal of the honorable member for Boothby to include Lieutenant-Governors in the item, and I voted accordingly.

Mr. BATCHELOR (Boothby) [5.20].—The Prime Minister has put it to us that it is a matter of grace to make this concession. It has also been said by one or two honorable members that a matter of State rights is involved. But it appears to me that whatever issue is involved, certainly State rights are not in any way affected. No one can contend that the States have any sort of right to demand that their Governors shall be enabled to import goods duty free. Customs taxation is exclusively a subject for control by this Parliament. It has nothing whatever to do with the States. I am informed by the honorable member for Laanecoorie, who was once Commissioner of Customs in Victoria, that in this State the Governor has always had to pay Customs taxation on imported goods, just the same as any other citizen.

Mr. SALMON.—The first Governor-General of the Commonwealth, when he arrived, was charged duty on his wines and other imports.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—Yes; I believe that Lord Linlithgow—the Earl of Hope-toun, as he then was—had to pay duty on the taxable goods that he brought in. It is really a pity that the amendment of the honorable member for Hindmarsh was not carried, so that we might have laid down once and for all the principle that this exemption should apply only to the present representatives of His Majesty, and not to their successors. We certainly ought not to go further than that. In fact, I do not know that we need even go so far.

Mr. GLYNN.—I do not think the concession ought to be made to any one.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—I agree with the honorable member. We should pay adequate salaries, and not try to “make it up” in a piecemeal or *sub rosa* fashion. The salary paid should be the beginning and end of the Governor-General’s and of the State Governors’ emoluments. The Prime Minister, however, puts it that this is a concession to the States which may allay some sort of friction. I do not think there could be any friction over a matter like this. Certainly there ought not to be. If there is likely to be any friction over such an absurd thing it cannot be allayed by making little concessions. The amount involved is merely a bagatelle. The States can, if they desire that their Governors shall not pay Customs duties, repay to them the amounts collected by the Customs. But the principle should be laid down that no one should be allowed to bring goods into this country for personal use, or for any other purpose, except after paying the duties which this Parliament has imposed. Whatever reasons there are for requiring Bill Jones or Tom Smith to pay duties on goods which they import are equally applicable to the Governor-General and to States Governors. There ought to be no exception. However, as the Committee was not disposed to support our contention, it is of no use for me to challenge a division on the question of the addition of Lieutenant-Governors.

Mr. FRAZER.—If we exempt the goods of Governors, why not of Lieutenant-Governors also?

Mr. BATCHELOR.—I assume that the Committee is determined not to extend the privilege to the Lieutenant-Governors. Therefore I ask leave to withdraw my amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.
 Item, as amended, agreed to.

Postponed item 424. Articles imported by or being the property of the Commonwealth, free.

Amendment (by Colonel FOXTON) proposed—

That after the word "Commonwealth," the words "or of a State and imported for use in the Public Works or in the Public Service of such State."

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [5.29].—I hope that this proposed addition to the item will not be accepted. I think it would lead to very serious consequences indeed—probably consequences not intended or contemplated by the honorable member who has submitted the amendment. The Committee might fairly leave this question of the taxation of State property to the law as embodied in the Constitution, and as it will no doubt shortly receive the interpretation of the highest Court recognised in such matters by the Commonwealth. The law upon the subject is contained in section 114 of the Constitution, which says that the Commonwealth shall not impose—

any tax on property of any kind belonging to a State.

On the face of it, of course, the provision is fairly liberal and comprehensive in the direction of freedom and the exemption of State property of all kinds and descriptions from Federal taxation.

Mr. WATSON.—Probably it means real property, all the same.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—At one time I was inclined to give it a very wide interpretation, viz., that it might cover property of every description, including landed estate, as well as goods and chattels. I was then inclined to think that that was the real intention and most reasonable interpretation of the provision, but I have seen reason to reconsider my opinion. I consider that in dealing with an instrument of government, such as a Constitution, we ought to be very careful as to the canon of interpretation and construction, and that, if we see two possible meanings or constructions of a provision, we ought to accept, and I believe that the Supreme Court of the Commonwealth, in the same way as the Supreme Court of the United States, would adopt and accept such an interpretation and construction of a Federal instrument as would be most workable, consistent with its preservation. And if there was an interpretation which might lead to the destruction of the system of government, I think that the Court of final jurisdiction would hesitate before it accepted the interpreta-

tion. I firmly believe, as the result of calm and prolonged consideration, that if the word "property" in section 114 of our Constitution received the widest possible meaning and interpretation, and that it included State imports, that interpretation might, in the end, lead to the breakdown of our system of Customs and Excise revenue. It might lead to a most unexpected and disastrous result, which the friends of the Constitution and the Commonwealth would not hope to see, and which they would most earnestly pray should be averted. If the view were accepted that all goods and chattels imported by a State Government were by the term "property" exempted from taxation—

Mr. WATSON.—What would be the limit?

Sir JOHN QUICK. — "Property," widely construed, means real and personal estate, as well as goods and chattels.

Mr. WATSON.—It might include chattels. There is no limit to which a State might not go.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—No.

Mr. WATSON.—A State might supersede private imports.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—Quite so. A State might launch into all kinds of enterprises, and become the sole importer of goods and chattels, for the purpose of disposing of them to private customers and taxpayers.

Mr. WATSON.—In that way it would get indirectly the Customs revenue.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—In that way it would kill the source of revenue from Customs and Excise contemplated by the Federal law. At the same time, if we reach a stage for the federalization of all revenue from Customs and Excise, a State which went in for wholesale importation might escape Customs and Excise duties, and at the same time would also claim to share in the distribution of the revenue from the Customs and Excise duties paid by the people of other States. That is an interpretation which no friend of the Constitution ever contemplated. I do not believe that any reasonable interpretation would lead to that result. At any rate, I should firmly hope not. But the honorable member for Brisbane is not content with leaving to the High Court the construction of the word "property," in section 114. He wants express Federal legislation to grant absolute immunity to the State Governments to import goods and chattels for the use of State

Departments. That is a most dangerous provision to introduce. It will lend force and sanction to the view that all State imports ought to be free. I certainly think it would be very unfair to the Commonwealth, and also to the several States which did not launch into such vast schemes and enterprises, if such exemption from duty were granted. I hope that the Committee will make short work of the amendment by summarily rejecting it.

Mr. GLYNN (Angas) [5.35].—There is no doubt that the honorable member for Brisbane has raised a very difficult question; at least, I feel it somewhat difficult to say, with any emphasis, what ought to be done. But, on the whole, I think that we ought to exempt State imports until we abolish the principle of crediting the Customs revenue to the States in which imported goods are consumed. As long as we do not alter that provision of the Constitution, there is no danger, so far as I can see, of the abuse of this exemption by a State, for the simple reason that it would be simply getting its own revenue to the extent of three-fourths. No State would become such a large importer of goods as to destroy the whole fiscal system, and the apportionment of revenue from Customs and Excise duties fairly throughout the Commonwealth.

Mr. HEDGES.—Suppose that they went in for Socialism?

Mr. GLYNN.—As long as by doing that it is diminishing the Customs revenue which has to be paid back under the Constitution—

Mr. WATSON.—That provision can expire in a very short time.

Mr. GLYNN.—When we do abolish that provision under which the Commonwealth credits a State with the duties paid on articles consumed therein, we can provide—

Mr. WATSON.—I refer to the Braddon section.

Mr. GLYNN.—Speaking subject to correction, I do not think that it touches the matter.

Mr. WATSON.—I think that it does, though not on the legal side.

Mr. GLYNN.—I think that what touches the question are sections 89 and 93, under which each State is credited with the duties levied on the commodities consumed therein. In 1903 this question was raised in the case of the Attorney-

General of New South Wales against the Comptroller-General of Customs for the Commonwealth.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The constitutional question is pending in the High Court.

Mr. GLYNN.—Suppose that New South Wales, in the exercise of the right which it then asserted, if it had a right, imported very largely railway material free of duty, if we choose to exempt it. Then it is simply surrendering three-fourths of the Customs revenue which otherwise would be paid to the State in case the duty were levied. That is a check on the abuse of the exemption. So long as we do not abolish the system under which each State is credited with the duties paid on commodities consumed therein—

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—Of course, under any system we would have a large proportion of the Customs and Excise revenue. That supports the honorable member.

Mr. GLYNN.—No doubt. Since the whole of our Customs revenue after provision had been made for our expenditure might be apportioned among the States in any way that the Commonwealth thought fit, it would be ridiculous to allow each State to defeat the equity of the division by becoming a very large importer of dutiable commodities.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Does the honorable member think that we should in the meantime make any alteration, especially as the matter is *sub judice*?

Mr. GLYNN.—I do not think that the question *sub judice* is touched.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—What I mean is that we shall soon have a decision as to our rights and powers.

Mr. GLYNN.—If we determine now to grant this exemption, and the High Court subsequently holds that as a matter of constitutional right the exemption already exists, no harm will be done; but on the other hand, if whilst favoring an exemption at the present time we refrain from granting it, and the High Court later on determines that the States have no exemption under the Constitution, then we shall do an injustice to the States if we do not grant it by legislation. The Committee should take action now if they believe it wise to cover the possibility of the exemption not being provided for.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—If we thought we had the power but did not think it wise to part with it, we should nevertheless abandon it by the action proposed.

Mr. GLYNN.—Let us assume that States' imports under the Constitution are not exempt. It does not follow that we have not the power by legislation to make them exempt. We are asked to exercise that power, and my contention is that if the Legislature think the exemption ought to exist and the Constitution has not granted it, now is the time to give effect to that belief.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—If the Constitution has not granted it, how can we grant it?

Mr. GLYNN.—The question before the High Court is not whether we can or can not exempt States' imports, but whether the Constitution, apart from our legislation, grants the exemption.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—That is what I said.

Mr. GLYNN.—I did not understand the honorable member to say so. If he holds that view he cannot possibly differ from the position I am putting. There are two alternatives. The exemption may exist under the Constitution; if it does, we need not legislate on the subject. On the other hand, it may not exist under the Constitution, but we have the power to grant it by legislation. If we think that we ought by legislation to grant this exemption to the States, now is the time to take action. If we desire to grant the exemption, but omit to do so because the High Court is considering the question from the point of view of the Constitution, then if the exemption does not exist as a constitutional right, we shall not have granted it by legislation although we believe that it ought to be granted.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—We do not believe that it ought to be granted.

Mr. GLYNN.—Some do and some do not; I am merely endeavoring to help the Committee to a judgment in the matter by putting the legislative and constitutional aspect of the question before it. Whilst with some doubt I think that we ought now to grant the exemption, I hold that as soon as we begin to distribute the Customs and Excise revenue upon some other principle than that which has regard to where the commodities on which duties were paid were consumed, we ought not to do so.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—Why grant it at all?

Mr. GLYNN.—That is a perfectly sound position.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—Is it the honorable member's conclusion that we ought not to grant it at all?

Mr. GLYNN.—No. I say with some diffidence that we ought to grant it whilst a check against its abuse is imposed by the fact that the State which imports goods free of duty will be surrendering revenue.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—The honorable member thinks we should grant the exemption as long as the existing system of distribution of surplus revenue remains in force?

Mr. GLYNN.—That is so. If we can thus place ourselves in a perfectly logical and sound position, I think that we ought to do so, for reasons which I shall explain.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—To that extent only?

Mr. GLYNN.—Yes. We have to deal with a time at which the relations of the States and the Commonwealth are somewhat delicate and timid. They sometimes almost remind me of one of the characters in *Little Dorrit*, Old Dorrit, who—if I may be allowed to put the States in this position—was always suspicious that some one was reflecting on his honesty when no reflection was intended, and that something was to be done to his detriment. Under section 131 of the Customs Act we have exempted the Commonwealth, but not the States, from the payment of Customs duties. That seems an invidious distinction as against the States. If the Commonwealth chose to become a very large importer of commodities it could avail itself of that exemption to defraud the States, so that whatever pertinence there is in the remarks of the honorable member for Bendigo applies, to a large extent at all events, to the exemption already granted to the Commonwealth, not merely under the Tariff proposals, but by the Customs Act.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—The Commonwealth, however, has power over the Customs and Excise duties, and may increase or diminish them.

Mr. GLYNN.—What has that to do with the question with which I am now dealing—the point that the Commonwealth is at present creating an invidious exemption in favour of itself, and that under that exemption it could, if it chose to abuse its power, lead us to the unfortunate position assumed to be possible in the case of the States? Let me put an even stronger

case in favour of our granting for the present an exemption of State imports, and one that may hold to some extent, although with weakened force, when we adopt some other principle of distribution. When a State borrows, say, £1,000,000 in London, it brings out that money in the shape of goods—generally in the form of railway material or other of the larger commodities consumed by the States. In such circumstances, the Commonwealth immediately takes one-fourth of the revenue raised by way of duty on goods representing those loan moneys. Is it right for the Commonwealth, by taxing the imports of the States, which in ninety-nine out of a hundred represent loan moneys, to diminish the amount so raised in London.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—I do not think that is the position.

Mr. GLYNN.—It is. I would remind the honorable member that some years ago South Australia, in order to remove a false impression, exempted its imports from the payment of duty, recognising that its loan moneys were diminished to the extent of the Customs duties collected on imports representing them. Under the old system of taxing the imports of the States, the loan balances in the books were never at their true amount.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—That difficulty would exist just as much after the adoption of a new system of distribution as it does at the present time.

Mr. GLYNN.—It was because I appreciated that fact that I said just now that this case would hold, perhaps with weakened force, after we had adopted some other principle of distribution.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—I do not think that the difficulty would be diminished.

Mr. GLYNN.—I merely suggested that the difficulty would exist with perhaps diminished force. In hitting off a conclusion on the spur of the moment, one does not like to be emphatic.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK. — Having once granted the exemption, would we be able afterwards under the pooling system to take the money from revenue?

Mr. GLYNN.—I think so. If we merely provide that whilst the present conditions exist the exemptions shall apply, the States will not have any cause to complain if we say later on that under the new conditions of distribution they ought not to apply.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—But they will.

Mr. GLYNN.—I do not wish to elaborate the question. I have endeavoured to give reasons for a temporary exemption of State imports. I think that, in the circumstances, to be logical and consistent, we ought for the present to exempt State imports. I put that conclusion not, perhaps, with the cocksureness of some who hold the contrary view, but merely for the consideration of the Committee, acknowledging that I had some difficulty when I read the amendment in making up my mind as to what ought to be done.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Should we act in a matter that involves millions of money when we have a doubt?

Mr. GLYNN.—Does the honorable member mean a doubt as to the policy or as to the power?

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—As to the policy.

Mr. GLYNN.—Judging by the debates that have taken place from the first in the Federal Parliament, not a single policy that has been postulated or made the subject of legislation has been free from doubt. I have never known the deputy leader of the Opposition, fair and able as he is, to agree to a Government proposition without some qualification. Parliament is an assembly where people are supposed to speak their minds. If they have not a mind on a subject, they often extemporize a pretence of one. When a proposal is put before us, we generally agree to its adoption with a good deal of travail and disquietude as to whether we are doing right or wrong, and, that being so, I do not think that the existence of a doubt as to the expediency of the policy ought to prevent us from deciding that the balance is in favour of an exemption for the present of State imports.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—At this stage it would require a long debate to enable us to determine whether or not it is a wise step to take.

Mr. GLYNN.—I am sorry that my arguments are so untenable as to suggest the impossibility of our arriving at a conclusion without a long debate.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Not at all. The honorable member has made a very able speech.

Mr. GLYNN. — Assuming the humility that ought to embellish the argument of a member of Parliament, but seldom does, I put these considerations before the Committee, acknowledging that with a considerable degree of doubt and hesitancy I have decided to support the amendment

if it be pressed to a division. At the same time, I would suggest to the honorable member for Brisbane that he should consider whether he ought to press it. If he does, he should certainly limit the operation of the proposed exemption until we legislate under the powers preserved to us by section 93 of the Constitution.

Mr. WATSON (Bland) [5.54].—For a variety of reasons I hope that the amendment will be rejected. In the first place, we have the constitutional aspect of the question that was urged by the honorable member for Bendigo, but another consideration which leads me to this view is that as soon as the Braddon section is superseded, either by a fixed arrangement with the States, or by effluxion of time, this proposal would involve in most cases a probable discrimination against local manufacturers in tendering for Government supplies. Suppose a duty of 30 per cent. were imposed on a certain article, and a State Government called for tenders for supplies of that article, the position might be that the local manufacturer would not be able to supply it at the price at which it could be imported.

Mr. HEDGES.—Is that the way the shoe pinches?

Mr. WATSON.—That is one way.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—The local man might not charge more, but he would be deprived of the protection which this Parliament intended he should have.

Mr. WATSON.—Exactly.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—And to that extent the fiscal system of the Commonwealth would be rendered inoperative.

Mr. DEAKIN.—And inoperative by reason of the act of some one else, and not of ourselves.

Mr. WATSON.—That is so.

Colonel FOXTON.—Does not that apply equally in the case of supplies required by the Commonwealth Government?

Mr. WATSON.—So far as the Commonwealth Government is concerned, I do not think it is in the same position in relation to Customs and Excise taxation as are the States Governments, because the exclusive power to deal with that taxation has been handed over to the Commonwealth Parliament under the Constitution.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Still, the effect would be the same from the fiscal point of view.

Mr. WATSON.—I do not think so. It is to be assumed, I think, that this Parliament will insure that the

administration of the Commonwealth Government is in consonance with the policy embodied in the Tariff, whether it be a free-trade, a revenue, or a protectionist Tariff. I say that if we put in a provision of this description a distinction must be drawn as between the Commonwealth and the States Governments in that the fiscal policy of the country might be rendered nugatory by the action of some of the States Governments. As to the suggestion of the honorable member for Angas, to allow these exemptions to run until the book-keeping section ceases to operate, I suggest that the honorable member might very well reverse the position.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—If anything of the kind were done, it should be as part of a general financial arrangement.

Mr. WATSON.—I quite agree that the only justification for it would be that it was a part of a general financial arrangement. I point out that the section to which the honorable member for Angas has referred might be repealed or modified to-morrow, but we do not anticipate that the Tariff will be altered to-morrow. If the honorable member's contention is that the exemption during the period of the operation of the bookkeeping section would involve no injustice, I would ask him to put the matter in the other way, and say whether while the bookkeeping section continues in operation the States Governments would suffer any real injustice from the imposition of the duty when three-fourths at least of the amount collected by means of this taxation is returned to the States.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—There must always be a return to the States of a substantial proportion of the Customs and Excise taxation.

Mr. GLYNN.—Only under the Braddon section. We might make a return of nine-tenths to one State.

Mr. WATSON.—I admit that we might do that, but it is not very likely that we would. When the honorable member for Angas admits that once the bookkeeping section is rendered inoperative by the action of this Parliament, the whole situation will be changed, it does not seem to me that he advances his case when he points out that under the Braddon section nine-tenths might be returned to one State. It seems to me that the honorable member would be on safer ground if he were to assume that no injustice was likely to be

done to the States while the bookkeeping section continues in operation, and we know that as soon as it ceases to operate his proposal would not remedy the objection.

Mr. KING O'MALLEY (Darwin) [6.0].—I hope the Committee will agree to the item as it stands. In the first place, because to do otherwise would so complicate the finances of the States and the Commonwealth that no Treasurer in Australia would know where he was. In the next place, of what use is it to carry a protective Tariff if the States imports are to be admitted free? Again, it should be remembered that the Commonwealth is paramount, and we should not permit it to become subordinate to the States. Another point is that we are testing before the High Court the question whether the Commonwealth possesses this power to levy taxation on States' imports, and if we now admit that we have not the power to do so, we give our whole case away. If this Parliament is going to surrender, why should we fight the case in the High Court? I trust that the honorable member, for the sake of his own reputation as a lawyer, will withdraw the amendment.

Mr. PALMER (Echuca) [6.2].—There is one difficulty in connexion with this matter which has struck me, and which arises from the fact that the system of Government adopted in the various States is not uniform. For instance, in one State the municipal system may be carried out in its entirety, and in another very imperfectly and incompletely. The result might be that in a State in which its municipal system of government is incomplete, imports to a very much greater total value might be treated as States imports, as compared with the imports to another State where the municipal system is complete. There is a danger of this unfair discrimination as a consequence of a lack of uniformity in the system of government prevailing in the different States.

Mr. WYNNE (Balaclava) [6.3].—From some of the speeches to which we have listened, it would appear that certain honorable members are disposed to look upon the States as foreign powers, and upon the Commonwealth as a dominant power overriding subject States. The people of the States are also the people of the Commonwealth, and anything that affects them affects the people of the Commonwealth. We have to ask ourselves whether they would be any more likely to act unjustly

towards local manufacturers than the Commonwealth Government would be?

Mr. DEAKIN.—Would not that argument apply with equal force in the opposite direction — why not trust the Commonwealth?

Mr. WYNNE.—It is assumed that the Commonwealth Government would not give a preference to a foreign manufacturer in the purchase of goods required for public works and services; but I do not see why it should be assumed that the States Government would act differently. Why should we make a distinction, and say that goods required by the people of the Commonwealth shall be admitted duty free, whilst goods required by a section of the people of the Commonwealth shall be subject to taxation? I say that all Government importations should be free, or all should be subject to taxation. Why should we create friction by putting the States Governments in the position of subjects dominated by the Commonwealth Government? As the honorable member for Angas has stated, money borrowed by the States is introduced in the form of goods. If a State borrows £1,000,000, why should £250,000 of the amount go to the Commonwealth Government?

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The amount which the Commonwealth Government would receive would not be £250,000, but one-fourth of the duty collected on £1,000,000 worth of goods.

Mr. WYNNE.—Assuming an average impost of 25 per cent., if a State Government imports £1,000,000 worth of goods, it will realize only £750,000, because one-fourth of the amount must be paid in taxation, and would be retained by the Federal Government.

Mr. KING O'MALLEY.—But the States Governments would get three-fourths of the £250,000 back again.

Mr. WYNNE.—Why should we take one-fourth of the duties levied on States imports when the States Governments derive no benefit from taxation on Commonwealth imports? I think that in this matter we should treat the Commonwealth and the States on exactly the same basis. We should not let the people of the States rest under any feeling that they are being unjustly or unfairly treated. To do so is to lessen the feeling of sympathy in the States for the Commonwealth. I believe that the people in one State are as loyal to the Commonwealth as the people in

another. Tasmania might require to borrow money for railway purposes. The existing system is hard enough on that State, and why should we make its position still harder? It ought not to be our policy to oppress the people of those States which are loyal to us and anxious to assist forward the Federal movement. But if we take to ourselves special exemptions, the feeling may arise that we ought not to treat ourselves better than we do the States.

Mr. SALMON (Laanecoorie) [6.10].—This is not a State *versus* Commonwealth matter, and I am sorry that certain honorable members on the other side who favour the amendment should regard those who object to it—and I am one—as opposed to the States and desirous of minimizing State rights.

Mr. GLYNN.—Did that idea run through my argument?

Mr. SALMON.—I do not attribute that view to the honorable member for Angas.

Mr. WYNNE.—I did not say a word about State rights.

Mr. SALMON.—The honorable member for Balaclava, throughout his speech, made it appear that those who opposed the amendment desired to place upon the States disabilities which they were not prepared to place upon the Commonwealth. That is not the right way to look at it. If I am here when the inevitable struggle comes, no one will be more ready to stand up for State rights than I shall be.

Mr. HANS IRVINE.—Now is the time to do it.

Mr. SALMON.—There is an honorable member who regards this as a matter of State rights.

Mr. HEDGES.—Have the States no rights now?

Mr. SALMON.—I was challenged when I said that that question had been imported into the debate. Yet already two interjectors have shown that they regard this as a matter of State rights. I regret that they adopt that attitude. I am not raising the question, nor is it necessary to raise it, as the honorable member for Angas agrees. He, with his keen debating faculty, would have advanced it if he had thought it to be a legitimate argument. I hope the amendment will be considered and decided apart from the State rights question. I see in it very grave dangers. If carried, it will operate in a direction which is least expected, and which would be least relished by those who support it. Those who are most strenuous in their ad-

vocacy of it, should it be carried, will afterwards deeply regret that it was ever brought within the region of practical politics. If we place this exemption within the reach of the States, it will do a great deal to destroy that feeling of amity and union which we desire to encourage throughout the Federation. It will offer an opportunity for the large States to compete, not only with each other, but with the smaller States. It will destroy that desire which the framers of the Constitution endeavoured to crystallize when they provided for an Inter-State Commission, whose duty it would be to see that the States acted fairly with each other in matters of trade. In those circumstances, I enter my emphatic protest against the question being brought up, especially at this juncture; and I sincerely hope that the loyalty of honorable members to the Constitution under which we work will be strong enough to enable them to give a vote which will show, not that they are desirous of acting against the States or of securing for themselves something which they are not prepared to give to the States, but that they are convinced that the exemption thus granted would operate against the best interests of Australia, and that the decision of the vital issues raised should be postponed until the whole question of the financial relations of the Commonwealth and the States is being considered.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE (Flinders) [6.14].—Without entering into some of the forcible arguments that have been urged both for and against the actual merits of the proposition of the honorable member for Brisbane, it seems to me that the most convincing answer to the amendment is that it is unwise for us to make any considerable change in the existing relations of the Commonwealth and States until we can deal with the really difficult problem of the financial relations of the States and the Commonwealth. It will be very unwise to deal with that question piecemeal. There is a great deal of weight in the contention of the honorable member for Balaclava that although we undoubtedly possess the absolute power under the Constitution to regulate the whole domain of Customs and Excise taxation, we ought to avoid any action, which is not absolutely necessary, that will differentiate between ourselves and the States, and that it would be wise to place State importations as far as possible on the same level with Commonwealth importations whether they are taxed or not

taxed. The objection has often been urged—and was voiced to-day by the honorable member for Angas—that a State usually borrows money for the purpose of carrying out public works, the money comes out in the form of goods or materials, and the exaction by the Customs Department of duties on those imports really deprives the State of a certain portion of borrowed money, and is not a taxation of revenue. There is, however, a latent fallacy in that argument. The action of this Parliament in imposing Customs duties on those imports gives State Parliaments and State Governments an opportunity of paying duties out of borrowed money, which they ought never to do. If they did right they would always arrange that the duties on goods of that kind imported should be paid out of revenue. That ought to be a part of every sound financial arrangement by a State, so that that argument does not carry the matter very much further. We shall shortly have to face by far the most difficult and delicate problem that this Parliament has yet had to deal with. When that question comes before us it will be our duty so to deal with it that the States will be given certainty and stability in their financial position. I shall always be in favour of that; but we shall be acting foolishly if we begin to tackle that extremely difficult problem by touching a little portion of it as represented by an exemption of this kind.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [6.18].—The honorable member for Flinders has on the whole expressed my views. It is out of the question for us to give this matter the consideration it deserves at this stage of the session, although I do not think there is the slightest ground for protest on the part of the honorable member for Laanecoorie, seeing that the honorable member for Brisbane gave notice of his intention to raise it some three months ago. It is not his fault that its consideration has been left to the last hours of the session. On the other hand, I am sure that the matter cannot receive to-day the treatment that its importance deserves. I am not sure that on the whole the honorable member for Brisbane will not serve his cause better by waiving his right to have the matter decided now. The whole question must shortly be readjusted on a broad basis when we come to deal with the financial relations of the Commonwealth and the States. The conviction has long been growing in my mind that when these relations are fixed they will not be on the basis of a purely

financial arrangement alone, but will be also on the basis of a wise, broad, and far-reaching statesmanship, beyond the narrow lines of mere finance. Then will be the proper time to raise this matter. That time must come very shortly, and is it worth while to raise it now? The honorable member for Angas inclines to support the amendment on the ground that, if we do it now, there will be a sufficient check upon the States to prevent them from doing much damage. He wisely refrained from entering into the question of the wisdom or unwisdom of the proposal, and merely confined himself to a statement of what was best to do in the short interval before the final financial readjustments are made. I do not know that we ought to agree to the amendment. Once the States were permitted to get all their importations free, it would be a very difficult and delicate matter to disturb the arrangement. Taking a bone out of a dog's mouth would be child's play to it, if this Parliament should afterwards decide to tax State imports.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—Is not the whole question before the High Court in New South Wales?

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The question of our powers, now before the High Court, does not affect in the slightest the question of statesmanship raised by this proposition. There is much force in the contention of the honorable member for Balazlava that if we are going to exempt our own importations, and to that extent place our local manufacturers at a disadvantage, we should treat the States in the same manner. I am not sure how it could be readjusted, but every one recognises that anomaly, and the sooner the Government take steps to rectify it the better. If we intend to make the States pay for all their governmental importations, we should, it would seem, set them an example. There are many considerations that weigh on one side or the other, in my mind, and make it difficult for a layman to come to a decision as to the whole proposal. There is the fiscal view of it taken by the honorable member for South Sydney. Here we are in the very act of framing a system of taxation which we hope will compulsorily divert the purchases of local people into local channels as distinct from channels oversea, and if we apply that compulsion to private individuals, shall we exempt the Governments of the States under whose jurisdiction those private individuals are?

Colonel FOXTON.—What about the Commonwealth?

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The same argument applies there. I have just said that the whole thing is an anomaly.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—Why not strike out the whole item?

Mr. GLYNN.—That would be wiser. I do not believe in anomalies of this sort.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The further one investigates the position, the more anomalous it appears. From the constitutional point of view, there are a different set of conditions. We have decided to permit the States to interfere with our instrumentalities in respect of income tax and other matters. Can the States deny us the right to similarly interfere with their instrumentalities? So the whole thing goes on, and a very interesting series of dialectical exercises is presented.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—We hold that the States cannot tax our incomes, and how, therefore, can we levy a tax on States goods?

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—We have already decided to permit the States to tax our incomes, and, surely, we have as much right, I think, to tax their instrumentalities also. We have given the States the power to tax our incomes freely, and in order to satisfy their insistent claims. It seems to me that if we continue our present situation the States have no reason to object to our taxing their instrumentalities as they tax ours. But this does not get us nearer a wise and final adjustment of the whole question. I am inclined to think it would be better if the matter were not pressed at this moment. It ought to be left over until the whole financial adjustment comes to be made later. When that adjustment is made, I hope it will not be on any narrow financial basis, but will display broad, far-reaching statesmanship. Until then we might go on as at present. I feel that, under all the circumstances, if this matter is pressed to a division, I shall, without questioning the wisdom of raising the question, and without committing myself finally, be inclined to vote to let things remain as they have been for some years past.

Mr. MAUGER (Maribyrnong — Postmaster-General) [6.27].—Might I, in view of the short time at our disposal, and of the vast importance of the question, appeal to the honorable member for Brisbane to withdraw his amendment? There

is not the faintest chance of his proposal being carried, and it deals with a question which ought to be discussed from many points of view.

Mr. HEDGES (Fremantle) [6.28].—The first Federal Parliament placed on record, in section 131 of the Customs Act, their interpretation of the section in the Constitution, which, in my opinion, ought to apply to States and Commonwealth alike. Section 131 of the Customs Act is as follows—

No goods the property of the Commonwealth shall be liable to any duty of Customs.

Evidently the Commonwealth desires to have one reading of the section of the Constitution when applied to itself, and another reading when applied to the States.

Mr. GROOM.—Would it not be better to leave the interpretation to the High Court?

Mr. HEDGES.—The Federal Parliament has put its own construction on the section of the Constitution; and, under the circumstances, it is not surprising that there is dissatisfaction throughout the States. In my opinion, the Commonwealth takes rather a greedy view, especially when it is remembered that New South Wales and Victoria are stronger, though not so large in area, as are some of the other States.

Sitting suspended from 6.30 to 7.45 p.m.

Mr. HEDGES.—If section 114 of the Constitution permits the Commonwealth to collect duties upon State imports, it necessarily follows that it authorizes it to levy a tax upon steel rails imported by the States. There is nothing whatever in the argument that the Commonwealth returns to the States three-fourths of the Customs and Excise revenue collected within their respective borders. As a matter of fact, the whole of that revenue belongs to the States. A tax upon steel rails is a monstrous thing. I ask honorable members to compare the position of Western Australia with that of Victoria from the stand-point of their respective railway systems. The latter is practically riddled with railways, whereas the former has huge areas which can be developed only by railway enterprise. Why should the people of Western Australia be asked to pay a duty upon steel rails which are necessary for the opening up of that country? I am satisfied that the collection of

duties upon State imports is retarding the progress of Australia. I maintain that the full amount borrowed by a State to enable it to undertake any specific public work should be expended upon that work. Under the present system, however, a portion of it is diverted—almost by a trick—into another channel. When the electors in the various States voted in favour of the Constitution Bill, I am satisfied that they never anticipated that they were assenting to any such proposition. The goods imported by a State are the property of that State, and ought not to be taxed. I fear that honorable members are too prone to speak of a “tax” as a “duty.” In this connexion I notice that at the recent Imperial Conference our Prime Minister was pulled up by Mr. Lloyd-George for making use of the word “duty” instead of “tax.” He said, as will be seen by reference to page 360 of the official report of the proceedings—

A “duty” on our goods? I do not mind the word—I am prepared to substitute that word.

Merely to oblige the Prime Minister, he was prepared to substitute the word “duty” for “tax.” I claim that when the word “duty” is defined at a gathering of that kind as a “tax,” the duty charged upon State imports must be a tax. I wish honorable members clearly to understand that I am not discussing this question from the point of view of State rights, although I consider that there are State rights which we must recognise. Seeing that the States themselves constitute the Commonwealth, what harm can result from assisting them to develop their territory, even though in doing so we may be called upon to strain a point? But I maintain that in the present instance we are straining no point. It is the right of the States to have their imports admitted free of duty. The honorable member for Bendigo has pointed out that if the view for which I am contending be correct, the States might enter into business enterprises and import all kinds of goods for sale. I think that the very opposite is more likely to happen, and to the detriment of the States. If our industrial legislation be pushed much further, the Commonwealth will be handling all the business of Australia, or dictating to others how they shall handle it. I trust that the Committee, even if they do not agree to the amendment, will seriously consider it, and that the Government will

do all in their power to bring about a better feeling between the Commonwealth and the States. The collection of duty upon State imports does not mean much from a revenue stand-point to the Commonwealth, but it has created a very bad feeling throughout the whole of Australia. There are large areas still waiting to be opened up, but that result cannot be achieved without the purchase of large quantities of material which has to be paid for out of loan funds. The residents of Western Australia do not like the idea that when they are borrowing money for the purpose of developmental works a portion of it will be diverted into another channel for the benefit of the eastern States.

Mr. MAHON (Coolgardie) [7.55].—The honorable member for Brisbane has been rather unfortunate in having this important question discussed at such a late stage of the session. I apprehend that whatever vote honorable members may cast will not necessarily represent their matured views in respect to this question. It is not by any means a new question here, but rather one which the ablest minds in Parliament and outside have made familiar to the public. But the time is scarcely ripe for its settlement. We are not yet in a position to measure its probable consequences. The honorable member for Fremantle seems to think that Parliament is capable of interpreting the Constitution; but I would remind him that such an interpretation is no part of our functions. Such questions as this must be settled by the High Court.

Mr. GROOM.—As a matter of fact, the question is before that tribunal now.

Mr. MAHON.—The question is a many-sided one, and it would not be fair to honorable members who may vote against it—

Mr. ARCHER.—I do not think that any honorable member will have to vote against it.

Mr. MAHON.—Then I understand that it is to be withdrawn. I think that that is the wisest course which can be adopted. I would point out to the honorable member for Fremantle, who appears to scent some danger in the Government proposal, that this tax or duty is merely a tax or duty upon material used by the States in commercial enterprises. If he will recall what are regarded by old-fashioned political economists as the true functions of the State, he will recognise that there is

no necessity for a State to import anything. According to these authorities, its proper function is the maintenance of law and order in the community.

Mr. McWILLIAMS. — The honorable member does not accept that doctrine?

Mr. MAHON. — Not at all. I merely say that it represents the view of certain old-fashioned political economists.

Mr. PALMER. — It is a pity that the honorable member does not accept it.

Mr. MAHON. — The honorable member for Echuca may accept it, but he will not find many persons—even amongst those who ordinarily think with him—adopting that view nowadays.

Mr. PALMER. — Oh yes.

Mr. MAHON. — I do not wish to be side-tracked at present, but the honorable member must know that during recent years the functions of government have been greatly enlarged, and that it is not possible to revert to the ideas of non-interference which were entertained by our forefathers. We have accepted new duties and recognised new principles; and this acceptance and recognition must go on so long as injustice exists, and until the strong shall no longer be in a position to oppress the weak. Personally, I see no limit to the functions which the Government may be required to undertake for the good of the community. But to follow out logically the idea apparently entertained by the honorable member, one must permit of the employment of child labour in mines.

Mr. PALMER. — The honorable member must not foist his ideas upon me.

Mr. MAHON. — I have no wish to do so. But the honorable member desired to foist his ideas upon me. He chided me for not accepting the views of certain old-fashioned political economists—

Mr. PALMER. — The honorable member wants to go the whole hog.

Mr. MAHON. — The honorable member may be thereby making a mistake. However, we need not discuss that question now. When the honorable member for Fremantle complains of the Commonwealth taxing State imports he should recollect that it only does so in so far as the States become competitors with private enterprise. That being so, we have to consider whether we are justified in exempting State imports while taxing the imports of traders who are in competition with the States. Such a problem lends itself to no rough-and-ready settlement. It does not matter

whether we call the impost a tax or a duty. I think the terms are synonymous. Protectionists say that some duties are not taxes, but I find that generally the imposition of duties does mean taxation in some form or other. If it does not involve increased prices to the consumer on imported articles, it means that the local manufacturer obtains a larger price for his commodity. That, I think, is in nine cases out of ten the inevitable consequence of the imposition of duties. From my point of view it is a good thing to see the States importing goods and restricting the domain in which private enterprise operates. In Australia, we have competed with private enterprise through the agency of the States with very great advantage. The development of Australia has been greatly promoted by the work of Governments in directions which previously, and in other countries, were supposed to be the avenues peculiarly reserved for private speculators. But I hardly think that Australia has arrived at that stage of development when a proposition of this kind would be wholly equitable. I imagine that railways and tramways, water supply, and other works undertaken by States that have not reached the level of development of New South Wales and Victoria will necessarily have to be constructed from imported material. Those States will necessarily require a larger quantity of imported material than will the closely-settled States. Therefore, they will pay more to the revenue than will the more highly-developed States.

Mr. HEDGES. — It is a false revenue.

Mr. MAHON. — It is worse than that, because most of these imports are paid for out of borrowed money. As I pointed out some time ago, the revenue of Victoria, in the boom years—say, in 1888 and 1889—was inflated in a most dangerous manner, and the people were under the false impression that Victoria had a much larger revenue than was really the case. When the great volume of imports ceased, there was, of course, a shrinkage to normal dimensions. That is the sort of thing we have to guard against. I quite agree with those who say that we ought to be very careful as to our decision in this matter, from that point of view alone. I am glad to have an intimation that the amendment is to be withdrawn, because, as I have said, at this stage I should feel bound to vote against it; whereas, later on, when

matters have developed a little further, and we have a clearer vision, the arguments in favour of the amendment will perhaps commend themselves more strongly to a number of honorable members than they do at present. I think the honorable member for Brisbane is wise in not pressing his amendment at present. I feel sure that it would be rejected, probably largely by the votes of those who, after mature consideration, at a more favorable opportunity, would be inclined to vote in its favour.

Mr. GLYNN (Angas) [8.6].—With the object of putting on record a suggestion which I made as to the form in which the amendment of the honorable member for Brisbane might take, I move—

That the amendment be amended by inserting after the word "or," first occurring, the words "until Parliament, in pursuance of sections 93 and 94 of the Constitution Act, alters the basis of payment to the several States of the surplus revenue of the Commonwealth."

That amendment would carry out what I suggested, and what I think the honorable member for Brisbane also intends. I am aware that his amendment is to be withdrawn, but I submit my amendment upon it for the sake of placing it upon record. I should also like to mention—to show that first impressions are not always correct on these matters—that when I was speaking before I suggested that there is an anomaly, almost appearing to be an unfair one, in allowing Commonwealth imports to be exempt whilst we tax State imports. But immediately after I sat down I thought of a difficulty in connexion with taxing Commonwealth imports. That is, that you could scarcely determine with any approach to fairness what particular State should be credited with the duties received. One has only to think of that to see how peculiarly it would work. Suppose there was a large importation of goods into South Australia and Western Australia for the purposes of the Transcontinental railway. I am afraid that the other States would rather look askance at allowing those two States to get the bulk of that revenue. I argued that we should treat all alike; that we should not exempt the Commonwealth if we do not exempt the States. But that argument I now see is not necessarily conclusive, because it struck me afterwards that we should find it difficult to apportion the revenue received. That is the point. I also mentioned—as the result of a conversation with a pretty

intelligent member before I spoke—that if you tax the imports of the States you will be giving the Commonwealth a fourth of the proceeds of the duties, which duties will be paid out of loan moneys. Personally I do not think there is anything in that point. But I do not think the fallacy of it has been exposed. The real fallacy of it is this—and I intended to mention it—that it does not make the smallest difference as a matter of fairness whether the import duties are the result of loan moneys or purchases from revenue. Suppose the States purchased material for public works for cash.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—But in the one case we shall be using as revenue that which is absolutely borrowed money.

Mr. GLYNN.—What difference does it make as regards the equities whether the import duties are paid out of loan moneys or out of cash—that is, out of revenue?

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—It is not a matter of equity but of sound finance.

Mr. GLYNN.—I do not think it makes the smallest difference as to the right to tax or the equity of taxation whether the import duties are paid out of loan money or out of revenue, because in either case the same deduction would be made from State funds.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS (Robertson) [8.10].—Without entering into the interpretation of the Constitution and the changes that must take place in future, I think that as legislators we have to look at this matter from a business point of view rather than from the point of view of persons who are trying to interpret the Constitution without first applying to the High Court. The burden of the argument in favour of the amendment is that owing to the importation of railway material or other materials required by the States an immense amount of borrowed money will be spent, and an enormous revenue will be received from the Commonwealth in the form of the three-fourths revenue returned to the States. It is argued that in that case the States will really be receiving revenue from borrowed money and that an extra inducement will be held out to them to borrow. It is likewise contended that the Commonwealth will be receiving revenue from borrowed money. If we are very exacting we shall admit that that is not sound finance. But sound financiers would see that no danger came to a State in consequence of the system of bookkeeping that

is being pursued under the Constitution. In one State of the Union just upon £1,000,000 has been paid out of revenue towards the liquidation of bonds. The Commonwealth itself has laid down a principle that is very salutary, inasmuch as we have not so far borrowed a penny, but have incurred extensive expenditure out of revenue. The State of Western Australia has set an excellent example in establishing a sinking fund, about which she has not yet changed her mind. I say that she has not changed her mind about it so far, because in some States they started out with good intentions, but when they found that they had put together a large sum of money for the liquidation of loans the spirit of acquisitiveness seemed to assert itself, and they grasped the sum thus accumulated and spent it. Sound financiers would get over such difficulties. If large sums of money were received by a State from taxation upon imports paid for out of loan money, it would be a duty to see that that revenue was appropriated for the purpose of the liquidation of Treasury bills or other bonds falling due. If we wish to be sound in our system of finance, we could quite easily get over the small difficulties suggested.

Mr. FISHER.—How does the honorable member discriminate between a loan for State purposes and one for purposes not under State direction?

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—I take it that the honorable member refers to expenditure within a State, say for the purpose of laying down a water supply, or for reticulations of water within a city where the expenditure is controlled by a board.

Mr. FISHER.—In the case of a municipality the principle is exactly the same.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—A municipality raises through, or without the aid of, the Government a sum for the construction of large public works, but it should be remembered that when municipalities have borrowed money in England it has always been borrowed with the security of the State at their back. Again, the States themselves raise loans in England on the authority of Acts of Parliament. The borrowing powers of municipalities are so limited by Acts of Parliament that they can only borrow money in proportion to their revenues.

Mr. FISHER.—But that hardly affects the honorable member's argument. The States would still be bringing in material and paying duty with borrowed money.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—It comes back to the one point which I have just answered, and that is that the State is borrowing money and treating it as revenue. If its finances are on a sound basis it will see that the borrowed money is not used for governmental purposes, so as to release persons from the payment of the taxes which they should be called upon to pay. The State will see that the money is earmarked for the purpose of liquidating a debt which is falling due periodically, as is done in the case of South Australia.

Mr. FISHER.—Does not the honorable member see that it would be necessary to trace all the trust and municipal imports which were bought with loan money?

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—That would cause no difficulty. The State is not carrying on the business of a tallow chandler, but is dealing in large sums, and it will be quite an easy matter to earmark them. It has its loan policy or its public works policy. At one time South Australia had what was called "a broad and comprehensive policy," which meant the expenditure of an enormous sum of borrowed money during a long period, in which they carried out the Port Victor water scheme. It is easily possible for a State to earmark any sums received from that source, and to appropriate them justly and honestly in paying off a debt. I do not see that there is any necessity for the system which has been proposed by the honorable member for Brisbane. At the present time the States import whatever materials they want, and three-fourths of the duty paid thereon, and a very large proportion of the balance is returned to them. If, however, the States do not get the whole of the fourth share, who gets it? Do the other States benefit at the expense of a particular State, or do the States occasionally benefit or live upon each other? No; we have been taught to believe by those who framed the Constitution that no one State can benefit at the expense of another State; and though in the expenditure of a given sum one State may benefit to some small extent, yet in the long run it will be found that there will be very little gained by one State at the expense of another. So that if at the present time the States are getting back from the Commonwealth all the money to which they are justly entitled, less the one-fourth share, what have they to complain about? It must be remembered that as regards that one-fourth share, the Commonwealth is

really the States, just as the States are the Commonwealth. The States form one body. If we take money out of one pocket and give it to the States we pay it into the other pocket, and *vice versa*. It will be found that the States are not losers in any degree.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—Yes, they are, because they pay a good deal for the book-keeping.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—From a long experience I have come to the conclusion that the man who tries to save money by not keeping books is the one who will lose the most.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—But the honorable member will see that under the other system, it would not be necessary to keep the books.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—The book-keeping system is prescribed by sections 93 and 94 of the Constitution, but as soon as the Commonwealth is well established, and things have adjusted themselves in every State, it can be dispensed with. In the early years of the Commonwealth this machinery is an essential, but it will work itself out by effluxion of time. We have incurred the expense, and it will not be altered in the slightest degree by passing this amendment, because those provisions will terminate in due course. It seems to me that there is not much in the proposal. I believe that the States would like their goods to come in duty free. I am a citizen of a State just as I am a citizen of the Commonwealth. How is it possible for us to rob ourselves?

Mr. HEDGES.—The other States rob us more in the other way.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—I see what is troubling the honorable member's mind. Some States think that they are being robbed for the benefit of another State—

Mr. HEDGES.—In Western Australia the people are paying 19s. per head as compared with 9s. per head in New South Wales.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—But it will be found that the people of that State fancy that they are going to be robbed for the benefit of the others. It is a fallacy. The Constitution has been so well devised that no one State can rob the others. The honorable member has interjected that the taxation per head is 19s. in Western Australia as compared with 9s. in New South Wales. Is that owing to the Constitution or the Tariff? No. It is because the children of the men in Western Australia

are at present domiciled in other States. As soon as they join their parents the latter will pay exactly the same amount per head as is being paid in the several States.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—The honorable member's point is that Western Australia is using imported goods for public works much more largely than are the other States.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—The people of Western Australia are using more railway material in opening up their territory, and more piping in the running of water into their desert and for reticulation; they are spending enormous sums in their young country; but does the honorable member for Fremantle suppose that the other States have ceased to carry out public works to provide for their population which is increasing in a greater ratio than is the case in Western Australia?

Mr. HEDGES.—Not in proportion to the population.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—We have only to look to America.

Mr. HEDGES.—Let us keep to Australia.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—I want to quote a parallel case. It has been found in America that young colonies will double their population in the course of twenty-eight years. Sir Henry Parkes, who looked into this matter some years ago, when Federation was being advocated, laid it down that Australia was repeating the history of the Colonies which now form the United States of America. Western Australia made a little spurt the other day, and is doing very well indeed, but there is nothing to lead one to suppose that it will continue to progress at the same rate.

Mr. HEDGES.—Yes, there is. It is progressing faster than are the other States, and in the right direction.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—If the honorable member went to Tasmania, and it had a little spurt, in ratio it would be progressing to a greater extent than even Western Australia. It is merely a spurt which is taking place in the latter State, and those who have gone there lately have lost their heads too much to see that its population is only a handful in comparison with the population in the other States.

Mr. HEDGES.—The honorable member is giving away his case.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—The other States are increasing in population in a greater ratio.

Mr. McDougall.—Do not stir up the indignation of the "corner" party.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—One gets tired of these references to Western Australia. No one is better pleased to see that State progress than are the people of New South Wales. The people of Western Australia are spending a lot of money on their railways, and are afraid that the other States may get that money, but they will not get any portion of it. Western Australia will still get back its three-fourths share of the Customs and Excise revenue. A very large proportion of it will go back to the State in connexion with the working of the new services and also the transferred services.

Mr. HEDGES.—Which have not yet been paid for.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—Let the honorable member remember that those services have to be paid for here, and that there is left a small balance. The sense of justice which prevails in the States will insure that Western Australia is not robbed of one penny. Of the £5,000,000 which it is proposed to spend in Western Australia on a railway, and about which the honorable member is so much alarmed, the people of New South Wales will pay one-third, but I am not making any complaint on that score. Western Australia will contribute a mere bagatelle towards that expenditure. Yet the honorable member is afraid lest New South Wales may get some of the money. Why are we not afraid of Western Australia getting some of the money? Because we have sufficient common-sense to know that it could not possibly get any of it. If it were going to get our money, there would very soon be a reshuffling of the cards. We would very soon get tired of the union if we thought that Western Australia was going to fatten on our millions. However, I do not think that there is much in the amendment.

Mr. HEDGES.—I do not think that there is, either.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—The discussion will have done no harm.

Mr. KING O'MALLEY.—But the honorable member is opposed to the proposal.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—Yes; because I do not see that it is necessary. The discussion has thrown light on many matters. Even the honorable member for Fremantle has undergone a change. Now that he finds that Western Australia will derive a benefit from the large contribution of New South Wales to the £5,000,000 to be spent on a railway, he begins to think

that there is likely to be some advantage to his State.

Mr. HEDGES.—The honorable member does not know what the Government intend to do.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—I know that they have undertaken to spend £20,000 on the survey of a railway from Port Augusta to Kalgoorlie, but I predict that it will cost £50,000.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—And Western Australia expects the other States to build the railway, and New South Wales to contribute a third of the cost.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—The railway is estimated to cost £5,000,000, but I believe that it will have cost twice that sum by the time they have made provision for water along the route. I have not yet said that I intend to give Western Australia an opportunity to handle the expenditure of those millions, but when the States agree to give New South Wales the Federal Capital I shall think about this proposal to construct a transcontinental railway. I do not think that it will receive any consideration from me until the other States have completed their part of the compact in the Constitution. This discussion will have done some good, but no harm can accrue if the amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. HUTCHISON (Hindmarsh) [8.29].—I am very pleased that the honorable member for Brisbane has decided to ask leave to withdraw his amendment. I believe that it is a very wise decision on his part, and, while the honorable member for Angas is at liberty to have his proposal on record, I do not think that he put the position exactly as it stands. It is true, as he has said, that in collecting duty on railway material imported by a State, we may diminish the amount it will receive in respect of any loan. But it is equally true—and this is the point that I desire to emphasize—that if we had a free-trade Government in power in any State it could readily destroy the protective effect of the Tariff upon many of our industries if its imports were exempt from duty.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—Why assume that a State would abuse this power?

Mr. HUTCHISON.—Let me illustrate my point. The honorable member is aware that all the pipes required for the water-works of the States are now being made in the Government workshops at Adelaide; but that not long ago we had in power there a Government which, instead of obtaining its supplies locally, imported

pipes, not only from Great Britain, but also from Germany. The consequence was that a large number of men were thrown out of employment, and as their purchasing power was thereby diminished, the revenue suffered. Thus, if we allowed the States to import goods free of duty, they could not only destroy local industries if they desired to do so, but diminish the revenue of the Commonwealth.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—We were making water pipes at the Government workshops in South Australia before Federation.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—But, as the honorable member is aware, a former South Australian Government actually imported pipes that could have been made in the State. If we granted this exemption, what would be our position if we had in any of the States such a Premier as the ex-Premier of New South Wales, Mr. Carruthers, who had no sympathy with the Federation? So far as I am aware, the Premier of South Australia is the only leader of a State Government who has any real sympathy with the Federation.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—That is a mere assumption.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—Has not the Government of Tasmania been constantly girding at the Federation, and complaining of its injurious effects upon that State? It is possible that we may have a reactionary Government in power in any of the States, and if we granted this exemption there would be nothing to prevent it from importing millions of pounds worth of material from Great Britain, and probably from Germany, Belgium, and Japan, with the result that local industries would be injured, and the Commonwealth revenue diminished. The exemption of State imports would give a free-trade Government a splendid opportunity to destroy the effects of the Tariff. In my opinion, we ought not to exempt them. It would be dangerous, and might work injury to local industries as well as to the revenue of the Commonwealth.

Mr. McWILLIAMS (Franklin) [8.38].—If proof were needed that the Committee is not in a suitable frame of mind to discuss so important a proposal as this is, it would be found in the speech just delivered by the honorable member for Hindmarsh. His mind is so impregnated with the fiscalism that we have been discussing for the last few weeks that he has altogether lost sight of the main fea-

ture of this question, which relates not to fiscalism, but to constitutionalism.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—It is a question of fiscalism.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—I was at a loss to understand the heat with which the Treasurer last night received the amendment moved by the honorable member for Brisbane. He declared that if it were carried it would mean the destruction of the Commonwealth.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I said it would be the first step towards disintegration.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—I would remind honorable members that the Government have succeeded in passing a Bill which is practically on all-fours with the proposal embodied in the amendment. If there is one section in the Constitution which is put in plain English it is section 114, which provides that—

A State shall not, without the consent of the Parliament . . . impose any tax on property of any kind belonging to the Commonwealth, nor shall the Commonwealth impose any tax on property of any kind belonging to a State.

Mr. WATSON.—If it is so clear there is no need for the amendment.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—In a case based on this section the High Court has recently given a decision, which it had practically to read into the Constitution from precedents obtained elsewhere. The Prime Minister and the Treasurer felt so strongly on this question that they held that the States had no power to tax the income of a Commonwealth officer, and with a desire to uphold the Constitution they refused to pay income tax in order that the question might be tested.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—That section of the Constitution had nothing to do with the matter.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—The Prime Minister, in discussing the question, directed special attention to the power of the States to tax the Commonwealth and the power of the Commonwealth to tax a State. He founded his contention on the celebrated Maryland case, and urged that if the Commonwealth had power to tax a State or *vice versa*, the one, by carrying that power to extremes, might absolutely crush the other out of existence. The Prime Minister urged that if a State had power to tax the incomes of servants of the Commonwealth it might tax them to such an extent as to render it impossible for a Federal officer to live within its territory. Let us consider the reverse position. If

the Commonwealth had power to tax the material imported by a State it would have equal power under the Excise Act to tax the material made in a State, and by the extreme exercise of that power it might so tax imported and locally-made railway material as to compel the States against their will to surrender their railways to the Commonwealth. The system of finance that we are adopting in this connexion is the most rotten that has ever been known in Australia. We are taking the loan moneys of the States for Commonwealth revenue purposes.

Mr. WATSON.—We are not taking it.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—I am surprised that the honorable member should adopt that view.

Mr. WATSON.—The statement has been made over and over again, but it will not bear examination.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—What is the position if we collect duty on, say, steel rails imported by a State, and purchased out of loan moneys? It is true that we return to the States 75 per cent. of the revenue so obtained, and that they can either use it as current revenue or pay it into a trust account for the redemption of their loans—

Mr. WATSON.—Which not one of them has done.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—With that we have nothing whatever to do. The point I make is that 25 per cent. is retained by the Commonwealth Government, and used every year to meet current expenditure.

Mr. MATHEWS.—To finance the Departments previously administered by the States.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—It might be devoted to the best possible purposes, but I still say that no system of finance was ever introduced by any Government in Australia which was so absolutely rotten in its fundamental principles as that which treats borrowed money as current revenue.

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—We do not take the money. The States give it to us.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—They pay it out of loans, and we take it at the Customs House.

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—They should pay it out of revenue, and if they do not, that is their look out.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—Does the honorable member seriously contend that when the States have adopted the policy of de-

fraying the cost of public works from borrowed money we have any right to say, "It was wrong for you to borrow this money, and because you have borrowed it we will commit the far greater wrong of taking one-fourth to meet the current expenditure of the Commonwealth?"

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Why debate the matter at length when the amendment is going to be withdrawn?

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—It is most unfortunate that the discussion of this question, which is the most important that has come before the Commonwealth Parliament this session, should have been delayed until this period of the session. I wish to say on behalf of the honorable member for Brisbane that that is not his fault, since it must now be over two months since the honorable member gave notice of his amendment. As one who entirely approves of the principle contained in the amendment, I am bound to confess that I think it would be a mistake to press it to a division to-night. I wish merely that it should be clearly understood that I am thoroughly in accord with the principle of the amendment, and whether it is pressed to a division to-night, or the question is dealt with next session, I shall give it my hearty support.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN (Calare) [8.48].—I do not propose to debate the question at any great length.

Mr. WATSON.—The amendment is going to be withdrawn.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—That is the very reason why I wish to say a word or two. With the object of moulding public opinion in a certain way, some honorable members put motions on the business-paper on which they do not seriously propose to test the feeling of the House. I wish to say, first of all, that the Committee need pay no attention to the constitutional aspect of the question, since this Parliament is neither the custodian nor the interpreter of the Constitution. We should, in our own interests, be careful that we do not infringe the provisions of the Constitution, but it is for the High Court to interpret it, and to say whether this or that legislative provision is unconstitutional. The High Court has been appealed to in connexion with the matter which we are now discussing, and any legislation which we pass will have no effect if in the opinion of the High Court it is unconstitutional.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—This Parliament dealt with the payment of income taxation

after a decision on the subject had been given by the High Court.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—It is still open to question whether this Parliament had the power to waive certain rights in that connexion.

Colonel FOXTON.—If the decision of the High Court were that the Commonwealth could not tax States imports this Parliament might still pass the exemption proposed.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—It might, but it would not be worth the paper on which it was written. In just the same way if we pass a Tariff Act imposing taxation on States imports that provision will not be worth the paper on which it is written if the High Court decides that it is unconstitutional. In my opinion it was the intention of the framers of the Constitution to make the Federal Legislature supreme within its own domain. In order to bring about a Federation that would be substantial and enduring they decided to withdraw the whole of the power to impose Excise and Customs taxation from the Parliaments of the States, and place it in the custody of the Federal Parliament. The reason is apparent. A concrete instance as to what might happen has recently arisen in the State of New South Wales. Until quite recently the Government of that State paid duty on States imports, under protest it is true, but only the other day they made a demonstration against the Federation in this particular matter. They did not take a stand against the payment of duty on iron rails or the one-hundred-and-one materials imported for State purpose, but against the payment of duty on wire netting imported for the purpose of distribution to private land-holders. That is a concrete example of the difficulties which would confront the Federation if the amendment were carried, and if the High Court were to decide that States imports are exempt from Customs and Excise taxation.

Colonel FOXTON.—The wire netting referred to would not be exempt under my amendment.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—I am not so sure that it would not. The late Premier of New South Wales held that it was exempt under the Constitution.

Colonel FOXTON.—That is a totally different thing.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—He proposed to test the question. The wire

netting was indented and imported by the State just as truly as any other material required for State purposes.

Mr. ATKINSON.—The amendment refers to materials imported for the public works and services of a State.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—How are we going to identify goods imported by a State for public purposes? A State Government might import wire netting for the purpose of re-sale to private land-holders.

Colonel FOXTON.—That would not be for the public works or services of the State.

Mr. WATSON.—Suppose a State Government decided to wire-net land before they threw it open to selectors?

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—The honorable member for South Sydney has shown how impossible it would be to define States imports. Assuming that one of the States was controlled by the Socialist Party, about which the honorable member for Brisbane seemed to be so much concerned at the time of his election, and the Socialist Government, in the name of the whole people, undertook the importation and distribution of all articles required for general consumption, the fact that they would be able under the amendment to claim that those importations should be exempt from taxation shows the absurdity of the whole proposal. I venture to say that the man who, inside or outside of this Parliament, wishes to stand by the Australian Federation must oppose a proposal of this kind, because it is fraught with the greatest possibilities of danger to the stability and endurance of a satisfactory Federation of any kind.

Mr. BATCHELOR (Boothby) [8.53].—At this stage of the session, if an opportunity had presented itself to give a silent vote on the amendment, I should have adopted that course. I understand that the honorable member for Brisbane does not intend to press his amendment to a division, and I shall, therefore, have no opportunity to record a vote on this momentous question.

Mr. CHANTER.—It will come up again.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—I do not think it will come up for discussion again in a Tariff. I content myself, in the circumstances, with saying that, for the reasons I gave in speaking on the Budget, I am in favour of the amendment, as proposed to be amended, by the honorable member for Angas. I see no reason to fear the

evils that have been prophesied should the amendment be agreed to. In my opinion, they are based upon an assumption that the States would deliberately set to work to thwart the object we had in view in passing a Tariff.

Mr. CHANTER.—Have we not had an example of what a State Government might do?

Mr. BATCHELOR.—I do not know that we have had such an example. The matter to which the honorable member refers was only a passing incident. The concession to the States which the amendment would involve would amount to very little so far as the Commonwealth is concerned, and it would be worth our while to make it if by doing so we might hope to allay the friction, which is known to exist, between the States and Commonwealth, but which I do not admit is justified. I shall not discuss the question further. I have already placed my views on record, and am prepared to let the matter go.

Colonel FOXTON (Brisbane) [8.58].—I do not propose to reply to any of the arguments advanced against the amendment which I moved at a quarter past 5 o'clock this morning. It is unfortunate that a question of so much importance should necessarily have had to be brought on for discussion in dealing with the Tariff at such a very critical period of the session. I recognise that it would require two or three days' discussion to do it justice, and we know that it is not practicable to devote that time to the consideration of the matter now. I said, in moving the amendment, that, for the reasons I have already mentioned, I scarcely expected to be able to carry it at this period of the session. There is a good deal I might have said at the time, and could say now, in support of it, and in reply to the arguments which have been used against the amendment. But I do not intend to do so. I fully accept the principle embodied in the amendment of the honorable member for Angas, and would have voted cheerfully for it as part of my amendment. But, as has been intimated by several speakers, I have agreed, under the peculiar circumstances of the situation, and with a view to facilitate the rapid dispersal of honorable members to the homes which they are so anxious to reach, to withdraw the amendment.

amendments, by leave, withdrawn.
agreed to.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [9.3].—I ask the Committee to authorize the Chairman, before reporting the resolution to the House, to make the formal amendments in the Tariff which are set out in a schedule which has been distributed. These amendments in no way alter the determinations arrived at by the Committee; they merely correct errors which have accidentally occurred.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—Has the Treasurer dealt with the question affecting the specific duty on pianos, which was discussed yesterday?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Yes. That was dealt with at the time. I take this opportunity to announce that I have been asked by a large number of honorable members not to agree to the recommitment of items, and I shall resist any recommitment at this stage. What I am asking the Committee to authorize the Chairman to do is a very simple thing, and in New South Wales would be done by a Chairman without special authority of this kind. I think that our Chairman is supersensitive in asking for this authority. If I were in his place I should be quite ready to take the responsibility of making necessary clerical amendments.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [9.6].—I offer no objection to the course proposed to be taken. As the Treasurer says, in many Parliaments mere clerical amendments are made by the presiding officers without special authority. I see nothing in the schedule beyond corrections of obvious mistakes and inaccuracies. I understand that it has been prepared by the clerks of the House.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—And the departmental officers.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Whoever may have helped them, the clerks are responsible for it, and I am prepared to trust their judgment in matters of this kind.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [9.8].—There is not in the Tariff a definition of "goods the produce or manufacture of the United Kingdom."

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Those words will be defined in the Bill.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—I was going to suggest that they be defined. That is necessary to prevent litigation and disputes.

Mr. WILKS (Dalley) [9.10].—The honorable member for Parramatta neglected to congratulate you, Mr. Chairman, upon your conscientiousness, which furnishes an example which the presiding officers of the

State Parliaments might copy. Many of the mistakes which have occurred have been due to, not your want of vigilance, but the brutal way in which the Government have kept us sitting for long hours at a stretch.

The CHAIRMAN.—I understand that it is the pleasure of the Committee that I make the alterations indicated in the schedule which has been referred to.

HONORABLE MEMBERS.—Yes.

Mr. WATSON (South Sydney) [9.12].—I wish to say that it seems to me an unwise decision on the part of the Treasurer to determine not to recommit any item. There are one or two distinct anomalies which will create injustice, and should therefore be remedied.

Postponed item 152. Stripper Harvesters, each, £16.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN (Calare) [9.13].—The duty on stripper harvesters was discussed at length last Parliament. I contributed to that discussion, and, if I can, wish to avoid the delay which would be occasioned by speaking upon it at length again to-night. I interpret the verdict of the people at the last elections in favour of the decision arrived at by the last Parliament, and therefore I intend to move that the proposed duty be reduced from £16 to £12, the rate then fixed. If the Treasurer will agree to that, I shall not discuss the matter further; but, if he will not, I must, in the interests of my constituents, place their case fairly before the Committee.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—Why make the duty as much as £12? It was increased by the last Parliament from £6 to £12 under conditions which have never been carried out.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—That is true; though there are reasons which might be offered as an excuse for not carrying out those conditions, and the Government say that they intend to see that they are carried out. If the Treasurer will consent to the reduction, and allow the duty to stand as it was before, this very debatable question can be disposed of at once, and we can pass to the consideration of other subjects which invite urgent attention. If on the other hand the Treasurer intends to fight for a specific duty of £16, we who are opposed to that must join issue with him. I should like to hear what he intends to do.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I cannot be forced into making a statement just now.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—Then I shall address myself to the main question. I hope that during the debate the Treasurer will consider the matter. I have no doubt that if he finds that the numbers are against him, as I hope he will, the debate will be terminated. There are several interests at stake, each of which is important, and entitled to fair consideration. But none of them should be bolstered up at the sacrifice of the others. The first interest affected is that of the manufacturers. It is so substantial that they have made themselves heard in the press, before the Tariff Commission, and by representations in this Chamber. The Commission, after its inquiry last year, reported the number of manufacturers in the Commonwealth to be twenty-four. Mr. McKay in a letter to the press to-day places the number at thirty, so that apparently there has been an increase of six in the meanwhile. Accepting his statement as accurate, there are thirty firms, large and small, engaged in the manufacture of stripper harvesters in the Commonwealth. There are several large factories, of which that at Sunshine is the largest, and there are a number of small ones in country centres. I believe there is one in the Treasurer's electorate. The next big interest involved is that of the employés. The Commission stated their number, based on Coghlan's statistics, at 1,800. Mr. McKay in his evidence put the total at 2,000. I am prepared to assume that there are 2,000 hands employed in the production of stripper harvesters. The third interest is that of the consumers, whom it would not be wise for the Committee to ignore, for if there were no users of the machines the interests of manufacturers and employés would at once disappear. According to the latest statistics, the total number of farmers in the Commonwealth is from 250,000 to 270,000, but a considerable number of them do not use harvesters. Their use is confined to the wheat-growing interests, and is also affected by climatic conditions and the nearness of railway communication. In the damper climes, and in places with ready access to railways, the farmer finds that it pays him to save his straw, and so he uses other methods of harvesting. Harvesters are used in drier parts and in more isolated places where the straw is not of so much value. The great trouble which the manufacturing interest has to face is the competition of importations. We have heard

a good deal about American machinery manufacturing combines, and in the last Parliament there was a scare as to the alleged large dumping contemplated by them in the Commonwealth. It was said that they were actively engaged in preparing large shipments for sale here so cheaply and on such easy terms that those engaged in agriculture would be tempted to buy their machines in preference to the local article, and that as the result the Australian manufacturer would be completely crushed out, and the importers would control the trade in the Commonwealth. But how far do statistics show that the local manufacturing interest has suffered from outside competition? In 1905, 1,730 machines were imported, of which no fewer than 1,000 came from Canada. During the same year we exported 418 machines. I have not the figures for 1906, as there seems to have been a difficulty in obtaining them. But from statements made during the investigations last year it appears that 484 machines were exported in the first six months. The Minister to-day laid upon the table a return covering the period from 1st January to 30th November of this year, so that it is practically up to date. It shows that the total imports for the first eleven months of this year amounted to 708 machines, and that we exported 101. I tried to ascertain the number manufactured here, but the Minister had to confess that he had been unable up to the present to obtain the information. The only return of that kind in the report comes from South Australia, where 153 machines were manufactured for the eleven months. The figures I have quoted do not indicate any very serious competition by outside manufacturers. They rather show that owing to the heavy discouragement imposed by the Tariff upon the importation of harvesters, the number imported has fallen off by over 1,000 since 1905. It is hardly likely that during this month over 1,000 machines will be brought in. A new ground of objection is being taken to a reduction of the duty. The House was informed when the first Tariff was brought down that McKay and Company had expressed themselves satisfied with a specific duty of £15 per machine as a sufficient embargo against importation. Since then Parliament, on the invitation of the Minister, has agreed to a specific duty of £12 per machine. Mr. H. V. McKay, in a letter in both to-day's Melbourne papers, claims that the conditions attached to the new Excise regula-

tions place his company at a disadvantage. He states the position of his company as follows—

To the Editor of the *Age*.

Sir,—As the harvester duties will apparently be dealt with at an early date, I wish to point out a few of the losses inflicted on the implement makers of Australia by the 1906 legislation, which was said to be for their benefit. Take my own case, for instance. The price of harvesters has been reduced to the extent of £20 each. My wages bill has been raised more than £5,000 per year, and my total cost of raw material has recently advanced more than £10,000 per year on an average turnover. To put it briefly, the following figures show the loss inflicted in one line alone in a normal year on the Sunshine Harvester Works by Parliament reducing the selling price of the machines, and by failing to allow for an increase of the selling price in accordance with the cost of raw material and the increase in the wages:—

Loss by Government reduction of price on 2,000 machines at £20 each	£40,000
Increase of cost through advance in raw material	10,000
Increase in wages through Federal Arbitration Court decision	5,000

Total annual loss inflicted ... £55,000

And this does not include the total loss inflicted on the Sunshine Harvester Works, where many varieties of agricultural implements are manufactured besides harvesters, and the loss, as shown above, is a larger sum by many thousands of pounds than the total profit ever made by me in my most prosperous year.

The above loss refers to the Sunshine Harvester Works alone, and bears as heavily in proportion on 30 other manufactures of implements in Australia. In order to permit of wages being paid on Mr. Justice Higgins' scale, the market would have to be secured to the Australian manufacturers. The present cost of selling in competition with foreign trusts is very heavy, and would be saved by an effective Tariff of £25 per harvester, as proposed by the manufacturers before the Tariff Commission.—Yours, &c.,

H. V. MCKAY.

11th December.

It will be seen that this firm estimates that under the legislation designed for the purpose of helping the industry, and at the same time securing reasonable wages for the workmen, and preventing undue charges to the consumer, their annual loss will be £55,000.

Mr. MCWILLIAMS.—Does the letter state how many are employed?

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—No; but Mr. Justice Higgins stated that his decision would affect about 500 men employed by this firm. In this letter Mr. McKay states that if the industry generally is to be placed in a position to comply with the requirements of legis-

lation, a specific duty, not of £16, but of £25 per machine must be imposed. I undertake to say that if, under a specific duty of £25, imports continued, a request would be made for a still higher duty; nothing short of actual prohibition, apparently, will meet the demand made by this firm.

Mr. MAUGER.—I would make the duty £25 to-morrow if I had my way.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—Then, it is a good job that the Postmaster-General is not all-powerful in the Cabinet. The honorable gentleman seems to think that there is only the manufacturing interest to be considered. However, I represent other interests, and, while I have no desire to do injustice to manufacturing industries, I must do my best to see that no injustice is done to those other industries.

Mr. MAUGER.—My point is that if we impose proper conditions, Australian manufacturers ought to command the Australian market.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—The figures show, I think, that the local manufacturers practically control the market at the present time. In less than two years the importation has decreased from 1,700 machines to 700 machines; so that the industry has no reason to complain, as compared with other industries, which have, at least, to fight as keenly for their existence. From the report of the Tariff Commission, I find that the materials which enter into the construction of these machines is valued at £26; that the wages amount to 30 per cent., or about £12; that the sale charges amount to the big total of £22; and that the profit is set down at £18, on a machine placed on the market at £78. It will be seen that the materials and wages amount to £38, and that the sale charges and profit amount to £40. I have no desire to harshly criticise this firm. I know that in many respects it is an estimable firm, which places a good machine on the market.

Mr. BOWDEN.—The firm deserve all they can get.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—I suppose so, but no firm have so persistently presented their case to this Parliament, and their demand has ever been in the direction of shutting out competition. First, a specific duty of £15 was demanded, and now they are on the doormat asking for a specific duty of £25.

Mr. MAUGER.—Internal competition cannot be shut out.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—I am not quite so sure about that. Not a great while ago, farmers found that the price of these machines jumped from £70 to £80, and as high as £105. They did not know the reason at the time, but it was subsequently discovered that the manufacturers and the importers had entered into a combination which was broken up only when the firm of Martin and Company, of South Australia, withdrew. Prices then dropped again. I quote this to show to what extent internal competition can be regulated. This was an arrangement, not between men engaged in the same industry, who may be supposed to have a brotherly feeling, but between the manufacturers and their active competitors, the importers. When this firm come to Parliament and persistently seek for special concessions, whereby their competitors may be handicapped, inquiry is invited as to how they treat the workmen, who are the prime factors in the production of the machines. If the treatment accorded to the workmen were liberal, I for one would not feel disposed to enter upon the very strong criticism that I am tempted to undertake. I find that, as far back as 1901, an effort was made to organize the employes in the Sunshine Harvester factory. A representative of the employes of the various companies visited the factory and brought the subject before the men. Subsequently, at a meeting of the men, which was held to consider the question of extending the Wages Board system to the factory, Mr. H. V. McKay was reported in the newspapers as saying that he thought the proposal, if carried out, would prove detrimental. He went on to impress on the meeting the necessity for his being allowed to conduct his own business as he pleased. That, I think, is a sentiment that will appeal very strongly to all anti-Socialists, and economic thinkers. Mr. McKay was reported to have also said that the employes should weigh well any action they might take, so as not to "clog the wheels of what was now a thriving industry." I emphasize the fact that the proposal before the meeting was simply to bring this company under a system to which their competitors had to submit. The whole object of the proposal was to place Mr. McKay upon the same level as that occupied by the manufacturers located in Melbourne. Mr. G. McKay, another

member of the firm, is reported to have said at the same meeting—

One effect of the trade being brought under the Act would be that improved labour-saving machinery would have to be obtained, and this would mean the displacement of many hands. He was of opinion that under the creation of Wages Boards, trades should be discouraged.

The position which he took up was that he was conducting his factory by manual labour, and he could only continue to do so if he could obtain that labour at a less rate than that which the Wages Board would allow. Despite the representations of the firm, a vote was taken, and the press reports stated that 110 men voted for the establishment of a Wages Board and fifteen against it. In 1904 a Wages Board was established, and a portion of the employes engaged by this firm was brought under its control. After due inquiry, the Board fixed the maximum wage of ironmoulders of the best class at 60s. per week, and the minimum at 54s. per week. The wage of ironmoulders' labourers was fixed at 38s. per week. One improver was allowed to every two journeymen or fraction thereof employed in the trade. Ironmoulders were to receive a minimum of 8s. per day if employed on work other than pipe-moulding work or work connected therewith. A scale of wages for improvers was also laid down. During the first year improvers were to be paid 5s. per week of forty-eight hours, during the second year 7s. 6d. per week, during the third year 10s. per week, during the fourth year 12s. 6d. per week, during the fifth year 15s. per week, during the sixth year 20s. per week, and during the seventh year 25s. per week. After that he could claim the minimum wage for a tradesman. Thus an improver, upon entering the service of this firm, had to serve seven years before he could command a weekly wage of 25s. What happened? As soon as Mr. McKay was asked to comply with the conditions laid down by an impartial tribunal, he closed his factory. The Melbourne daily newspapers set out in great headlines the reasons advanced for this step. If honorable members will refer to the *Argus* of 7th October, 1904, they will see an article headed "Wages Board Decision. Six hundred men thrown out of work." The article states that these operatives had been thrown out of employment as the result of what was regarded by the firm in question as an adverse decision on the part of the Wages Board. I leave honorable members to

Mr. Thomas Brown.

judge whether that Board was harsh in its treatment of this particular firm. Subsequently a deputation waited upon the Chief Secretary, Sir Samuel Gillott, on behalf of these unemployed, and preferred a request that the finding of the Wages Board should be abrogated. Mr. McKay also wrote to the Chief Secretary on the 13th October, 1904. In his communication he said—

I would respectfully request that something be promptly done to remove the embargo of Wages Board conditions from the implement and harvester business. I further request that if this cannot be done at once, you will give me an assurance that the Wages Board conditions will not come into operation at the factory at Bravbrook. If you will do that, I am prepared to considerably extend the factory, and will install more costly machinery: while, if there is any chance of the Wages Board conditions being applied there, I do not feel justified in spending the money.

That was the attitude taken up by Mr. McKay towards the Wages Board of Victoria. As a matter of fact, it was stated by the Inspector of Factories, Mr. Ord, that compliance with the decision of the Board did not require the payment of wages in advance of those generally paid in the trade, and that the Melbourne firms were paying to their employes the rates that this firm had been asked to pay.

Mr. FOSTER.—Is the honorable member "stone-walling"?

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—The honorable member claims to be a friend of the workers.

Mr. FOSTER.—I am as good a friend of the workers as is the honorable member. Does he wish to be insulting?

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—No. But the honorable member cast what I consider an unwarranted reflection upon me. I am endeavouring to place information before the Committee with a view to showing the manner in which this firm treats its employes.

Mr. FOSTER.—I did not intend to cast any reflection upon the honorable member, but it is very near the end of the session, and we want to get to work.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—I have had some fourteen or fifteen years' experience of political life, and I have discovered that when a Government desire to secure the passing of an unpopular measure they have merely to fill in the earlier part of the session with the consideration of a lot of unimportant proposals, and then to force the objectionable measure through at the fag end of the session. An old employe

of the firm, named Weickhardt, who appeared before the Tariff Commission, stated, upon oath, that a man named Tregeniza, who was employed in the carpenter's shop, was receiving only 20s. per week, and that another employé, named Lang, who was engaged in the blacksmith's shop, and who was a married man with a family, was in receipt of only 27s. 6d. per week. He further stated that a tinsmith's labourer, named Kaufmann, was paid only £1 a week, notwithstanding that he had a wife and family to support, and that a labourer, named Campbell, who had a wife and eight children to maintain, received a similar wage. From his evidence, it also appeared that the best tradesman in the tinsmith's department was a man named Harrison, who received only 30s. per week, whilst a competent plumber was paid only 15s. per week.

Mr. CROUCH.—Is the honorable member giving the substance of the sworn evidence?

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—Yes. Although an attempt was made to discredit Mr. Weickhardt's testimony upon the ground that he was a discharged employé, no evidence in rebuttal of his statements was forthcoming.

Mr. McWILLIAMS. — Was not Mr. McKay afforded an opportunity to produce his books, and to refute the statements in question, and did he not decline to do so?

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—I understand that he was afforded that opportunity. Some very valuable evidence with respect to the labour conditions of the industry was given in the inquiry before Mr. Justice Higgins. The summing-up of the Judge was a masterly performance, and I am glad that the Government have given it permanence in the form of a parliamentary paper. I think that they might reasonably have supplemented Mr. Justice Higgins' summing-up by reprinting the evidence given at the inquiry as to the wages paid and deemed by Mr. McKay to be fair and just, the wages claimed by the employés to be reasonable, and those determined upon by Mr. Justice Higgins as a living rate. By means of such a comparison we should have been able more readily to understand the various contending interests. If honorable members will turn up *Life* for last month they will find a paragraph in which is given a typical domestic balance-sheet submitted by one of the witnesses, who was a married man with two children. His weekly expenses were £2 5s. 9d., made up as follows:—Rent 12s.

6d., lodge money 1s. 3d., firewood 2s. 6d., milk 3s. 6d., meat 5s., groceries 10s., newspapers 6d., vegetables 3s., bread 5s., butter 2s. 6d. I do not think that any one will say that that was extravagant living for a man with a wife and family. The witness went on to say that there was no provision for clothing, for gas, fares, or tobacco. The witness was paid 10s. per day. He was a pipe moulder. Can it be wondered at that under such conditions of living men are unable to save money? Remember that this witness was a tradesman; but there are labourers in the employment of the same firm who were working for far less and whose minimum Mr. Justice Higgins fixed at a much lower rate. The Judge stated in his summing-up that he was in doubt whether he should fix the wages for labourers at 7s. or 7s. 6d. a day. He was inclined to think that 7s. 6d. was a fair wage, but he gave the benefit of the doubt to the employers and fixed the rate at 7s. per day. Can it be wondered at that when, after a life-time of toil, a labourer reaches old age, he is without means to provide for himself and has to become a charge upon the public? Unfortunately, under our present system of civilization flesh and blood are the cheapest of commodities. But I hope that the time will speedily come when the flesh and blood of men and women of our own race will have a greater value than the mere commercial value placed upon them at present by employers. One of the objects of this new protection policy is to provide a means of securing better remuneration for those who do the world's work. Mr. Justice Higgins found that he had to determine upon a basis for fixing the scale of wages. He had to determine whether a wages rate should be based upon what is generally known as the iron law of wages—that flesh and blood is to be bought like any other commodity in the cheapest market—or whether he should adopt some other standard. He said—

I cannot think of any other standard appropriate than the normal need of the average employé, regarded as a human being living in a civilized community. I have invited counsel and all concerned to suggest any other standard, and they have been unable to do so. If, instead of individual bargaining, one can conceive of a collective agreement—an agreement between all the employers in a given trade, on the one side, and all the employés on the other—it seems to me that the framers of the agreement would have to take as the first and dominant factor the cost of living as a civilized being.

It was on that basis that he determined the rates of wages. I turn to the

evidence of Mr. McKay, who said, in regard to the fixing of wages—

I have endeavoured to get labour at the cheapest price that I honestly could.

Another employer, Mr. Rigby, of the Austral Otis Company, said that his idea of a fair wage is—

what the employer, on looking at the man, chooses to give him for the work.

Contrast the standard laid down by Mr. Justice Higgins and the standards of these two employers. The Judge says that you must take into consideration the wages necessary to allow human beings to live under civilized conditions. The employers say, in the one case, "We must get labour as cheaply as we honestly can," and, in the other case, "We should pay a man what we think he is worth after looking at him." Those are the distinctive lines upon which the Judge, on the one hand, and the employers on the other, thought wages should be determined. As a humanitarian, I am prepared to endeavour to maintain the standard which the Judge thought it right to fix. I believe that if employers generally would consider the needs of their workmen a little more, things would be very much better than they are in the labour world. It is the failure to observe that standard that necessitates remedial industrial legislation such as it is found necessary to pass if we are to preserve a decent standard of civilization in this country. I trust that the Government will see their way to let this proposal remain as it was determined upon by Parliament last session. When it was formulated in legislation I disagreed with it, and gave my reasons. But I recognise the conditions under which the present Parliament has been elected. I do not think that it would be right to expect the Committee to go back upon what was determined, nor do I think that honorable members would be prepared to do so. The system should be given a fair trial under the conditions laid down. If it is found that some alteration in the system is necessary, let it be made as the result of experience. So far, it has not had a fair trial. The firms interested have practically defied the law. We have reached a stage when the Government must do something. They should either carry out the law in its entirety, or propose to Parliament to repeal it. I must ask honorable members to consider this matter from the point of view of the great producing interest, with which I am concerned as much as with the interests of the

workers. I allude to the interest of the farmers, of whom we have 250,000 or 270,000 scattered over Australia. They are the men who are developing the resources of the Commonwealth, and without whom both manufacturers and labourers would be without employment to-day. They receive no benefit from the protective policy of this country. They have to cater principally for the open markets of the world. Where they compete there is no discrimination as to whether competitors pay low or high wages. They have the handicap of long distances and great cost of transit to reach their markets. I find from the Commonwealth statistics that last year these farmers, after providing for the local consumption of the Commonwealth, exported 18,000,000 centals of wheat and 3,000,000 centals of flour, of a total value of £6,138,000. That large interest must receive consideration. Whilst I admit that in our legislation we have endeavoured to do something for them, still it must be recognised that that legislation has not yet been brought into effective operation. I hope that the Government, instead of raising the duty on harvesters by £4, will allow the old rate to stand. What is the position disclosed by the evidence given before the Tariff Commission? The natural protection which the local manufacturers receive amounts to, at least, £14 16s. 6d. per machine.

Mr. MATHEWS.—The honorable member knows that that is of no use against the ramifications of a trust.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—If the honorable member had been in the last Parliament, he would know that, quite apart from the duty, it enacted a special measure to deal with trusts.

Mr. MATHEWS.—It has not been brought into operation.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—I suppose it was thought by the Government that there was nothing to operate upon. I remember that the Minister came down here with great enthusiasm and promised that if there was anything to operate upon he would act very quickly.

Mr. FRAZER.—The Bill was going to save Australia.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—Yes. When the duty of £12 is added, it will be seen that every machine has a protection of £26 16s. 6d., which, if this item be agreed to, will be increased to £30 16s. 6d., as against a cost of £38 for material and labour.

Mr. FRAZER.—And when the big manufacturer got that protection, he closed down his works in order to show his appreciation.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—That is another matter which shows how little the firm I have been criticising have considered their workmen. With them it is not merely a question of pay, but a question of adopting American industrial principles of a most objectionable character. If the shoe pinches, if they want special consideration, they shut down their works at once, and bring the pressure of their work-people to fight for their cause. Why is America controlled by the big trusts and the "boodlers," as the honorable member for Darwin loves to describe the great operators? Why is it that they are enabled to operate as they do? It is simply because they have concentrated in their factories large masses of men who are living under such conditions that the temporary cessation of work means the pinch of poverty. By the simple operation of closing their works temporarily and shutting out the men, they compel them to fight for "boodleering" schemes in order that they might get some bread and butter. The firm to which I have been alluding have adopted that principle. They shut down their works against the operation of the Wages Board, and scored to a certain extent. They enjoyed an advantage as against the local competitors. As soon as Mr. Justice Higgins gave his decision, the same tactics were repeated. They do not deserve very great consideration from men like myself who have real sympathy for the toilers who sweat in the shops and factories of big concerns. I move—

That the words "and on and after 13th December, 1907, each £12," be added.

Mr. HUTCHISON (Hindmarsh) [10.20].—I hope that the Government intend to accept the reduction of duty proposed by the honorable member for Calare. I do not intend to follow in his footsteps and traverse all the ramifications which are connected with this question, because we shall have an opportunity to do so when the new protection comes before us in the shape of a Bill. I believe that it would shorten this discussion if the Minister would say whether he is prepared to accept the duty fixed in the Harvester Excise Act of 1906, and to give to the new protection the trial to which the honorable member for Calare has referred. I am quite willing that it should be given a trial, but I am unwilling to give those who, so far,

have not complied with its provisions any advantage which I can help. I would ask the honorable member for Calare to help me to reduce the duty to £6, or to have no duty at all.

Mr. MATHEWS.—Wipe it right out.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—If it were not for the fact that in going below £12 we should destroy the system of new protection, which we are trying as an experiment—

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—I am willing to give the new protection a fair show.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—That is very fair on the part of the honorable member, and it is all that I ask from the Government. The employers in the different States, at any rate in South Australia, were very anxious that the new protection should be enacted.

Mr. HANS IRVINE.—I do not think that they are now.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—I do not think so either. At that time they were very anxious to help the party to which I belong, and to see that the workers received a share of any protection which was given.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—How much have they received from McKay?

Mr. HUTCHISON.—I shall come to that in a moment.

Mr. MAUGER.—He is paying it now, at any rate.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—I am glad to inform the honorable member that in South Australia there is a number of firms who are paying the wages which have been agreed to.

Mr. TUDOR.—And I presume that there are in Victoria too.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—I am assured that there are some employers in Victoria and New South Wales who are also doing so. No honorable member desires to hurt these manufacturers. On the contrary, we want to help them. I should like them to get a higher duty, so long as I could compel others to fall into line with them. But some honorable members have asked, "What about McKay?" I am astounded that a firm which on their own statement have reaped enormous profits should have paid their employes very small wages. What does a circular signed by H. V. McKay disclose? It reads—

The following figures show the loss inflicted in one line alone in a normal year on the Sunshine Harvester Works by arbitrarily reducing the selling price of the machines and by failing

to allow for an increase of selling price in accordance with the cost of raw material, and the increase in the wages :—

2,000 machines at former price of £85 each	£170,000
2,000 machines at legally fixed price of £65 each	130,000
Loss by Government reduction of price	40,000
Increase of cost through advances in raw material	10,000
Increase in wages through Federal Arbitration Court decision	5,000

Total annual loss in comparison with previous years ... £55,000

This does not include the total loss inflicted on the Sunshine Works, where 50 to 60 other varieties of agricultural implements are manufactured besides harvesters, and the loss, as shown above, is a larger sum by many thousands of pounds than the total profit ever made by the manufacturer in his most prosperous year.

Here we have a statement from the firm itself that they were making enormous profits. I take it for granted that they are not, as reported in the press, going to extend their works in order to make a larger loss.

Mr. TUDOR.—They have denied that statement in the press, I think.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—Even if they are not, I do not suppose that if the firm get a duty of £12 they will be likely to go under. If that is so, they ought to be ashamed of the fact than many years ago, without an award at all, they were not paying the wages which have been fixed by Mr. Justice Higgins, and also giving the men large bonuses.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—The statement quoted shows that he was £5,000 a year short in his wages bill.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—Exactly, and in spite of the enormous profits admitted by himself. I am quite pleased to see a firm making as large a profit as they can, so long as they are treating fairly the consumers and the employés.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—On what condition did we double the duty last year?

Mr. HUTCHISON.—On the condition that the employés were to share in the protection to the industry. I am not going to say that McKay does not intend to do that now that he is compelled to do it, but I maintain that without being compelled at all he ought to have been paying much higher wages. If the price of raw material were to rise, and the firm were to come and give evidence to that effect, I am sure that honorable members would be quite willing to see that they were fairly treated and were allowed to charge a proportionately higher price for their machines. But we have had

no evidence to that effect from the firm. I have had some evidence that the price of material has increased, in fact I know that it has advanced, but no appeal has been made to us. I am sure that if all the circumstances were taken into consideration and it were found that it was impossible for the firm to pay fair wages and to make a fair profit on the capital, the Government would be quite willing to give some relief to them.

Mr. HANS IRVINE.—Charge the farmer.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—I am sure that the consumer would be quite willing to pay a fair price. There is no farmer worthy of the name of a man who has any desire to see an employé sweated; I know that he would not. He is quite willing to pay for his machines a price that will enable a fair wage to be paid to the manufacturer's employés.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—The farmer always has to pay a good price for his machines.

Mr. HUTCHISON.—Exactly. I do not think that the farmer can complain, particularly about the price of his machines, because since this Parliament intervened it has been fair. But I know that the price at which ploughs were then sold is not a profitable one to the manufacturer to-day. I should like the Minister to say that he is prepared to leave the duty as it is. I should deprecate any attempt to further lower it, because if we do reduce it below £12 we shall not allow the new protection to have a trial. While I consider that the Government have not done their duty in regard to the administration of the Harvester Excise Act, still I contend that we ought to give the new protection a trial. The Government have issued fresh regulations and assured us that they intend to take action against those manufacturers who are not complying with the law. If they do that, I am quite willing to allow the duty to stand at the old rate until it reaches the Senate. If the decision of the High Court should be favorable to the employés being dealt with fairly and the Senate should recommend a duty of £16, I shall be quite willing to concur therein. I do not think it is necessary at this late period of the session when we have other matters to deal with to speak at length. I believe that I am voicing the opinion of a very large number of honorable members when I say that that will be the stand taken, and that under present circumstances they will not agree to the higher duty.

Amendment agreed to.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Postponed item 153. Strippers, each £8.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN (Calare) [10.31].—I hope that the Treasurer will agree to revert, in this case also, to the duty under the old Tariff.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That the words "and on and after 13th December, 1907, each £6," be added.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Postponed item 154. Metal Parts of Strippers and Strippers, per lb., 2½d.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That the words "and on and after 13th December, 1907, per lb., 1½d.," be added.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Question—That the schedule, as amended, be agreed to—proposed.

Mr. FRAZER (Kalgoorlie) [10.33].—I presume that the question may be debated.

The CHAIRMAN.—Not unless the honorable member proposes to move the insertion of a new item relating to the postponed items, with which we have just dealt. The schedule is practically disposed of.

Mr. WATSON.—Cannot we move a re-committal at this stage?

The CHAIRMAN.—No; such a motion may be submitted at the report stage. I have merely proposed this question formally, because there is some doubt as to whether the introductory words to the schedule were agreed to when it was originally discussed.

Mr. FRAZER.—I presume that I shall be in order in moving that a new item be added?

The CHAIRMAN.—Yes.

Mr. FRAZER.—I wish to take advantage of this opportunity to direct the attention of the Treasurer to an apparent anomaly which has occurred as the result of a division taken on the item "Wire Gauze."

The CHAIRMAN.—Order! If I were to allow the honorable member to follow the line of discussion that he has just taken up, the whole Tariff would be reopened.

Mr. FRAZER.—I understood that I should be in order in moving the addition of a new item.

The CHAIRMAN.—The honorable member will have an opportunity, at the

report stage, to point out any anomaly, but he cannot move the insertion of a new item at this stage, unless it relates to the postponed items, with which we have just dealt.

Schedule, as amended, agreed to.

In the House:

Resolutions reported.

Motion (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That the House will this day again resolve itself into the Committee.

Motion (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) proposed—

That the report be taken into consideration forthwith.

Mr. WATSON (South Sydney) [10.41].

—I wish to urge upon the Treasurer the desirability of recommitting the schedule with a view to the reconsideration of two items in regard to which a serious anomaly has been allowed to creep in. I refer to items 353C and 355, under the heading of leather, in the schedule as amended. Item 353C includes white sheep and white lamb skins, which have been made dutiable at 15 per cent., whilst item 355 includes, amongst other articles, crust skivers, which have been made duty free. The trouble is that the Tariff, as at first introduced by the Government, proposed that white sheep and white lamb skins should be dutiable under the general Tariff at 30 per cent., with a duty of 25 per cent. on imports from the United Kingdom. These skins are used as a substitute for white kid for covering the stoppers of bottles and work of that kind, and, as a result of the proposal made by the Government in the first instance, their manufacture was started in New South Wales. A considerable number of men were employed, with the prospect that the development of the industry would lead to the employment of a greater number. The Government at the last moment accepted a new arrangement of the schedule, under which they reduced the duty on the whole item to 20 per cent. all round, except in respect of white sheep and white lamb skins, which were made dutiable at 15 per cent. I say that a mistake was made in differentiating between these skins and other classes of leather originally included in the same item, and they should also have been made dutiable at 20 per cent. It does not seem to me to be reasonable to make any distinction between these various classes of leather, and as the industry which has only recently been established in New South Wales for the

manufacture of these skins is one which is likely also to be established in other parts of the Commonwealth, that is, I think, a reason why the anomaly should be corrected. In regard to item 355, what I am particularly concerned about is the inclusion in the free list of crust skivers. That was done at the suggestion of an honorable member who was under the impression that the article could not be made here.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am afraid that honorable members will suffer very serious inconvenience later on through being unaware of what is going on, but it is almost impossible for them to know what is said while there are so many conversations taking place.

Mr. WATSON.—In the past crust skivers have been largely imported from New Zealand, but they are now locally manufactured, and should, therefore, be omitted from the free list and placed in the same item as the other leathers to which I have referred. They are split sheep skins in an almost finished condition of manufacture. It is anomalous that they should appear in the free list, and that white sheep and white lamb skins should be dutiable only at 15 per cent. when other varieties of leather are made dutiable at 20 per cent. As I might, if I sat down now without doing so, lose my right to move later the recommitment of the schedule for the purpose of reconsidering the duty to be imposed on these articles, I propose to submit the motion now.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Does not the honorable member think that he had better leave the Senate to deal with the matter?

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Would it not be sufficient if the Minister now indicated that he would consent to what the honorable member proposes?

Mr. WATSON.—I am not aware as to how far the Senate can increase duties.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The Senate can suggest increases. The danger is that if the honorable member's request for the recommitment of the schedule is agreed to there will be many requests of the kind made.

Mr. WATSON.—I frankly admit that, and I am not any more anxious to go into the whole schedule again than is any other honorable member. It seems to me that it is right that some attempt should be made to rectify anomalies so far as that can possibly be done.

Mr. JOHNSON.—What about the duties on hats?

Mr. WATSON.—As the honorable member is aware, I am against the high duties imposed on hats. However, I formally move—

That the schedule be recommitted, with a view to the reconsideration of items 353C and 355.

If there is any other way by which the difficulty can be overcome, I shall be only too willing to adopt it.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I desire to ask you, Mr. Speaker, whether another place has power to request increases as well as decreases, or other variations in the items sent to them in the Tariff?

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question which the honorable member has put is one upon which the whole House will be interested in having a ruling. My ruling, following precedents which have already been laid down by this Parliament, is that it will be becoming for the other branch of the Legislature to make a request to us for an increase, as well as for a decrease, or any other modification.

Mr. FRAZER (Kalgoorlie) [10.52].—I wish to bring under the notice of the Government an apparent oversight in connexion with the removal of item 225—Wire cloth, wire gauze, *ad valorem* (General Tariff), 5 per cent.; (United Kingdom), free—from the schedule. It was alleged in the Committee that it covered only certain classes of wire goods which were used chiefly for doors, &c., in houses, and being made in a factory at Richmond, and the item was struck out without debate. Those articles then automatically fell under item 170—Manufactures of metal n.e.i., *ad valorem* (General Tariff), 30 per cent.; (United Kingdom), 25 per cent. The duties upon that item were subsequently reduced to 25 and 20 per cent. It has since been discovered that, through the omission of item 225, battery and milling screens, and screens for cyaniding purposes and furnaces, have become dutiable at those rates. Under the old Tariff they were free, and under this Tariff, as first submitted, they were dutiable at 5 per cent., and free. The difficulty that has arisen can be got over by specifying a certain mesh. By that means the industry on whose behalf the honorable member for Yarra had the original item struck out will not be interfered with. I ask the Government to give my request favorable consideration.

I do not think that any honorable member will oppose it, as the articles which I have mentioned are not made locally. To put myself in order, I move—

That item 170—Manufactures of metal n.e.i.—be recommitted, with a view to insert—“170A. Wire Cloth and Wire Gauze, made of Wire, and having a mesh of not less than 120 per square inch—Free.”

That will not affect the class of screen manufactured at Richmond, and its adoption will prevent the mining and milling industries being unduly penalized through a misapprehension on the part of the Committee.

Mr. KNOX (Koovong) [10.55].—When item 175—Screws n.e.i.—was under consideration, the duties were re-arranged, and an anomaly was inadvertently created. “Screws for wood” were made dutiable at per cwt. (General Tariff) 5s. 6d., (United Kingdom) 5s., while “screws, n.e.i.” were made subject to a duty of 5 per cent. (General Tariff), and free (United Kingdom). The anomaly is that screws for wood were made subject to a fixed instead of an *ad valorem* duty. The effect has been that on some of the larger-sized screws a duty equal to 50 per cent. *ad valorem* is being paid.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I think that was pointed out at the time.

Mr. KNOX.—Yes; but the Minister recognises now that a serious anomaly has arisen, as has been shown by the iron-mongery trade. I desire to move in such a way that screws for wood shall be subjected to an *ad valorem* rate. The Department do not want to charge the fixed duty which was passed by the Committee. The Minister has already recognised the anomaly, and I should like him to submit the matter now to the departmental officer in charge of the Tariff, with a view to framing the necessary alteration.

Mr. WILKS.—Does the honorable member want a recommitment now, or a re-adjustment in another place?

Mr. KNOX.—The item, as passed by the Committee, is doing a serious injustice throughout the Commonwealth. The Committee never believed for a moment that so high a duty as 50 per cent. was being imposed on the larger screws. On the different sizes the fixed duty is equivalent to *ad valorem* rates ranging from 10 to 50 per cent. The Minister has already offered to give every facility for the rectification of the anomaly, and if it is possible to adjust the matter now,

I earnestly urge that it may be done, inasmuch as the whole of the trade is at the present moment dislocated.

Mr. GLYNN (Angas) [11.0].—I have a little list of items I should like to have re-committed, but, out of consideration for the House, and afterwards of the Committee, I shall limit my proposition to the re-committal of one item. In doing that I am taking into consideration what I know to be the wish of some other members, for instance, the honorable member for Riverina, who last night had a good deal to say about the unfairness of manure bags being taxed, and a handicap thus being placed on local producers of manure, whilst similar bags from Japan are admitted free. Salt bags were struck out of item 114, which made them free, and became dutiable, along with gypsum and manure bags under n.e.i. That has been very strongly objected to by the salt manufacturers of South Australia, and, I think, with a good deal of justice. It has been pointed out to me, and also, I think, to the honorable member for Boothby that to include salt sacks in the *ad valorem* list will mean taxation of about £1,500 or £1,600 a year on the salt industry.

Mr. PAGE.—Salt bags or sacks are being made in Queensland.

Mr. GLYNN.—I am informed on good authority that salt bags and sacks are not made in Australia. Those interested in the salt industry of South Australia do not object to paying a tax on gypsum or hessian bags, if they have to be taxed, because these can be manufactured locally; but they do object to having to pay a duty on salt bags or sacks made from jute, which, as I say, are not made in Australia.

Colonel FOXTON.—They are made in Australia.

Mr. GLYNN.—I do not wish to inflict quotations in proof of my statement, but I am informed that they are not made here, and this is a very severe tax on an industry which is almost entirely confined to one State. I therefore desire to move that item 114 be re-committed with a view to re-inserting salt bags.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—Will the honorable member add gypsum and manure bags made of jute?

Mr. GLYNN.—I have no objection, and I move—

That item 114 be recommitted, with a view to re-inserting salt, gypsum, and manure bags made of jute.

I have on my list some other anomalies, but these may be cured by the Department, and some of them by the Senate. However, I call the Treasurer's attention to the fact that there has been a good deal of discontent amongst merchants at the distinction made between woollen piece goods weighing over 5 ozs. to the square yard, and those which do not weigh 5 ozs. to the square yard. I am now referring to item 124A. The objection of the merchants has been supported by the Customs agents at Port Adelaide, who, I believe, have approached the Department, along with the merchants. At present I do not desire to move the re-committal of that item, because there is some hope that the matter may be inquired into by the Department, or that, on the motion of some private member, something may be done by the Senate. However, if any other honorable member move that the item be committed, I shall support him.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [11.5].—I have no doubt honorable members on all sides would like to have certain items re-committed, and I have myself a pretty considerable list of anomalies. But I suggest that, in the circumstances, and with a view to terminating the business before Christmas, we might very well leave a little for the Senate to do in the way of rectification. I strongly suggest to those who have actually moved for recommitments, and those who contemplate doing so, that they might leave these matters, as I say, to the Senate.

Mr. WILSON.—Some might be adjusted very simply.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I shall certainly resist all the motions.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The honorable member for Corangamite has had some experience of how some "simple" matters are adjusted in Committee. My experience is that it is just those matters which provoke great debate. I am afraid that if all items containing anomalies are re-committed, we shall have a Tariff debate extending over next week. I am sure none of us desire that that should be the case. Personally, I feel that I have had my fair share of Tariff discussion, and that the sooner we get away from this atmosphere the better. Under the circumstances, I intend to forego my right to propose any recommitments; and I shall be glad indeed if honorable members will take the same course.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [11.8].—I desire to move the recommitment of item 150, with a view to the elimination of the words "discs for agricultural implements."

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—There is no necessity for that.

Mr. CHANTER.—The matter has been arranged.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—With reference to the articles under the heading of leather, to which attention has been drawn by the honorable member for South Sydney, I may say that to-day I received a communication from leather manufacturers in Sydney, drawing my attention to the fact that a mistake of the kind indicated has been made to their prejudice, with reference to white sheepskins and skivers. I have reason to believe that the alteration reducing the duty on white sheepskins was, to some extent, made on the motion of the Minister, in consequence of representations by myself. Those representations were made on the strength of a communication in writing placed in my hands, signed by a leading Victorian manufacturer, in which I was assured that the manufacturers of New South Wales concurred in the proposed alteration. It now appears that the New South Wales manufacturers did not concur; and, therefore, I consider, as a matter of right and justice, that the item should be restored to the original duty, namely, 20 per cent. I desire, also, that skivers should be removed from the free list, and treated as originally recommended by the Tariff Commission, and as subsequently proposed by the Government. These are two mistakes which have been made through misrepresentation; and if they cannot be put right at this stage, without involving complicated debate, then I ask the Government to take steps to see that the item is open to review by this House on a request from the Senate. I also join in the request which has been made by the honorable member for Kalgoorlie, supported by other Western Australian members, that screens of not less than 120 mesh, should, in the interests of mining, be restored to the free list. I think that a mistake was made in removing them from the free list.

Mr. WEBSTER (Gwydir) [11.10].—I also desire to direct attention to an anomaly which has been overlooked. Under the Tariff fishing lines are upon the free list, whilst the raw material of which they are made is dutiable. I would ask the Trea-

surer to see that that anomaly is rectified when the Tariff comes before the Senate.

Mr. WILKS (Dalley) [11.11].—I desire to bring under the notice of the Treasurer certain grievances under which some of my constituents allege that they suffer. Though I do not father their complaint, it is my duty as their representative to bring it forward. I consider that the present Tariff contains more anomalies than did the old Tariff, and I hope that the Senate will perform good work by arranging the schedule upon a more scientific basis. It so happens that the two largest glassware factories in New South Wales are located in my electorate, and some ten days ago they wired me—

Vote last night means ruin to our industries. Less than 40 per cent. against Germany useless. Get item recommitted.

Personally, I cannot vote for any higher duty in respect of item 253 than 25 per cent. The two factories to which I have referred are those of the Federal Glass Company and the Co-operative Flint Glass Company, of Leichhardt. In justice to them, I have placed their complaint before the Committee. They declare that they are worse off now than they were under the old Tariff. I put their complaint before the Treasurer for what it is worth, and I ask him when he is dealing with the other anomalies not to overlook it. I regret that although the Tariff Commission was appointed chiefly to rectify anomalies, the present Tariff contains more anomalies than did the old Tariff.

Mr. MAHON (Coolgardie) [11.16].—I move—

That item 84 (Condensed Milk) be recommitted.

My object is to secure the imposition of a duty of 1½d. per lb. upon sweetened milk under the general Tariff, and of 1d. per lb. under the preferential Tariff. Unsweetened milk I wish to make dutiable at 1½d. per lb. under the general Tariff, and at 1d. per lb. under the Tariff for Great Britain. The existing duties on condensed milk were agreed to on a Friday afternoon very hurriedly, and without proper debate. Worse still, they were carried upon the strength of inaccurate statements made to the Committee by the Treasurer and the honorable member for Mernda.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I did not make any misleading statements.

Mr. MAHON.—I have the correction here. The Treasurer made certain charges

against the importers of Nestlé's Milk, which I am assured are absolutely unfounded. He ought to be in possession of a copy of the letter which I hold in my hand, and therefore he must be aware that his statements have been absolutely contradicted.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN (Calare) [11.17].—I would ask the Treasurer to consent to the recommitment of item 187, which relates to wire-netting.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I intend to resist any recommitments.

Mr. THOMAS BROWN.—If there are to be no recommitments, perhaps another place will consider the reasons which I desire to advance on the present occasion. I wish to make the present duty upon wire-netting operate as from the 8th of August, instead of 11th October. Our pastoralists and farmers are fighting a life and death struggle with the rabbit pest, and I am sure that anything which this Committee can do to assist them it will most willingly undertake. It would be of material assistance to them if we allowed the reduced duty upon wire-netting to operate as from the 8th August instead of from the 11th October.

Mr. JOHNSON (Lang) [11.19].—I am very glad that the Treasurer has declared his intention to resist any attempts to reopen the Tariff discussion. It must be quite obvious that if he allows one item to be recommitted he cannot consistently refuse to permit the recommitment of other items. Thus the whole Tariff discussion would be re-opened, and at this late stage of the session it would be extremely unwise to take any such step. Anomalies, of which there are very many, can be adjusted by the Senate. If the Treasurer had expressed an intention to recommit any items, I was going to bring some under his notice, including item 122. But under the circumstances I do not propose to do so.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS (Robertson) [11.21].—The proposals for the recommitment of items, and the anomalies that exist in this new Tariff, go to show how demoralizing business of this kind is. We are quite incompetent to deal further with the Tariff until after a fresh general election. When the last election took place, the issue placed before the country in large areas of Australia was that of anti-Socialism against Socialism.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The matter before the House is that of determining whether

or not certain items shall be recommitted. If the honorable member will address himself to that subject, I shall be glad to hear him. But a debate on general policy will not be in order.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—I think, sir, that you missed my point. I should like to see the whole Tariff recommitted, and would, if necessary, propose that it be recommitted, if only for the purpose of pointing out that Parliament is demoralized, and that the whole country is to a large extent demoralized by what has taken place. Representations have been made to honorable members from all quarters with respect to duties. Some people who have received the benefit of larger duties than were formerly proposed are not satisfied because they have not got as much as their neighbours. Therefore, they want a little more. We were sent here for the purpose of removing anomalies. Many honorable members were elected expressly for that purpose. A number were sent into Parliament whose fiscal faith was not under consideration by the electors, but whose votes have, nevertheless, had the result of carrying these Tariff anomalies of which I am complaining. If another election were to take place, in all probability the new Parliament would be better able to deal with a Tariff that is simply full of anomalies which must be reconsidered within the near future. I decline to ally myself with any party that considers this to be a fair settlement of the fiscal question. Therefore, I look forward with a good deal of hope to a dissolution. I should like to see whether we cannot have a party returned to power that will endeavour to do justice to the whole country. I trust that the House will do nothing in the direction of a recommitment, but will allow the Tariff to be sent up to the Senate. No doubt it will be sent back to us with recommendations for amendment. But when this House has finally dealt with it, it will have to be submitted to the electors for reconsideration, and at the next election I earnestly hope that the whole question will be reopened.

Mr. ATKINSON (Wilmot) [11.25].—I desire to suggest the recommitment of item 68, hay and chaff, with a view of having the old duty restored. There had been a drought at the time when we dealt with the item. Had the rains which have since fallen benefited the country at that

time, probably a different result would have been attained when the division took place. This Tariff is supposed to give protection all round, but I do not think that the farmer has received much consideration under it. His interests as well as those of other sections of the community ought to be regarded. The duty in the case I mention is not one that is likely to operate harshly. Since Federation it has not been of much use to the farmers, but occasions may arise when New Zealand may prove a very severe competitor in the Australian market. Seeing that New Zealand bears none of the burdens incidental to Federation, I think it only right that our own farmers should have a modicum of protection. I hope that if there are to be any recommitments the Treasurer will not overlook the item to which I refer.

Mr. BATCHELOR (Boothby) [11.27].—I understand that the Treasurer is definitely opposing all recommitments. Under those circumstances it is not worth while to make suggestions in that direction. It is doubtful whether, in face of the opposition of the Government, a motion for the recommitment of any item could be carried, and those who desire the reconsideration of some items might prejudice their case by a defeat. It would, therefore, be wiser to rely on alterations being made in the Senate. I rose to draw the attention of the Treasurer to item 376.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I have made a note of that.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—I suggest to honorable members that it would be wise for them not to press to a division their requests for recommitments.

Mr. TUDOR (Yarra) [11.29].—Like every other honorable member, I have had a "fair sickener" of this Tariff. But I do not want to lose my right to move the recommitment of some items in the event of any other items being recommitted. I do not expect that any items will be recommitted; but, in the event of the recommitment of any item being allowed, I should like to move the recommitment of item 123, which deals with parasols, sunshades, and umbrellas, and item 376, which deals with cycle parts, with a view to remove an anomaly which I believe that I, owing to a misunderstanding, created. After we had been sitting for twelve or fourteen hours, a proposal was given to me by those who thought that they understood the business, but I, unfortunately, misunderstood

one word, with the result that an anomaly was created. I am quite willing to forego my right to move the recommitment of those items if the Treasurer will assure me that he will endeavour to have them dealt with in the Senate, as I desire. I also want to get a recommitment of a paragraph of item 303, which subjects spruce and deal to a heavier duty than has hitherto been imposed. It is practically a tax upon people who build houses, as that kind of timber is not produced here.

Mr. MATHEWS (Melbourne Ports) [11.32].—I recognise that we cannot hope to succeed with any proposal to recommit an item, but I indulge in the hope that the Government may see their way to consider the very modest request to insert an item making superphosphates dutiable at 5 per cent. in the general Tariff and free when imported from the United Kingdom.

Mr. MALONEY (Melbourne) [11.33].—I hope that the Government will not agree to the recommitment of any items, but, if they should do so, I shall move the recommitment of the item corsets, in order that a very unjust burden which has been placed on every girl and woman in the community may be removed.

Mr. CARR (Macquarie) [11.34].—In the event of a motion to recommit an item being considered by the Treasurer, I intend to move the recommitment of paragraphs J, K, and L of item 234, which deals with oils.

Mr. McDONALD (Kennedy) [11.35].—Seeing that honorable members desire so large a number of items to be recommitment, may I suggest to the Treasurer that he should agree to recommit the whole Tariff?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [11.36].—I am very pleased with the tone of honorable members. Of course, there are anomalies which I desire to have corrected, but I feel that if I were to agree to the recommitment of one item I must agree to the recommitment of all items that might be desired.

Mr. McDONALD.—Does the honorable gentleman say that he must agree to my suggestion, too?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—No; I do not agree to recommit the whole Tariff. So far as I can learn, the recommitment of a large number of items would be proposed if I agreed to the recommitment of one item. If honorable members will stand by me, as I feel that they will, we shall not have any items recommitment at the present time, be-

cause it would take a long while to deal with the items desired to be recommitment and to rectify anomalies. It is quite impossible to pass a large Tariff without its containing a number of anomalies. It would not be wise on my part to pick out a few of the cases which have been mentioned by honorable members, but it is my intention to use all the persuasive influence I can with the Senate to deal with most of them. I could mention a few special items, but honorable members can depend upon it that while they are enjoying a holiday and while the Senate is dealing with the Tariff I shall be here for a great part of the time to help if I can to get anomalies removed. I am anxious that the public shall feel that every care has been taken to prevent anomalies. It is hardly necessary to say that I want a Tariff which cannot be attacked in a serious way as the last one was attacked. It has been discovered that a mistake was made in regard to discs. Telegrams have been sent to-day to Collectors of Customs to allow them to come in as minor parts, as the law allows. There will be no difficulty on that score, and all the trouble to the farming classes in that regard is, therefore, over.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—It has been suggested on this side that the honorable gentleman might recommit the item dealing with pianos.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not want to have another discussion such as we had yesterday, at any rate for a while. I hope that honorable members will support me in my action, not because I do not want to recommit any items, but because I do not think that at this particular time honorable members could stop as long as would be required to deal with all the recommitments which would be desired. Therefore, I shall not agree to the recommitment of any item.

Mr. WATSON.—In view of the statement of the Treasurer the best thing which I and perhaps other honorable members can do is to depend upon the good offices of the Government in another place. I ask leave to withdraw my motion.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Perhaps the House will be pleased if I put all the other propositions in one motion, namely, that the recommitments proposed be agreed to.

HONORABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear.
Motions negatived.

Original question resolved in the affirmative.

Resolutions of Committee of Ways and Means agreed to.

Motion (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That Sir William Lyne and Mr. Groom do prepare and bring in Bills to carry out the foregoing resolutions.

CUSTOMS TARIFF BILL.

Bill presented by Sir WILLIAM LYNE and read a first and second time.

In Committee:

Clause 1—(Short Title).

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [11.40].—With one or two exceptions, the provisions of this Bill are similar to those in the old Act. The exceptions are clauses 6 and 8. Clause 6 deals specially with the preference to Great Britain. The honorable member for Bédigo called attention to the need for such a provision, and I was able to tell him that it was already incorporated in the Bill. Clause 8 saves the South African preference. The question was raised whilst the schedule was under consideration, and I told honorable members that such provision would be made.

Mr. BOWDEN.—Is there any provision in regard to the island trade?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—No. Sub-clause 2 of clause 3 is a provision that is new to our Tariff Acts, but common to Tariff Acts of other countries. It provides that—

The headings of the respective divisions in the Schedule are used solely for convenience of classification, and shall not in any way affect the interpretation of the Customs Tariff.

That sub-clause is designed to facilitate the administration of the Act.

Clause agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 9 agreed to.

Schedule—

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I move—

That the definitions "Sheet" and "Plate," appearing in the heading to the schedule, be left out.

This amendment is necessary in consequence of an alteration which has been made in the schedule itself.

Mr. HUME COOK.—The definitions have been provided in the items themselves.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—That is so, and we, therefore, do not require them in the heading.

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That the following definition be inserted in the heading to the schedule:—"Wool or Woollen" includes all manufactures of wool or hair or combinations thereof."

Schedule, as amended, agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [11.45].—I propose to move, with the concurrence of the House, the suspension of the Standing Orders to enable the Bill to pass through its remaining stages without delay.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I shall object.

EXCISE TARIFF BILL.

Bill founded upon the resolutions of Committee of Ways and Means presented by Sir WILLIAM LYNE, and passed through all its stages without amendment.

SPECIAL ADJOURNMENT.

Motion (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) agreed to—

That the House, at its rising, adjourn until 11 a.m. to-morrow.

ADJOURNMENT.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [11.50].—I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

It seems to me that there is every prospect of our being able to adjourn to-morrow for the Christmas vacation, and a strenuous attempt will be made to finish our business then. I ask honorable members to assist us in doing so.

Mr. WATSON.—What business is it proposed to take to-morrow?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—There is the Excise Procedure Bill. I am not sure that the Manufactures Encouragement Bill will be proceeded with. That is a matter upon which I shall have to consult the Prime Minister. Personally, I think that not much will be gained by dealing with the measure to-morrow, because its consideration cannot be advanced beyond a certain point until we re-assemble next year.

Mr. WILSON.—What about the Defence statement?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—That will be made to-morrow. There are also the amendments of the Senate in the Quarantine Bill. I do not know what will be done in regard to that matter.

Mr. WATSON (South Sydney) [11.52].—In my opinion, it would be unfair to proceed with the Manufactures Encouragement Bill to-morrow. I do not say that from any hostility to the measure, although I voted against its second reading. But, seeing that it involves the appropriation of an immense sum of public money, there ought to be great care taken in the preparation of the schedule.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I hardly think that the Bill will be taken to-morrow.

Mr. WATSON.—It would be hardly fair to ask the House to consider it then, especially as, in any case, it cannot be passed into law until it has gone through the Senate, and the Tariff must take precedence of other business there. At the present time, commercial enterprises are hung up awaiting parliamentary decision on the Tariff.

Mr. WEBSTER (Gwydir) [11.54].—I expected to have an opportunity to move a motion regarding a matter of urgent importance of which I have given notice. I know that the House is very tired, but I should like to ascertain whether the Government can see their way clear to allow me the opportunity to move that motion to-morrow?

Mr. WATSON.—What is the subject?

Mr. WEBSTER.—It is a motion for the appointment of a Select Committee to inquire into certain matters affecting the working of the postal, telegraphic and telephonic systems of the Commonwealth. In my opinion, no inquiry has ever been more urgently needed. The present state of affairs from beginning to end, is unsatisfactory, whether one has regard to the conditions under which the employes are working, the administration of the Telephone Branch, the sweating of the semi-official postal officials, or other phases of the matter. I have no desire to carp at the Government. Very many of the evils which exist are due to conditions over which they have no control, though there are evils which they could remedy. The matter concerns both the public and the officials of the Department, and I think that the result of an investigation would be that anomalies would appear so glaring, and the true cause of difficulties so obvious, that the Government would be able to arrive at a proper solution of the whole

[263]—2.

problem. The Department would then be properly organized, the public better served, and the employes better treated.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [11.56].—The matter to which the honorable member for Gwydir has referred is one upon which I cannot make a definite statement without consulting the Prime Minister. I hope, to-morrow, to make a statement to the House in regard to certain proposals for expenditure in connexion with the Post Office. I do not feel disposed to take the responsibility of finding the money for the proposed expenditure without the concurrence of the House, and I intend, therefore, to say what is proposed, and to test the feeling of honorable members before providing money for certain expenditure for which provision is not made on the Estimates.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—What about the increments to salaries?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I think I have already said that they are to be paid.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

House adjourned at 11.57 p.m.

House of Representatives.

Friday, 13 December, 1907.

Mr. SPEAKER took the chair at 11.0 a.m., and read prayers.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have received the Treasurer's statement of receipts and expenditure during the year ended 30th June, 1907, accompanied by the report of the Auditor-General, which I now lay on the table.

Ordered to be printed.

ALLEGED FORGED SIGNATURES TO PETITION.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Honorable members will remember that a short time since, in adopting a report of the Printing Committee, it was directed that a petition which had contained some signatures which were believed to be forgeries, should be forwarded by the Clerk of this House to the Attorney-General for such action as he might think fit to take. A reply has now been received from the Attorney-General's Department, which I will ask the Clerk to read.

Letter read by the CLERK, as follows—

Attorney-General's Department,
Melbourne, 11th December, 1907.

Sir,—

Referring to your letter of the 16th ultimo (No. 1907/246), forwarding an extract from the Votes and Proceedings of the House of Representatives relating to certain alleged forged signatures to a petition from electors of the Hume Division, and your further communication forwarding the petition and correspondence in connexion therewith, I have the honour to inform you that all the papers have been submitted to the Crown Solicitor, who advises that in his opinion, a prosecution for forgery would be unsuccessful.

I have the honour to be, Sir,
Your obedient servant,

GORDON H. CASTLE,
Acting Secretary.

The Clerk,
House of Representatives.

MILITARY BOARD.

Mr. SALMON.—I desire to ask the Minister of Defence, in view of the fact that on several occasions the question of including in the Military Board some members of the Militia Forces has been under consideration in this House, and questions have been asked about it by myself and other honorable members, whether he will give the House information—which apparently has gone from the Department to the press already—concerning his intentions in this regard?

Mr. EWING.—I am not responsible for what has appeared in the press. I spend a good deal of my time in somewhat acrimonious discussions with representatives of the press, because they allege that they do not get enough information concerning the business of my Department. The honorable member for Laanecoorie thinks that in this case they have managed to get too much. With regard to the statement to which reference has been made, I may say that it is accurate. The Prime Minister will make a statement with regard to the matter a little later on.

Mr. SALMON.—Does not the Minister think that honorable members should be informed?

Mr. EWING.—Yes. I did not inform any one; but the honorable member must be aware of the extraordinary ingenuity, ability, and intelligence of the representatives of the press. I am often astounded by the information I see published. The paragraphs are often "kites," but they are sometimes correct, as to the information they convey.

KEROSENE DUTIES.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—In reference to some remarks previously made with regard to the higher price charged for kerosene, in consequence of the duties imposed, I think that, in justice to one firm, at any rate, it is right that I should ask the Prime Minister if he has received information to the effect communicated to me by letter?

Mr. DEAKIN.—Is that from the Colonial Oil Company? If it is, I read it to the House yesterday.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Then it is unnecessary that I should say any more in connexion with the matter.

POSTAL, TELEGRAPHIC, AND TELEPHONIC SYSTEMS.

Mr. WEBSTER.—Following up the statements which I made on the motion for the adjournment of the House last night, I wish to ask the Prime Minister whether the Government are prepared to allow time for the discussion of the notice of motion standing at the head of the general business for to-day? This notice appears in my name, and deals with a matter of urgency and of importance to the public welfare. I believe that my proposal so accurately represents the feeling of the House on the question that honorable members would be prepared to allow the motion to pass almost as a formal motion. The Prime Minister was not present when I referred to the matter last night, and I now ask him whether the Government are prepared to give the time necessary to deal with the question?

Mr. DEAKIN.—Considering that the Government find themselves compelled to set aside several measures which they believe to be of urgent importance, it is plain that they cannot be expected to have general notices of motion called on in preference. If there were time to deal with the motion referred to by the honorable member and with other general motions on the paper, there would be time to deal with those Government Bills. I regard the motion in the name of the honorable member as one of the most important that could very well be submitted in that regard. He seeks the appointment of a Select Committee with full powers

to inquire into and report upon the postal telegraphic, and telephonic systems and the working thereof.

That would mean an investigation perhaps only second in magnitude and importance to that of the Tariff Commission.

Mr. WEBSTER.—It would be far more important.

Mr. DEAKIN.—I admit that the honorable member has been following up this subject with great persistence. If it were alleged by the Minister in charge of the Post and Telegraph Department that there is no cause for dissatisfaction and that there is no need for reform, I could understand the honorable member pressing his motion. But in view of the fact that my honorable colleague the Postmaster-General, who has not long occupied the office, has most publicly admitted that there is need for searching investigation and for action, and that he is making that investigation and taking that action, it is, I think, reasonable that he should be allowed sufficient time to see whether the task he has undertaken is beyond his strength. Personally, I do not think that it is.

Mr. WEBSTER.—The fact is that he cannot get enough money to do what is required.

Mr. DEAKIN.—I am afraid that is entering into a larger question. I can remind the honorable member that yesterday another proposal of a very grave nature was submitted for drastic changes in respect of the Post Office.

Mr. WEBSTER.—The difficulty would be solved by the body sought to be appointed by my motion.

Mr. DEAKIN.—If honorable members were agreed amongst themselves as to the course to be taken and the remedies to be devised, the Government would soon be able to put a measure through the House without waiting for a report from the Select Committee referred to in the honorable member's motion. I cannot accede to the honorable member's request in view of the task in which the Postmaster-General is engaged, and in view of the fact that at the present stage of the session it would be impossible to discuss the question as its importance demands.

Mr. WEBSTER.—I desire to ask the Prime Minister, further, whether he will agree to give time for the consideration of my motion, provided that it is allowed to go without discussion?

Mr. DEAKIN.—I have not the power to ask honorable members whether they would agree to that course, but must say,

on the part of the Government, that before any such motion can be assented to, it will be necessary for my colleague to state the case as he sees it in regard to the Department and the reforms which he proposes to carry out.

PUBLIC SERVICE EXAMINATIONS.

Mr. TUDOR.—I have observed that in a list of the scholarships secured by scholars of one of the colleges in Melbourne, the statement is made that a Mr. E. A. H. Randall

passed qualifying examination as engineer to Commonwealth Service, and that

L. H. Hurley, W. B. Lancaster, and G. Embelton passed examination for admission to Commonwealth Service.

I wish to know whether the examination referred to was a separate examination for pupils attending this college, or was an open examination?

Mr. DEAKIN.—So far as I am informed at the present moment, this was an examination open to students at the college referred to.

Mr. TUDOR.—Only for collegians?

Mr. DEAKIN.—As I am informed, it records the success of scholars who have passed the official Public Service examination.

CHRISTMAS RECESS.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I wish to ask the Prime Minister whether we may hope that we shall be able to conclude the business to-day and get away to our homes?

Mr. DEAKIN.—I see no reason to doubt it.

FEDERAL CAPITAL.

Mr. WILKS.—I desire to ask the Prime Minister a question without notice. Reference has been made in the press to communications passing between the Premier of New South Wales and the Prime Minister of the Commonwealth relative to the settlement of the Federal Capital site. In the communications it appears that the Prime Minister stated that the Government could not deal with the question during this portion of the session, owing to the Tariff and other matters which were before the House. The honorable gentleman appears then to have been asked in a very courteous way whether the Government would make the consideration of the

question an early matter when our sittings are resumed? Now that the olive branch has been held out by the Premier of New South Wales, I wish to ask the Prime Minister whether he will reciprocate, and agree that the settlement of the question should be, if not the first, at least amongst the first business taken in hand after the Christmas adjournment.

Mr. DEAKIN.—But for an unfortunate accident my reply to the last letter from the Premier of New South Wales would have been in his hands this morning. It has missed the mail for Sydney, and will not reach him until to-morrow morning. Until he has received it I do not propose to make it public, although I am not only willing, but anxious, that the Premier of New South Wales should lay the whole correspondence before the public. That correspondence has been conducted throughout with the greatest courtesy, and I think we have shown that we appreciate the manner in which the case has been submitted to us. I believe that our reply to the Premier of New South Wales will be satisfactory to that honorable gentleman.

Mr. WEBSTER.—Some weeks ago thirty or more members indicated their desire to pay a visit of inspection to the Tooma site; and, in view of the fact that before Parliament arrived at a decision in regard to the Federal Capital, very inadequate provision was made for the members of both Houses to visit this particular site, I ask the Prime Minister whether he is willing to afford the necessary facilities now?

Mr. DEAKIN.—The Government are, of course, practically bound by the Act already on the statute-book, in which a previous Parliament made its choice of a site. At the same time, we cannot be blind to the fact that a number of members in both Houses maintain that some sites have not been examined as they ought to have been.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—What is desired is the fulfilment of the compact with New South Wales.

Mr. DEAKIN.—I notice that, within the last few days, a Minister of the State Government of New South Wales indicated the possibility that Albury might yet be chosen.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—A Minister's expression of opinion is nothing.

Mr. DEAKIN.—It is an indication of the feeling of the State to which we de-

sire to pay every regard, consistent with retaining the decision in our own hands. No reply can be given referring to one site only; but I trust that, by the time the House re-assembles, members will have clearly decided in their own minds whether they feel that they are under any disability in regard to any other sites. When we understand the feeling of members of both Houses, the Government will consider the most economical and expeditious way of enabling any that really deserve further examination to be visited. That can only be promised, of course, in respect to members who have not already inspected the sites, and also, in the most severely economical manner.

Mr. BOWDEN.—If it is found to be desirable that honorable members should pay visits of inspection, I should like to know whether the Prime Minister will arrange that they be paid during the Christmas adjournment, so that we may be able to deal with the whole question as soon as the House re-assembles.

Mr. DEAKIN.—Visits of inspection will be impossible during the Christmas season; and except in regard to the site mentioned by the honorable member for Gwydir, no application has been made. We desire to make an end of these visits, and of the whole question; consequently, if honorable members desire that any further sites be inspected, they should make known at once the number of members who wish to take part in the visit.

TELEPHONE BUREAUX.

PROVISION OF SITTING ACCOMMODATION.

Mr. BOWDEN.—I wish to ask the Postmaster-General, without notice, whether, in view of the prolonged delays that take place in certain telephone bureaux before subscribers can use the telephone—I refer particularly to Springwood and Katoomba—he will cause a few chairs or seats to be provided for the convenience of the public who have to wait for the use of the telephone? It is no uncommon thing to see people standing or leaning against the walls at some of these bureaux for nearly an hour. Sometimes they are ladies with infants in their arms. This sort of thing is very undesirable, and an arrangement such as I suggest would be a great convenience.

Mr. MAUGER.—If the honorable member will give me particulars, I will see what can be done.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. WATSON.—I wish to ask the Prime Minister whether he is yet able to inform the House as to the business for to-day, and whether it is proposed to take the Manufactures Encouragement Bill?

Mr. DEAKIN.—I did hope that, after the Excise Procedure Bill, we should have been able to go on with the measure to which the honorable member refers, but inquiries have been made, and several honorable members have indicated that they do not propose to consent to its passage through Committee without addressing themselves to amendments of a serious character, which they think ought to be discussed. In those circumstances, I am sorry to say that it appears impossible to hope that that measure could be passed, even if we meet again next week. It bids fair to occupy a week of itself, from what we can learn of the amendments proposed to be moved.

Mr. WATSON.—What is the business for to-day?

Mr. DEAKIN.—The Excise Procedure Bill, and, with the consent of the leader of the Opposition, which I hope he will give, the Senate's amendments of the Quarantine Bill. I do not want to be unreasonable, but that is a very necessary measure. When honorable members are taking their departure, I shall be prepared to explain the defence policy.

NAVAL AGREEMENT.

Mr. JOHNSON.—In view of certain statements which have appeared in the press, and which indicate a radical change in the naval defence policy of the Government, I desire to ask the Prime Minister whether he is, or contemplates, negotiating with the Imperial authorities with a view to the termination of the present Naval Agreement?

Mr. DEAKIN.—Some portion of the statement which I propose to make will deal very fully with that question.

STANDARD SIZE OF BAGS.

Mr. PAGE.—I wish to ask the Minister of Trade and Customs a question without notice. In the account published in yesterday's *Herald* of an interview regarding the weight of cornsacks, a Mr. Peverill, of Charlton, is reported to have said that the Federal Parliament should not consider the stevedores as compared with the farmers, and that he wanted, if

anything, a larger bag than the present. He did not know whether Java sugar bags would be too large. Does the Minister know the weight of wheat in one of those Java sugar bags, and does he think, on the score of humanity, that any man should be asked to carry it?

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—The statement as quoted by the honorable member from the *Herald* was not made at the deputation.

Mr. TUDOR.—It was made at their meeting before.

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—I do not know anything about the meeting held before. I had a Java bag filled with wheat, and it weighed 337 lbs. I invited several members of the deputation to try to carry it, and they informed me that the only one who, if he had been present, would have carried it, to show what could be done, was the honorable member for Indi.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—We have had a deputation this morning to the Premier of Victoria, and there appears to be some misunderstanding regarding the letter which the Minister of Trade and Customs read yesterday to the deputation. I desire to ask the Minister, in view of the conflict of interests, that no action should be taken until this House, after it reassembles, has had an opportunity of expressing an opinion upon it.

Several HONORABLE MEMBERS.—Oh!

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—Honorable members may say "Oh," but it is absolutely necessary to consider both sides. We are not talking of bags weighing 315 lbs.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The honorable member must not debate the question.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—We want to stick to the 240 lbs. bag. An assurance from the Minister that there will be no alteration until this House has an opportunity of deciding the question, so far as it can do so, will give great satisfaction to the large number of farmers concerned.

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—It is difficult to conceive how there could be any misunderstanding about the letter referred to by the honorable member. I shall have pleasure in laying it upon the table. It consists of only about half-a-dozen lines sent by Mr. Bent.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—He was invited by the honorable member to do so.

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—I invited him to express an opinion, and he stated

clearly that the Victorian Government intend to introduce legislation that will prevent the use of bags for grain that will hold more than 200 lbs. I have stated repeatedly that we are in entire accord with that view. The deputation urged yesterday, through the honorable member for Bendigo, that we should have uniformity. New Zealand, by a committee representing all interests, has decided that 200 lbs. should be the maximum, and the Prime Minister of New Zealand stated that if he had his way he would make the limit 100 lbs. We do not wish to interfere with those who have bags here, and plenty of notice will be given before an alteration takes effect, but we have come to the conclusion that the time has arrived when we must stop the putting of wheat into bags to the extent that has obtained in the past.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—I should like to ask the Minister of Trade and Customs whether it is not a fact that the deputation of farmers, which waited on him yesterday, repudiated any desire to use heavy bags, and merely asked that the old standard bag of 240 lbs. should be sanctioned?

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—The deputation, yesterday, did repudiate any desire to use heavy bags, but, at the same time, it was admitted that many farmers were using them; and it is well known that this is the fact. The deputation asked that the weight should be reduced to 240 lbs., and I freely admit that something must be done in the way of Government intervention, or, otherwise, the heavy bags will continue to be used.

Mr. SAMPSON.—I understand that the Minister of Trade and Customs rests his decision to reduce the size of corn sacks to 200 lbs., mainly on the letter received from the Victorian Premier, indorsing that view. I should like to ask whether, in view of the fact that the Premier has decided, notwithstanding that letter, that the standard size of sacks, so far as the State is concerned, should be 240 lbs., the Minister will announce to the House that he does not intend to persevere in his intention to further reduce the size.

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—So far as I know the Premier of Victoria has not withdrawn his letter; but if he were to withdraw it a dozen times that fact would be my opinion.

CUSTOMS INFORMATION: ALLEGED DISCLOSURE.

Mr. WILKS.—In reference to the reply given by the Minister of Trade and Customs, to my question, yesterday, in regard to an alleged disclosure of an official communication to the Customs Department, I should like to know whether he has yet received any reply, and, further, whether it is not the fact that the information trickled out through himself.

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—I have not had time to consult the officers of the Department, but I was informed late last night that the information had gone from me direct—that I was asked to furnish copies of circulars, and that I had furnished to Mr. Beale the document referred to.

Mr. WILKS.—Then the Minister is the culprit.

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—I do not know whether or not I should be called a culprit; but I am making the most complete inquiry. I desire to see whether anything improper has been done, though, in my opinion, that is not the case. As I say, I was informed late last night that I had forwarded copies of circulars, and amongst them this, to Mr. Beale. I have asked the officers of the Department to make inquiries, and to obtain copies of letters I have written, and so forth.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—But this document was not a circular.

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—If any one asked me for a written statement of information in the custody of the Department, I should be very loth to give it, and if it were of a private and confidential character, it would certainly not be handed over. But, naturally, I should pass on a circular, especially if it appeared to be one which required answering.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The Treasurer admits that it was not a circular, but a document, handed to him.

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—That is what I am inquiring into. As a matter of fact, no one handed me any document of the kind; and I do not know how the document referred to came into my possession, except in the way that we all ordinarily get circulars. I do not wish reflections to be thrown on any one; and if I did send on this document, I shall be prepared to frankly admit the fact, and take the responsibility. I desire to make quite sure of the facts; and, since I have

been told that I sent this document on, I do not wish the slightest blame to be attached to any officer of the Department. I do not think any officer of the Department would be guilty of disclosing information of this kind; personally, I should not give any information except in the ordinary way; and immediately I am placed in possession of the facts, they shall be laid before the House, so that honorable members may judge for themselves.

SUNSHINE HARVESTER WORKS.

DISMISSAL OF EMPLOYEE.

Mr. McDUGALL.—I desire to ask the Prime Minister, without notice, if his attention has been drawn to the case of Charles Day, who was dismissed from McKay's foundry, because he refused to sign a document which reduced his wage status under Mr. Justice Higgins' award from 10s. a day, as a blacksmith, to 8s., as an iron-bender, and whether the Prime Minister has seen the document, which reads as follows—

I, the undersigned, being classified as an iron-bender in the employment of Mr. H. V. McKay, Sunshine Harvester Works, Sunshine, on time work, in the manufactures referred to in the "Excise Tariff Act 1906," at the rate of wages of 1s. 0½d. per hour, equal to 8s. 6d. per day, from the 9th November, 1907, or later date of engagement, I hereby certify that the above classification and rate of pay is correct according to the Excise Tariff standard which I have read.

Will the Prime Minister take steps to prevent any further abuse of power on the part of employers in the direction indicated?

Mr. DEAKIN.—This is the first that I have heard of that course having been taken. I assume, of course, from what is stated that it is a real case; and shall ask my honorable and learned colleague to investigate it and any similar cases.

NEW PROTECTION.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—I desire to ask the Prime Minister whether he has read, in the press of to-day, that the new protection proposals are not meeting with general satisfaction amongst his friends, and that quite a number have "gone back" on him. Further, I should like to ask the Prime Minister whether he has noticed that the Melbourne Age of this morning calls him a "dreamer" and a "cynic," because he has proposed this new protection, and whether, in the face of that feeling on the part of the Age, he proposes to press the matter further?

Mr. DEAKIN.—I do not think that I should pursue the honorable member with explanations. Some newspapers are adversely criticising the methods proposed to be adopted in connexion with the new protection, but I am very gratified to find that its object and the general principle underlying it have received a general sanction, even from some of our opponents. What they object to is not the end in view, but the insufficiency of the machinery proposed to be adopted. That is a matter which is fairly open to criticism.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—The millennium would be a good thing.

Mr. DEAKIN.—If the criticism of the new protection is limited to the means to be adopted, we shall welcome it from whatever quarter it may come, and gladly receive suggestions for making it more effective.

KALGOORLIE TO PORT AUGUSTA RAILWAY SURVEY ACT.

Mr. FRAZER.—I wish to ask the Prime Minister whether he has received any further information from the Premier of South Australia regarding the prospect of the Parliament of that State passing a Bill consenting to the survey authorized in the Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway Survey Act being carried out?

Mr. DEAKIN.—Yes. I have received a telegram from the Premier of South Australia stating that he has every hope of passing the measure in question.

PUBLIC SERVANTS: GRATUITIES.

CASE OF THE LATE MR. CLARKE.

Mr. WEBSTER.—I desire to ask the Treasurer whether the gratuity which has been promised for some months past to Mrs. Clarke, widow of the late Joseph Clarke, who sacrificed his life on the altar of duty in the General Post Office, Sydney, has yet been paid, and if not, why not?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The honorable member concluded his question by asking, "If not, why not?" The reason the gratuity has not been paid is because I have not received the authority of Parliament to pay it. If we had not run so close to the Christmas adjournment, I had intended to submit to the House a Bill that has been drafted, with a schedule attached, which deals not only with the case of the late Mr. Clarke, but with a large number

of cases of a similar character. Seeing that provision has been made for a considerable number of cases, it is necessary for us to proceed in a special way, otherwise we may practically revive the payment of pensions or gratuities which Parliament decided some three years ago should not be continued.

Mr. WEBSTER.—Does the Treasurer intend to make provision for these cases before the Christmas vacation?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Does the honorable member think that is possible if we are to adjourn to-night?

Mr. WEBSTER.—I do not know.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not think that it is. Having heard that a question was likely to be asked upon this subject, I have sent to the Treasury to obtain the Bill to which I have previously alluded. I am sorry that I am not in possession of it at the present time, as I should then be in a position to read out the list of those whose cases I intend to submit to Parliament. Personally, my sympathies are with these people, and I should like to pay the gratuities provided for, especially the one to which the honorable member has referred. But he must recognise the invidious position in which I should place myself if I authorized the payment of that gratuity without at the same time dealing with the other cases. I might very reasonably have been asked why I had selected one case for special treatment.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Of course every honorable member is aware that this session has been put right out of its orbit, owing to the necessity for dealing with the Tariff. As one of the consequences we have not yet been able to consider the Estimates. Therefore, the question of payment of gratuities to the widows of unfortunate officers who have died under peculiarly distressing circumstances has not been considered by the House.

Mr. MAUGER.—The gratuities are not provided for upon the Estimates.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—But under ordinary circumstances they would have come up for consideration.

Mr. WEBSTER.—The case of Mrs. Clarke was provided for upon the Estimates, but the item has been removed from them.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I am aware that it appeared upon the draft Estimates. A few days ago the Treasurer showed me some half-dozen cases in which he proposed to grant gratuities. I am particularly interested in one of them. I should be pre-

pared to heartily support every one of those cases if they appeared upon the Estimates. In view of the peculiar circumstances, which have created the present position, I think that the Treasurer might well take it upon himself to authorize the payment of these gratuities in one or two of the most urgent cases. I ask him if he will consider the advisability of adopting that course, trusting to Parliament to indorse his action.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—As I have previously stated, I have already sent for the Bill to which I have alluded, and at a later stage I shall be happy to let the honorable member see it, or, perhaps, to announce its contents to the House.

TELEPHONES.

Mr. LIVINGSTON.—I desire to ask the Postmaster-General when he expects to obtain a supply of telephones to take the place of those destroyed by the recent fire in Melbourne?

Mr. MAUGER.—Tenders were accepted yesterday for a supply of copper wire, and a cable has been despatched for a new supply of telephones to take the place of those destroyed.

POSTAL OFFICIALS: INCREMENTS.

Mr. J. H. CATTS asked the Treasurer, *upon notice*—

1. Will he give authority for all approved increases in the Postal Department to be paid before Christmas, so that postal officials will not be made to suffer because of the Tariff intervening before the passage of the Estimates?

2. Has this not been done in some cases, and the money paid out of the Treasurer's advance account?

3. Will he make a special note of senior assistants, who are lowly paid officials, and see that their advances from 1st July last are paid before Christmas?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—In reply to the honorable member's questions, I beg to state—

1. I have already given authority for all increases approved by the Public Service Commissioner. The Commissioner, however, informs me that the increases in Postmasters' salaries cannot be made until he has revalued the offices.

2. Yes. Payments have been made in cases where the salary with the addition of increment did not exceed £160.

3. Provision has been made on the Estimates for a new grade of senior assistants, but before the increases can be allocated reports have to be obtained as to the assistants most deserving of advancement. Every effort will be made to complete the necessary inquiries, and, if possible, the payments will be made before Christmas.

CUSTOMS TARIFF BILL.

Report adopted.

Motion (by Sir WILLIAM LYNE) proposed—

That this Bill be now read a third time.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [11.39].—I had intended to take advantage of this motion to address some general observations to the House on the subject of the Tariff. But I think I shall be best consulting the wishes of honorable members and assisting in the speedy termination of the business to be transacted before the adjournment if I forego my opportunity to traverse what otherwise would be a very tempting field. I am most unwilling to provoke a general debate, in view of the fact that honorable members wish to get away to-day. I will therefore content myself with one or two personal observations. My first is to say how glad I am that the whole matter has been put through with so much goodwill, and that so much cordiality remains. I have never seen a more tremendous and fierce encounter resulting in so little bitterness and with so slight a display of acerbity.

Mr. WILKS.—The honorable member has been quite a joker himself recently!

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—My honorable friend has been close to me—that is the reason. I make willing mention of the cordial assistance which has been rendered to us in the giving of information—I do not mean always in a public manner—by the Minister in charge of the Tariff. I make that acknowledgment very willingly, and should like to add how glad I am that in all our tussles across the table, we have not forfeited the goodwill of each other. Then I think a word is due to the rare skill and patience of the Chairman of Committees. He does not seem ever to have lost his head—even when we have lost ours. I make that tribute very cordially, and very willingly. Some mention should also be made of the readiness, courtesy and tact and the rare knowledge of all subjects connected with the Tariff, which have been placed freely at our disposal by the Minister of Trade and Customs, and his officers behind the chair. Assistance has been given by them to honorable members on all sides of the House with the greatest readiness, and to me personally it has been of the greatest possible value. I am

quite sure that Dr. Wollaston, from behind the Speaker's chair, has had as much to do in relation to the framing of this Tariff, as perhaps any of us immediately in front of the chair. The time to speak of our own officers will come a little later. But I am glad that the whole matter has ended up with so little remaining behind which could give us cause for regret and remorse. Perhaps I have been one of the greatest culprits, and if I have erred at any time I hope for the forgiveness of my fellow-members. Passing from personal considerations, let me add that this Tariff is now going up to the Senate with all its imperfections on its head—and they are many.

Mr. WATSON.—They are, indeed!

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—They are many; and whether it is to be ultimately for the good of the industrial progress of this continent remains to be seen. Whether, as Sir Edmund Barton once put it, we are binding the "shapely daughter of Australian commerce" in closer fetters, or whether, on the other hand we are providing for her an ampler opportunity for the display of her quality, remains to be proved, and much will depend upon the point of view. But, for good or ill, the Tariff is going from us; and we can only hope, that plus Tariff or minus Tariff, our industrial expansion will be continued, bringing in its train an increase of the blessings and comforts which inhere in our civilization.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE (Flinders) [11.45].—I cordially agree with every word which the deputy leader of the Opposition has said; but there is one point which he has inadvertently omitted, and which I think we shall all agree ought to be made. We ought to express our obligations to those three members of this House who spent many months in pursuing investigations in relation to the matter with which we have been dealing. I refer to the members of the Tariff Commission. We have not, of course, been able to accept the whole of the recommendations of either side. That would have been impossible. Anomalies in the Tariff have been discovered here and there, which are pointed out throughout the recommendations, and are apparent to both sides.

Mr. WATSON.—We have created others.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—We have created others, which, perhaps, were worse than

those previously in existence. I think we ought not to let the opportunity pass without showing our cordial appreciation of the very great toil and labour undertaken by those gentlemen who, without any remuneration, conducted that prolonged inquiry.

Mr. WILKS (Dalley) [11.46].—A great deal of milk and honey have been expended in regard to the framing of this Tariff; and, although you, Mr. Speaker, are not supposed to know what takes place in Committee, you would think from what has been said that we have had a very pleasant time during the last five months. Personally, I think it has been a rare old scramble. I admit that I have done my fair share in the scrambling for my electorate, and for New South Wales. I have not got all I wanted, but I got as much as I could. I am only sorry that I could not get any more. I venture to say that the Tariff leaves us in a form less scientific as to its arrangement, its terms, and the disproportionate amount of assistance rendered to certain industries, than the old Tariff was. I hope that the Senate will attempt to remedy those defects. Anomalies exist in the Tariff to-day which constitute a severe travesty on the work of the Commission, for which the country paid such an enormous amount of money, and upon which some of the members of this House and of another place did such laborious work. I can assure you, sir, that this new Tariff is more disfigured by anomalies than was the Tariff of 1902, and that the chief purpose for which the Commission was appointed has not been achieved. I doubt whether for many years to come we shall see a complete Tariff thrown upon the table of this House, though I do expect to see the Treasurer of the day bring down Tariff Bills dealing with features which require special treatment. As far as I am concerned, I have tried hard to have removed the duties on the necessities of life. But my main concern was to be in the scramble, and do the best I could for the people of my electorate, and for New South Wales. It is all very well to disguise matters, and say that scrambling did not exist. It did exist, and it was only in accordance with human nature that it should. It existed in 1902, and it existed again in 1907. I was very pleased to hear the deputy leader of the Opposition compliment the

Treasurer as he did. The honorable gentleman deserved it. He has done remarkably well, from his own particular stand-point. But I also think that the deputy leader of the Opposition himself is well deserving of compliments for the way in which he has stuck to his work. Personally, I was very pleased indeed to see the true character of the Honorable Joseph Cook revealed, and I believe that his urbane and kindly nature has been recognised by men of all parties throughout these prolonged debates.

HONORABLE MEMBERS.—Hear, hear.

Mr. WILKS.—His conduct of the business on behalf of the Opposition has reflected a great deal of credit upon him, and the work that he has done is deserving of our most cordial acknowledgment.

Mr. SALMON (Laanecoorie) [11.50].—I desire to join issue with the honorable member for Dalley with regard to the statements he has made as to the way in which this Tariff has been dealt with.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—Is it worth while to provoke a general debate?

Mr. SALMON.—I desire to say, as one who has had experience in connexion with the construction of the previous Tariff, and a few years before of a Tariff debated by the State Parliament of Victoria, that I hailed with a great deal of pleasure the very much greater freedom from regrettable features shown during our recent discussions compared with our experience in relation to those two previous Tariff debates.

Mr. WILKS.—Hear, hear. We were all busy in the scramble, and so we had to be pleasant.

Mr. SALMON.—The honorable member in speaking of a scramble and the efforts of honorable members to get advantages for their electorates or States is speaking entirely for himself. I accept him, of course, at his own valuation, although previous to his speech I would not have attributed to him such actions as he has ascribed to himself. Throughout the discussion on the Tariff, in Committee, I was struck with the very much better feeling that was exhibited by the representatives of the different States as compared with the discussion which we had in 1901 and 1902. I believe that a very much better feeling prevails throughout Australia to-day than existed at that time. I trust that it is only

an earnest of what we may hope to have in the future, and that, as time rolls on, we may be able to see the complete obliteration of the unfortunate differences which have kept us apart in the past, and which, when they disappear, will undoubtedly remove the only obstacle to the progress and welfare of the Commonwealth.

Mr. WATSON (South Sydney) [11.52].—I think that we can all join in the kindly expressions of the deputy leader of the Opposition with respect to the work performed by the officers of the Trade and Customs Department, as well as the officers of this House. One can easily understand that we have given them a rather bad time, although in some measure we ourselves have participated in that. I, of course, recognise, as did the honorable member for Flinders, the work done by the members of the Tariff Commission. It was very informative, and of much value to myself, and I believe to honorable members generally. It is possible that many persons outside do not quite appreciate the immense amount of labour involved in that work. It was not merely to say that that I rose, but to refer to the Tariff question generally. It has appealed to me that when a revision of the Tariff is undertaken, apart from the question of broad policy involved, our method of doing the work seems altogether unsatisfactory. I think that the experience which we have just gained might be remembered with a view to taking action of some sort, and so bettering things a little in the future. It is inevitable that in the heat of party strife a chance majority is taken full advantage of by one side or other. But the result of that mixing up of interest and feeling is that we have to-day, as we got on the last occasion, a Tariff which is not harmonious, which is unnecessarily complex as regards rates of duties on somewhat similar articles, and which, in its interpretation, will, so far as I can see, involve a great deal of trouble to the Trade and Customs Department, the general public and merchants. It may be said that any anomalies of that character, or deficiencies of method, can be set right in the Senate. But the members of that body will be governed by just the same weaknesses, if they be weaknesses, or, at any rate, by the same desires as have animated the members of this House. There will be a series of struggles in respect of different items just as there was here, and we are not

justified, I think, in expecting from the other Chamber in the direction of simplification or remedying anomalies, any more than we, in the heat of party struggles, were able to achieve here.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—What we want is a Board of Trade.

Mr. WATSON.—It is worth while to consider whether, after the lines of policy have been decided in Committee, the Tariff should not be referred to a Committee representing all shades of opinion in the House.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—That was suggested earlier in the day by myself and others.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—It would be very much better to have an independent Board, representative of all the States.

Mr. WATSON.—Perhaps that would be better.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—When the suggestion was made, the House would not listen to it.

Mr. WATSON.—Perhaps the honorable member misunderstands my suggestion. I do not think it possible for such a Committee to achieve anything before the question of policy has been decided, but when the rates of duties on given articles have been decided, my idea is merely that, consistent with those rates, a better and simpler classification might be arrived at than has been the case. That is what I am urging, but very likely the suggestion of the honorable member for Flinders would be the better one, namely, to get an outside body to go through the Tariff during an adjournment of the House.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—What I was suggesting was a permanent Board of Trade who would make themselves familiar at all times with the ramifications of business.

Mr. WATSON.—It is very likely that the body which is thought of, or suggested, in connexion with the scheme of new protection will eventually, if not at once, assume that complexion.

Mr. ARCHER.—It will have its hands full then.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—They will have enough to do without that.

Mr. WATSON.—That may, or may not, be. I think that a very considerable improvement might be made even with the resources at our command.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—Can we properly discuss that question now?

Mr. WATSON.—I do not think that we can take any practical action at the

present time, but I believe that it is worth while to consider whether, before the Tariff is finally disposed of—and that will not be for some months, because it has to be dealt with by the Senate, which may suggest to us some amendments—it is not possible to devise some method by which a sort of supervising Committee could go through the items purely from the standpoint of classification, and make recommendations which would be acceptable and meet with practically unanimous approval. Apart from that, I do not know that anything more need be said at this stage. I, for one, am very glad that the Tariff is about to pass out of our hands, at any rate for a time.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I rise, sir, as a matter of personal explanation, and it is to explain my failure to refer to the labours of the Tariff Commission in the few remarks I made. It was not due to the fact that I had overlooked its work, but to a singular misapprehension on my part. Until this moment I have been under the impression that the Bill had to go through a further stage when an opportunity would be presented to me to make further remarks. I had forgotten that the custom does not obtain in this Parliament of moving "That this Bill do now pass." I had it in my mind to speak perhaps in more detail than I did when I spoke just now, so far as the Tariff Commission is concerned. My feeling is that it has done an invaluable work for Australia as much in its negative as in its positive aspect in showing us clearly what our duty is to the industries of Australia in the direction of avoiding extremes, as well as in correcting anomalies and abuses. I regard the negative aspect of that investigation as being perhaps as valuable as its positive one. That, I take it, was the intention when the Commission was first appointed, and that is why its neutral character—I mean so far as fiscal decision was concerned—was established in its *personnel*. Therein I think a very wise thing was done, and now that the Commission passes into the realms of history and its reports become, may I say, a fiscal classic, as I believe they will, I think that the value of its constitution will become more and more apparent as time rolls on. But I make willing mention, as I have done many times during our deliberations, of the rare skill and ability of its Chairman. Even when I have differed from him, I have

always been ready to pay to him the compliment which is due to the enormous work which he did on the Commission, and the rare skill with which the inquiry was conducted. I say the same with regard to other members of the Commission. The Commonwealth will be under a lasting debt of gratitude to these gentlemen who, at so much inconvenience and cost to themselves, gave their time, their industry, and ability so freely and cheerfully to the service of their country.

Mr. FRAZER (Kalgoorlie) [12.1].—I think that we may all congratulate ourselves upon the conclusion of our labours on the Tariff, although with a number of the decisions arrived at by the House I am not in agreement. Whilst I do not deny the great work done by the Tariff Commission, which has presented to the House a mass of useful information, it appears to me that a manufacturer had only to appeal to it for an increase of duty to secure immediately a recommendation in support of his request. I have no doubt that the Chairman of the Commission, as a protectionist, felt that he was justified in making such recommendations, but as the result of many of them, the framing of the Tariff, in many cases, has been discussed and fought on the basis, not of free-trade *versus* protection, but of protection *versus* prohibition.

Mr. WATSON.—Not at all.

Mr. FRAZER.—That, at all events, is my view.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—According to that view, nearly every honorable member would feel it necessary to make a personal explanation.

Mr. FRAZER.—Perhaps so; if the honorable member desires to make a personal explanation, I shall not object; but I think that I am justified in expressing my own views. I hope that before we are called upon to deal with the requests of another place, we shall have received from the Ministry an indication—as the result of their action with regard to the Excise duties now collectable—that will satisfy us that the protection of employes in protected industries is going to be largely extended. The Tariff, as passed by us, contains a number of anomalies, but since the House has determined that there shall be no recommitments, we can do nothing at this stage to remove them. I trust that, when the Tariff is returned from another place,

we shall find that it has been so rearranged that, whilst our secondary industries will have reasonable consideration, some of the penalties which it now imposes on the great primary industries of Australia will have disappeared.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [12.6].—In common with my brother members of the Tariff Commission, I feel a sense of relief and thankfulness at the approaching termination of our labours on the Tariff in this House. I desire to acknowledge the kindly references made by the honorable member for Flinders, the honorable member for South Sydney, and the deputy leader of the Opposition to the labours of the Commission. In preparing the way, so to speak, for the consideration of the Tariff in this House, we were merely pioneers, or servants, of the Parliament, collecting the evidence and ascertaining the views of the people of Australia. I speak for my colleagues and myself when I say that, in discharging that duty, we always endeavoured to remember that we were a Commonwealth Commission, charged with the duty of ascertaining the views and interests, not of any particular State, but of all the States of the Union. We endeavoured to do our duty to the best of our ability, from an Australian stand-point, and I rejoice to know that the reports of both sections of the Commission have assisted honorable members to form their conclusions one way or the other, and have also helped to develop and mould public opinion. In its deliberations on the Tariff, the House must necessarily have been in a more advantageous position than was the first Parliament. On this occasion we were not dependent upon secondary evidence, or the evidence of letters or interested interviews at Parliament House, but had the advantage of sworn evidence, collected with scrupulous care and impartiality, from all parts of Australia. I feel some sense of satisfaction in the knowledge that if the views of the section of the Commission with which I was more particularly identified have not been fully and completely indorsed the general tendency of the Tariff has been proximately in that direction. I desire to avail myself of this opportunity to say that although my labours as Chairman of the Commission were particularly severe and trying, since I had to preside over a Commission consisting of an equal number of free-traders and protectionists, I rejoice to

know that throughout the work I never had any dissension or a single ground of difference with my colleagues. We joined together unanimously in the endeavour to do our duty, from our respective stand-points, to the best of our ability, and I specially thank the Deputy leader of the Opposition for his generous recognition of our labours.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [12.8].—I keenly appreciate the kindly remarks spontaneously made by the deputy leader of the Opposition in regard to myself, and can assure him that, following as they did upon what he described as the strenuous and severe fights that we have had across the table, they have sunk deeply into my heart. It is pleasing to know that, having fought as hard as we could from our respective stand-points, we are able now that the work is over, to say that our friendship is as great, if not greater, than ever. I thank him for his very generous attitude on many occasions during the consideration of the Tariff, and especially towards the latter part of our labours upon it. When the first Federal Tariff was under consideration, it was strenuously contested, some very hard things were said, and there was not much give or take on either side. I must say that I feel grateful to the deputy leader of the Opposition for the fact that, although never receding from the position that he took up with regard to any item, he refrained from carrying on the debate hour after hour—as was often done in connexion with the first Tariff—when the result was a foregone conclusion. I desire also to acknowledge my indebtedness to many honorable members, and particularly to my friend the honorable member for Bourke. That honorable member sat by me at the table during most of the time that the Tariff was under consideration, and so arranged the work as to be of very great assistance to me. When a Minister is keenly watching the progress of the Tariff of which he is in charge, it is impossible for him to attend to every detail; but the honorable member for Bourke displayed a faculty for arranging the amendments, and looking after other branches of my work that was exceedingly helpful to me. I desire also to make a reference to the good work done by Dr. Wollaston and his officers. I have been brought into close touch with Dr. Wollaston, for many years, and have learned to regard him as one of the

ablest men and finest characters we have in the Public Service. He and the officers associated with him—especially Mr. Ewing—have rendered very valuable services to me and to the House generally. When we commenced the consideration of the Tariff, I felt that it would be well to have in attendance a departmental officer who would have in his mind, and be able to give at a moment's notice, any information regarding details that I might require. I felt, too, that the right to apply to such a source of information should not be kept to myself, and that honorable members should have the same access to it as I had. Therefore, I asked the Comptroller-General of Customs to be in attendance daily, and as the deputy leader of the Opposition has admitted, his knowledge of the Tariff and of Customs administration proved of great value to honorable members generally. I know that the honorable member for North Sydney often consulted him. By doing so, the honorable gentleman and others were able to understand more readily the effect of the various proposals brought forward for consideration. With regard to the Tariff Commission, I wish to say that its members and Chairman performed a task the magnitude of which may not be fully recognised by those who have not closely studied their reports. It is very difficult to so frame a Tariff that its arrangement will please every one; but the honorable member for Bendigo entered heart and soul into the work, as no doubt his colleagues did also, and presented reports which were of great assistance. I have been charged with not following the recommendations of the Tariff Commission, but I did so as far as I could, and if the Tariff be analysed, it will be found that I followed their recommendations in a great number of instances. A Minister must have opinions of his own, and the proposals of the Government are always likely to differ somewhat from the recommendations of a Royal Commission. But, although I did not accept in their entirety the recommendations of the Tariff Commission, I pay my tribute of acknowledgment to the value of the work done by the honorable member for Bendigo and his fellow Commissioners, which was of a great and lasting character.

Mr. HENRY WILLIS.—The reports of the Tariff Commission ought to be indexed.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Probably something will be done in that direction when opportunity offers. I did not expect that

the Tariff would please every one. In my political and public life, I have never attempted to please every one, knowing that the result of such an attempt would be that I should not please any one. In this, as in other matters, I have taken what has seemed to me to be the best course, and by doing so, I think I have pleased more than I should have done had I tried to please every one. It has been said by the honorable member for Kalgoorlie that the Tariff struggle has been one, not between protectionists and free-traders, but between prohibitionists and protectionists. Each must have his own opinion on the point. I hold strongly the view that the rates are not high enough. I did my best to keep up my end of the stick, and, although, like every Minister in charge of an important measure, I had to submit to reverses, I hope that after the first annoyance, I accepted my defeats in the proper spirit.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Is not the Minister glad that he will not see my face opposite him for the next three months?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—For some time past, the honorable member and his chief have been very considerate to me, for which I thank them. We know the honorable member's staying powers. If he had wished to be obstructive, he could have played business very considerably; but, instead of obstructing, he assisted the Commission greatly. Much credit is due to the Opposition for the manner in which they have enabled us to deal with the Tariff, so that we are now able to take a short rest. With regard to anomalies, honorable members will find that they are few—remarkably few compared with those of the previous Tariff. The Comptroller-General has informed me in the course of a conversation on the subject, that it will be possible to remove some of them by the exercise of powers conferred by the Customs Act, and that will be done, the endeavour being made to carry out the clearly expressed wishes of the Committee. It will, however, be necessary for Parliament to deal with other anomalies. The ups and downs of the Tariff consideration were very remarkable. Sometimes, for a day or two, feeling ran very high.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—There was high tide and a low tide.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Yes. The Tariff shows that. There was a time of slack water, when we made great progress, while occasionally we seemed almost unable to make headway. Sitting such

hours, the making of mistakes and the creation of anomalies was unavoidable. But these are fewer than may be thought, and I thank honorable members for the support they have given me. I am informed by the officials that the last Tariff was not nearly so well arranged from the administrative point of view. The grouping of items in this is much better, and that, of course, will make it more easily understood, and will facilitate its administration, to the great advantage of both the public and the Department. If during a long and trying period, when the continuous strain was bound to affect the temper, though I curbed mine as much as I could, any harsh word was uttered by me which might have hurt the feelings of any honorable member, I trust that those who were offended will think no more of it, and that we shall be even better friends than we were before. I hope that the adjournment for the Christmas vacation will take place to-day.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Surely the Minister more than hopes that it will?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—It will do so if honorable members continue to show the forbearance which has been exhibited under very trying circumstances during the last few days. While the Tariff was in Committee I, on many occasions, was greatly assisted by the good offices of the honorable member for South Sydney in trying to bring together the two opposing sections. Reference has been made to the advisability of appointing a Grand Committee. The matter was discussed in the New South Wales Parliament some years ago on more than one occasion. I agree with the honorable member for South Sydney that something should be done to relieve Committees of the whole of questions of detail and arrangement. But in New South Wales it was found that members would not forego rights of criticism because a certain course was recommended by a Grand Com-

MATHEWS.—A member's constituents will not permit him to do so.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I think that if I were to propose to appoint a Grand Committee, our experience of objections would be similar to those raised in the New South Wales Parliament. I think that if the attempt were made in this Parliament it would be that just the same feeling existed, that honorable members generally want to have a finger in the pie. I

do not think that the remarks which were made by the honorable member for Dalley should be taken seriously, because I do not think they were meant seriously.

Mr. WILKS.—They were meant seriously. I do not believe in hypocrisy of any kind.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Nor do I.

Mr. WILKS.—We had a fair scramble, and the honorable gentleman has been in it, and I do not blame him.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I fought hard enough, but I do not think that I engaged in anything which could be described as a scramble. I like to see matters dealt with in a straightforward and earnest way.

Mr. WILKS. — Can there not be a straightforward scramble?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I am afraid that the word, when used to describe proceedings in this House, might be misunderstood if allowed to go to the public without some definition of what is meant. However, I am not complaining this morning. I believe that the Tariff we have just passed is better than the old Tariff, though I wish I could have kept some of the duties higher, because I believe in a protective Tariff, and not in a half-and-half measure.

Mr. MAHON.—In prohibition.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The honorable gentleman cannot point to one item in the Tariff in connexion with which prohibition was proposed.

Mr. MAHON.—I can point to many such items.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—If the honorable gentleman will spend a few hours during the recess in looking through the United States of America and Canadian Tariffs, he will find that the Tariff we have passed is very much lower, although the Tariffs of the countries named to-day are not supposed to be so. I have to thank the honorable gentleman for assisting me to see that last we shall see and will see. I was a very busy man, and I have any case which has the Tariff up to the continued until

Question resolved by Google
Bill read a third time

EXCISE PROCEDURE BILL.

SECOND READING.

Debate resumed from 14th November, 1907 (*vide* page 6058), on motion of Mr. GROOM—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE (Flinders) [12.24].—I do not know whether honorable members have recently had their minds directed to the provisions of this Bill. I think it is highly improbable that they have. I should like to say that, although the measure deals only with giving additional powers to the Court created for carrying out the provisions of the Excise Tariff (Agricultural Machinery) Act, it really involves the consideration of the whole question which lies at the bottom of the policy of what is known as the new protection. I should be very sorry, at this stage of the session, to invite honorable members on this Bill to enter into a general discussion of the principles of the new protection, but I should like the attention of the Prime Minister while I deal with what I conceive ought to be our attitude with regard to this particular measure. The honorable gentleman has, as we all know, outlined the new protection policy, which is to be brought in, as I understand, at an early period after the Christmas adjournment. I hoped that the Prime Minister would have seen the wisdom of permitting the consideration of this very large extension of the powers of the Court which has been created, to stand over until the House had an opportunity to deal with the principles on which the measure is based. The fact that the President of the Court desires to have these powers for the purpose of enabling him more efficiently to carry out his duties, while of great importance, is of small importance compared with the duty which we shall have to perform in dealing with the acceptance or rejection of the whole principle of the new protection. I should have desired that before we discussed even this Bill, we should have had some more definite and explicit statement by the Prime Minister of what the new protection really means. A statement has been circulated amongst honorable members, in which the honorable gentleman has exhibited his powers as a cloud artist. If I may say so, he possesses in a greater degree than any man in this Parliament, or perhaps in any other Parliament, the power

of creating an atmosphere for a new idea, by involving it in a kind of golden haze of generalities, making it appear extremely attractive. On this subject we have had nothing solid as yet to which we can direct our criticism, and I think we ought not to attempt to criticise the proposal until it is put before us in some concrete form. We have been told that under the new protection the worker will be assured a higher wage, that the employer will be assured the possession of his profits as before, and that notwithstanding that both of these are to have their positions relatively and comparatively improved, we are to have the happy consumer standing by and smiling upon the scene because he is not to be asked to pay a penny piece more for the goods which he requires. I should say that there never was a vision of the millennium to be compared to this since the prophet Isaiah depicted the time when the wolf shall dwell with the lamb, the leopard shall lie down with the kid, and a little child shall lead them. What I want to point out is that the millennium which the Prime Minister intends to usher in under the name of the new protection is to be effected not by means of, or accompanied by, a spiritual regeneration of the race, but by the simple expedient of an Act of Parliament and a Board of Trade. We shall await with the very greatest interest the steps which are to be taken which will induce this new condition of humanity, and I am sure that if it can be brought about, it will be welcomed by honorable members on both sides—certainly by none more than by myself. I propose to say nothing more about the general merits of the policy, on which we must delay criticism until it is before us in some concrete shape. But there is another aspect of the matter which I think should be brought forward with some degree of prominence at the present time, and that is the constitutional foundation for the whole of the new kind of industrial legislation this Parliament has been passing. Until the High Court has definitely pronounced an opinion one way or the other, I should be very sorry to pronounce on this question a categorical or positive opinion. But I do think that the Government ought to take into very serious consideration the very grave doubts which have been expressed, and the ground for those grave doubts, as to whether this Parliament has any power at all

to deal with matters of this kind in this way. We seem to have been proceeding in the Federal Parliament since its inauguration very much upon the advice given by the Lord Chancellor in the play of *Iolanthe*. When some character in the play seeks his advice, in his various capacities, he gives various advice, and finally says: "As your family solicitor, I advise you to chance it." I think that that is the advice upon which legislation has been passed in this Parliament—that if we do not know whether we have the power to do a certain thing, we should chance it. That is not what I conceive to be an attitude likely to advance either the power or dignity of this Parliament. I feel convinced that the attitude adopted towards legislation of trying one thing after another on the ground that we might chance it, entering upon what probably are very considerable trespasses upon the domain of the powers of the States without previously having any definite rule given us by the Court—

Mr. DEAKIN.—The honorable member should remember that only in one section of one Act has it been held that we have gone beyond our powers, and that that was passed in defiance of the law advisers of the day.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—I quite admit that the leader of the Government deserves every credit in connexion with that particular piece of legislation, since not only did he warn the House that it was not within the power of this Parliament, but he declined to carry on the Government because the provision was carried against him. There is no doubt that he took every step to prevent this Parliament on that occasion going beyond its legitimate powers.

Mr. DEAKIN.—The point is that that is the only case of the kind.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—I do not think the argument is a very strong one, because I think only one or two of the matters with which Parliament has dealt have yet come before the High Court for its decision, and, therefore, it might be said that out of 100 per cent. of the cases that have come before the High Court it has been determined in 50 per cent. that the legislation of this Parliament is *ultra vires*.

Mr. DEAKIN.—No; there was the question of the sealing of ships' stores, and also the Customs Act as a whole, and the income tax matters.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE. — The Customs Act was not one of the measures on which there was a decision.

Mr. DEAKIN.—Yes, it was one. The question of our constitutional powers was raised by that Act.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—I should be very sorry to say anything which might be assumed to anticipate a decision of the High Court on any of the measures which we have already passed. Several of them are coming up for review, and no doubt in due time, and I hope before very long, the High Court will be enabled to give us, not only a decision in these cases, but one which will lay down some guiding principles by which we can rule our conduct in the future. On this measure, however, I think it is not only my right, but my duty, to bring forward reasons for doubting whether we should proceed further with this legislation until the High Court has given us a decision on the point involved. I should like very shortly to state the grounds for the very grave doubts which have arisen in my mind, and in those of other lawyers I know, with regard to the constitutionality of the whole of this intricate method of regulating industrial matters by means of the imposition of duties of Excise with a remittance of the Excise upon compliance by the people affected with certain rules. As I understand the argument used in favour of this class of legislation, it is that, as we have the power to impose duties of Excise, we consequently have power to impose them subject to any conditions, and may make their imposition subject to the condition that, if men pay a certain rate of wages to their employes, the Excise will not apply, or will be remitted, to them. I would point out first that there is no special or expressed power in the Constitution to impose duties of Excise at all. Our power to impose duties of Excise, as well as of Customs, arises only under the general power contained in paragraph (II.) of section 51 of the Constitution, thus—

51. The Parliament shall, subject to this Constitution, have power to make laws for the peace, order, and good government of the Commonwealth with respect to—

(II.) Taxation.

Mr. GROOM.—The words "duties of Customs and Excise" run through the Constitution.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—I shall refer to that. The provision I have quoted is the

only legislative power we possess on that subject. Section 90 and some other sections assume that Customs and Excise duties will be imposed, and of course the whole administration of that matter became transferred to us on the institution of the Commonwealth. Section 90 provides—

On the imposition of uniform duties of Customs, the power of the Parliament to impose duties of Customs and of Excise, and to grant bounties on the production or export of goods, shall become exclusive.

That implies that Parliament has a legislative power which, on a certain event happening, is to become exclusive. But that power comes merely from the general grant of power regarding taxation which I have quoted. This kind of question has been raised in several cases that have gone to the Privy Council from Canada, and in many cases decided in Canada itself. It has arisen also, to some extent, in the United States of America. It is perfectly true that the Court cannot inquire into the motives of Parliament in passing an Act. It has been determined over and over again that if Parliament has the right to cover a particular ground by legislation, no Court may inquire into the motives which actuated Parliament in passing the law. But there is another principle to which I would earnestly direct the attention of the Attorney-General, and also of the Prime Minister, who is quite as capable as are any of us to review a legal argument. That principle is that, although you cannot look into the motive with which Parliament has passed a particular Act, you have to look—if the legislative authority of Parliament is limited, as it is in this case, by an enumeration of subjects—not at the form of the Act, but at its real scope, substance, effect, and aim, in order to find whether it falls, or does not fall, within any of those enumerated subjects. I propose to give a few examples to show what has been done in that matter in Canada. I do not propose to go at length into it now, although I have been very interested in the question, and have investigated it very fully. I propose to bring forward these points, not for the purpose of asking this House to express any opinion upon the matter at present, but more for the purpose of directing, as earnestly as I can, the attention of the Government to it before this class of legislation goes any further.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The honorable member does not suggest that there are no

other powers implied in the Constitution besides those specified?

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—We have every power implied for the purpose of enabling us to carry out those which are expressed, but there are also implied restrictions.

Mr. SPEAKER.—So far as I can form an opinion—not from a mere glance now, but from an earlier examination—the Bill before us deals purely with the question of procedure before the Court. It does not deal with any policy such as that which has been called by the honorable member and others the new protection. I, therefore, cannot allow a broad discussion on that policy to take place upon the consideration of a Bill which affects procedure only. The honorable member will see that I could not allow on this Bill the discussion of a scheme which has been outlined in a paper laid upon the table, and which has to be brought before the House at a later stage. The only matter which we can discuss now is the amending Bill before us. I ask the honorable member not to discuss anything more, unless he finds that it is absolutely necessary for his argument to do so.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—I was putting it that this Bill, which, in one sense, is called the Excise Procedure Bill, in another sense enlarges very considerably the powers of the Court with regard to the admission of evidence, and other matters. I submit that my argument is quite relevant to that aspect of the Bill. In fact, if the Bill is proceeded with, I intend to propose amendments of the original measure in order to limit to some degree the powers of the Court. I really cannot discuss the matter at all unless I am at liberty to show the foundation of the legislation as a whole.

Mr. SPEAKER.—If the honorable member finds it necessary for his argument to do so, I shall not interfere. At the same time, I felt bound to call attention to the fact that this was a procedure Bill only, and that, therefore, the debate upon it must be confined within some reasonable limits.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—I shall not detain the House very long. The line of argument which I was pursuing was that we have here a legislative power limited by an enumerated class of subjects, and matters that are necessarily incidental to the carrying out of that power. The particular question before us is related to the power of taxation. It has been held by the Privy Council, in the Canadian case of *Russell v. The Queen*, 7 Appeal

Cases, where very much the same class of indirect effect was urged, that—

The true nature and character of the legislation in particular under discussion must always be determined, in order to ascertain the class of subject to which it really belongs.

A very good example of this principle is given in the case of *The Attorney-General for Quebec v. The Queen Insurance Company*, 3 Appeal Cases. That is a very apt illustration, because there was in that case an Act of the Provincial Legislature of Quebec, imposing a tax on certain policies of insurance. It was contended that that was not authorized by the Canadian Constitution. The Legislature of the Province was authorized by the Constitution to make laws in relation to shop, saloon, tavern, auctioneer, and other licences. It purported to make a law, within the particular terms of that authority, relating to licences, but it was urged that, although that was the particular form in which the law was brought forward, and although it appeared on its face to be within the terms under which the legislative power had been granted, yet in reality and effect that was not the real scope or aim of the Act, which, consequently, was *ultra vires*. The Master of the Rolls, Mr. Justice Jessel, than whom there could be no higher authority, said—

The Statute in question purports to be on the face of it in exercise of that power—

Just as the legislation now before us purports, on the face of it, to be in exercise of the taxing power—the power of imposing duties of Excise—in our Constitution—

It enacts that every assurer, except people carrying on marine insurance, shall be bound to take out a licence, before the 1st day of May in each year, with the revenue officer of the district, and to remain continually under license.

He says finally that, although the Act purported to be a Licence Act, when the real purpose and effect of it were examined, it was found to be, not a Licence Act at all, but a Stamp Act, and that, therefore, although in form the Legislature purported to be exercising one of its powers, it was not really exercising that power in that particular Act, which therefore was void. The Court held that the Legislature had exceeded its powers, although it purported to be exercising them, just as we are here purporting to exercise our taxing power, whilst we are really using this machinery for the enforcement of certain social obligations. My objection, argument, according to those decisions, is that you have to look, not at the mere form of the legislation, but at the

real object to be attained as appears from the Act itself. The case of *Regina v. Watson*, 4 Cartwright, p. 478, is another case in point. In the Court below, Chief Justice Armour, of the Canadian Court, referred to the primary object of the Act as being a guiding principle in ascertaining whether the Act fell within the power given by the Constitution or not. Although his judgment was reversed on appeal, the Judges of Appeal did not reverse his decision on that ground, but maintained the same principle as he had advocated. A striking illustration of the application of the principle is given in the case of *Tai Sing v. McGuire*, which comes very near the present case. The Parliament had made an Act to provide for the better collection of Provincial taxes from Chinese. That was undoubtedly a matter which lay within the powers of the Provincial Parliament. It was expressly provided by the Constitution that they should have power to do what they purported to do in that case.

Colonel FOXTON.—That was a Provincial Parliament.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—Yes. But, as the honorable member knows, we have no more right either by implication or by direct trespass to infringe upon the rights of the States than they have to infringe upon ours. We have no paramount authority to break the Constitution, any more than they have, so that any argument that will hold one way holds equally well the other. The Act in question, in that case, was entitled an Act to provide for the better collection of Provincial taxes from Chinese. In its preamble it professed to prevent the evasion of payment by Chinese of taxes—which was also a matter entirely within the power of the Provincial Parliament—and to enact its provisions as a more simple method for the collection of those taxes. The enforcement of Provincial taxation was clearly a matter within the Legislative capacity of the Province. The Court held that, if the form of the Act were the substance of the Act, if its real aim was as shown in the title and preamble, and if the Court had been bound to look only at its form, and not into its real nature, the passing of the measure would have been clearly within the power of the Provincial Parliament but—

The Court held, on examination of the enacting clauses, that its real object was not to collect revenue, but to drive the Chinese from the country,

Mr. CROUCH.—Which was a matter purely within the jurisdiction of the national Parliament.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—Precisely—

thus interfering at once with the authority reserved to the Dominion Parliament as to the regulation of trade and commerce, the rights of Chinese, and the treaties of the Empire.

The Act was held to be *ultra vires*. In order to show that the Act dealt with a matter which was within the jurisdiction only of the national Parliament, the Court had to go behind its apparent form. The Legislature said "This is an Act to enforce provincial taxation," but the Court replied "No, it purports to be such, and Parliament has said that that is its purpose, but it is our duty as a Court to determine whether that is its real purpose and effect. We have to look behind the form which Parliament has chosen to adopt, and inquire into the real scope and effect of the Act. We find, on so doing, that it is not an Act the real purpose of which is to enforce Provincial taxation, but an Act the real purpose of which is to drive Chinese out of the State." The Master of the Rolls at the end of the judgment, which I cited before, and which I think is applicable to the present case, said—

The result is this, that it is not in substance a Licence Act at all. It is nothing more nor less than a simple Stamp Act on policies with provisions referring to a licence, because it must be presumed that the framers of the statute thought it was necessary in order to cover the kind of tax in question with legal sanction that it should be made in the shape of a price paid for licence.

Of course, Parliament said that it was passing a Licensing Act, but Mr. Justice Jessel said that, in substance, and in fact, it was not a Licensing Act. As a lawyer, I should be sorry to express a definite opinion at this stage, and say that the House ought to allow itself to be entirely governed by this judgment in a doubtful case of the sort with which we are dealing. But even if the Attorney-General has given his opinion in favour of this Bill—and I say this with all respect to the opinion of the Attorney-General—I do not think that, as a body, we ought to take the risk.

Mr. GROOM.—When the Government were advised in regard to this Bill, there was another Attorney-General.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—I know that the present Attorney-General is not responsible.

Mr. GROOM.—I am not seeking to evade the responsibility, but merely pointing out the fact.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—All I say is that, in my opinion, it would be well on the part of the Government not to press this measure now. It would be wiser on their part to take the opportunity afforded by the approaching adjournment, to go fully into the matter—perhaps more fully than they have yet gone into it—and ascertain whether we are not running very great risks indeed, in inaugurating a widespread, comprehensive scheme, to cover the whole ground of *laissez-faire* economics, at all events, so industrial protection extends. Should far as possible subsequently be found this legislation's foundations not constituting to rest on four, it would lead to disappointment, heart-burning, and additional friction between employers and employed. I think between employers and employed. I think merely throw this suggestion seriously consider that the Government may seriously admit that the matter. Of course, I quite support this Bill, if the Government insist on its provisions of must pass. There are certain provisions in the Bill itself which are likely to be rather injustice; but I am now referring to the whole to the constitutional aspect. The discussion question will have to come up for consideration next year, and I suggest that it would be better to let the matter stand over until then, even if the President of the Arbitration Court is, for the time being, deprived of some of the powers that he thinks necessary. I have now only a few words to say with regard to some of the provisions of the Bill. Clause 3 is as follows—

In the hearing and determination of any application the President shall act according to equity good conscience and the substantial merit of the case, without regard to technicalities of legal forms, and shall not be bound by any rule of evidence, but may inform his mind on any matter in such manner as he thinks just.

Then clause 5 provides that counsel or solicitors are not to be heard.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Except by the consent, and with the leave of the Court.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—What I have to say in regard to these clauses illustrates the position I take up with regard to the whole Bill. If we are creating or empowering a tribunal to fix rates of wages, or conditions of labour, that are to affect people with regard to future acts, then, I say, that it is not only permissible that the Government should be allowed to inform itself by its own officers, or by its own agents, or by its own appeal ever means it likes, or thinks right, to place the matters before it, but it is desirable.

that it should have that power. Moreover, I am quite prepared to concede that when dealing with future relations it may be the very wisest, most economical and best course to prevent those who come to state the case on either side having the advantage, or disadvantage, as the case may be, of being represented by counsel or solicitor.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—If there are not lawyers, there will inevitably be experts.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—That is so. I shall not enter into the question whether in dealing with determinations which are to govern the future conduct of the men affected, very much wider powers may be given to the Court or tribunal, than would be given if it were dealing with rights or wrongs already committed. But if, in fact and in substance, a large number of persons, who have been carrying on their businesses before this legislation was passed, are arraigned before the Court—whatever the legal form may be—as guilty of past offences, then we have no right to prevent them from being represented by any persons they may choose to represent them. If they are not represented, then they have the right to say that the Court must not inform itself by conjecture, guesswork, or hearsay, of what has taken place. If I am charged with an offence, for which I may be mulct in hundreds, or, it may be, thousands of pounds, the case must be proved against me by legal evidence. That is a principle which ought not to be lost sight of. I have no sympathy at all with Mr. McKay, and other gentlemen who have allowed themselves to fall into a very awkward position. I do not know how Mr. McKay conducts his business, and I do not intend to inquire; but I cannot forget that, in this instance, Mr. McKay removed his works from where he was subject to Wages Boards to a place to which the jurisdiction of these Boards does not extend. Although Mr. McKay was legally entitled to take that step, I feel that it does not entitle him to very much sympathetic consideration on our part. Nor do I feel much sympathy for other protectionist manufacturers who, to a large extent, asked, not for reasonable protection, but practical prohibition, and who have forsaken all their other political friends, and have sought the alliance of the Labour Party, for the sole purpose of obtaining the duties they desire. I do not feel, as I say, much sympathy with those men when they emerge, certainly with

higher duties, but with a rope round their necks.

Mr. McDUGALL.—They did not get much support from certain members of the Labour Party.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—Those manufacturers remind me of the position of the young lady—

Who smiled as she rode on a tiger;

They returned from the ride

With the lady inside,

And the smile on the face of the tiger.

Mr. McDUGALL.—I thought that the Opposition corner party had already succeeded in cutting the claws of the socialistic tiger.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—In the present instance I congratulate the tiger. However, this is not a question of sympathy. We ought, as reasonable men, to put our sympathies and animosities aside; if we propose to lay down a definite policy in regard to wages or other conditions, we must base it on right and just principles. If we desire to have a tribunal to regulate future conduct and procedure, let us give it wide powers, and enable it to inform itself, without legal technicalities or checks on evidence, of the circumstances it has to determine. Do away with counsel if that is the more convenient method; but if we are to invest the Court with those great additional powers, and, at the same time, hale before it men who are charged, no matter what their conduct may be, with the commission of past offences, we have no right to deprive those men of the right, which all ought to have in every British community, to have the charge proved according to the law of evidence, and not by conjecture, guess-work, or hearsay. I do not desire, at this stage, to take up further time in discussing the measure. It would be well, when we are so near the Christmas vacation, to realize the fact that, even if the powers sought for be granted, they will only create greater difficulty in the administration of the law already in force, until there has been an opportunity afforded to Parliament to place the whole legislation on a sure, logical, and sound foundation.

Sitting suspended from 1 to 2.15 p.m.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [2.15].—I do not intend to detain the House by offering any lengthy remarks upon this very important measure which, after all, is purely a procedure Bill, and does not raise the constitutional questions which have been discussed by the honorable

member for Flinders. At the same time, it is well that he should have given us the brief review which he did of the constitutional aspect of this matter. It will, no doubt, prove very useful later on, but it would, indeed, have been a specially valuable contribution at the time that the Excise Tariff (Agricultural Machinery) Act was under consideration. As I understand it, this is a Bill which is intended to clothe the President of the Arbitration Court with the powers requisite to enable him to fully discharge the very onerous duties which have been intrusted to him, and as such I shall leave the whole responsibility of it with the Government. The measure contains some very drastic provisions—provisions which are of a very far-reaching character, and some of which raise an entirely new position so far as our legal procedure is concerned. It seems to me that the primary object of the measure is to enable the President of the Arbitration Court to obtain full information concerning the cases upon which he is asked to adjudicate, and to protect absolutely the individuals who furnish that information. I understand that the President of the Court has himself impressed upon the Ministry the necessity for clothing him with the full and ample powers which it is proposed to confer upon him under this Bill. I cannot help making a passing reference to the interesting memorandum which has been submitted to us by the Prime Minister on the subject of the new protection. I confess that I was very disappointed with that memorandum in one respect.

Mr. DEAKIN.—Because there was nothing millennial about it.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—There is plenty that is millennial about it, but very little that is practical. I have all along understood, in connexion with that memorandum, that the Prime Minister intended to furnish the House with a list of the industries to which the new protection is to be applied.

Mr. DEAKIN.—No.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—That has been a very general understanding. Honorable members have been under the impression that when the memorandum was submitted it would contain a schedule of the industries to which the new protection is to be made applicable. Do I understand that the Prime Minister does not contemplate submitting such a schedule, until the Bill

dealing with the proposals of the Government is brought forward?

Mr. DEAKIN.—I have said so several times.

Mr. WATSON.—It is hardly possible to decide what industries ought to be included in the schedule until the Tariff has been passed.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—So far as that is concerned, the memorandum itself was kept back until the Tariff had passed.

Mr. DEAKIN.—The honorable member for South Sydney means passed by both Houses.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Surely that is a quibble. The memorandum was kept back.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—The Labour Party would not let the Tariff pass its final stages until they got their promissory note. The only thing left out of the note is the amount.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Exactly. The duty on harvesters was left in abeyance for that purpose, the understanding being that in the interim the memorandum relating to the new protection would be submitted. The memorandum has now been submitted, and I find that it contains nothing novel. It really embodies the scheme put forward by the honorable member for South Sydney, and I congratulate him upon having so completely engrafted upon the Prime Minister's mind the principles of the new protection, as outlined by him when he was the mouth-piece of the Labour Party. The voice is the voice of Deakin, but the hand of Watson is plainly to be seen throughout it. The Bill proposes to confer some very drastic powers upon the President of the Arbitration Court, and one of these is contained in clause 9. Reference has already been made by the honorable member for Flinders to the provision relating to the prohibition imposed upon the appearance of lawyers before the Court. I should like to say that I long ago arrived at the conclusion that, if these industrial Courts are to have any good effect, there must be less law about them, less of legal technicality, and more of substantial justice. Heretofore, the peculiarity of all these Courts has been that, whilst we have enacted that their procedure shall be conducted upon the lines of equity and good conscience, we have at the same time established an intricate legal procedure. I am not quite sure whether, from the very structure of these Courts, it has not be-

come a necessity to have a legal presentment of the cases coming before them. However, in this Bill we are asked to declare that only with the complete concurrence of the parties concerned, and with that of the President of the Arbitration Court, shall lawyers take any part in its proceedings. But whilst we shut out the lawyer, I fear that we shall inevitably set up a system of procedure which, on the whole, may prove to be not less costly, and perhaps a little less efficient, than the present system.

Mr. PAGE.—It is very funny to hear the honorable member barracking for the lawyers.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I hope that the honorable member will not run away with that notion. I am merely pointing out that the honorable member desires to substitute a lay lawyer for a trained lawyer.

Mr. PAGE.—We want to be allowed to put our own case in our own way.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The employés will not put their own case in their own way. They will get a man who is without a legal training to put it for them, and the possibilities are that they will pay him a good fee for doing so. In the New South Wales Land Court, for example, we know that lay lawyers have been evolved, and that they receive big fees for their services—fees which sometimes run into hundreds of pounds. I am not quite sure that, by this Bill, we shall escape any technicalities and any detailed procedure which now attaches to the getting of legal evidence.

Mr. PAGE.—The legal practitioners did not come out of those scandals any cleaner than did the layman.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—But the legal practitioner is subject to the discipline of the Court.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I make no comment on those Courts. The point that I desire to make is that we are simply changing the designation of the same instrumentality. I shall await the result of this experiment with much interest. I wish now to call attention to the tremendous powers conferred by clause 9, which provides that a man may not refuse to answer any question put to him by the President of the Court. In this connexion we must recollect that no appeal will be allowed from the decision of this tribunal.

Mr. WATSON.—I hope not.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—That makes the matter all the more serious. I think I am

right in saying that if a witness before an ordinary Court of Justice is compelled to answer a question put by a Judge, he has the right of appeal if his answer would prejudicially affect his case. But, under this Bill, he will have no right of appeal, and yet he will be compelled to answer any question put to him by the President of the Arbitration Court. That is a very grave departure from our ordinary legal procedure. The Bill contains a number of other provisions which will not prove to be of very much use, and in this matter I speak from practical experience. I refer to those provisions which purport to protect the individual who supplies information to the Court. The measure lays down that if a witness offers the Court information he shall be protected from any punishment, damage, loss, or disadvantage arising from his act. This provision applies equally to employer and employé. It declares that the employer shall not dismiss a workman for supplying such information, and that the workman shall not be permitted to leave his employment.

Mr. GROOM.—That provision is already the law in several of the States, and it is also embodied in the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Act.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I venture to say that in practice it will prove so much waste paper. I should like to ask the Attorney-General if he ever knew of an employer discharging an employé for any such reason? I never did. The employer always discharges his workman for some other reason. Obviously, it will be impossible for the Court to arrive at the motives which influence a workman in leaving his employment, or which influence an employer in discharging any of his hands. In other words, this Bill seeks to tie a man to his work.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—It merely ties him to give another excuse for leaving his work.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The whole of its provisions seem to me to take us back to the old days of the fifteenth century, when, by Act of Parliament, a man was tied down to his work, had his remuneration fixed, and his outlook generally determined. It will be a most interesting experiment, but its results on the industrial life of the community have yet to be seen. I shall offer no objection to the measure, but shall leave the Government to take full responsibility for it. I hope that if it accomplishes no good, it will at least work

no harm so far as the future industrial relations of the Commonwealth are concerned.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney) [2.30].—Like the honorable member for Parramatta, I recognise that at this stage, the Bill before us can neither receive the attention which it deserves, nor can we anticipate being able to do anything with it, by way of amendment, to reduce—as I should like to reduce—the severity of its provisions. I am afraid that we are embarked on a course of which this, and the other measures of a similar character that we have passed, are the preliminaries, and which is altogether different from the standard that English Judges and British people, in consequence of the experience of the past, have set up. We are giving such unrestricted powers that, if they were used to their full extent and were not controlled by very high principles on the part of those exercising them, they would bring us back to the old Star Chamber system of British jurisprudence. It was the very excesses resulting from unrestricted powers being given to British Judges, that led the British people to adopt the principle—and a very sound principle I think it is—that every Briton should be deemed to be innocent until proved to be guilty.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—And the other principle that it was desirable to keep judicial functions, as far as possible, apart from political matters.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I quite agree; that also is an important principle that we are departing from.

Mr. GROOM.—The memorandum, concerning the new protection, combats that objection.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I am not going to discuss the new protection proposals. In the first place, there is no time for a full debate upon them; and, in the second place, we are merely furnished with a memorandum, and have no definite proposals before us. Until we have them it would be impossible to discuss that matter with any intelligence. I should have liked, as I have said, to move some amendments upon this Bill, because I think it would be unfortunate if we confirmed such legislation without proper safeguards to the parties concerned, whoever those parties may be. If we continue this class of legislation we shall reach a stage when some uniformed officer will be able to go up to a man in the street and say, "You

are guilty of an offence;" and on the man's declaring, "I am not guilty," the responsibility of proving his innocence will be thrown upon him. It is exceedingly difficult, in some circumstances, for a man to prove that he is not guilty, though there may be circumstances when it may be easy to prove innocence. It would be a most unfortunate thing, which might be worthy of an autocracy, but certainly not of a democracy, to extend that class of legislation. We ought to examine and consider very carefully all proposals which contain such drastic conditions. However, I quite recognise that the majority of honorable members are in favour of this Bill. I recognise that, if any amendment were made in it, the Bill would be hung up, inasmuch as the Senate is not sitting. Consequently, knowing that no amendment would be accepted, and that there is a majority in favour of the Bill passing into law, I shall, with these protests, simply allow the Government to pass the measure, throwing the responsibility on them, as the honorable member for Parramatta has done. But I would ask the Government, in dealing with certain alleged offences against the Excise Act, not to allow their minds to be biased, either by political influences or by any partiality.

Mr. GROOM.—Of course the Government are not likely to be so influenced.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Well, certain actions are being taken that I, personally, think are not quite just. No one will accuse me of having any leaning, political or otherwise, towards the manufacturers of harvesters. The honorable member for Melbourne Ports smiles. I can assure him that while I have never had any personal feeling against any manufacturer, I have had a very strong objection—and have shown it in this Parliament—to absolutely unnecessary assistance, as I considered it, being extended by Parliament to the manufacturers of harvesters. Harvesters have dominated this House—in fact, this Parliament—for years. On all occasions, I have opposed the entrenching of those manufacturers at the public expense to the degree attempted. Therefore, I might feel, if I allowed myself to be influenced by such ideas—some pleasure in the difficulties into which the manufacturers have got. But that consideration would not prevent me from trying, at any rate, to look at the case fairly and justly; and I do say that when you ask men to do

an impossibility, and then attempt to punish them for not doing that impossibility you are taking a very unfair course. How could these manufacturers possibly arrive at a scale of wages which would be satisfactory to somebody who had not been appointed, and whose decision could not be anticipated? It is absolutely impossible. To my mind, seeing that the delay in enforcing the legislation was due to the Government—

Mr. GROOM.—No.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I am not desiring to reflect on the Government for that delay. There are delays that cannot be overcome.

Mr. GROOM.—It was in the hearing of the application.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The Attorney-General will remember that a certain time was given before the Act came into operation, and as the Excise duty was to be imposed on the 1st of January if proper wages were not paid, it was the duty of the Government to provide the tribunal that was to fix the proper wages.

Mr. GROOM.—The Judge was appointed from the beginning of the operation of the Act. The delay was largely caused by a desire to meet the convenience of the manufacturers and the employés.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—If the time was not sufficient, a longer time could have been allowed, and the Act need not have been brought into force on the date named. If, on the other hand, the time was sufficient, then there was neglect somewhere in reference to the non-establishment of the tribunal and the fixing of the wages. Fair and reasonable wages were to be paid from the 1st of January, but the Court did not, till nine or ten months afterwards, determine what fair and reasonable rates were. The Judge of the Court has not decided, so far as I know, that the wages which he fixed were reasonable on the 1st of January.

Mr. WATSON.—He specifically said he was not in a position to do that.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I believe that he has not done that; and, consequently, I cannot see what proof there is that the employers were not paying reasonable wages on the 1st of January. That, however, is a legal question with which I am not going to deal. It is rather the broad unfairness of the position to which I wish to call attention; and I do say that when it was absolutely impossible for the manufacturers to know what would be fixed

as fair and reasonable wages, and when the Government had not collected the Excise, because fair and reasonable wages were not determined, then it does seem unjust to compel these manufacturers to forfeit large sums of money because they did not comply with decisions that had not been given, and were not given for months afterwards. As I have said, I might take a certain amount of malicious delight, if I allowed myself to do so, in the situation of those who have been worrying this House, absolutely unnecessarily, for many months.

Mr. GROOM.—That would be contrary to the honorable member's nature.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—None of us is free from that feeling.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—When, according to all the evidence, they were doing excellently, they were not satisfied. They wanted more and more. They were always before us. If I remembered these things, I might take malicious satisfaction in observing where they have landed themselves. But I do not think that any member of this House has any right to look at such questions from that point of view. The right thing even if we are opposed to an individual or his actions, is to look to what is just and fair. Personally, I think that the demands that are being made are not just and fair. Therefore, I draw the Minister's attention now, as this will be our last opportunity, to this subject, in the hope that the Government will give that consideration to it which they ought to give, and that they will consider it with the object of doing, not even what is strictly legal—not of exercising every power they possess—but of doing what is just to all concerned. I will not detain the House any longer. I would only allude in passing to the memorandum of the Prime Minister in regard to the new protection. It is so easy to draw beautiful placards. It is so difficult to secure the results anticipated from those placards. I think that the Government will find when a Bill is presented, however good the object of it, enormous difficulties will have to be met and that any legislation that is proposed will not be equal to meeting them.

Sir JOHN QUICK (Bendigo) [2.45].—I support the second reading of the Bill, and I hope that it will be passed this year. It is simply a procedure Bill, intended to give effective operation to the Harvester Excise Act of 1906. It has been

found that the Act is not quite operative without some machinery provisions which, I think, have been suggested by the President of the Arbitration Court. It is not true that the Bill creates any penal offence, as a matter of substance, against employers and manufacturers. I do not think that any one can successfully contend that the Federal Parliament or Government has a direct mandatory power to determine rates of wages or hours of labour. I can find no direct power of that kind within the four corners of the Constitution: I can find no direct coercive power over employers and manufacturers. That has led to the current contention that this legislation is *ultra vires*, and therefore unconstitutional. It seems singular that that view was not presented when the legislation was submitted to the Parliament, and passed, I believe almost unanimously. There was a general concurrence of view that if it did grant an increased advantage of a substantial character to employers and manufacturers, that grant ought to be coupled with conditions. The difficulty was how to impose these conditions successfully in the absence of direct coercive power. The Tariff Commission considered that matter, and we could find no means or method of exercising a power over employers and manufacturers, except by holding over their heads a threat that unless they granted good wages and working conditions the two Houses would be asked to withdraw the increased protection. It was thought that that was a roundabout, ineffective method of operating upon employers and manufacturers, and the ingenious idea occurred to the honorable member for Wide Bay that it might be so embodied or found in the taxing power; in other words, that as Parliament had the power over Excise it might impose an Excise duty upon certain manufacturers, coupled with the condition that those who granted fair and reasonable wages to their workers should be exempt therefrom. There can be no doubt that it has a perfect right to exempt goods or persons from Excise duty. I do not wish to pronounce any final opinion on the constitutional question, because that is quite unnecessary as well as unsafe, but, as at present advised, I see no reason why Parliament should not grant an exemption from Excise duty, coupled with the condition that the grantees shall do certain things.

Sir John Quick.

Mr. GLYNN.—We can exempt a class of persons.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—If we can exempt a class of persons, I see no reason why we should not exempt a class of goods such as a class of goods produced under fair and reasonable working conditions. That is not creating an offence. It is not imposing a statutory duty on those people. It is not telling them, as employers are told in the Victorian factories that if they do not do a certain thing they will be liable to a penalty, and that if that is not paid they will be sent to gaol. Under our Factories Act employers are liable to be fined or sent to goal if they do not grant good wages. Under the Federal Act, however, the employers are not so liable. No punishment is attached to the withholding of good wages, but an advantage is held out to them who pay good wages in the shape of an exemption from Excise duty. Suppose it were found that we could not grant an exemption, it would be very easy then to exercise the bounty granting power. Parliament could easily grant a bounty for certain goods, or to the manufacturers of certain goods which are produced under fair and reasonable working conditions, and withhold the bounty in other cases.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—That is not at all certain.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—Parliament has already done that in connexion with the sugar bounty. That is not creating an offence on the part of those sugar-growers who abstain from granting good wages. It is optional. They have, so to speak, an inducement held out to them in the shape of a bounty. In the same way, under the Harvester Excise Act, those employers who grant good wages have an inducement held out to them in the shape of an exemption from Excise duty. It will be seen that there is something to be said on both sides of the question. I am not going to pronounce a final opinion, but it is fairly arguable that Parliament, having imposed an Excise duty coupled with an exemption, must do all it can to effectuate that legislation in the shape of the procedure provisions which have been suggested by the Court. It has been stated that if persons are charged with an offence under this Act, they will be called upon to prove themselves innocent. Again, I point out that no offence is created in the Act, even if they abstain from

granting good wages, but those employers who seek the advantage of an exemption are invited to apply to the Court and show good reasons for obtaining it.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—Yes, but that is just the same thing in another way.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—I do not think it is. If they claim the advantage of an exemption, they are called upon to show that they are entitled to it.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—We cannot usurp legislative power by a trick.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—It is hardly a trick.

Mr. BOWDEN.—We are getting indirectly what we cannot get directly.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—Of course, if the Court pronounces this legislation a trick, it will have to be abandoned. Where would be a trick in granting to some manufacturers a bounty, coupled with the condition that they would not get it if they did not grant good wages? Surely there would not be a trick in doing that, and if there is not, I cannot see that there was a trick in passing the other legislation.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—The penalty is the imposition of the Excise duty.

Sir JOHN QUICK.—That, I know, is the contention, and I am not going to pre-judge the argument one way or the other. It seems to me that there is a great deal to be said on both sides. I have had enough experience of constitutional questions to arrive at the conclusion that it is not wise for us to constitute ourselves the judge of such questions, unless, of course, they are absolutely clear and beyond doubt. I prefer to leave them to the decision of the High Court. No doubt this power of exemption is a very great and important power. I sincerely trust that those who are interested in exercising the power, and those who wish to see this jurisdiction successful in its operation, will allow it to be exercised with great caution, judgment, and discrimination. It should not be exercised in a manner which would be a burden to industry, which would destroy great enterprises, which would worry or persecute employers and manufacturers, and drive them out of business, because, if that were done, the workers would be the first to suffer. What should be done under this legislation is to endeavour to get a tribunal or a method of determining disputes that would do justice between man and man, between manufacturers and workers. I see no reason why the Court should not have power to recognise and give force and

effect to agreements between workers and employers. I do not think that it ought to be called upon to go behind voluntary agreements arrived at between workers and employers. And here let me say that, in my opinion, manufacturers of harvesters in this State made a great mistake in not doing what their fellow manufacturers in South Australia did. Shortly after the Harvester Excise Act came into force, the latter called their men together, and the two parties arrived at a common agreement as to the increases of wages and better conditions which were to govern their relations in the future. I believe that a friendly agreement was arrived at between employers and hundreds of workers, and that saved a lot of trouble. Mr. Justice O'Connor adopted the agreement practically; he placed the imprimatur of authority and legality on it, and in South Australia there is not half the trouble that exists in Victoria, where the manufacturers, after they got an increase of 100 per cent. in the duties, did not move a finger to arrive at an understanding or agreement with their workers. On the contrary, they stood by waiting for something to turn up, and probably thinking that they would escape altogether. But now that they are suffering, one cannot help feeling sorry for them; although I submit that they themselves were to blame. I also think that under a judicious administration of this law the Arbitration Court ought to take into consideration all the conditions and circumstances surrounding an industry. It should not pass a uniform standard for Australia, but the wages operative in any part should be regulated or modified according to local conditions and surroundings—the state of industry and the cost of living.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—What would be the size of the tribunal?

Sir JOHN QUICK.—I cannot help that. It is absolutely absurd to suggest that the same rate of wages should prevail in Melbourne as prevails in, say, Kalgoorlie. Any system of industry would break down and be destroyed if we had a Court insisting upon uniform wage conditions existing throughout Australia. This system of native industry which we are endeavouring to promote by the imposition of high duties would collapse and be absolutely ruined under an unwise administration of the law.

Mr. GLYNN (Angas) [2.57].—I do not intend to say more than a few words, because I recognise that it is desirable that, before the train hour arrives, honorable members should have a chance of dealing with the Bill in Committee. After having carefully looked through its provisions, and compared them with the provisions of the Arbitration Act, I can see no substantial difference between them. There is just a difference in one or two sections, to which I will draw attention; but there is no substantial difference between the provisions of the two measures. The time, then, seems to have gone by for an attack on this class of legislation, on the ground of its being too drastic, because what this Bill proposes to do is to give the President of the Arbitration Court, in one capacity, and for a similar purpose, powers which he, under the Act of 1904, had exercised in another capacity. I use the expression "for a similar purpose" because, whether he sits as President of the Arbitration Court, under the Act of 1904, or as the person designated in the Act of 1906, his inquiries are still into the question of the fairness of the remuneration of labour. That settles the other important question of whether the powers ought to be granted. The President of the Court says that he cannot get on properly with his inquiries without additional powers. I wish to draw attention to just one alteration. It is only the alteration of a word, but that does sometimes make a difference in substance. It occurs in clause 5, in which the question of the representation of parties by counsel or solicitor is dealt with. In the Act of 1904, it is provided that the parties may be represented by counsel or solicitor, either by an agreement between themselves or by the permission of the President. In this Bill, the two things are cumulative. It is necessary to get, not only an agreement between the parties, but also the consent of the President of the Court. I do not think that it makes much difference, but I wish to draw attention to the fact. The provisions of this Bill are practically identical with the provisions of the Act of 1904. As regards the Excise duty, this is not the time to discuss either its policy or its constitutionality. I have always followed the wholesome rule that if it is advisable to do a certain thing, although the power may be doubtful, we ought not to stultify ourselves by refusing to do what is right, simply because the constitutionality of our

legislation may be challenged. That rule was applied when the case under the Act of 1906 was brought on; because although a few words were then uttered as to the inefficacy of its provisions, there was no elaborate argument on the question, and perhaps had one occurred it would have been futile, except as an aid to the lawyers outside in finding their authority. As the matter has been mentioned by the honorable member for Flinders, with his usual ability and clearness, I propose to give one or two references to authorities that may perhaps tend to strengthen the light that he has thrown upon the question. It seems to me that the reason the Act of 1906 has not been tested up to the present is, first of all, that there was, I understand, an attempt, by means of an arrangement between the Government and the manufacturers, to obviate the necessity, if it existed, of going to the High Court for an opinion upon the question. Another reason is that some manufacturers have also thought that even if they succeeded in showing that the Act was bad they would still have to pay the Excise—that, in other words, they would get rid of the condition regarding wages, but not of the obligation to pay Excise. All I can say is that that is possible. It may be probable, but whether it is or not depends upon the effect of what the High Court says as to the Act being opposed to section 55 of the Constitution. That section provides that laws relating to taxation shall deal only with the imposition of taxation; and it may or may not be that this Bill deals with some other matter of policy.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—It might also follow from the decision of the Court that the real scope of the Act was beyond the Legislature, and the Excise as well as the conditions would therefore go.

Mr. GLYNN.—The real point that is troubling the manufacturers is that they might obtain a decision that the Act was bad as an attempt to usurp the powers of the State in dictating rates of wages, but that it was not bad as an exercise of the power to impose Excise.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—That is possible.

Mr. GLYNN.—It is only possible—whether it is probable or not is a matter that we need not now discuss. This is not the time to consider the question of our power generally to lay down conditions in imposing Excise duties, but I should like to give one or two references to authorities. It

has been decided in America, in the great income tax case of *Pollock v. The Farmers' Union*, that a class may be exempted from taxation. That touches the point mentioned by the honorable member for Bendigo—the power to make exemptions in favour of a particular class; but it does not carry us any further, because the provisions of the American Constitution on which it is based are not identical with those of the Constitution of the Commonwealth. Some of the Judges in that case said, however, that they had never known in the history of Tariff legislation in America a case in which the rate of duty was made to depend upon the person or corporation called upon to pay it. That goes to the root of the question now before us. The point was not decided, but it certainly touches the question under consideration. I shall come a little nearer to the problem now before us by a reference to some decisions given in the *Federal Power over Carriers and Corporations*, by Prentice, one of the chief writers on the commerce laws under the American Constitution. He says, at page 54—

The Supreme Court has often held, in passing upon the validity of State laws, that the Courts will look into the operation and effect of a statute to discern its purpose, and that if laws purporting to be enacted in the exercise of powers belonging to the State have no real or substantial relation to the objects of those powers, it is the duty of the Court so to adjudge and thereby give effect to the Constitution.

Upon that point he refers to several cases; I might add another: that of *McCulloch v. Maryland*, the celebrated case referred to in connexion with the income tax decisions in which Chief Justice Marshall in similar words states an identical conclusion. To quote from another authority, this writer says that if Congress—

may use a power granted for one purpose for the accomplishment of another and very different purpose, it is easy to show that a Constitution on parchment is worth nothing.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—If we exercised such a power we could usurp every legislative function of the States by imposing some form of taxation—say a poll tax—coupled with an exemption providing the person to whom it was applied would comply with certain conditions.

Mr. GLYNN.—Yes. Let me give one additional authority laid down in the *Federalist* as to what was intended by the framers of the American Constitution. Hamilton says—

The propriety of a law in a constitutional light must always be determined by the nature of the powers upon which it is founded. Suppose by some forced construction of its authority (which, indeed, cannot easily be imagined), the Federal Legislature should attempt to vary the law of descent in any State, would it not be evident that, in making such an attempt, it had exceeded its jurisdiction, and infringed upon that of the State? Suppose again that upon the pretence of an interference with its revenues, it should undertake to abrogate a land tax imposed by the authority of a State, would it not be equally evident that this was an invasion of that concurrent jurisdiction in respect to this species of tax which the Constitution plainly supposes to exist in the State Governments?

In dealing with this matter in the House, one does not wish to be an advocate of one side or the other; one's desire is rather to throw out suggestions; but it is interesting to glance for a moment at other authorities. One of them, *Tiedeman*, on *State and Federal Control of Persons and Property*, has a very elaborate dissertation upon the unconstitutionality of protection in America. He practically says that it is not open to question that protection is against the Constitution. If that be so, all I can say is that we ought not to rely too much upon authority, because the first Federal Tariff has existed since 1789, and the policy is still pretty active and alive in America. There are other authorities that I might cite, such as the American distillery cases, in which it is laid down that a distinction cannot be made between the tax which shall be imposed on one distillery, and that which shall be imposed on another. That approaches fairly closely to the Excise (Spirits) Act of 1906. The sooner this question is raised by some outside person the better.

Mr. W. H. IRVINE.—We have the dual power of taxation of commerce, as far as protection is concerned.

Mr. GLYNN.—That is so; but so has the American Congress. One could elaborate the question as regards protection in America. As a matter of fact, one of the grounds of secession was that the southern States ineffectually challenged the right of the northern States to impose protective duties. When the Federal Constitution was framed, they negatived the whole protectionist policy, declaring it to be opposed to the principles of the Constitution. In making these observations I merely wish to show the outside public that there lies before them

a nice field to engage lawyers to help us to ascertain before we establish a Board of Trade—before we exercise extraordinary powers opening up vast possibilities of interference which were never dreamt of—the constitutionality of these provisions.

Mr. KNOX (Kooyong) [3.10].—I feel that I should be wanting in my duty if I did not express the regret so widely felt that the Government should have decided at this juncture to bring forward a Bill involving such important departures as those for which provision is made in the measure before us. I am perfectly sure that the Minister in charge of the Bill and his colleagues generally have no desire to interfere unnecessarily with our great functions of trade and commerce; but the uncertainty at present existing unquestionably is having upon them a most detrimental effect. This Bill is an illustration of the unwisdom of hurriedly passing important legislation. Had we recognised, when the Excise Tariff (Agricultural Machinery) Bill was before us that it required administrative machinery, there would have been no necessity for the introduction of this measure. I enter my protest against this Bill, which embodies so many drastic provisions, being rushed through the House at the present time. Had it been limited to the granting of one or two powers necessary to enable information to be secured and witnesses to be cited to appear before the Court, there might have been some justification for it. We find in it, however, many objectionable conditions. We find in it, in the first place, the undesirable principle that a person cited to appear before the Court shall prove that he is not guilty of the offence with which he is charged, and he is also called upon to conduct his own case without the assistance of intermediaries to enable him to place his position before the Court in a just and equitable manner. Even such a provision as that might well be left in abeyance until we are asked to deal with the general Bill based upon the new protection proposals of the Government. As the honorable member for Flinders has observed, it might well be said of the memorandum which has been laid upon the table, "the voice is Deakin's voice, but the hands are the hands of Watson." It is probably because of the dual influence behind it that it does not bear the imprimatur of the Government. That, however, may be a purely graphical error. I speak as one entirely

in sympathy with the efforts being made to secure reasonable wages and fair conditions of labour for employes in industries, and particularly those industries which apply to Parliament for the protection of high duties. I was returned, not only to secure the reasonable and effective protection of our industries, but also to see that the interests of the workers are properly safeguarded. In view of the fact that the law vacation is at hand, no harm would be done were this debate postponed until our re-assembling in March, when we could deal with the subject carefully and fully, instead of being pressed to deal with it in a manner which, I fear, may hereafter cause reflection and regret. I am sorry that the measure provides for methods of dealing with witnesses and obtaining information which are, in my judgment, unjust.

Mr. GROOM.—The powers given are the same as are given by the Conciliation and Arbitration Act.

Mr. KNOX.—In my opinion it is an unfortunate thing that these powers are given by the Bill. I should like to deal with the measure from other points of view, but, under the circumstances, I feel that, whatever small verbal alterations may be made in Committee, I must place on the Government all responsibility for its objectionable features.

Mr. WISE (Gippsland) [3.18].—I cannot understand how any one who, like the honorable member for Kooyong, says that he is in entire sympathy with every effort to secure reasonable wages for employes, and to do justice to those who ask for protection from outside competition, can wish for the postponement of this measure until our re-assembling after the Christmas adjournment. The validity of the Excise Tariff (Agricultural Machinery) Act might be an interesting question to discuss, as its effect upon manufacturers who have failed to secure exemption under it might also be; but at present we have to do merely with a procedure Bill to enable its provisions to be put into force. While the original Act remains on the statute-book, and there is no decision of the High Court that it is unconstitutional, we must regard it as valid, and be prepared to pass whatever procedure provisions may be necessary to secure its ends. The honorable member for Angas says that he has compared the Bill carefully with the Act, and finds in it no provision contrary to those of the

Act, except that which allows counsel to be employed under a joint arrangement between both parties and the President. It is not the fault of the Minister that the measure has been brought forward so late in the year. Its provisions have been threshed out in the Senate, and it has been awaiting our consideration for weeks, since it was sent here from that body.

Mr. GROOM.—The debate was adjourned at the request of the Opposition.

Mr. WISE.—Yes. The Government wished to deal with the measure before the Tariff was concluded. Had it been dealt with then there would have been time for its longer discussion.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—We recognise that the circumstances constitute a reason for not blocking the measure now.

Mr. WISE.—My remark was intended as an answer to the statement of the honorable member for Kooyong that the Government have done wrong in bringing the measure forward so late in the year. He referred to its provisions as drastic, and spoke of persons being compelled by it to prove their innocence. But, as the honorable member for Bendigo pointed out, it must be remembered that no punishment is provided for in the original Act. The Act provides that if a person proves certain things he may obtain exemption from the payment of Excise. No person is penalized for not doing something, but persons are granted a favour—relief from the payment of Excise—if they do something; two very different positions from the legal point of view. The object of the Bill is to enable the President of the Commonwealth Court of Conciliation and Arbitration to—

act according to equity, good conscience, and the substantial merits of the case, without regard to technicalities or legal forms.

He is not to be—

bound by any rules of evidence, but may inform his mind on any matter in such manner as he thinks just.

To do this he must be given drastic and unusual powers. I cordially support the Bill. No attempt having been made to repeal the Act, it is our duty to take all steps for the proper enforcement of its provisions. As to the constitutional position, I agree with the honorable members for Bendigo and Angas that, when we regard legislation as desirable, we should not stultify ourselves by hesitating to pass it because doubts are expressed as to its constitutionality, unless it is reasonably cer-

tain that it would be unconstitutional. Where there is no such certainty we should, as the honorable member for Flinders says, "chance it," or, rather, assert our view as to its probable constitutionality by giving effect to it. If we do not exercise our powers unless we are unanimously of the opinion that their proposed exercise would be constitutional, we shall pass very few measures. Our duty is not to decide constitutional questions; these must be left for decision to the High Court. No one would suggest that we should pass legislation generally thought to be unconstitutional; but wherever we have a reasonable opinion that we can constitutionally exercise our powers of legislation, we should, if we think it desirable, do so.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN (Indi) [3.25].—I suppose that there is no hope of a postponement.

Mr. GROOM.—No.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—In my opinion, the introduction of the Bill at this stage is a blot upon the great work of a great session. I understand the desire of the Government to placate their supporters. The measure has been introduced at the eleventh hour to serve those who have helped to keep the Ministry in existence. But as the Courts are about to go into vacation, no useful purpose will be served by passing the Bill before the next meeting of the House. It has been said that it is a Bill to merely legalize errors of omission and commission in respect to the Act No. 16 of 1906, and the honorable member for Bendigo has stated that persons will not be penalized under it. I do not know what he means by that. The Bill bristles with £100 penalties.

Mr. TUDOR.—For wrong-doing.

Mr. TILLEY BROWN.—I am obliged for the interjection. It adds point to my reply that the honorable member for Bendigo does not understand the position. If a man is required to pay a penalty of £100, and he refuses to do so, how can the money be recovered but by process of law which may lead to his imprisonment? No useful purpose will be served by forcing the Bill through the House at the present time.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee:

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clause 2 (Interpretation).

Mr. CROUCH (Corio) [3.28].—I wish to draw the attention of the Attorney-General to the definition of the word "application," which is to mean an application under section 2, sub-section *d* of the Excise Tariff Act of 1906. It seems to me that that includes applications not only to the President of the Court of Conciliation and Arbitration, but to Judges of the Supreme Courts of the States, and to State industrial authorities. Clause 15, however, seems to contemplate applications only to the President, who can refer them to a Judge of the Supreme Court of a State, or to a State industrial authority. Am I not correct in thinking that a Supreme Court Judge has independent power to hear an application under the Act of 1906?

Mr. GROOM.—Every application must first be made to the Commonwealth Court.

Mr. CROUCH.—Paragraph *d* of section 2 of the Act of 1906, to which I am referred, is as follows—

Provided that this Act shall not apply to goods manufactured by any person in any part of the Commonwealth under conditions as to the remuneration of labour which—

d. are on an application made for the purpose to the President of the Commonwealth Court of Conciliation and Arbitration declared to be fair and reasonable by him or by a Judge of the Supreme Court of a State, or any person or persons who compose a State Industrial Authority, to whom he may refer the matter.

Does the Attorney-General mean to contend that the Judge of a Supreme Court of a State has not an independent authority to hear such a matter, whether it is referred to him by the President of the Arbitration Court or not?

Mr. GROOM.—The honorable member will see that the whole thing is governed by the words "on an application made for the purpose to the President of the Commonwealth Court of Conciliation and Arbitration." All applications of the kind must go through the President, and the regulations have been framed accordingly.

Mr. CROUCH.—But a regulation cannot affect the independent power of a Judge of the Supreme Court of a State.

Mr. GROOM.—The application must in the first instance be made to the President of the Court of Conciliation and Arbitration. That is the way in which the section is interpreted, and that governs the whole thing.

Mr. CROUCH.—There is nothing in section 2 of the Act of 1906 which would warrant that interpretation, but it would

be useless for me now to put views before the honorable gentleman in conflict with that interpretation with which I wish to say I entirely disagree.

Clause agreed to.

Clauses 3 and 4 agreed to.

Clause 5. On the hearing of any application, no party shall (except by consent of all the parties and by leave of the President) be represented by counsel or solicitor.

Mr. GLYNN (Angas) [3.33].—This is the only clause in which I notice a departure from the Act of 1904. It requires the consent of both parties, and of the President to the appearance of counsel or solicitor in a case. I direct attention to the proposal, because one party to a case might wish to employ counsel, the President might think the case one in which counsel should be engaged, and the other party would still be able to prevent the appearance of counsel. I do not know whether this proposal was introduced in the Senate.

Mr. GROOM.—It is an amendment made in the Senate; the provision was not in the Bill as originally introduced.

Mr. GLYNN.—It should not have been made. The word "and" in this clause should be "or," as it is in the Act of 1904.

Mr. CROUCH.—Let the honorable member move in that way.

Mr. GLYNN.—I am a lawyer, and prefer that a layman should move the amendment. However, I move—

That the word "and" be struck out, with a view to insert in lieu thereof the word "or."

Mr. GROOM (Darling Downs—Attorney-General) [3.35].—I ask the honorable member not to press his amendment. The provision was carried in the Senate because of a desire that the legal element should not be introduced into the proceedings of this Court to a greater extent than might be necessary. It was felt that the powers under the Act would probably be exercised in the wholesome way suggested by the honorable member for Bendigo, and carried out at Adelaide, the parties, as far as possible, arranging amongst themselves for an impartial inquiry by the President of the Court of Conciliation and Arbitration, and without the aid of counsel. I do not think that the substitution of "or" for "and" would really make very much difference.

Mr. GLYNN.—On reconsideration, I prefer personally not to move an amendment;

but, if any layman wishes to raise the question; I have no objection.

Mr. CROUCH.—I object to the withdrawal of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN.—I have not yet put the amendment to the Committee.

Amendment (by Mr. CROUCH) proposed—

That the word "and" be left out, with a view to insert in lieu thereof the word "or."

Mr. WISE (Gippsland) [3.37].—I hope the honorable member for Corio will not proceed with this amendment, the effect of which, if carried, would simply be to hang up the Bill, which would have to go back to the Senate for reconsideration. It would be a thousand pities if the whole object of pushing on with the Bill this afternoon were to be defeated, and the procedure of the Court tied up for the next two or three months.

Mr. CROUCH (Corio) [3.38].—Honorable members who believe that the clause as it stands is in the interests of the workers, are greatly mistaken. It strikes a very severe blow at the cause of every man who desires to get justice at the hands of this Court. I appeal to honorable members not to rush through whatever the Senate may have sent down to this House, merely because we are so near Christmas. I ask them to agree to an amendment which, but for the fact that he is a lawyer, the honorable member for Angas would like to have moved. I wish to have the clause so amended as to give the President of the Court of Conciliation and Arbitration the power to permit the appearance of counsel in a case if he thinks that the interests of justice and the interests of the parties to the case would thereby be served. The men who are managers of large foundries and factories have not reached the positions they occupy because of any ability to address a Court, or electors, or to examine witnesses as members of this Committee would probably be able to do. I have in mind a blacksmith at whose place in Ballarat I served as an office boy. He was incapable of speaking a dozen words in public. If he went into a Court, he would be struck with stage fright, and be incapable of expressing his views, although he is able to manage 120 employés in an agricultural implement factory. That man, because he is a working man, and has not had a college or university education, is to be penalized to please the Labour Party in the Senate. The honor-

able member for Angas felt that he was in a difficulty in moving an amendment, because he is a lawyer. I can honestly assure the Committee that I, although a member of the legal profession, am not speaking in its interests, but am pleading only for the rights of men to whom an injustice will be done if they are not allowed an opportunity of having their case properly presented to the Court. About 100 years ago persons accused of certain capital offences, or of treason, were not allowed to be represented by lawyers, and those who have read Macaulay's history will remember his account of the case of a man who was absolutely stricken down by the terror of his position, and incapable of making a proper defence. It was really judicial murder to allow that man to be tried under those conditions. Honorable members can imagine what a tongue-tied fool an employer or employé, who had no training at public speaking, or knowledge of the forms of a Court of law, would feel if he had to conduct his own case. To repeat a phrase which I used some years ago regarding a similar proposal, "The lawyer is the saviour of the weak." One honorable member told me that he is against the employment of lawyers in these cases because they can afterwards, by moving for injunctions or prohibitions, take the matter into other Courts, where different procedure obtains.

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—I said that lawyers were more concerned with legal points than with facts and evidence.

Mr. CROUCH.—The honorable member told me that he was afraid, not so much of the proceedings before the Court of Conciliation and Arbitration, as of the subsequent proceedings. Clause 3 already prevents the raising of legal and technical points before the Court. The lawyers are excluded by this clause only from applications before the Court of Conciliation and Arbitration, and they will still be able to take part in any subsequent proceedings by means of injunction or prohibition. I believe the real motive behind this attempt to exclude lawyers is to avoid the large amount of time which has been occupied in the hearing of industrial cases. A much more effective and just way to shorten the proceedings would be to introduce a provision similar to that in the Electoral Act, by which the costs as between solicitor and client would be limited. There is an old legal maxim that "ignorance of the law excuseth none," but this seems to be a ca-

where ignorance of the law will justify a man in pretending to be a lawyer, for any but the trained man will be allowed to appear. I suppose this clause really aims at helping the trades union secretaries, who have usually worked these cases up in the past, and, apparently, the only persons to be seriously prejudiced will be the manufacturers. It is not fair to interfere with a class of men who have as much right as have the workers to present their case to the Court. I trust that we shall have a division on this question, so that we may ascertain the position which the Government take up. In the Senate, the representative of the Government characterized this as an unfair provision, and voted against it, but it was carried in the teeth of the Government. Yet the Minister in charge in this House, regardless of whether he is acting fairly to the employers or not, is supporting the clause, simply because the Government want to get the Bill through, so as to have a certain record of legislation passed before we adjourn over Christmas. I desire to be fair to both sides, particularly in a Bill of this sort. It would be less dangerous if the President of the Court were allowed to grant leave for parties to be represented by counsel. That is so under the Electoral Act. In the case of the Echuca election petition, one of the parties objected to lawyers being allowed to appear, but the other party immediately swore an affidavit that he would be prejudiced if he was not allowed to be represented by counsel. The Judge decided that time and money would be saved and justice done, by permitting each side to employ one counsel. I submit that what has happened in the Industrial Appeal Court of Victoria before Mr. Justice Hood will happen again. Although lawyers are supposed to be excluded, it is a matter of fact that they sit behind and try to galvanize their clients into saying the right thing. Under the circumstances, it is clear that some of the parties will not be able to properly present their case, no matter how well they may be privately instructed by lawyers. The Attorney-General must know very well that the absence of legal assistance always tends to protract the proceedings and cause delay.

Mr. GROOM.—Not in a simple investigation as to matters of fact.

Mr. CROUCH.—If the Attorney-General does not agree with what I have just

said, I am surprised and sorry. If I can get one voice with me, I shall divide the Committee on the question, not in the interests of the legal profession, but in the interests of the parties concerned.

Mr. KNOX (Kooyong) [3.53].—I shall not give my voice for pressing this question to a division, because, as I have already said, the responsibility must rest with the Government. I entirely concur in what has fallen from the honorable member for Corio; and, as I have objected to this clause, so I shall object to the clause with which we have to deal later.

Mr. HEDGES (Fremantle) [3.54].—We have heard much of what may happen under this clause; but I can tell honorable members what has happened under a similar provision in the Arbitration Court of Western Australia. Certain solicitors had in their office a man who, though entitled to practice in Victoria, was not entitled to practice in Western Australia, and therefore he was at liberty, not being technically a lawyer, to appear in the Arbitration Court. I have been closely associated with several cases before that Court; and I have seen more time wasted and expense incurred through lack of knowledge on the part of those who conducted the cases than could have been occasioned if professional assistance had been allowed. Half-finished lawyers appear to conduct cases; and the result is extra trouble and expense. I have seen leaders of Labour appearing and receiving better pay than lawyers would have expected; and I feel sure that the Committee will make a mistake if they adopt this clause.

Amendment negatived.

Clause agreed to.

Clauses 6 to 14 agreed to.

Clause 15 (Powers of Authority to whom application referred by President).

Mr. CROUCH (Corio) [4.0].—I have looked carefully into the various clauses of this Bill in order that I might be in a position to effect some improvement in the measure. But whenever any honorable member has attempted to address the Committee, so much impatience has been exhibited that I do not propose to discuss its provisions.

Clause agreed to.

Clause 16 agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment; report adopted.

Bill (by leave) read a third time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE TO MEMBERS.

Mr. GROOM (Darling Downs—Attorney-General) [4.3].—I move—

That leave of absence be granted to every member of the House of Representatives from the determination of the last sitting of the House in the year 1907, to the date of its first sitting in the year 1908.

A similar motion has already been carried by the Senate. As a matter of fact, I do not think that there is any real necessity for passing such a motion. I am of opinion that the proposed adjournment does not require it. However, as a doubt has been raised in the case of one or two honorable members who have leave of absence, and whose leave will expire during the adjournment, it seems wise to follow the example set by the Senate.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

SPECIAL ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. DEAKIN (Ballarat—Minister of External Affairs) [4.4].—I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until Wednesday, 11th March next, at 3 o'clock p.m.

The original intention was that we should meet again on 4th March next, but a number of honorable members have assured me that an additional week would be welcome, and the Treasurer tells me that his Supplies will carry him forward to that time.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

ANTARCTIC EXPEDITION.

Mr. DEAKIN (Ballarat—Minister of External Affairs) [4.5].—I wish to submit a motion without notice. It relates to a novel proposal which has been in my mind during the past week or two though I have only received two days ago a letter from Professor David, of Sydney, a well-known scientific man, who is about to accompany the expedition under Lieutenant Shackleton to the South Pole. The cost of that expedition, to the extent of £24,000, has been subscribed by Lieutenant Shackleton and his private friends. But owing to losses sustained by others who had tentatively promised to contribute, the expedition is short by £5,000 of the amount necessary to enable it to obtain a full supply of stores and equipment for its stay in the antarctic regions, probably, for

three years. Professor David, who is accompanying the expedition, without remuneration—as a number of other scientific men are doing—has written to point out, that although the scientific information to be obtained is of universal value, yet it has a special value to Australia, because of the greater knowledge of meteorology which it promises, and because, if there are any economic possibilities in these antarctic lands, Australia will probably be the country which will most directly benefit. Under these circumstances, since the expedition has awakened world-wide interest, and will be one of the best equipped ever despatched on a mission of danger of this kind, I venture to ask honorable members to give the Government authority to advance a sum not exceeding £5,000 for the purpose of completely equipping it. Lieutenant Shackleton has already left for New Zealand. Professor David and others leave in a week. The sum of £5,000, although considerable to us, is, after all, not a large gift from the revenue of Australia. No similar demand is likely to be made for many years. The men who are risking their lives in the expedition have already promised to give a considerable share of the scientific specimens—the flora and fauna—which they may gather, to the museums of Australia. Under the circumstances, I have submitted this proposal to as many honorable members as were within my reach. I consider that by adopting it we shall be taking a course which will be worthy of Australia, will do us credit abroad, and advance the cause of science—which is the cause of humanity—without making any undue demand upon us. I therefore desire to move—

That this House authorizes the Government to advance a sum not exceeding £5,000 for the purpose of supplying the necessary equipment to the antarctic expedition about to proceed to the South Pole.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Is it the pleasure of the House that the Prime Minister have leave to move the motion without notice?

Mr. FRAZER.—I object.

Mr. DEAKIN.—I merely invite an expression of opinion from the House upon the proposal. The Government will be prepared to accept responsibility for any action they may take. Before acting upon their own motion, however, they felt that, as the House was sitting, it was due to honorable members that they should be consulted. I regret that the Senate cannot also be informed.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Perhaps I may suggest a means by which the Prime Minister can achieve his object. He is at liberty to move the suspension of the Standing Orders, and if that motion be carried by a statutory majority, he will then be in order in submitting the proposal that he desires to submit.

Mr. DEAKIN.—The Government will have no hesitation in taking action. I beg to present the following paper—

Antarctic Expedition under Lieutenant Shackleton.—Letter from Professor David, of the Sydney University, requesting the Commonwealth to give financial assistance to the Expedition, and to move—

That the paper be printed.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [4.8].—I am glad that a way has been found to permit of the House expressing its opinion upon the proposal outlined by the Prime Minister. I only wish to say one word in regard to it, and that is a word of cordial approval of his suggestion. I hope that he will carry it out, and that he will not stint the expedition so far as a few pounds are concerned, in the prosecution of this very necessary work. I think that an opportunity now presents itself which should be seized by the Government—an opportunity which may not recur for many years. We owe a duty to ourselves and to posterity to explore the antarctic regions. From a scientific, and indeed from every point of view, it is our obligation to do what we can to make known all that lies hidden in that mysterious land. Believing that the expedition is to be thoroughly equipped intellectually, scientifically, and in every other way, I support the motion most cordially. I sincerely hope that the expedition may prove an abundant and abiding success.

Mr. FISHER (Wide Bay) [4.9].—This is not a proposal to assist an expedition which is bent upon money making. It is a scientific, exploratory, and dangerous enterprise, and we ought to feel pleased that men who are specially trained are prepared to devote alike their time and their intellect to the investigation of this comparatively unknown portion of our planet. An appeal has been made by a scientific Australian for assistance to enable Lieutenant Shackleton's expedition to carry out its work thoroughly, when once it has reached the antarctic regions. It is not an appeal to begin a thing, but one to enable a project which is well under way to be carried out. We are

asked to provide less than 20 per cent. of the amount necessary to thoroughly equip the expedition. I think that it is the duty of this Parliament to provide the requisite funds, especially as it has been appealed to by Professor David. We could not refuse such an appeal unless we were perfectly callous about such matters. Ours is the only nation in the Southern Hemisphere to which an appeal can be made for support by such an expedition. I will do my utmost to assist the Government to provide the £5,000 now asked for.

Mr. WILKS.—It will have my support, although it is for something that is not in my electorate!

Mr. KNOX (Kooyong) [4.10].—I am not in a position to speak on behalf of any party collectively, but I think I may say for those honorable members who sit in this corner that they will heartily support the Prime Minister in the suggestion he has made, and do everything they can to assist in the voting of the money asked for. I need only add that, in my opinion, the proposal is a wise one, and that we all wish God-speed to the expedition.

Mr. FRAZER (Kalgoorlie) [4.11].—I must say that I have absolutely no sympathy with the method adopted by the Government in springing this question upon the House at this particular time. I have no doubt that if Parliament had been consulted at a proper time, the money would have been granted. But before we are asked to participate in the equipment of such an expedition as is contemplated, proper notice should be given. The fact that the expedition was to start has been before the country, and before the world, for a considerable time. But not one word has been said in this Parliament as to the vote of a grant. When, however, we arrive at the stage of being within a few hours of an adjournment for some months, a proposition is suddenly submitted for the grant of £5,000, without any opportunity being afforded for its consideration. We had an experience this morning of an entirely different description, when a suggestion was made to pay gratuities to the widows and children of some of the employees who have died in the service of the Commonwealth. But their necessities did not seem to call for consideration by the Government, because we were so near to an adjournment.

Mr. DEAKIN.—The honorable member is quite wrong. The Treasurer is only waiting for an opportunity to bring forward a proposition with reference to those cases, and he will do it as soon as this matter is disposed of.

Mr. FRAZER.—The Prime Minister cannot say that I am quite wrong, because he was not in the chamber—

Mr. DEAKIN.—I was in the chamber.

Mr. FRAZER.—The Treasurer gave an answer to the effect that nothing could be done.

Mr. HUME COOK.—On the contrary, he said that he would bring a Bill forward this afternoon.

Mr. FRAZER.—He said that he could not do these things without the sanction of Parliament.

Mr. DEAKIN.—He is going to ask for the sanction of Parliament, and has his Bill ready.

Mr. FRAZER.—How is he going to get it passed when the other place is not sitting? How can authority to do these things be obtained except by Statute? Every one knows that a Bill cannot be passed at this particular period, because the Senate is not sitting. I say that there is a greater necessity to attend to our own affairs, and to give reasonable satisfaction to those who have been placed in straitened circumstances, than to vote £5,000 for the support of an expedition about which no information has been furnished to the House. I frankly admit that the House seems prepared to dispose of £5,000 of Australian money in this fashion. Honorable members seem in quite an enthusiastic vein with regard to the matter. But I suppose that if a request were submitted to them personally, we should not find one who would put 5s. of his own into the affair. Although a public appeal has been made through the press of Victoria by the Chief Justice of this State, I have not heard of any one rushing down to the *Age* office or the *Herald* office, and I have not seen the names of many honorable members in the subscription list.

Mr. CROUCH.—The Postmaster-General gave £5 5s.

Mr. FOSTER.—£26,000 has been subscribed.

Mr. FISHER.—It is to be hoped that people will not parade their subscriptions.

Mr. FRAZER.—I do not care whether they do or not. But I do not think that we are justified in plunging this country

into an expenditure of £5,000 without any information being furnished to us as to the possible benefit that will accrue even in the event of the expedition being successful. I am not going to say anything harsh, or to suggest that the men engaged in this enterprise are not deserving of public commendation for the efforts they are about to make to accomplish a task that has previously proved to be beyond the power of man. But I do say that if a proposal of this description was to be submitted, it should have been placed before us some time ago.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—The Government only got the application yesterday.

Mr. FRAZER.—The Prime Minister might have received the application from Professor David only yesterday, but I am saying that the facts relating to the expedition were known to the Government, as they were known to honorable members, a considerable time ago. I do not think that it is fair to propose to expend £5,000 of Australian money without Parliament having a proper opportunity for consideration, so as to be able to express a reasonable and creditable opinion.

Mr. BOWDEN (Nepean) [4.19].—I congratulate the Government upon the action which they are taking in this matter. Whatever benefits may arise to the world in general from the results of the expedition, there can be no doubt whatever that the benefits to Australia will be very many more fold than to the rest of the world. I am glad that we as a Commonwealth have an opportunity of taking a financial interest in the expedition. The amount involved is not large considering the issues at stake, and when we remember that the success of the expedition and possibly the lives of those taking part in it may depend upon the complete equipment of the expedition, we will be glad to sanction this expenditure. The people of this country will hope for the success of the enterprise, and the Prime Minister and his colleagues may rest assured that Australia will stand behind them in relation to the expenditure of this money.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

OFFICERS' COMPENSATION BILL.

Mr. SPEAKER reported the receipt of a message from His Excellency the Governor-General, recommending an appropriation for the purposes of this Bill.

In Committee (Consideration of Governor-General's message):

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [4.22].—I beg to move—

That it is expedient that an appropriation of revenue be made for the purposes of a Bill for an Act to provide for compensation to be paid on retirement or on decease of certain officers of the Commonwealth.

I think that the simplest way of introducing this measure is to say that certain amounts have been submitted to me with requests for payment; but I felt that I was not justified in taking the responsibility of paying them without an intimation of some kind from Parliament. With the exception of one or two, the payments asked for relate to the wages of men who lost their lives in the public service. The names and amounts are as follow—

To widow of Lieutenant-Colonel Bayly, formerly Commandant, South Australian Military Forces	£487
To widow of Colonel Ricardo, formerly Commandant, Victorian Military Forces	134
To widow of Master Gunner Price, formerly Military Clerk, Central Administration	110
To widow of Sergeant-Major Fraser, formerly of the New South Wales Military Forces	30
To ex-Gunner Watson, Royal Australian Artillery, Victoria	24
To widow of J. Wilson, formerly Senior Lineman, Postmaster-General's Department, New South Wales	200
To widow of S. Burnett, formerly Telegraph Lineman, Postmaster-General's Department, New South Wales	200
To widow of W. R. Child, formerly Sorter, Postmaster-General's Department, New South Wales	137
To widow of G. H. Chapman, formerly Telegraphist, Postmaster-General's Department, New South Wales	297
To widow of J. Clarke formerly Inland Mail Clerk, Postmaster-General's Department, New South Wales	319
To widow of T. Martin, formerly Telegraphist, Postmaster-General's Department, Queensland	500
Total	£2,438

Those are all the names that I have before me at present, but I have telephoned to Mr. Allen, the Secretary to the Treasury, to inquire whether there are any more. I believe there are two others, though I am not sure of their names.

Mr. WATSON.—On what grounds are the grants supposed to be asked for?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I am sending for the papers so that I may be able to state the merits of each case.

Mr. WATSON.—What is the general policy involved? Are these persons entitled to anything under the law as it stands?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—No.

Mr. WATSON.—On what ground is it proposed to depart from the law, and how far is it likely to take us in the future?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—That is a point I want to submit to Parliament. These are all special cases. I should have to take the responsibility of making the payments if I did not first submit the cases to Parliament.

Mr. CROUCH.—There is one special case which has been omitted. The widow and children of the late Sergeant-Major Coffey are very hard up.

Mr. WATSON.—That is not the question.

Mr. CROUCH.—He lost his life.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Most of these cases are much the same in character.

Mr. WATSON.—Why is it proposed to depart from the law? If there is a good reason for making the departure I should like to know what it is?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The papers will give the particulars of each case. At the present time I am not in a position to say that all the cases are similar. But for special reasons various Ministers have approved of these sums being paid. In some cases—in most cases, I think—the man lost his life in the execution of his duty, leaving his widow or family badly off. I shall give the detailed information to honorable members presently if I can get the papers. I am sorry that they are not here now. There is no law that will cover such cases.

Mr. CHANTER.—But the law of justice.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Exactly. It must be done as an act of grace on the part of this Parliament, and that is why I have hesitated to act. If I had been free to act I should not have hesitated to make the payments, but I felt that it involved a departure from the law. It seems to me that it would be ignoring the decision at which Parliament arrived some time ago, namely, that no more gratuities or pensions should be paid except in special circumstances, to have made these payments without express authority.

Mr. CROUCH.—Is there any special urgency for bringing on this matter this afternoon?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I can only tell the honorable member what I have been told by honorable members, and that

is that in many of these cases the widow or those who were dependent upon the breadwinner are in dire distress, and that something should be done to relieve them. That is the main reason assigned in all the cases.

Mr. WATSON.—The Minister ought to be able to tell us why in these cases he proposes to go beyond the law. If the persons were killed or injured accidentally while on duty, I take it that there is some provision under which a grant may be made.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—There is no such provision that I am aware of, though I may not be right.

Mr. BAMFORD.—There is some provision in the Defence Act.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not know of any provision.

Mr. WATSON.—I know that a grant was made to the widow of a man who was killed while on duty in the Post Office.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I believe that a grant is always made subject to the approval of Parliament.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—There have been several cases already.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I admit that there have been some cases, but I do not think that there is a law which sanctions the payment, or which would indemnify me if I incurred the responsibility of paying the money.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—If there was a law on the subject the honorable gentleman need not come here to-day.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Exactly. I believe that there is no such law, and that is my reason for submitting the cases to-day.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta) [4.28].—I am acquainted with the particulars of one case, and so are other honorable members. I refer to the case of the late Joseph Clarke, inland mail clerk at the General Post Office in Sydney. He had been in the service for about forty-four years, and was on the eve of retiring on a pension. He would have been away on leave had he not been kept back specially by the Department to deal with the year's mail tenders.

Mr. WATSON.—Was he killed?

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—He was working night and day over the mail tenders, and he practically dropped dead at his work.

Mr. WATSON.—It does not follow that he did not die from natural causes.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I suppose that he did die from natural causes.

Mr. WEBSTER.—Accelerated by over-work.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I should think that the natural causes in that case were sheer over-work. At any rate it is a very hard case. He was just going out on twelve months' leave. I understand that the compensation which the Government propose to make to the widow simply covers the twelve months' leave and three months' accumulated leave which was due to him, and which he would have taken in the ordinary course of events. That is the only case in the list that I know of; and if the others are on the same footing the Committee will only do a simple act of rudimentary justice in voting these small amounts to the widows of the unfortunate men.

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN (Eden-Monaro—Minister of Trade and Customs) [4.30].—The Treasurer has asked me to explain a case with which I am acquainted, and the explanation will probably furnish an answer to the inquiry of the honorable member for South Sydney. I indorse every word that has been said in regard to Mr. Clarke. He was entitled to leave, but, practically at our request, remained at his post. He died in harness.

Mr. WEBSTER.—He remained at his post for some months after he was entitled to leave?

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—Yes. The amount proposed to be voted to his widow is based on the leave to which he was entitled. I made the recommendation that compensation should be granted, and after looking into the matter very carefully, was disposed to suggest that a sum of £500 should be paid to his relatives. I believed that such a payment would be justifiable; but we had to fix a principle on which the payment should be made, and we based it on the leave to which he was entitled. I also recall to mind the case of J. Wilson, who was engaged in the Telephone Construction Branch, and was burnt to death or electrocuted whilst working on a telegraph pole.

Mr. WATSON.—That was a very hard case.

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—I believe that the Department, to a certain extent,

contributed to his death, although it was not legally responsible. We gave his widow some little assistance by appointing her to the charge of a semi-official post office. She was left with several little children, and I thought I should be justified in recommending that a grant be made to her to enable her to educate them. Owing to the employment of temporary hands who did not thoroughly understand their work, the Department, to my mind, contributed, to a certain extent, to Wilson's death.

Mr. WATSON.—Is the case provided for in this Bill?

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—Yes; a sum of £200 is provided. The cases of Clarke, Wilson, and others, have been very carefully considered, and the payments proposed to be made are based upon a general principle. Many cases of hardship have been brought forward, and it seems to me that, in voting these amounts, we shall lay down the rule that we are entitled to consider deserving cases. I hope that the time is not far distant when we shall make certain provision which will render it unnecessary for the widows and children of Commonwealth officers who have died at their posts to come cap in hand to us.

Mr. WATSON.—We have a life assurance scheme.

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—That is so. These are not the only cases that have been brought under our notice; we have had to weed them out, remembering that regard must be had to the state of our finances. I would ask Parliament to deal generously with the widows and relatives of officers of the service who have either died or have been killed whilst at their posts.

Mr. FISHER (Wide Bay) [4.34].—In the first Parliament, I raised the point that we should lay down some definite principle as to the granting of compensation to the surviving relatives of employés of the Commonwealth who died at their posts.

Mr. GROOM.—They are not even under a Workmen's Compensation Act.

Mr. FISHER.—That is so. While, in some of the States the surviving relatives of public servants who die at their posts are entitled to compensation under Workmen's Compensation Acts, we have practically no power, except with the consent of the States Treasurers to grant compensation in such cases. It seems to me, however, that this is a haphazard scheme.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—It is rough justice.

Mr. FISHER.—The Government have been able to select only a few cases, leaving a large number untouched. The only point in favour of this Bill is that it seems to be a recognition of the fact that we ought to pay some compensation to the relatives of those who are killed whilst on duty. I could cite the case of a postmaster who, although in the service for 35 years, never had a holiday, and who within a month of his retirement on a pension died. No provision is made in this Bill for the payment of compensation to his relatives. It is only natural that difficulties should arise in attempting to deal with questions of this kind in a hurried and haphazard fashion. I understand that it is the policy of the Government to grant the surviving relatives of officers who die whilst in service compensation equal to at least twelve months' salary.

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—Six months' salary in most cases. They get what they deserve.

Mr. CROUCH.—The relatives of an officer who had 35 years' service would be entitled to compensation equal to 35 months' pay.

Mr. FISHER.—That is under the Victorian system. I think that the Victorian Government grant compensation equal to one month's salary for every year of service.

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—There is the case of the man Martin who died from plague in Brisbane.

Colonel FOXTON.—Plague contracted whilst on the premises of the Department.

Mr. FISHER.—The case I am citing is that of a man who contracted pneumonia owing to the faulty way in which repairs to the postal buildings which he was obliged to occupy were being carried out.

Colonel FOXTON.—In the other case the contagion was in the office.

Mr. FISHER.—It matters very little whether the cause of death is plague contracted owing to the insanitary condition of departmental premises or pneumonia due to the clumsy way in which repairs were being made to the Commonwealth building occupied by the officer; in either case the right to compensation would be the same. I hold that we ought not to tinker with a matter of this kind. The only way in which we can deal out even-handed justice is to lay down some general principle and stand by it. The sole result of dealing with individual cases in this haphazard way is that those who have a number of persistent

friends, who will take care that the Government are well informed of their situation, are likely to secure compensation whilst those whose cases are equally deserving, but who rely solely upon their rights, absolutely fail. I am not going to oppose the Bill, but I urge this Government, as I have urged other Administrations, to lay down a general principle on which compensation in cases of this kind shall be granted.

Mr. WATSON (South Sydney) [4.38].—I do not wish to say anything against some of the cases for which provision is made, because, so far as one is able to ascertain the facts, it appears to be quite justifiable to grant the proposed compensation. But let us take first of all the case of Mr. Wilson to which reference has been made. Undoubtedly something is due to the widow of a man who was killed on duty. Owing to some extraordinary circumstances Wilson was practically electrocuted whilst working on a telegraph pole, and his widow is certainly entitled to consideration. The trouble in regard to a number of these cases is that no particulars have been furnished to the House. I have gathered that some of them relate to officers who have died from natural causes whilst in the service.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I have all the particulars.

Mr. WATSON.—If it is proposed to give compensation to the widows of officers who while in the service died from natural causes a very wide field will be opened up, and it seems to me that no case of that sort should be dealt with in what are practically the dying hours of the session.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—Provision should have been made on the Estimates for all of them.

Mr. WATSON.—I take it that the Treasurer saw that some time must necessarily elapse before we should be able to deal with the Estimates and thought it was necessary to take immediate action. But the honorable member should not ask the House on the eve of a long adjournment—when every honorable member is anxious to get away, and there is no possibility of a detailed discussion—to grant compensation to the relatives, not of officers who have been killed whilst on service, but of those who have died from natural causes whilst in the employ of the Commonwealth.

Mr. WILKS.—Cases of hardship might arise in connexion with the death of public servants from overwork.

Mr. WATSON.—That is a proposition which it would be very hard to prove. If it is once admitted that such cases deserve compensation, and claims are afterwards made on behalf of the relatives of others of whom it is alleged that they died through overwork, they will be equally hard to resist. I do not think that cases other than those which have been clearly shown to be accidents, or the results of accidents, should be dealt with as emergency cases.

Mr. JOSEPH COOK.—I do not think that we can draw any hard-and-fast line like that.

Mr. WATSON.—If we cannot, it is problematic whether we are justified in making any grant at all. I think that we shall be laying up a crop of troubles for ourselves if, by passing a grant on an occasion like this, we admit that the relatives of an officer who has died in the service in the ordinary way should get compensation.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—I think that the honorable member supported Colonel Bayly's case.

Mr. WATSON.—It was shown in that case to my satisfaction that Colonel Bayly died because of the effect on his health of exposure during the South African war.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—But he was not killed on service.

Mr. WATSON.—There were medical certificates to the effect that his death as a young man was due to exposure on active service. If any similar case can be made out in this instance, I shall not raise any objection to its being met; but the Treasurer should insist that in every case special circumstances shall be shown before special treatment is accorded. If it can be shown later that the cases are special, we should be justified in making similar grants. Wilson's case is undoubtedly a special one. There may be details which justify similar action in other cases, but, so far, we have not been informed of them.

Mr. WEBSTER (Gwydir) [4.43].—I was surprised at the observations of the honorable member for South Sydney with regard to one of the cases which he considers should not come within the benevolence of the Government—that of a man who died at his work, but under

natural conditions. The amount it is proposed to pay to the widow of the late Joseph Clarke is not equivalent to the amount owing to him for overtime, and for the leave to which he was entitled at the time of his death. When he died he had worked 235 hours overtime, for which he had not received payment.

Mr. WATSON.—Some officers seek for overtime because of the shakels attaching to it.

Mr. WEBSTER.—That was not so in this case. Mr. Clarke's doctor warned him time after time that he should not continue at his work, and gave him certificates to the effect that it injured him to do so. But Mr. Clarke was induced, in the interests of the Department, to remain at his task until the thread snapped. He practically died at his post. After he had appealed to his superior officer for relief from the duty which was killing him, he fell unconscious on the floor of the office, was carried to the hospital, and died the following day. The doctor attending him stated that it was nothing else than a case of murder. No fine distinction can be drawn between death the result of an accident and a case like that of Mr. Clarke. However, I am glad that the Treasurer proposes to do some amount of justice to the relatives of worthy men who did their best for the service in which they were employed, and I ask him to say whether the money will be paid before Parliament re-assembles?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—If it is voted it will be paid almost immediately.

Colonel FOXTON (Brisbane) [4.47].—I am in complete sympathy with the proposal of the Government, but I should like some information regarding the basis on which the various amounts were assessed, and the relation which they bear to each other.

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—In the Postal Department we had to assess each case on its merits very largely.

Colonel FOXTON.—I understand that no rule has been laid down to the effect that the compensation must bear a direct relation to the amount of salary.

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—Personally, I thought that Mrs. Clarke ought to receive £500.

Colonel FOXTON.—Having had some experience in matters of this sort, I recognise the difficulty of laying down a hard-and-fast rule; but I ask, to what extent

any rule has been followed, because I notice that of two of the beneficiaries, both widows of Commandants, one is to receive something over £400, and the other something over £100?

Mr. EWING.—Colonel Bayly's case was reported on by a Board. It having been proved that his death was consequent upon his South African service, the Board assessed the amount which should be paid to his widow. Colonel Ricardo died suddenly, leaving his wife impoverished, and as he was at the time entitled to two months' leave, it was decided that, instead of allowing the Department to profit thereby, Parliament should be asked to grant the money to his widow.

Colonel FOXTON.—Then the two amounts were calculated on different bases.

Mr. EWING.—Yes.

Colonel FOXTON.—The case of Colonel Bayly affords the basis for one means of assessment of compensation. He lost his life practically in the service of his country, as the result of disease contracted in that service. The adoption of this measure will undoubtedly, as the honorable member for South Sydney has pointed out, lead to a crop of similar applications for compensation, so long as Parliament shirks the duty, which I think is thrust upon it, of making provision of some sort for those who retire from the service of the Commonwealth, and for the widows and children of those who die in that service.

Mr. EWING.—It ought to be done.

Colonel FOXTON.—It ought to be done. I think that such a measure might well have been given precedence of a great deal of Commonwealth legislation that I could name.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON.—A proposal of the kind was brought before the first Parliament and rejected.

Colonel FOXTON.—This Parliament will certainly learn, as other Parliaments have done, that it is absolutely necessary to make some provision of the sort if we are not in every session to have to deal with a crop of applications from the widows of those who have died in the service of the Commonwealth. In Queensland at one time we had a Civil Service Superannuation Act, and as a result of its repeal at the instigation of certain sections of the Civil Service themselves the Parliament was faced at the end of each session with the necessity of dealing with what came to be known as the "Widow's Vote." I have no doubt

that the practice is still going on. I wish to say that the case of a Mr. Gooding who was employed in the service of the Department of External Affairs is, I think, precisely on all-fours with Colonel Bayly's case. He was employed as a Government agent on vessels going to the South Seas, and it was proved that as the result of exposure on a voyage he contracted the disease of which he afterwards died. To retain his position it was necessary that he should start on another voyage, and he was proceeding to do so, although in a very bad state of health. Within a few hours of the time fixed for the sailing of the vessel, as a result of the disease which he had contracted and while in the performance of his duty, he fell down and expired on the platform of the central railway station in Brisbane. I believe that all that was granted in his case was the balance of a month's salary.

Mr. FISHER.—There was one case where they "docked" half-a-day.

Colonel FOXTON.—This man Gooding as truly died in the execution of his duty as did Colonel Bayly.

Mr. CROUCH.—Could the case to which the honorable member refers be provided for without another message from the Governor-General?

Colonel FOXTON.—I am prepared to admit that even if it could there is no official information before the Committee which would justify its inclusion in the present measure. My object in referring to it is to say that if a general principle is to be applied the case should be included, and I shall have no hesitation in bringing it under the notice of the Treasurer with a view to provision being made in some similar measure after the Christmas adjournment. I have nothing more to say, except that I have very great sympathy with the proposal before the Committee and will give it my cordial support.

Mr. DUGALD THOMSON (North Sydney [4.55].)—I quite agree with those honorable members who have stated that it is very desirable that some system of dealing with these cases should be devised. I do not say that it should be a system of pensions, but a scheme which could be made applicable to different cases of the kind referred to. I know that Ministers must have very great difficulty in deciding whether they should recommend compensation or not under existing conditions. There is one of these cases of which I know some-

thing, and that is the case of the widow of Gunner Price. Her husband served in South Africa, was sent to Thursday Island, and while in the service contracted a disease of which he subsequently died. I believe that a Medical Board inquired into the matter and decided that the man died from a disease contracted owing to the nature of his service and recommended compensation to his widow. The Minister could not see his way to grant compensation. The widow saw me, and I wrote to the Department, who decided to reconsider the decision as to the six months' leave of absence which Price was granted two or three days before he died to give him an opportunity of recovering his health. Whilst the Department would not grant ordinary compensation they saw their way to grant payment for the salary which would have been earned without service during the six months' leave. That was promised, and the widow was informed of the decision. The trouble in many of these cases is that the payment of the compensation is delayed. The people who require assistance fall into greater difficulties every day, when, if they could get the money at once they would be able to do something with it, perhaps in the purchase of a small business. These cases should not now be left to be dealt with on the delayed Estimates, and to prevent invidious distinctions there should be some strict definition which would govern the cases in which compensation should be granted.

Mr. TUDOR (Yarra [4.58].)—It is quite possible that what we are doing to-day may be quoted as a precedent for future action. Whilst I have every sympathy with a number of the cases submitted by honorable members, Parliament is in my opinion the worst possible place in which to deal with such matters. There can be no doubt that if the friends of the persons interested in any claim for compensation are persistent enough they will be able to get something for them on occasions like the present. I should like the Treasurer to say whether it has not been the practice to get the permission of the States Governments concerned for the payment of compensation in these cases.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—That is only as to whether or not we should charge the compensation to a particular State. We could pay this compensation in any circumstances, but it has been the invariable custom to ask the States Governments concerned if they were agreeable to the payments being

charged against them, and I personally do not quite approve of that practice.

Mr. TUDOR.—It is not pleasant to have to oppose any case of the kind. It appears as if one were harsh should he do so, though he might know more about it than other members of the Committee. There are only two Victorian cases in the whole of this list. One of the officers, Colonel Ricardo, was killed in the hunting field. He cannot, by any stretch of imagination, be held to have been killed on duty.

Colonel FOXTON.—He was entitled to two months' leave of absence on full pay.

Mr. TUDOR.—I remember the case of a Victorian officer, dealt with in the Estimates twelve months or two years ago. He had a paralytic stroke, and was unconscious until he died. If he had regained consciousness sufficiently to be able to sign his resignation, his widow would have been entitled to £400 or a month's pay for every year he had been in the service. As it was, she was able to get only £130 out of the Department. There should be one uniform system throughout the States. The matter should not be brought up in this way, leaving honorable members to raise objections when they know that there are valid objections in some cases. It would be very easy for us to shirk our duty now, and to throw the responsibility on to the Treasurer for the whole of the payments. Honorable members should be given in detail the reasons why the money is proposed to be voted. Some of these are apparently hard cases; but there should be no picking and choosing. We should deal either with all alike or with none at all.

Mr. WILKS (Dalley) [5.2].—If any question calls for sympathetic treatment, this one does. The Treasurer has brought down, at the last moment, a list of gratuities and grants. It is most dangerous to deal with matters of that kind in a hurryscurry fashion at the end of a session. It only bears out the justice of my complaint that the Estimates have not been dealt with. If they had been dealt with at the proper time, these matters would have been considered under each Department, and we should have received full explanations as to the validity of the claims. Two of the cases I know are sad and deserving ones; but the whole question really requires special legislation. There is no essential difference between the case of a man who dies a violent death and that of a man who

dies on duty through overwork. The difference is only a question of sentiment; but the honorable member for South Sydney is apparently more concerned about the cases of those who meet with violent deaths. The loss to the family of the officer is no greater in the one case than in the other. I know the case of Mr. Clarke, who was a well-trusted officer of the Postal Department in Sydney. His time was long up to leave the service; he was entitled to draw a large sum from the superannuation fund; he did not draw it; his services as an expert officer were retained in the interests of the Commonwealth; he was pressed to remain, and he did so, although he was in a bad state of health, and he died at his work. He was entitled to certain grants of which his widow is now the loser. Representations were made to the then Postmaster-General, who is now the Minister of Trade and Customs, and that honorable gentleman promised to place a sum of £500 upon the Estimates. That amount appeared on his draft Estimated, but the Treasurer of the day removed it. To-day the same Treasurer proposes a grant of £319, although the Minister whose responsibility it was to inquire into the case, and who had the assistance of his departmental officers, valued the loss of that officer's services, and the gratuity due to the widow at £500. I am not cavilling at the amount now offered by the Treasurer, but I should like to know what system he proceeded on in graduating these grants. The mere fact of impoverished circumstances is not a very good argument. I shall not vote for a grant simply because a certain official has left his widow in impoverished circumstances. The late Colonel Ricardo received a salary of £800 a year and allowances, and we should not expect that his widow would be left badly off.

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—Hear, hear; we ought to compel them to make provision.

Mr. WILKS.—Exactly; but there are hundreds of officers in the Commonwealth service who have just enough to live on, and even if they meet their death in circumstances more severe than those in Colonel Ricardo's case, the plea of impoverished circumstances will be of no avail to those they leave behind. While I will vote for this motion to-day, I do so under protest against the question being dealt with in this hasty manner. I con-

sider that the Government should frame special legislation to deal with it. I happened to know Colonel Bayly, who bore a reputation as a skilful training officer in New South Wales. I know that his widow will be thankful for the grant in this list. In comparison with other grants, the amount is not over large. But putting aside individual cases, I put it to the Treasurer that hundreds of bread-winners lost their lives in the Boer War, while many of those who returned were less capable of earning their livelihood, and surely those who were dependent on them are entitled to as much attention from the Treasurer as he has given to these specialized cases. In the cases of Mrs. Bayly and Mrs. Clarke, members knew the circumstances, and were able to approach the Minister about them. But what about the hundreds of other cases where those concerned have no political friends? The whole matter should not be one of political friendship or knowledge, but should be dealt with in a special Bill, in preparing which the Government must be very careful that their sympathy does not carry them too far, lest the evils of the American pensions system be repeated here. While I will vote for the motion, I regard its introduction as another evidence that the Estimates should be part of the first work of the session, when all matters of this kind can be canvassed and properly dealt with. I hope that other honorable members will assist in passing proper legislation of a definite character next session.

Mr. CROUCH (Corio) [5.9].—The case of Sergeant-Major Coffey, who is a constituent of the honorable member for Kooyong, has been before the House more than once; it was inquired into by the honorable member for Swan when Minister of Defence, who said that he thought it was a most deserving case, and yet it has been overlooked in this list. Apparently that has happened through the Treasurer not having a distinct system to go upon. Of course, that is not the Treasurer's fault, but it is the fault of the House through not giving him a clear direction in the matter. This officer was one of the best sergeant-majors and drill instructors in the Victorian Defence Forces, and because of his smartness, he was selected over other competitors for service in the first contingent for South Africa. He remained in South Africa till 1902, going right through the war, and he returned with injuries from which he died two years and four days later. Had he

died five days earlier than he did, his widow would have been entitled to an Imperial pension; but the Imperial authorities refuse to grant pensions in cases where the men die more than two years afterwards. The result was that this poor woman was left with one son and three other children to battle with the world. During the two years he lived he received his ordinary pay as sergeant-major; and when he died his widow was given the balance of his month's pay.

Mr. EWING.—I do not remember the case.

Mr. CROUCH.—The case was inquired into by the State Treasurer, Mr. Bent, who fully recognised the justice of the claim, but, owing to the fact that at the time of the man's death, in 1903 or 1904, the control of the forces had passed over to the Commonwealth no action was taken by him. Thereupon, the widow applied to the Commonwealth, when it was pointed out to her that her husband had gone to South Africa with a State contingent; and so between the two she got nothing. Unfortunately, the son, who was earning a small wage in a tobacconist's shop, died, and she was left with three girls, only one of whom was earning a living. I have mentioned this matter before in Parliament, and I know that the honorable member for Kooyong has also interested himself in the case. The right honorable member for Swan, when Minister of Defence, made inquiries, and said that, on the first occasion when Parliament dealt with the Defence Act, some provision might be made; and in the meantime he obtained for the woman an allowance of £1 rs. a week from the Victorian Patriotic Fund. It unfortunately happened that of the Patriotic Fund of £150,000 raised in Victoria, all was sent to England except about £40,000; and the money is becoming exhausted. In New South Wales the wiser course was taken of keeping all the Patriotic Fund for the benefit of the soldiers of the State; but, in both cases, funds are running out, and allowances are being reduced. I should like a promise from the Treasurer that not only in the two cases which have been presented to us in what I may describe as a haphazard manner, but that in any case in which a claim would appear to rest on the conscience of the community, or of this Parliament,

favorable consideration will be extended to the persons concerned.

Mr. KNOX (Kooyong) [5.16].—I am much indebted to the honorable member for Corio for referring to the case of Sergeant-Major Coffey, to which I myself have drawn the attention of successive Ministers of Defence. It appears to me most extraordinary that the present Minister of Defence has not been approached about the matter; but I suppose the consideration of the Tariff has driven other matters out of our minds. This is one of the hardest cases that could come under our notice. I rose, however, more to call attention to the case of an officer of the Post and Telegraph Department, in order to show how necessary it is that some system should be devised for the payment of these gratuities. The breadwinner of the family, in the exercise of his duty, became utterly incapacitated, and the victim of suffering, to which death would be almost a relief, is a burden on his family. There ought to be means devised by which unfortunate men so placed shall receive some compensation. I regret that I was quite unaware that these proposals were to be introduced to-day.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—It was only at the last moment that I found it would be possible to introduce them.

Mr. KNOX.—Had I known, I certainly should have asked the Treasurer to include the names of Sergeant-Major Coffey and the postal official I have mentioned. I trust that the passage of the measure before us will not preclude representations being made to Ministers in regard to one or two cases which are prominently in my mind at the present time. With that in view, I am prepared to accept the proposals made by the Minister, believing that the fullest investigation has been made.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [5.17].—If honorable members desire, I shall be glad to give fuller information regarding the cases comprised in this measure.

Mr. KNOX.—I do not think that is necessary.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I hope honorable members will not blame me for introducing this measure at the last moment. We all know how much uncertainty there was as to whether we should be able to terminate the business before Christmas; and to take my chance of an opportunity. the short debate that has taken

place shows that I was right to make this appeal to honorable members. If the Committee desire, I shall be very glad during the recess to consider any very urgent cases which may be submitted, especially where the poorer classes of people are involved. I feel I would be justified, though, perhaps, in a very limited way, in affording relief without waiting for the formal approval of Parliament. However, I have to be very careful to see that money is not wasted, and I have taken every pains not to recognise any claim which could not thoroughly be justified. I hope honorable members will give me the opportunity to pay, before Christmas, the gratuities which have been sanctioned, because I know that in some, if not all, of the cases help is urgently required.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Resolution reported and adopted.

Ordered—

That Sir William Lyne and Mr. Chapman do prepare and bring in a Bill to carry out the foregoing resolution.

Bill presented, and read a first time.

Ordered—

That the second reading be made an Order of the Day for this day, and that the Bill be passed through its remaining stages this day.

Bill read a second time and reported without amendment.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [5.21].—In moving—

That this Bill be now read a third time.

I desire to say that the honorable member for West Sydney brought under my notice two other cases, one that of an officer named Doughty and the other that of an officer named McDonald. He asked me to mention them and to have an inquiry made into them, and I promised to do so.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Bill read a third time.

PUBLIC WORKS EXPENDITURE.

POST AND TELEGRAPH DEPARTMENT.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE (Hume—Treasurer) [5.22].—I beg to lay upon the table the following paper—

Statement of certain expenditure for Works and Buildings not provided for on the Estimates, but urgently required.

I desire to intimate to honorable members that very large claims have been made by the Post and Telegraph Department for expenditure upon what it regards as necessary works. So far I have declined to recognise these claims, and no provision has been made for them upon the Estimates.

But I wish now to make a short statement in reference to this matter, and to announce my intentions in respect to it. Unless exception is taken to the course which I propose I shall follow it. The Postal Department has made very large demands upon me because of the unexpected expansion of business—an expansion which was unforeseen and was not provided for in the Works and Buildings Estimates. This Department alone has asked for more than £100,000. The Postmaster-General has made urgent appeals to me for additional funds for the following purposes:—Ordinary telephone extensions in New South Wales, £34,000; construction of special trunk telephone lines from Sydney to Wollongong, Sydney to Katoomba, and Sydney to Gosford, £6,598; construction of the Sydney-Tenterfield copper telegraph wire, to meet the wire being erected in Queensland to provide for the Inter-State and international business, £11,960; or a total of £52,558. The Department states that unless this expenditure is incurred it will be impossible to complete essential works in New South Wales. An appeal has also been made for £33,240 to be expended in Victoria in providing cables for underground telephone extensions, conduits for same, new junction lines, copper wire, &c. The telephone extensions required in Queensland are estimated to cost £5,526. The Department has also asked for £11,094 for cables for undergrounding the telephone system in South Australia, to make ready for the introduction of the electric tramway system. It represents that this work is extremely urgent, and that unless it is carried out before the electric tramway system in Adelaide is introduced there will be a serious interference with the telephone system. The Department of Home Affairs asks for an amount of £7,679, including £5,000 for an additional story required in connexion with the extension of the General Post Office, Melbourne. I would point out that tenders were accepted for the erection of two stories of this post office, and that they are approaching completion. It is necessary that a roof shall be put on the building. I intend to ask for sufficient money to erect the extra story, so that the roof may be put on, and any claim for double payment obviated. There is no doubt that many of the works asked for are of a very urgent nature, and it is desirable that they should be undertaken during the pre-

sent financial year. Parliament has placed at my disposal the amount of £200,000 under the Treasurer's advance, of which the expenditure of £85,000 has been already authorized. About £36,000 of this amount will be removed when the Appropriation Bill has been passed, leaving £49,000 to be included in the Supplementary Estimates, 1907-8. There remains a balance of £115,000, a part of which could be used for the most urgent works required. I should have preferred to introduce additional Estimates for new works and buildings before the Christmas vacation, in order that parliamentary authority for the expenditure might have been granted, but as it was imperatively necessary that the Committee of Ways and Means should not be interrupted while the Tariff was under discussion, I shall not have an opportunity of introducing these estimates until later in the session. I make this statement now in order that Parliament may understand the situation, and so that honorable members may not be surprised if additional estimates for new works and buildings to the amount of about £120,000 are introduced. In the meantime, unless very strong objection is taken, I shall anticipate the approval of Parliament by authorizing such works as appear to me to be of the most urgent character. I wish further to say that I have not sufficient funds to pay everything within the next three months. But I can select the most urgent works, and ascertain what expenditure will be required upon them until Parliament re-assembles. I shall thus be in a position to enable them to proceed without crippling the Treasurer's advance, and without disturbing the ordinary routine of the Treasury. If no objection be urged to the course which I have outlined, I intend to pursue it in order to prevent the stoppage of works which are now in progress.

Mr. BAMFORD.—We ought to sit all next week to consider the works which have been outlined.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I take it for granted that I am to do the best that I can in this connexion. I am very anxious to be able to come to this House and say, "I have not overstepped the amount of the expenditure foreshadowed in my Budget to any large extent." That is why I express the opinion that if it is overstepped it will be because of the great expansion of the business of the Postal Department, and because of the clamour which has been

raised by honorable members and the public for the carrying out of necessary works.

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—What does the Treasurer propose in regard to granting extra assistance in the postal service?

Mr. MAUGER.—Will the Treasurer supply whatever temporary assistance may be required?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I cannot reply to that question, because I do not know how far I should commit myself.

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—The Treasurer knew the amount the other day.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I have my own opinion about the alleged sweating and the overtime. When a demand for the appointment of 1,000 new hands was made to me before I delivered my Budget Speech, I hesitated before I would sanction the making of so many appointments. In my Budget Speech I said that I would find money for new appointments up to the extent of £400 for permanent and such temporary hands as were absolutely necessary before the matter was dealt with by Parliament, but I would certainly not find the money for all that I was asked to do. I conclude by moving—

That the paper be printed.

Mr. FISHER (Wide Bay) [5.32].—I have listened with care and interest to the statement made by the Treasurer, who, in my opinion, has not absolved himself in any degree from his responsibilities as Treasurer by the statement which he has made. I should like it to be clearly understood that, in my opinion, what he is principally responsible for is the carrying out of the undertakings given in his Budget Speech and the careful administration of the finances of the Commonwealth. Extraordinary statements, such as we have heard this afternoon, must not be taken as absolving the Minister from the obligation of carrying out the policy laid down when he was expounding his Budget a few months ago.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—Hear, hear; but I think the honorable member will admit that I have been bantered considerably over these matters. I have to ward off attacks.

Mr. FISHER.—The first business of the Treasurer of the Commonwealth is to protect the public revenue. I have been more than surprised lately to find Cabinet Ministers bantering each other on matters of expenditure. The sooner that kind of thing is brought to an end the better will it be for the cause of good government.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I do not know what the honorable member is referring to.

Mr. FISHER.—Well, I have heard one Cabinet Minister say that he would do so-and-so if another Minister would give him the money to do it with. Such a condition of affairs does not bespeak good government. That is all that I have to say on that point. The Treasurer is bound to safeguard the interests of the Commonwealth from a financial point of view. No Treasurer has ever held office who has not had demands made upon him for at least twice the amount of expenditure that he was prepared to authorize. A Treasurer is not to be sympathized with simply because more requests are made to him than he can comply with. But it is only just that, having said so much, I should add that a Department like that of the Postmaster-General is an extremely far-reaching Department, and, in many respects, a paying one. Expenditure in connexion with it is not like expenditure on Defence, as to which the money might often as well be thrown into the river. Indeed, it might better be thrown into the river, because then there would be a chance of fishing it out again. But when we spend money on Defence, we have no guarantee that the experts will not tell us that the money we spent last year would have been better unspent. Much of the money spent in connexion with the Post and Telegraph Department is really revenue-producing, and that fact should be kept in mind by the Treasurer. He, of course, must take the responsibility of granting these advances where he thinks that the services that will be rendered, or the income that will follow as a result, will afford a sufficient justification for them to Parliament. I consider that this Parliament has been very generous towards every Treasurer who has taken the responsibility of expending money for the expansion of the services of the Commonwealth. By that I mean, not adding to these actual services by authorizing the appointment of new officers, but providing for public works of a remunerative character. Parliament has always looked very leniently on the actions of a Treasurer who has taken the responsibility of expenditure in such directions. My sympathies will be with the Treasurer if he can see his way to assist in easing off the pressure upon the Post and Telegraph Department. I do not mean that he should authorize a number

of fresh permanent appointments. The Treasurer must keep a vigilant eye on any proposals of that character, because they would mean permanent expenditure. I am referring more particularly to the authorization of expenditure on what is believed to be remunerative work. Of course, the financial responsibility can rest only upon one person, namely, the Treasurer, though secondarily it falls upon the Government of which he is a member.

Mr. KNOX (Kooyong) [5.36].—I am here to assist the Government in the conduct of business. Honorable members cannot reasonably complain that they had no notice that this business was to be brought forward, because I observe that upon to-day's notice-paper it is stated that a Supply Bill is to be brought forward. I am perfectly certain, however, that if it had been known that such a large and exceptional amount was to be asked for, some honorable members who have gone away would have remained.

Mr. MAUGER.—They all knew of the urgent necessity for this expenditure.

Mr. KNOX.—It was not represented to them that the demand would be so large. At all events a considerable number of members are not present.

Mr. MAUGER.—Honorable members are continually urging us to do this work.

Mr. KNOX.—So far as I am concerned, I have only to say that the responsibility must rest upon the Government. I echo what the last speaker has said, that nothing can limit the power of the House in carefully examining the expenditure of the Government. The informal sanction of these proposals must not be taken as any guarantee that full and liberal criticism of the expenditure incurred will not be forthcoming on a future occasion.

Mr. MAUGER.—The honorable member himself has asked for a good many works to be undertaken.

Mr. KNOX.—All the works that I have asked for were just.

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—Very necessary.

Mr. KNOX.—They were both necessary and just. I am sure that Ministers will admit that I do not worry them very often.

Mr. MAUGER.—There is not a line in this schedule that cannot be properly defended.

Mr. KNOX.—I draw attention to the fact that we are authorizing a very large expenditure in a House in which there is only a bare quorum. We are doing this

under a rule which appears to me to be "more honoured in the breach than the observance."

Mr. J. H. CATTS (Cook) [5.39].—We are now asked to give to the Treasurer a sanction to expend a sum of £100,000 on works and buildings.

Mr. BOWDEN.—No; the Treasurer has only made a statement as to what he proposes to do.

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—The Treasurer has made a statement seeking the sanction of honorable members to the expenditure of £100,000 in connexion with the items enumerated in the paper laid upon the table. He has not directly asked for the sanction of the House; but he has asked for an expression of opinion to guide his conduct in the matter. This afternoon, we practically agreed to contribute £5,000 to the cost of the Antarctic Expedition, and to compensate the distressed widows of public officials to the extent of £2,400. What I complain about is that, although the Treasurer can find a way to provide huge sums for those purposes, yet he is blocking reforms which are said by the postal officials to be necessary to put their Department into proper working order, so that the public may obtain value for their money, and public officers receive decent remuneration for their services, instead of being sweated. For some months we have been asking for the paltry sum of £12,000 to put things right in the Department, but the Treasurer has practically withheld that money, and so blocked reforms. On two occasions, I have asked him questions relating to the Post and Telegraph Department, and it appears to me that he is acting Postmaster-General as well as Treasurer.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I am controlling the whole of the expenditure of the Departments that has not been voted, and I will continue to do so, too.

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—It is a peculiar thing that, although the responsible officials state that a certain scheme is necessary in order to get rid of the sweating which obtains in the Post and Telegraph Department, and the Postmaster-General has expressed his willingness to carry out that scheme, yet the Treasurer places his judgment against that of his colleague, and the reports of the postal officials who declare that the scheme is absolutely necessary in the public interests.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I have to find the money, and, of course, they cannot act without money.

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—Certainly, the honorable gentleman has control of the money, but who is to be responsible for the management of the Post and Telegraph Department, in which sweating is carried on?

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—There is too much talk about sweating. I know a good deal of what is going on.

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—There will be continual talk about the sweating until some way is found to get rid of it. Scarcely a day goes by without question upon question being asked as to sweating in the General Post Office at Sydney, and delays in the conduct of business. There is a loud complaint by business men that they cannot obtain the services which the Department says it can supply to the public. Day after day we have questions asked here with a view to procuring some satisfaction, and at last we find that it is the Treasurer who has blocked the way. The postal officials have been blamed before the country.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The honorable member is not helping them. He is doing them more harm than he would if he were to be quiet.

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—I do not think so.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I think so, and the honorable member will know it, too.

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—Once we let the public know who is responsible for blocking the reforms which the Department say are absolutely necessary, and which the public declare almost daily in the press are required, and that the Treasurer has admitted that it is in his power to provide the necessary funds, we shall have advanced a considerable stage towards getting rid of the evil.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—The honorable member is proceeding in the wrong way.

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—I do not think so.

Mr. MAHON.—The Treasurer is like Gibraltar—he cannot be shifted.

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—I believe that he could be shifted much more easily than could Gibraltar. The time is fast coming when we shall have to get some satisfaction in this matter.

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—All right; let the honorable member start now.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I point out to the honorable member that the question before the House is that the paper laid upon the table by the Treasurer be printed.

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—I understand that in placing the paper upon the table, the Treasurer said that if there was no objection offered by the House it was his intention to give authority for the expenditure of this money, and that that course was taken in order to invite an expression of opinion. If we are not allowed to discuss the question, how can he possibly get an expression of opinion? However, sir, in face of your ruling, I do not desire to pursue the matter. I recognise that we can do very little now. I have not yet said much about the sweating which is going on, because I want the Postmaster-General to have every opportunity to make inquiry, and to rectify matters. After finding out that he desires to put things right, and is backed up by the postal officials—

Sir WILLIAM LYNE.—I am not going to be ruled by officials in any Department. There is a great deal too much ruling by officials.

Mr. J. H. CATTS.—What the postal officials have asked for is backed up by the Postmaster-General, whom the House holds responsible for the administration of this Department. The Treasurer should not stand in the way when the Postmaster-General wants the necessary funds to put matters right in his Department. I recognise that at the present time we have not much opportunity of doing anything substantial towards securing necessary reforms, but I intend to be heard on this subject when the House re-assembles next year.

Mr. WILKS (Dallev) [5.46].—I gather that in laying this paper upon the table the Treasurer is simply trying to feel the pulse of the House. He is a foxv old chap, sir. We have known him for years. He is not thinking of to-day, but looking ahead some months when these items will come under review. I am not so young as the honorable member for Cook, and therefore I do not propose to commit myself on this occasion. I am glad to hear the Treasurer say that he intends to button his pockets against the Postmaster-General or any other Minister who wants to catch the public eye by the mere expenditure of large sums of public money. Of course, it is right to expend large sums when the

expenditure is justifiable, but the Treasurer is the custodian of the public purse, and I was glad to hear that he does not intend to allow public officials to have all their own way. That is, I think, a well-timed statement. I believe that the Post and Telegraph Department will have to be put under the control of a Royal Commission, and managed in the same way as are the railways of a State. It is a gigantic Department, and the Treasurer is quite warranted in resisting the appeal for a large sum until he has received further information. I hope that he, as "our uncle," if I may use the term, will be as careful of the funds as was Sir George Turner.

Mr. MAUGER.—Sir George Turner was not in it with the present Treasurer.

Mr. WILKS.—I am very pleased to hear from the Postmaster-General that the present Treasurer is a "Turner *in excelsis*." It is certainly not a very popular rôle to play, but we need care and economy in the control of the public funds. If the Treasurer wants to add to his reputation, the more closely he follows in the footsteps of Sir George Turner the better it will be. If, however, he has exercised more care and economy than did that well-known Treasurer, the Postmaster-General ought to be very glad that he has a colleague to protect him against himself, because he is a soft-hearted sort of chap.

Mr. SPEAKER.—That remark is very unbecoming.

Mr. WILKS.—I meant to say, sir, that the honorable gentleman is soft-hearted. I am very pleased indeed that there is a curb put on him, and the Treasurer may expect honorable members to subject his colleague's demand for money to very severe criticism.

Mr. MAHON (Coolgardie) [5.50].—I would impress upon the Government the necessity, while spending so much money on city services, to be a little more generous in the matter of telephonic, telegraphic, and mail services for country districts. This Parliament has already unduly showered favours on the larger centres of population. For instance, our expenditure upon the over-sea mail service, which is incurred chiefly in the interests of the commercial classes, is twice as much as the return, and yet if I apply for the establishment of a mail service between two country towns I am often met with the answer, "It will

not pay." I experience great difficulty in securing the institution of a mail service for a country district even where I am able to show that it would result in only a small loss, whereas every one seems to be prepared to agree cheerfully to an annual loss of between £60,000 and £70,000 on the over-sea mail service. We recently agreed to the construction of a telephone line between Melbourne and Sydney at a cost of something like £40,000, and, although a very considerable loss is sustained upon it, no one complains.

Mr. MATHEWS.—According to the latest returns it is paying 9 per cent.

Mr. SALMON.—That is only on the cost of construction.

Mr. MAHON.—I have seen no such return, and have no hesitation in asserting that the line will not pay working expenses plus interest on the cost of construction.

Mr. BOWDEN.—It is also used for telegraphic purposes.

Mr. MAHON.—We have to deduct from its earnings a considerable sum in respect of the loss of telegraphic revenue consequent upon the construction of the line. I would urge upon the Postmaster-General the absolute necessity of giving a little more attention to the requirements of rural districts. As a case in point, I would remind the honorable member that the telegraph line on the west coast of Western Australia is so close to the ocean that breakdowns frequently occur.

Mr. MAUGER.—We have taken steps to remedy the trouble.

Mr. MAHON.—On a recent occasion four days elapsed before a break between Hamelin Pool and Roeburne was made good. If a delay of four hours, not to say days, occurred in the delivery of a city mail, or a telephone subscriber in one of our big towns were kept waiting for four minutes by the Exchange, we should have letters of complaint in the press next morning. But the cutting off of a community of pioneers from the outside world excites no outcry whatever. Out of the enormous sum which the Treasurer is finding for the Post and Telegraph Department provision should be made for a more generous country policy, more particularly in those States where the population is constantly expanding into new settlements. I would urge the Government to consider the desirability of departing from the old practice of insisting that all petty services that are sought for shall possess a

reasonable prospect of being remunerative. I have always held that the Postal Department ought to be an auxiliary to the development of the country. I admit that from a strictly departmental point of view that is not considered sound policy. The Department is a purely commercial one, but the Government themselves, in connexion with the oversea mail service, have made an important departure in principle, and are sacrificing something like £70,000 per annum. The Minister therefore should not view too critically requests for small services in outlying parts of the Commonwealth. There are places in my electorate which have only a fortnightly or monthly mail, and although I admit that it would not pay to run a weekly service I think that the Government should at least give some consideration to the wants of the people in such districts. In some parts of Australia men have to travel 200 or 300 miles to reach a telegraph office. I suppose that it is impossible for us to bridge at once such enormous distances, but if the Government can afford to construct a costly telephone line for the special convenience of the merchants of Melbourne and Sydney, they may well be expected to do something for the pioneers who are opening up the back country and making it possible for our city traders to prosper. I do not wish to labour this question. It is one to which I have often referred in the House; and in view of the fact that the Government contemplate this large expenditure, chiefly in respect of city services, I thought it desirable to reiterate my views on the subject. Let me, in conclusion, impress on them that it is not a healthy policy to gorge the people in the cities with postal facilities and to starve those in the country.

Mr. BOWDEN (Nepean) [5.56].—I rise simply to emphasize the point that the mere fact that the Treasurer at this late hour has seen fit to bring down this statement of proposed expenditure, and that we may admit that some of it is urgently necessary, must not be considered to do away with the right of honorable members to criticise at length at some other time the contemplated outlay. The Treasurer must take the full responsibility for it. I simply wish to make it clearly understood that our action on this occasion must not be interpreted as preventing us from scrutinizing, and, if necessary, criticising at some future time the expenditure for which the Treasurer has provided.

Mr. MAUGER (Maribymong—Postmaster-General) [5.57].—In reply to the honorable member for Coolgardie I may say that I have recognised for some time that there is very grave reason for complaint regarding the breakdowns on the telegraph line to which he has referred, and that I have already taken steps to remove what is undoubtedly a grievance. I have also tried to some small extent to make concessions to country districts, and it is certainly my personal desire to help them in every way. My honorable friend has administered the Post and Telegraph Department, and I need hardly remind him that its revenue-earning branches are undoubtedly in the large centres of population.

Mr. HEDGES.—They would be no good without the country districts.

Mr. MAUGER.—I have not said that they would be. I have merely stated the fact that the money-earning centres of the Department are in the large cities, where telephones must be grounded, metallic circuits provided, and up-to-date switchboards placed in position. These works having been commenced must be carried on to completion. In making such a statement, surely I am not detracting from the claims of country districts for consideration. I am entirely in sympathy with the honorable member for Coolgardie regarding the great drawbacks of life in scattered districts, and if I can do anything by means of a reasonable expenditure to help those districts it will certainly be my desire to effect an improvement.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

SECRET DRUGS, CURES, AND FOODS: MR. BEALE'S REPORT.

Mr. DEAKIN (Ballarat—Minister of External Affairs) [5.59].—The House is aware that an important report by a Royal Commission on Secret Drugs, Cures, and Foods was recently laid upon the table, and that certain honorable members questioned the wisdom of circulating it in the form in which it was presented. I therefore invited the assistance of honorable members who are also members of the medical profession, and am much indebted to them—particularly to the honorable member for Laanecoorie—for recommendations as to the portions of the report it would be desirable to distribute. They have ad-

vised the omission of three paragraphs, and of a passage in small print, in regard to which they were unanimous, and we thought that we could not do better than adopt their recommendations on what was strictly a medical question. I therefore lay on the table the revised report in substitution for the report previously presented, and move—

That the paper be printed.

Mr. BOWDEN.—Was the honorable member for Hunter consulted?

Mr. DEAKIN.—Yes; all the medical members of the House.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

PAPER.

Mr. DEAKIN laid upon the table the following paper—

Explanatory memorandum in regard to the New Protection.

Ordered to be printed.

DEFENCE POLICY.

Mr. DEAKIN (Ballarat—Minister of External Affairs) [6.2].—In pursuance of an undertaking given more than once this session, that the policy of the Government in relation to Defence would be submitted to the House before the Christmas adjournment, I take this opportunity to lay our scheme before honorable members. The fact that there is necessarily a small attendance in this last hour of our session this year imposes no disability, because the remarks I desire to offer will consist largely of quotations and figures, rapidly summarized, and, therefore, best studied in print. While it is physically impossible to deal with the whole defence question as it deserves, I shall endeavour to touch, however lightly, upon those many aspects which cannot be omitted without prejudice to a general outline. One of the chief reasons for the union of our States was the need of a common defence; but, until now, we have been content to take the course of expediency, and although there has been combination and reconstruction, the land and sea forces of the Commonwealth are still little more than the collective forces of the States. We now propose a new organization for the defence of Australia. Therefore, we are about to initiate a departure, contemplated at the inception of Federation, and intended to lay the foundation of our defence upon a basis as wide as the Commonwealth, without distinction of States.

This House has just completed its task of dealing fiscally with the industrial conditions of the country as a whole, and it is appropriate that we should proceed to deal nationally with its defence. I am, to a certain extent, in sympathy with the honorable member for Wide Bay, who, by interjection, inferentially deplored expenditure on warlike preparations. It is not because we admire, or desire, offensive warfare that great proposals are now to be submitted for the consideration of Parliament. That we should require to take thought for the morrow in this regard is, to the thoughtful, occasion for inappeasable regret. The enormous annual expenditure of modern nations, severally jealous of each other's possessions and privileges, foreseeing the contingency that they may become involved in deadly conflict, though unhappily an evident necessity, presents humanity in a stage of its evolution which cannot be regarded with pride or satisfaction. To-day the civilized world, and the uncivilized, too, consists of armed nations. Its leading nations are arming with more feverish haste than ever before, and, unhappily, the pace set by the foremost is that with which every people, desiring to protect itself from loss and aggression, must attempt to keep step. This has been termed cut-throat competition; and it is accurately so described. But as no one will suspect Great Britain, or still less one of her dependencies, of seeking to quarrel with her neighbours, or of harboring bellicose designs, we shall be believed when we say that our military preparation is strictly for defence, and with no threat of foreign offence. An obligation is cast upon us to protect the territory with which we have been intrusted, and the fortunes of our kindred who share its responsibilities with us; as our territory is part of the Empire, we are in a measure responsible to all its units across the seas to become to them a source of strength and not of weakness. There was a time, not long since, when it was confidently maintained that Australia was outside the area of the world's conflicts, and might regard in comparative quietude any hostile movements in other parts of the globe. That comfortable outlook has long since passed away. No one can contend that Australia is outside that arena to-day. On the contrary, every decade brings us into closer and closer touch with the subjects of other peoples planted in our

neighbourhood, and with the interests of other peoples more or less antagonistic to our own. Consequently being compelled by the very circumstances of our time and situation to recognise the active lust of conquest existing not only in the industrial but in the national sphere, we must now prepare ourselves to resist the deadlier weapons which are employed in the realm of battle. I would not wish to suggest that naval and military discipline are, so to speak, a dead loss. On the contrary, we must admit that in many respects they both make for physical well-being and to a certain extent, especially in the Navy, for a moral and intellectual tempering. There is some counterbalancing consideration in that regard. Nor can we fail to recognise that in many cases preparations for strife are dictated by high and noble motives. But what I do urge is that the best results from military training are to be obtained in a citizen army exactly in the proportion in which it is a citizen army. When men rally round their hearths and homes simply to safeguard them and those they love, they discharge a duty. They serve peace and justice. The obligation upon all of us is that we should at least hand down to our children the heritage that we ourselves received at birth, undiminished and improved as far as has been possible within our compass. Any preparation for war in our case is for a war of resistance; we prepare for war, in point of fact, only to preserve peace. This is the policy of the Commonwealth. Possessively the Commonwealth has very much to defend. Taking the lower standard one finds that the wealth of Australia has been variously estimated at from £1,000,000,000 to £1,200,000,000. To-day that enormous treasure is placed in the keeping of a handful of population. While we spend annually for the purpose of defence one out of every thousand pounds so reckoned, we certainly can not be accused of anything but the severest business economy of insurance. But obviously it is not upon the lower standard that we are able to measure our risks. If we lost the whole of our financial possessions we should miss them much less than if we were robbed of liberty, constitutional freedom, civilization, and social status. One hesitates even to consider such prospects, and yet one must recollect that there are grave contingencies

Mr. Deakin.

to be kept in view, if it be only at the back of our minds. None of us can conceive Australians in serfdom, or subject to an alien rule. Although the incredible consequences that would follow from the obliteration of our race and nationality can not be compassed by the imagination, we can never forget that what we have most to defend first and last is our national life and ideals more precious than life of the breathing frame. For our defence to-day we spend on the basis of the Estimates for the current year about 6s. per head of our population. Allowing for the pension system in the United States of America their outlay on defence is nearly thrice as large, that of Germany and of France is more than thrice as large, whilst the expenditure in Great Britain is more than twice as much as the German, and nearly twice as much as the French. We cannot therefore be accused of undue extravagance. What we are spending is not in covetous rivalry but for the sake of security. What we endeavour when spending is to obtain value for our money. What we seek is not the development of what is sometimes termed a military as distinguished from a martial spirit. What we aim at is the maximum of good citizenship, with the spirit of patriotism as the chief motive power of a civic defence force. For always, behind the weapons, behind the organization, behind the gun, there is the man. It is in the character and capacity of its manhood that the real strength and energy of resistance of a people must be found.

Mr. CROUCH.—And that is where we come in.

Mr. DEAKIN.—When we do go in we must come out well. In this country we accept the minimum of professional militarism strictly so-called, and in considering our national policy generally we require a maximum of navalism, if I may coin such a word. After all, the British Empire itself and all its parts depend for their unity and guarantee of freedom upon the Navy. That is its first line of defence, and we in Australia are distinguished in this particular, because we must rely more upon it than any other part of the Empire. Ours is an island continent, and its best defence will be that which prevents an invader from ever setting his foot upon our shores. Now, naval discipline and training differ in character very largely from

military training and discipline. The former is much more specialized on shipboard, and even naval militia demand far more training to reach a modern standard of efficiency. Still we have every reason to believe that the national instinct of the sea lives in our section of the race as much as in any other. Certainly every report we obtain, and every evidence we acquire, proves the success of our sailors in the Australian Squadron, and in the examinations and tests with men of the Royal Navy in the Mother Country. All go to show that they are maintaining the reputation of this country, standing well above the average standard achieved even in the finest navy the world possesses. But when asking you to make a far larger provision for naval development than has ever been attempted here, we require to recollect at the very outset that we owe to naval power and to the British flag our freedom in and ownership of this territory, the power to retain it, the whole of our political liberties and social standards. The Commonwealth is governed by a policy appropriately termed that of a "White Australia" because the "white ensign" flies all round our coast. Withdraw that, and peril would be instant. The Mother Country, though still "Mistress of the Seas," submits to have some of the fleets of battle-ships by which her coasts are guarded, occasionally distant from that base. But still those remaining afford her a measure of protection only to be obtained in our case by what would be distinctly termed coastal defence. The squadron in these seas may at any time be removed to the China or Indian Seas. When a parallel is sought to be drawn between her circumstances and ours, this contrast requires to be taken into account. Needless to say, our immense area means a long coast-line, and, therefore, the protection of Australian shores, quite apart from any attempt to share in operations upon the high seas, implies a great burden of responsibility. We are often taunted with paying no adequate share of the cost of, and with taking no part in naval defence on the high seas by, battle-ships. But, although since 1887 I have been engaged, with others, in considering various methods for the measurement of the responsibilities of the several portions of the Empire in regard to the maintenance of its flag upon the worlds' oceans. I have never yet, either by one standard or by any combination of standards, been able to arrive at, or find any one else who has arrived at,

a plan which is ripe for practical consideration. I propose, therefore, to pass by that part of the subject. It is not because we deny the main tenets of the "blue water" school. We admit that the sea is one all the world over, and that, therefore, the navy on the high seas must also be one, in direction and command, all the world over. But what we point to is that our problem of naval defence, putting aside the question of our share in the defence of the high seas, is a special problem to be viewed in the light of our special circumstances. This will be a principal element in shaping the local naval proposals which I shall presently disclose. Let me merely say, in passing, that any personal knowledge I have gained, either by reading or observation, encourages me to believe that, whatever signs of decadence may be discovered by critics in the Mother Country or in any of her departments, the Navy stands out as an exception. It is a distinctly up-to-date force, constantly adjusting itself to fresh conditions, whose officers and men prove on every occasion of trial that they retain, with the dauntless courage of the race, its natural adaptability, not only to the ancient wooden ships of the line, but to the curiously deformed modern structures of enormous interior complexity and deadly power constituting the Navy of to-day. No spectacle in England was, or could be, more impressive either to her own people or to those of us from overseas than that which was lately witnessed at Portsmouth. There in the Channel one saw the "fleets in being" gathered together, realizing by aid of the eye what their potency actually is. Dreadful thunders were locked within those iron hulls, fitted and finished within almost as delicately as a watch, containing every modern improvement, the latest developments of telegraph and telephone, every agency that can protect the crew or destroy a foe, all apparently in perfect condition and under absolute command. The British Navy is a proud and progressive service, not content to rely upon its past laurels, unequalled as they are, but pushing insistently forward, keeping in its iron grip the priority it has held for centuries. Such considerations as these will explain something I have yet to say in due time with regard to what that Navy may mean to us hereafter. We have also to be reminded that the latest vessels of war—battle-ships, armoured cruisers, submarines or

submersibles—from their greatest to their more diminutive sizes, make to-day far heavier and far more general demands on brain, nerve, and hardihood than were ever made in "the brave days of old." The intricacy and variety of their many mechanisms, enormous powers of speed, weight of projectiles and rapidity of firing with the immense range of their weapons of war—require such expert knowledge and training, such readiness of decision and promptitude of action, that they impose a strain upon their crews which would be simply inconceivable to our fighting forefathers who won the splendid sea fights at the beginning of the last century. To-day the Navy—always a service for young men, and consisting, except in positions of the highest command, of men under forty years of age, or very little above it—is to a still greater degree in the smaller craft with their more delicate pieces of mechanism, passing into the hands of young men. Submarines or torpedo destroyers owing to their fragility and high speed, fulfil their regular functions under circumstances of danger, which, in war, when every pulse of the men and the mechanism is at high tension, would be immensely increased. The pressure upon the nerve, courage, and capacity of each unit and upon every man in the British marine is far higher now than it has ever been, and still tends to increase with every one of the marvellous advances which science is making. To preserve naval efficiency under novel conditions such as these imposes much more arduous obligations than at any period in the world's history.

Sitting suspended from 6.27 to 7.45 p.m.

Mr. DEAKIN.—The question of defence, as seen from Australia, falls naturally into three parts. The first relates to the command of the high seas, the next to the protection of our coasts, and the last, to our power to hold our own territory against invaders. For the first, we rely on the Imperial Navy, with its battleships and heavy cruisers, the radius of whose operations, and artillery, is being extended year by year. Our second line of coastal defence has had hitherto a varying history; and as to the land defences which must repel invasion, I shall speak presently. On what may be termed the Imperial line of defence on the high seas, as I have pointed out, our share of

responsibility must be estimated hereafter. At the very outset of the recent Colonial Conference in London, the Prime Minister of Great Britain met us with the frank avowal that the British Government preferred no claim for money in relation to naval defence, and went on to add the extremely pregnant statement that the control of naval defence and foreign affairs must always go together. If honorable members appreciate the force of that axiom, they will see that it implies much both now and in the future. It implies that for the present, seeing that we have no voice in foreign affairs, we are not obliged to take any part in Imperial naval defence. It implies, also, with equal clearness, that when we do take a part in naval defence, we shall be entitled to a share in the direction of foreign affairs. But, in regard to the immediate situation, nothing could be more explicit. As we are in every respect outside of the domain of the foreign affairs of the Empire, and without any voice in the making of war or peace, so we remain for the present outside all responsibility for any naval defence on that score. But the question from our point of view cannot end with any such axiom. In order to mark the change which has come over the policy of British Governments in regard, first of all, to our political relations to the defence problem, and next in regard to the measure of defence which falls to our lot, allow me for a moment to refer to a few incidents in our own history. It was at a Conference in 1881 that the Premiers of the Australian Colonies put forward for the first time a definite doctrine of our mutual responsibilities. The whole naval defence, they said, should rest with the Imperial Government, while the military defence of the land, including the forts for harbor protection, should rest with Australia. That, so far as I remember, was the first definite doctrine laid down as to the division of the task of defence. The Premiers of Australia, on laying down that doctrine, demanded that, as part of the Imperial naval defence, there should be a squadron of Imperial ships set apart for the defence of our coasts. The Admiralty replied, declining to admit that responsibility, unless Australia paid the whole expense of maintaining the Squadron, and even expressed a desire that we should pay the cost of building them. Nothing was done.

Then came, in 1885, Admiral Tryon's scheme; and in 1887, at the first Colonial Conference held in London, a compromise was arrived at, by which a squadron of Imperial ships was set apart for Australia on condition that we shared the cost. The only change that occurred in 1902, when the third Colonial Conference was held, was that the Admiralty pressed hard for an immensely larger contribution than had been previously paid; and it was only after a great deal of bargaining that they consented to accept about half their original demand. Our Australian Naval Agreement Act embodies the arrangement then arrived at. At the same time, instead of being restricted, as before, to Australian waters, the new squadron was permitted to operate in the Australasian, Indian, or China seas. The only Australian characteristic of this squadron was that two of the vessels were to be manned by Australians, who were to receive extra pay. In 1903, in consequence of that Conference, the Act to which I have referred was passed. It sets out, in set terms, that its basis implies a single navy under one authority, and that the squadron, though called Australian, is to be stationed wherever the Admiralty believe it to be most effective for the defence of our trade and interests. At the same time, it is provided that Australia shall be treated as a base for coal and supplies. This Act, as honorable members will recollect, was passed only after protracted discussion. The Admiralty were not satisfied with the contribution made, and a section of our people were not satisfied with the bargain from our side. Consequently, when, in 1905, Admiral Fanshawe delivered several speeches, and one in particular, in which he pointed out the insufficiency of our contribution, I took occasion in August of that year to write to the British Government a despatch challenging his contentions. I pointed out that there was nothing distinctively Australian in the Naval Squadron maintained in these waters, that our support to it had been given in default of better means of co-operation, and that, being in no sense specifically associated with us, it roused no patriotic feeling. No exception was taken to the existence of a Naval Agreement between the British Government and ourselves; on the contrary, that was postulated. But exception was taken to the fact that our contribution was made in money, and only indirectly in men

when they entered the ships of the Squadron. In no other way were they connected with us, or representative of us. My objection was that Australia's part in this agreement was simply to find a certain contribution in money, and my suggestions were that we ought to substitute some active co-operation for this mere cash payment. In 1906 the Admiralty, by despatch, dissociated themselves altogether from Admiral Fanshawe's expressions of dissatisfaction. In October of that year, having in view the then impending Colonial Conference, amongst the resolutions I prepared was one asking reconsideration of the Naval Agreement. It will be found on reference to page 132 of the reports of that Colonial Conference, that, in the course of the debates, I verbally called attention to the same defects, from my point of view, in that Agreement. I contended that the monetary standard was not the most acceptable for an Australian contribution, and that some other form of co-operation was necessary; that, in its present form, the Agreement was not so popular as it ought to be, considering the great popularity of the British Navy—that, in short, the Agreement was not satisfactory to any one, and had been accepted only until a better means of united action could be devised. But shortly before the Colonial Conference opened, a debate occurred in the House of Commons, in which a speech by Mr. Balfour, followed by its indorsement on behalf of the present Government, exhibited an entire change of front on the part of the British Parliament, so far as the political side of this question is concerned. It was then intimated in the clearest terms that so far as the British Parliament was concerned it would make no further demands of any kind upon us in connexion with Imperial Naval Defence. The statement of the Prime Minister, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, that naval defence and foreign affairs must go together was made at the opening of the Imperial Conference in April last. That axiom exactly summed up the effect of the debate in the Commons. At our subsequent meetings, Lord Tweedmouth, who represents the Admiralty in the Government, plainly said—

Speaking for Great Britain and the British Government, we are responsible.

Upon page 129 of the report of the proceedings of the Conference it will be found that he uttered these memorable words—

We want you to give us all the assistance that you can, but we do not come to you as beggars.

we gladly take all that you can give us, but at the same time, if you are not inclined to give us the help that we hope to have from you, we acknowledge our absolute obligation to defend the King's Dominions across the seas to the best of our ability.

That was a splendidly magnanimous attitude. It was in accordance with the axiom of the Prime Minister. As the logical outcome of that axiom His Majesty's Government frankly declared that, having the sole control of the affairs of the Empire, and the sole decision of peace or war, the whole responsibility for the defence of the Empire—irrespective of what we might give—was their care. Upon page 130, Lord Tweedmouth added—

We are quite ready to enter into any arrangement with the Colonies that may seem most suitable to them, and which may seem to bring advantage to the Navy, and advantage to the Colonies themselves.

Upon page 482, by way of interjection, he summed up the Ministerial position very accurately in the statement—

We shall be willing to take in kind what has been paid in the past in hard cash.

That is to say, they are now prepared to accept the proposal that we previously submitted for a contribution by Australia in kind—a contribution from her own men and her own resources, instead of from our purse. But this broad statement, completely in harmony with the Prime Minister's declaration, was afterwards qualified by certain conditions imposed by Lord Tweedmouth. The consistency of these with the axiom of the head of the British Government is still to seek. We shall keep on seeking until we find a constitutional means of Imperial co-operation. Upon page 129 he said, on behalf of the Admiralty, that what he invited us to do was—

to place confidence in the Board of Admiralty, and in the present Government, for the future safety of the country.

That is to say, we were to place confidence in the British Board of Admiralty and in the present British Government for the future safety of the country. Presumably he meant more by the word "country" than the United Kingdom. He then proceeded to invite us to take some "leading part" in making more complete than it is at present the Naval Defence of the Empire. Afterwards he proceeded to the qualifications. He said—

The only reservation that the Admiralty desire to make is (1) that they claim to have the charge of the strategical questions which are necessarily involved in Naval Defence; (2) to hold the command of the Naval Forces of the

country; (3) to arrange the distribution of the ships in the best possible manner to resist attacks, and to defend the Empire at large.

These three very important conditions were followed by the statement that the British Government were responsible for the defence of the Empire, that they wanted us to help them in that defence, but only on the terms mentioned. Again, he said—

I want to claim first your help, and, second, authority to manage this great service without restraint.

Upon page 130 he remarked—

So long as the possession of unity of command and direction of the Fleet is maintained they—

meaning the British Government—

are ready to consider a modification of the existing arrangements to meet the views of the various Colonies.

Once more he said—

The distribution of the Fleet must be determined by strategical requirements, of which the Admiralty is the judge.

On page 148 he urged—

Then there is a point which has been alluded to more than once by speakers, and that is the question of the distribution of ships. At this moment, no doubt we are under certain obligations with regard to Australia, as to the ships that are to be on that particular station. It, in future, as I hope will be the case, there will be greater concentration of the ships, I want it to be very distinctly understood that I do not believe that our Dominions beyond the seas would suffer in any way from such an arrangement.

Again, he declared—

We want to consult with you as to the details of this scheme. Of course, if each separate Colony is to be treated on a different footing, we are quite ready to do that, and to make separate arrangements with each separate Colony according to its own wishes.

These quotations give a good idea of what is expected of us. We are asked to take a "leading part" in making the naval defence of the Empire more complete. Upon page 130 of the report of the proceedings of the Conference, Lord Tweedmouth defined exactly what he hoped would be our part. He said—

It would be of great assistance if the Colonial Governments would undertake (1) to provide for local service in the Imperial Squadrons, the smaller vessels that are useful for defence against possible raids, or for co-operation with the squadron, and also (2) to equip and maintain docks and fitting establishments which can be used by His Majesty's ships. It will further be of much assistance if (3) coaling facilities are provided, and arrangements can be made for a supply of coal and naval stores, which otherwise would have to be sent out specially or purchased locally.

The numbers inserted in the quotations, for convenience, are my own. It will be noticed that our small vessels are to serve "in the Imperial Squadron." Finally, on pages 130 and 131, he made some remarks which are worthy of special note. He suggested that—

If the provision of the smaller craft which are necessarily incident to the work of a great fleet of modern battleships could be made locally, it would be a very great help to the general work of the Navy. You cannot take the small crafts, such as torpedo boats and submarines, across the ocean, and for warships to arrive in South Africa or in Australia or in New Zealand or in Canada, and find ready to their hand well-trained men in vessels of this kind, would be an enormous advantage to them. It would be an enormous advantage to find ready to their hand men well trained, ready to take a part in the work of the fleet. There is, I think, the further advantage in these small flotillas, that they will be an admirable means of coast defence; and that you will be able by the use of them to avoid practically all danger from any sudden raid which might be made by a cruising squadron.

Here our vessels are to be apparently used by us to resist raids, and not necessarily "in the Imperial Squadron." I hope that without wearying the House I have now fairly placed before honorable members the essence of the propositions submitted to us in London by Lord Tweedmouth. Curiously enough, the Admiralty had then arrived at exactly the same position as the Australian Premiers did in 1881. The whole defence of the sea and its control is to be a matter for the British Government and the British Navy. The defence of our shores is to be left to Australia except that there may be a small flotilla of Australian vessels capable of being used by the Navy as a part of its squadron. That represents a political transformation. An equal transformation has taken place in the strategical policy of the Admiralty, which affects us most materially. The old doctrine, so far as I understand it, appeared to be that the strength of the Mother Country was to be asserted by the presence in every important sea of a separate fleet to patrol its waters and to maintain British interests against attack, so that wherever difficulty arose there would be a fleet in that particular portion of the globe prepared for duty. But in recent years the whole view of the Admiralty experts seems to have changed, and although there is still a certain amount of localization of forces the doctrine of concentration has been rapidly developed, and is now being

acted upon all round the world. As honorable members are aware, the old fleets of the Empire in Europe and on the American coast—they have been withdrawn from the latter—have been massed. Second or third rate ships have been discarded to the scrap-heap. The most powerful vessels of the old squadrons have been brought together, in order, instead of having a separate fleet in every ocean, and on almost every coast, to have fleets commanding great areas, consisting of the most powerful vessels, expeditious, and heavily armed, which, when concentrated, are enabled to operate at any particular point with greater effect than was ever attempted before. That is a transformation, as I understand it, of the system of naval strategy which has a great deal of importance for us. There was foreshadowed, in 1903, a sphere of operations for the Australian Squadron enlarged by the addition of the India and China seas. We now know that the fleet usually in Australian waters would be centred in time of war in accordance with the policy of concentration. The best ships of our squadron would be united with the best ships of the India and China Squadrons, and they, operating together, would become responsible for any force anywhere in those three seas. When the first Agreement was sought to be made, in 1881, and was afterwards made in 1887, with the separate Australian Colonies, there was a demand by Australia for the protection of our local shipping by a special fleet, which, though Imperial, was to be in part paid for by us, and was allotted to our coast. That consideration largely disappeared under the Agreement of 1902, and would now, in accordance with present views, disappear altogether. What the Admiralty desire here, in accordance with their policy, is to concentrate the three squadrons in the three Eastern Seas in time of peace. Instead of waiting for those three squadrons to join after a declaration of war, the policy is to unite them and keep them together beforehand. I have here a rough summary of the opinions which I ventured to express in London outside the Conference, adding the wishes of the British Government and of the Admiralty in regard to their present squadrons, including the Australian Fleet. The situation from their point of view and from ours is described in order to prepare the way for a new Agreement which would satisfy the Admiralty as well

as the people of the Commonwealth. I said that according to high authority the present subsidized Australian Squadron ought not to be continued, its best ships should be removed and united with those of the Indian and China Squadrons in one joint Eastern Fleet of powerful vessels. If war broke out this would be done at once now, under the Agreement, so that the concentrated naval force in these seas might be brought to bear upon our foe, wherever he might be found; on our coasts; off Japan; or off Colombo. Consequently, the sooner our present squadron can be merged in this joint Eastern Squadron in time of peace, so as to be ready for war, the better from the Admiralty point of view. The £240,000 subsidy paid by Australia and New Zealand does not compensate the Admiralty for its severance in time of peace from the other two squadrons now existing. It would pay the Admiralty to forego the subsidy and get its best ships into a squadron, free from the limitations imposed by the Australasian Agreement of 1903. While that bargain holds the striking force of the Navy in the East is impaired instead of increased. In the interests of the Empire the Agreement ought to be cancelled, according to the new view, as soon as possible. In the interests of Australia, if they can be considered alone, the same course is necessary. The best defence of this country on the high seas surrounding us can be secured by a joint Eastern Squadron of powerful ships operating wherever necessary. Both the Empire and Australia are therefore losing instead of gaining by the present Agreement. If the three existing squadrons were consolidated so far as their most powerful cruisers were concerned, the rest of the ships now on the Australian station would be left as at present, quite apart from any Agreement. They would patrol the Pacific, conduct surveys, and make their present rounds as they do now. Their base would be in Sydney, where they would use all the accommodation they now possess. They would be seen there and elsewhere on our coasts as occasion required. In addition, the new concentrated squadron would visit Australia save once a year in order that its capitals, which are all on the sea-board, might be kept in touch with the British Navy. This would be the order of things after the Agreement was cancelled, and without any new Agreement being required. Under these circumstances the

Mr. Deakin.

Commonwealth would devote itself to the defence of its harbors and coasts. It would spend the sums advised by the Committee of Imperial Defence in protecting our harbors by shore works. It would, in addition, add local floating defences. Many authorities strongly urge submarines at each principal port; two at least in Sydney and Melbourne, and one at each of the other capitals, together with some swift ocean-going destroyers capable of patrolling our coasts. Pending the building of the latter perhaps the Admiralty could give us a couple of the best cruisers of the "P" class that they are laying aside in the course of their reorganization. We could man these for the time being with Australians now engaged in the squadron, if they were spared to us for a fixed period. In any event, whatever ships and men we obtained would be available in time of war in the event of an attack upon our coasts, in order to act with the concentrated Royal Navy Squadron, or any part of it, in our own waters. These submersibles and destroyers would afford a very real help to the squadron and be of great value from the point of view of Imperial Defence in these seas. They and the harbor works, &c., would represent a greater naval contribution than the present subsidy. Putting it briefly, as I understand it, the policy of the Admiralty itself is that they regard the present Australian Naval Agreement as an encumbrance which they desire to cancel, in order that their ships may be free from any local conditions whatever; and they will only consent to have their ships limited geographically, as they are by the present Agreement, because of our insistence, and because of the contribution which we make towards their upkeep. But for their own part, the Admiralty are, at least, perfectly willing—some of its advisers are anxious—to be entirely freed from the present Agreement. In the next place, they look forward to the Commonwealth undertaking the defence of its harbors and coasts by a small flotilla such as I have already alluded to and subject to a very important and vital consideration to which I shall presently allude. The plan of naval construction suggested by our local officers, two years ago, has since been reviewed, in connexion with the necessary disabilities attaching to any isolated little service of our own, with its costliness and lack of stimulus and training facilities. My view in regard to the flotilla was clearly explained when in London. After quoting what Lord Tweed-

mouth had said about the value to the British Squadron of submersibles or submarines and destroyers in these waters, I went on to insist that these submersibles and destroyers, built, manned, and maintained at the sole expense of the Commonwealth, must remain under the control of the Government. Their distribution and movements would be entirely subject to that Government at all times. That is one of the features to which I wish to call the attention of honorable members, because it is supplemented by a novel proposal for directly associating our naval forces with those of the Mother Country. I ventured to press it then, and, as honorable members will see, am still pressing it upon the acceptance of the Admiralty. While feeling that for every constitutional reason any flotilla created and maintained by the Commonwealth must be under Commonwealth control, I have grown more and more deeply to realize the risks of our attempting to create a small force solely of our own, in which the men and officers would have no hope for experience or advancement except within its bounds. A small flotilla of that description would remain a thing apart, not directly committed to the high standards of the Imperial Navy. In the Imperial Navy, as honorable members are aware, the men and the officers on every station are changed at short periods. Elaborate provisions are made to prevent them becoming hide-bound, sit-at-ease, indifferent or mechanical. They are transferred from ship to ship. They are put regularly through fresh courses of training. They have to return periodically to learn the latest methods in their particular departments. The consequence is that the Royal Navy is a most progressive weapon, always kept up-to-date, its men constantly in practical training, and always stimulated by competition, by examination, and by every other means which can be applied, in addition to the always powerful incitements offered by frequent prospects of promotion to vacancies in the many Fleets of the Empire. I think that the more honorable members reflect upon it, the more they will see how different must be the condition of a little land-locked navy—if one may so call it—of a small flotilla cut off by itself, its officers and men removed from the possibilities of promotion or advancement, except by the slow and often unsatisfactory process of seniority, and with few opportunities for them to

keep themselves abreast of the rapid advances made in their branches of the service. I contend, with the diffidence which must attach to a layman, though with some confidence, that the force of these criticisms will be made apparent if you take any country with a small flotilla or a few small ships, and compare these with the same class of ships and the same class of men engaged in larger fleets with larger opportunities, and above all with those of the greatest of maritime powers, the British Navy. I ventured, therefore, to attempt to find a means by which we could get the whole benefit of connexion with the Admiralty and the Imperial Fleet, sharing its standards, its training and its prizes, and yet maintain the Australian character of our flotilla, and so make the suggestion which I now summarize. Let our officers and men be engaged here, under the same conditions as those of the Royal Navy, or be obtained after they have served in the Royal Navy. Let them serve on our local vessels for the usual term on this station, whatever it may be, and then pass into other ships of the Royal Navy, to continue their training elsewhere. This would keep them, while here, up to a standard of efficiency equal, at least, to that required everywhere in the Royal Navy. They would remain members of that Navy in every sense, recruited and serving under its laws. Their services in our ships would count in the same fashion as upon similar vessels in the Navy. They would be regularly inspected here by the Admiral or his deputies, and be subject to naval discipline and to all the penalties and privileges associated with such discipline. Australia would pay them, while they were on this station, at Australian rates of pay, though of course they would accept the usual deductions necessary to continue their title to share in the Royal Navy Pensions Fund. Preference would be given wherever possible in our vessels to Australian officers and seamen at every opportunity that occurred. Our ships would fly the White Ensign with the Southern Cross, and be altogether Australian in cost and in political control, as to their movements and stations. In everything else, they would be part of the British Navy, the officers and men being simply seconded for fixed terms for service under our general control; but in every other respect indistinguishable from the men in the Imperial Squadrons here or elsewhere. In

time of war, they would almost certainly be placed by the Commonwealth Government of the day directly under the Admiral commanding the Eastern Squadron, since he would be the highest naval authority in this part of the world. I doubted in London, and still continue to doubt, if any conditions would be imposed upon this transfer at such a time, but it must be clearly understood that the decision on these points must rest absolutely in the hands of the responsible Government of Australia when the emergency arises. We want the most effective ships and the most efficient men we can get here, with ample prospects of advancement to the latter when they merit it. We also want a flexible relation, as intimate as possible, between our Government and the Admiralty, which shall encourage the development of our local defence to the fullest extent, and in such a form as to supplement to the best advantage the Imperial Navy in our hemisphere. I took the opportunity, on my own personal responsibility, of pressing that upon the Admiralty and upon the British Government as, at all events, one means by which our flotilla might be kept entirely up to date, its Australian character maintained, and the control of the Commonwealth Government asserted. Under this plan we should procure, by the expenditure of the same amount of money, a far more efficient, active, and progressive service than we could hope to do with a navy in a back water—a service solely our own, and limited by our exchequer. It would then be practically a branch of the British Fleet, though under the Commonwealth, so far as political control was concerned.

Mr. BOWDEN.—There would be divided control in time of war.

Mr. DEAKIN.—No; the whole control would be in the Commonwealth, but if in a time of danger it chose to place its flotilla under the command of the Admiral on this station—and in the event of operations here I should say that, in almost every circumstance, one can imagine, that would probably be the case—it would then pass wholly under his control for the time being.

Colonel FOXTON.—But if it did not choose to do so?

Mr. DEAKIN.—Parliament would retain the whole control.

Colonel FOXTON.—We would have this anomaly, that there would be men and

officers of the Royal Navy practically unable to serve therein.

Mr. DEAKIN.—Not so, and why? Because, instead of being taken from the Royal Navy, our squadron would be an addition to the Royal Navy, and would not take anything from that Royal Navy even if not added to it. It would, perhaps, be less effectively employed apart, but, whatever it did, would help the British Squadron and assist to protect this part of the Empire. The Royal Navy could lose nothing by the existence of a special force, created and maintained at our expense, and not at that of the British taxpayer. So far as one can judge, almost under any conceivable conditions, the Government of the Commonwealth would feel that its safety was best served by placing those ships under the control of the highest naval expert in these seas.

Colonel FOXTON.—Almost certainly, I should think.

Mr. DEAKIN.—I should say so; but, after all, a Government's responsibility is to their people, and the Government must be answerable only to them directly. To part with its control altogether would be to part with the Australian character of this local flotilla, which is one of the elements that we hope to use for the development of the maritime spirit in this part of the world. By its means we can make a real addition to the British Navy. Our Squadron being an addition, although part of, the Royal Navy, could be employed with its ships to our mutual great advantage.

Mr. SALMON.—And Australia would become a recruiting ground for the Imperial Navy.

Mr. DEAKIN.—As it would to the same extent in no other way.

Mr. WILKS.—It would be an auxiliary squadron.

Mr. DEAKIN.—It would be an auxiliary squadron in the sense of being trained in exactly the same way as the Royal Navy, and, therefore, capable of acting with it as an auxiliary just as troops who are drilled together can act together. In fact, it would be part of the British Navy. The question between us at present is not principally one affecting our present payment towards the upkeep of the Squadron. As showing the attitude which the Ad-

miralty adopted towards the subsidy, Lord Tweedmouth said—

The best way to start the system he was suggesting would be to allocate for local purposes certain portions of the subsidies already given. The particular purposes to which that money should be devoted should be discussed in detail between representatives of the various Colonies and the Admiralty, so that a thoroughly good scheme might be worked out in the end.

The real question is one of control, though that only emerges gradually into view as the negotiations proceed. The problem before us is the association of our small naval strength with the great organization of fleets of the Mother Country so as to secure the highest efficiency and unity without sacrificing our right to the constitutional control of our own funds, and of any flotilla built and maintained at our own cost. I have made numerous quotations because honorable members, when they come to read them, will see certain inconsistencies appearing to have beset Lord Tweedmouth's mind at that time—inevitable contradictions that have since become clear, but which only subsequent events enabled us to discover. Honorable members will see that on the part of the Admiralty there are to be no more demands on Australia—no official claims for money. But there are conditions sought to be imposed though these differ in substance from the demands originally made on us. Of course honorable members will not forget that there are two branches of naval defence as it will be undertaken by the Commonwealth. First there is the British Squadron for which we make a contribution in money. It is with that, and with that alone, that the Admiralty are dealing in the correspondence presently to be read. But quite apart from that, there is about to be created by ourselves, at an expenditure of £250,000 a year, a force, towards which the Admiralty will not contribute, and over which they can claim no control except that which this Parliament may be pleased to give them. I ask honorable members to keep in their minds those two separate sets of proposals, because all the references made by the Admiralty relate only to our present contribution and their Squadron. We pay £200,000 a year to that Squadron, and that contribution is often ridiculed overseas. I venture to say that by no comparative test can it be subjected to ridicule. It will compare favorably with the £50,000 a year contributed by Cape Colony, with the £40,000 a year contributed by New Zealand, with the £35,000

a year contributed by Natal, and with the £3,000 a year contributed by Newfoundland. While the expenditure in Canada amounts to £185,000 a year, it is for the protection of her own fisheries, on docks which her vessels have to use, and on other matters from which direct local commercial benefits arise.

Mr. KING O'MALLEY.—Does Canada contribute nothing to the British Navy?

Mr. DEAKIN. — Not directly; she spends £185,000 on services which not only serve Canadian, but also Imperial ends, and are, therefore, counted by her as a contribution towards defence. I am not criticising that course, and certainly am not objecting to it, but point out that we cannot measure that expenditure of £185,000, from which the Canadians get considerable local present commercial benefits, with our contribution of £200,000, from which we get nothing of that kind.

Mr. FISHER.—They do not conceal the fact that they do not intend to pay a subsidy to the British Navy.

Mr. DEAKIN.—They do not conceal that fact; but I am not called upon to criticise them.

Colonel FOXTON.—Do not the Straits Settlements contribute anything to the British Navy?

Mr. DEAKIN.—A small amount is contributed, but that is a Crown Colony, and I am dealing with self-governing Colonies. At the present time, the Admiralty have consented to compound, so to speak, the contribution which has been made by Natal hitherto, and propose to compound that made by Cape Colony, accepting instead of cash a naval militia, drilled on a vessel which is to be provided by them, and also on certain submarines and destroyers, to be built and manned locally, at the expense of the Colony. Under what control they are to be placed I am not informed. It is in pursuance of our proposal that we should contribute in kind, instead of in cash, for the further term which our Naval Agreement has to run, and that it should be amended to that end, that since returning from London, having been in communication with the Admiralty, unofficially, since August last, and officially since September last, about the 23rd September I sent the following cablegram—

"In pursuance of my conversation, Tweedmouth and the Admiralty in London, and Ewing's conversation with Your Excellency, please telegraph to Admiralty inquiring whether followin

proposals, approved for amendments in Naval Agreement, substituting for present Commonwealth subsidy—

that is £200,000 a year—

offer one thousand seamen, Australians if possible, to be paid by Commonwealth for service in Navy on this Station, estimated cost of about £100,000 to Commonwealth per annum, remainder of present subsidy to be applied by Commonwealth to submersibles or destroyers, or similar local defences, as suggested London Conference. Two cruisers, "P" or superior, manned by 400 of the 1,000 Australians, to be retained Australian coast, peace or war. Loan of two "P" cruisers or superior, to be maintained by Commonwealth for training local Naval Militia, at estimated cost to Commonwealth of £60,000 per annum. This proposed amendment is in addition to Commonwealth vote this year—£250,000 for naval, harbor, and coast defence, and £50,000 for fortification harbors."

That is a proposal by which, in the opinion of this Government, we could make a contribution not open to the objections raised to the present Agreement, for it would be a contribution of men instead of money. In letting our contribution take that form, we should be considering our own interests as well as those of the Navy. The experience our men would gain upon ships of the Royal Navy would admirably qualify them for manning any ships that might be built and controlled by the Commonwealth. It would also provide for their receiving the most up-to-date training. Of the 1,000 Australian seamen whom we had hoped by this means to have qualifying on our coast 400 would man two cruisers stationed on our coasts. The "P" cruisers, I may say, are regarded as going out of date. Still these two cruisers manned by 400 Australians, and the other two manned by our naval militia, would at all events bridge the gulf between the present time and the season not too distant when the Commonwealth will probably have ships on which to place them. This contribution would develop the naval strength of Australia, relieve the Admiralty of the cost of 1,000 seamen, and be one which, I thought, they would be glad to accept, and we might be proud to tender.

Mr. WILKS.—It is men that they mostly need.

Mr. DEAKIN.—Not in other parts of the world. They have six offering for every one they are able to take. The Royal Navy has the pick of British seamen. We have to remember, however, that ours is a remote station, and that crews have to be sent at considerable expense over long distances for three years' service. That being

so, the contribution of 1,000 Australians would afford material relief to the Admiralty, and be a substantial support to the Squadron. Our despatch of 16th October, 1907, which summarises the history of the negotiations to date, reads as follows—

Prime Minister,
Melbourne, 16th October, 1907.

My Lord,

I have the honour to request that Your Excellency will communicate with the Secretary of State for the Colonies, inviting him to refer the Admiralty to my despatch of the 28th August, 1905, of which, for greater convenience, I enclose a copy. [*Commonwealth Parliamentary Paper*, Senate, No. 98 (1906).]

2. The subject therein dealt with has been fully and thoughtfully considered during the period which has elapsed since it was written, not only by Ministers here, but also during the recent Conference in London, where I had the great advantage of personally discussing the matter with Lord Tweedmouth and the heads of his Department.

3. Speaking generally, the further consideration which has been given strengthens the conclusions put forward in 1905, particularly those in which I dwelt upon the fact that at present none of our grant is applied to any distinctively Australian purpose, while our contribution would seem in part repaid if we were enabled to take a direct and active part in the protection of our shores and shipping. Our sole aim then, as now, was that of uniting with the Mother Country in the necessary preparations for national defence, and the scheme I have lately submitted included a method of sharing in the duty of naval defences by means of a contribution of Australian seamen instead of money, which is allied to the provision for the selection and partial training of the crews engaged in the proposed steamer service as members of the Royal Navy Reserve formerly submitted.

4. As the replies received to the despatch of 1905, which appear also on the paper enclosed, expressed disapproval of the special suggestion then put forward, the Government now invite reference to that part of the despatch of 23rd May in which the Lords of the Admiralty intimate that other aspects of the matter might be viewed with favour. A specially suitable opportunity for discussing these was presented in connexion with the London Conference, when the whole question was generally reviewed as far as practicable, considering the limited time at our disposal. Lord Tweedmouth, speaking on behalf of the British Government, was most generous, and Ministers have confidence that the proposals now put forward by the Commonwealth in consonance with his suggestion will be adopted upon the advice of the Admiralty.

5. It was my intention, on returning, to take immediate steps to give effect to the general understanding arrived at in London had not personal disabilities prevented me from giving it until recently the close attention which its details demand. After several conversations on the subject between the Minister for Defence, on behalf of the Government, and His Excellency the Admiral, whose freely-given assistance has been most highly valued, His Excellency was asked to telegraph to the Admiralty the proposals of this Government with reference to the

Naval Agreement of 1903. The telegram which I sent to Admiral Fawkes was as follows :—

"Confidential.—In pursuance of my conversation, Tweedmouth and the Admiralty in London, and Ewing's conversation with Your Excellency, please telegraph to Admiralty inquiring whether following proposals, approved for amendments in Naval Agreement, substituting for present Commonwealth subsidy offer one thousand seamen, Australians if possible, to be paid by Commonwealth for service in Navy on this Station, estimated cost of about £100,000 to Commonwealth per annum, remainder of present subsidy to be applied by Commonwealth to submersibles or destroyers, or similar local defences, as suggested London Conference. Two cruisers, 'P' or superior, manned by 400 of the 1,000 Australians, to be retained Australian coast, peace or war. Loan of two 'P' cruisers or superior, to be maintained by Commonwealth for training local Naval Militia, at estimated cost to Commonwealth of £60,000 per annum. This proposed amendment is in addition to Commonwealth vote this year—£250,000 for naval, harbor, and coast defence, and £50,000 for fortification harbors."

6. To a subsequent inquiry by the Admiral as to whether any Australian Naval Reserve that might be kept up would be included in the Naval Militia, a reply was sent that it had been agreed in London that this Government would take over the Naval Reserve in Australia.

7. The Parliament of the Commonwealth is now sitting, and members anticipate that before they rise the proposals of the Government in regard to naval defence, or at least a complete outline of them, will be submitted for their consideration. The matter is therefore urgent, and it was hoped that some general indication of approval by the Admiralty of the principles of the proposal forwarded, perhaps coupled with criticisms of some portion of it, might have been given by cable. The suggestions were made in the same spirit as that which inspired the despatch of August, 1905, and were intended as a groundwork which might become the basis of a formal proposal to be conveyed by despatch.

8. I am writing this now expecting that it will reach England in time to be considered in connexion with the cable message from the Admiral, and for the purpose of supporting the proposals therein made. These have been evolved, and are now put forward in the belief that they will form a means of promoting and enlarging that national co-operation and fostering that stronger sense of mutual support alluded to in my former despatch.

9. That communication concluded with a statement that the very life of the Empire depends on the Navy, and pointed out the necessity for taking every step possible to increase our maritime strength to enable us to meet all emergencies that International difficulties may create. That opinion becomes more deeply rooted in view of the consistent efforts of rival foreign powers to increase their influence. It is the conviction of Ministers that our proposed expenditure on defensive craft, which, while satisfying the desire for a visible and ever-present

means of immediate protection, would yet be capable of effective employment in co-operation with His Majesty's largest ships upon our coasts, would materially foster the desire among our people for a sea career, and so increase our maritime resources in a direction in which improvement is greatly needed.

10. I shall be glad if Your Excellency will request that this communication be forwarded to the Admiralty without delay, and will commend it to their immediate and favorable consideration.

11. If the scheme suggested is approved, some amendment will be necessary in the Naval Agreement of 1902, which forms the schedule to our Naval Agreement Act of 1903. Article VIII. will require to be recast, and some minor alterations made in Articles V. and VII., and, perhaps, XII., but the precise form can be settled later.

12. Perhaps the Secretary of State will suggest to the Admiralty that they should submit a draft of any amendments necessary to give effect to the foregoing proposals.—I have, &c., (Sgd.) ALFRED DEAKIN.

Governor-General, His Excellency, The Right Honorable Lord Northcote, G.C.M.G., G.C.I.E., &c.

That despatch was followed by certain unimportant cablegrams, and ultimately by the following cabled reply to our offer from the Lords of the Admiralty—

Referring to your telegram of 6th December, Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty point out that scheme proposed in your despatch, No. 249, goes beyond general undertaking arrived at during Conference. After full consideration, they regret that they cannot accept these proposals as they stand as basis of new agreement in substitution for Naval Agreement.

They adhere to the position taken up at Conference, that while they did not themselves propose to cancel the existing agreement, they were prepared to co-operate with the Colonial Governments if any alteration was desired by them, but so long as the existing agreement is not cancelled, the Admiralty is precluded from making the necessary strategical disposition of Naval Forces, and, therefore, the first condition of any new arrangement must be the cancellation of the agreement.

After what I have said as to the present policy of concentration that is readily intelligible to honorable members.

Mr. HUME COOK.—Any new arrangement would have to be by mutual consent.

Mr. DEAKIN.—Certainly. Then they proceed—

The Admiralty fear that they are not in position now to express opinion on the details of the scheme, which have not been yet put forward in sufficient detail to form basis of a new agreement. Your Premier appeared at Conference to realize that under scheme then sketched by him Admiralty would not be bound to maintain any particular ships permanently in Australian waters, and their Lordships are prepared to advise and assist in carrying out either the scheme submitted by Mr. Deakin at Conference, or any approved modified scheme for local defence, provided that such a scheme does not involve

a definite pledge to maintain particular vessels permanently in Australian waters. Before any definite conclusion can be arrived at, it will be necessary to ascertain the views of the Government of New Zealand as to any proposed alterations, and, further, Admiralty desire it to be understood that no increase of Imperial expenditure beyond that involved in the existing agreement can be entertained—

These are the last words, and the most important in the communication—

and regard it as essential complete control in time of war over local forces must be secured to Commander-in-Chief.

That means the Admiral on this station. It is a stipulation for his control, irrespective of the consent of the Commonwealth Government, of all the "P" cruisers, or, at all events, of the two manned by 400 men, and possibly of any smaller craft built by us with the remainder of the present subsidy. While we are invited to take a leading part in naval defence, that leading part is to be confined to times of peace so far as our control is concerned, and is to involve no control in time of war.

Mr. FISHER.—That is impossible.

Mr. DEAKIN.—I replied in these terms on Monday last—

Cablegram received with thanks for prompt reply. Ministers are unable to gather—(1) Assuming existing agreement cancelled, what amendments Admiralty propose in new agreement in addition to those mentioned in despatch of October 16th, paragraph eleven (11);

in which I indicated what articles in the present Agreement would need to be amended if the Government's proposal were adopted—

or (2) in what respects their proposal goes beyond the general understanding at the Conference; or (3) beyond any scheme submitted by Deakin at the Conference, Ministers wish to learn whether allusion to particular ships maintained permanently Australian waters refers anything more than cruisers manned by Australians; also what increase in Imperial expenditure is involved if their proposals are accepted. Control of vessels built and maintained at Commonwealth expense must rest with its Parliament, which would place them under Commander-in-Chief whenever that was deemed necessary. Ministers hoped that scheme by which these vessels would be maintained at standards of Royal Navy, both officers and men being trained in and passing through the Navy when not serving on Australian coast, would mean creation efficient auxiliary force of value to the Empire and precedent for other Dominions. New Zealand has been informed of the proposals, and will be again communicated with on receipt of reply to this.

That is the stage at which the negotiations at present stand. The impression left upon my mind by my visit to London was that the proposals made by us, and

roughly summarized in the notes from which I recently read, would be accepted cordially. I wish it to be clearly understood, however, that this does not imply that the Admiralty itself, which is the authority now negotiating with us, speaking as the Admiralty, was committed to any definite view. But, having met leading members of the Admiralty Commission and some of their leading officers, including most of the Intelligence Branch, and having discussed matters with them at great length and in detail, it appeared to me that the demand for control first put forward had been modified, and that we had every reason to expect a glad welcome to our offer. For that reason, amongst others, I proceeded deliberately and with confidence in the preliminary negotiations to which allusion has been made. I by no means despair of my proposition, and trust that the view now expressed by the Admiralty will not be maintained for any length of time. We had the great advantage, before submitting it, of receiving the kind assistance of His Excellency Sir Wilmot Fawkes. When our proposal is fully weighed and considered, it should commend itself to the Admiralty as a whole, as I know it did to some of its prominent Lords and their advisers. Hoping to have met the House with a complete agreement, under the circumstances it appeared advisable to take honorable members entirely into our confidence, and I have therefore informed them of the whole of the official communications to date. This is one of the questions which will require to be carefully pondered before our reassembling, when we shall proceed to deal with the Ministerial proposal for a vote of £250,000 towards building, maintaining and manning, a small flotilla of our own. The Admiralty is apparently endeavouring to insist upon exercising its authority in time of war to distribute its vessels where it pleases. I do not deny that it might be a wise thing for our flotilla to be attached to the concentrated British Fleet on these seas, and even to proceed with it to a considerable distance from our coast to cope with the enemy. The modern naval doctrine appears to be Napoleonic—that you should always be in greater force than your enemy at the particular point of attack. I do not dispute that this might be the wisest tactic, and am far from doubting the fitness of the Admiral of the station to advise the Government of the Commonwealth in time of war upon the disposal of our vessels.

On the professional side, I offer no opinion. What I contend for is a constitutional, not a naval, principle. Even a desirable thing loses much of its desirableness when an attempt is made to force it on a self-governing community, having the right to choose its own path, and accept the consequences. It will be dangerous for the Admiralty to insist on a supremacy which, if misadventure befel, would place the whole responsibility upon them. The Government of the Commonwealth, representing the Australian people, is entitled in this, as in every other matter, to speak and act for them. I have indicated how in my opinion it would act. Weighing its responsibilities, it must do what it believes best in the interests of the people. From this principle there can be no departure. I now turn to the proposals for expenditure on what I will term, for the sake of distinction, our local naval force. I had occasion in London to object, and wish now, to object, to the sense in which those words are often construed. I maintained at both Conferences, in 1887, when representing only Victoria, and in 1907, when I had the honour to represent the Commonwealth, that accepting the doctrine that the Empire is one—which is the only true foundation for Imperial sentiment—we must recognise that all the means of defending any part of it are Imperial. Ships protecting the Australian coast are as much Imperial as any that are protecting the Mother Country, and the naval force under the Union Jack and Southern Cross that beats off a hostile power in the Australian seas is as much Imperial as any under the Union Jack alone. Although "local defence" properly defines craft which cannot be sent long distances, and therefore operate always within a certain radius, to the full extent of its efficiency, it is Imperial as well. In speaking of our local defence, I speak of vessels whose sphere is practically limited to Australian waters. Yet these will be engaged in the defence of the Empire just as much as if they fought at the mouth of the Thames. Those who hear me will remember how Lord Tweedmouth alludes to the value of such a flotilla. It would be, he said, "of great assistance," of "much help," of "enormous advantage." Local defence is Imperial defence at a particular spot, but none the less Imperial on that account. With vessels built for, and presently, I hope, built by Australians,

manned by Australians, trained and kept up to the Royal Navy standard, we shall be gratifying Australian aspirations, while making the most real contribution to the defence of the Empire. In providing that part of our defence which will be absolutely under our own control, it appears to me reasonable to proceed from the ports and the shores outwards. We should commence by furnishing the naval defence necessary or advisable to supplement our shore defences, and having provided for the harbors, establish a zone round them which would permit free exit and entrance for vessels in times of war. Hereafter we shall also provide other and more powerful vessels for coastal defence. It seems a reasonable thing to begin at our centres. Most of our great cities are on or near the coast. We have a large and valuable commerce, Inter-State as well as oversea, which requires to be taken into consideration. Local naval defence demands vessels and men. After what I said at the outset, honorable members will sufficiently realize that those vessels, even though they may be small, carrying comparatively small crews, will be extremely complicated, and highly specialized, needing highly expert seamen. These will have to be picked as they are picked in the Imperial Navy. Men in their prime, chosen for their capacity, and subjected to thorough training will be required. In 1887, when returning from the first Conference which I had the honour to attend, I expressed the aspiration that I might live to see the day when, in place of subsidizing a Squadron, Australia would supply ships built, manned, and commanded by Australians. That time is now arriving. But the conflict of opinion as to the best means of defence and the particular type of vessel most advantageous under our circumstances is acute in the Mother Country, and echoed here. I am not competent to decide the question, but Lord Tweedmouth, speaking for the Admiralty at the Imperial Conference, strongly recommended submarines. They were, he said, the weapons of the future. They were directly suggested by him to Sir Joseph Ward as suitable for the New Zealand coast, and he expressed the opinion that before long they would supersede destroyers. He asserted that they were the best weapons available. In these circumstances, having regard to his official advisers, it

would be unwise for us to reject his counsel. Even in face of the fact that high authority, that men well known to us and to the Empire as experts of very high standing, such as Sir George Sydenham Clarke, who, although a soldier, has made a study of naval defence, also Admiral Cyprian Bridges, and some of our own naval officers, consider that, though the submarine may prove to be the most effective instrument in the future, its superiority has not been demonstrated as yet, our intention is to adopt this type of defence, if possible. So far as I could judge from the members of the Admiralty, from their officers, and from criticism in London, the main opinion of what might be termed the younger generation is almost entirely in its favour. We cannot shut our eyes to the fact that every powerful maritime nation to-day is largely adding to the number of its submarines. None of them have abandoned their experiments or reduced their numbers, though it may be admitted, and is perfectly true, that the submarine, as well as other vessels, is by no means perfected, and is undergoing frequent alterations. Though authorities differ, the submarine is admitted to be a most potent form of weapon if it were only because of its moral effect upon an attacking squadron. Having had an opportunity at Portsmouth of seeing these curious, porpoise-like vessels, as they approached, gradually submerging until nothing but the periscopes appeared above the surface, these, too, disappearing and leaving no trace of their movements, the spectacle was very convincing. Presently they returned to the surface. Now, seeing the facility with which they could cease to be visible, it became evident how demoralizing it must be to those in charge of battle-ships or cruisers to know that in their vicinity—where they do not know and cannot discover—there are enemies of insidious approach, capable of doing immense damage. Consequently, after the best consideration we could give to the matter, in face of admitted differences of opinion, it seems to us that for Australian harbor defence, and even for spaces immediately surrounding a harbor's mouth, in which hostile vessels would require to lie if they endeavoured to bottle up our shipping, the submarine is probably the best weapon. We have referred to submersibles, which honorable members, no doubt, are aware are

larger vessels with two motive powers, one using coal or oil when the vessel is on the surface, and the other using electricity, or possibly petrol, when the vessel is below the surface. Though not as favoured as submarines, it is possible that they may prove to be even better suited to some of our ports, but that is a matter for detailed consideration. When I spoke recently of the strain to which seamen in modern vessels are always subjected, it is to be recollected that this is especially true of submarines and submersibles. The youngest, most gallant, and ablest officers of the Navy are selected for this service; immensely proud they are of their task, and never in the slightest degree afraid of the risks that it involves. But it must be recognised that the maintenance of submarines in an efficient condition means, as I have said, a change every three years or so in order to relieve the strain upon the crews and in order to improve their training. Consequently, if we have a land-locked navy, our submarines would possibly become unsuitable, because we could not rely upon the crews and officers being kept up to the highest state of efficiency. It is pointed out by Lord Tweedmouth that the higher ratings, even of the ordinary British seaman, take six years to gain, and that all officers serve eight years before they reach even the rank of lieutenant. Those employed on submarines in particular require a specially long and severe training. Honorable members will now perceive the purpose of the remarks which I made at the outset. The smallest vessels, and perhaps these more than all others, require crews of great skill and capacity, high scientific training as well as very great courage and resource, and yet it is upon these apparently that Australians in the first instance should rely. The best submarines are those at present known as the C class. I have seen three classes, A, B, and C. The C class will probably in a short time be surpassed by the D class, now in prospect. The C class is at present the most modern submarine in Great Britain. We shall probably propose to the House, subject to a condition I will mention presently, that three of these should be purchased each year for three years, and that in addition to them two torpedo boat (coastal) destroyers, the most up-to-date of their class should be built annually for three years. This would give us at the end of that period nine sub-

marines and six torpedo boat (coastal) destroyers—fifteen small vessels in commission after the three years' programme is completed. Of course, these would be outside the Naval Agreement, and remain solely under Commonwealth control, although, as before stated, in my judgment they would be treated in the same way as any built under the new Agreement in time of war. The torpedo boat (coastal) destroyer is fitted with turbine engines, oil fuel, three torpedo tubes, and also carries two twelve-pounders. She would have a speed of twenty-six knots, and a complement of thirty-three men. The C class of submarines, whose details, as I have said, may be somewhat altered in the D class, would have an approximate speed on the surface of fourteen knots, with a speed when submerged of ten knots; two periscopes, and two propellers. The method of propulsion would be by electricity or petrol, they would be provided with two torpedo tubes, and would have a crew of sixteen. The first cost of a first-class torpedo boat (coastal) destroyer would be £42,000. Two therefore would cost £84,000, and there would be some expense connected with bringing them to Australia if they were brought from the other side of the world, about which I shall say something presently. A submarine costs £50,000, and £5,000 more to deliver in Australia. The total cost of each here would therefore be £55,000, and three would cost £165,000. The cost for the year for two first-class torpedo boat (coastal) destroyers and three submarines would amount to £249,000, or almost exactly the sum we propose to vote, leaving £1,000 towards the expense of bringing the torpedo boat (coastal) destroyers out to Australia. The cost for the upkeep of these little vessels may be far more than honorable members anticipate. The cost of oil, fuel, stores, and repairs of a first-class torpedo boat (coastal) destroyer would be £6,725. The wages for a complement of thirty-three men at naval rates, including a colonial allowance of 3s. a day, but without victualling, would amount to £4,500, leaving the total charge for the upkeep of these vessels nearly £12,000 a year. The cost in the case of submarines at naval rates of pay and our special allowance would be for each shore base of four men £570. For each submarine, double crews of sixteen each, £5,650, and for each small vessel or tug associated with them, with ten

men, £1,180, or a total of £7,500. Then repairs, sea stores, petrol, and victualling would take £3,600, making a total of over £11,000 a year. I need not enter into details with respect to clothing, pensions and so on. The total charge for upkeep, without the charge for the tug, would amount to about £57,000 for five vessels for the first year. The expenditure would rise to £114,000 for the second year, and to £171,000 when the third year's operations were completed. These figures are, at all events, sufficiently near for present purposes. The complete scheme would give us two submarines for New South Wales, two for Victoria, two for Queensland, one perhaps at Thursday Island, and one each for South Australia, Western Australia, and Tasmania, and one torpedo boat (coastal) destroyer for the chief harbor of each State. The probable period of usefulness of these vessels is reckoned at fifteen years, and allowing £50,000 a year, which would be one-fifteenth of the total cost, the annual outlay on completion of the present proposals would be £221,000, without including interest, say, £250,000 a year. Whether these precise vessels will be chosen will be determined partly by the association we are able to form with the Royal Navy through the Admiralty, and partly on the possibility that local advices may suggest some change. We do not feel that it would be judicious to endeavour even to look forward further than three years, but, following the principle to which I have already alluded, if after the three years the protective force be considered insufficient, probably it would then be wisest for us to acquire a torpedo destroyer, of a larger type than is at present current, or, at least, as large as the latest modern type, and capable of ocean-going coastal service. It must, however, always be remembered that in the heavy seas which frequently occur along the Australian coast the largest torpedo boat destroyer that you could find would sometimes be rendered almost powerless for rapid and effective action, and that, as the great security for its own safety, if confronted with a vessel carrying heavy metal, is speed, when that is lost the efficiency of even large coastal destroyers is much to be doubted. But probably by the time we are able to undertake them, there may be further developments, which will remove some of the

apprehensions entertained at present. Even as to ocean-going destroyers, as they are called, there is also a division of opinion. It will be necessary to obtain our first submarines and coastal destroyers from Great Britain, but if the general offers we have already received prove upon examination to be satisfactory, there are prospects that some, if not all, of those needed in the second or third years may be locally built, even if certain special parts are allowed to be imported. The policy of the Government is to build as many as possible here, since the vessels, whether originally imported or not, will require to be repaired and refitted in Australia. Besides the vessels, which would form a harbor and, to a certain extent, a coastal defence in our three years' proposal, the Government, having obtained, in May, 1906, from the Imperial Defence Committee, a report which deals with lights and armaments for the shore forts, have adopted its general principles and are applying them. The new armament recommended is that of the 6-inch mark VII. breech-loading guns, which, together with mountings and works, will cost £162,000 when complete. New electric lights, engines, and works will cost nearly £23,000. Ammunition—with the requisite reserves and supplies—will cost £107,000. We are devoting £50,000 this year, and propose, so far as we have responsibility, to continue that sum each year, until our fixed defences are brought up to the standard. They will probably take between five and six years to complete, by which time we shall efficiently light practically every port in Australia, and have their armaments of such a character as to render most material assistance to our naval defence, in offering a determined resistance to any cruisers we are likely to see in these waters. A large invasion is not expected, but we must be prepared for sudden raids. When we have obtained another model, we have every reason to believe that the carriages for these guns can be made in Australia. Plans and specifications are being obtained, and we shall soon be prepared to call for tenders. The total expenditure proposed for guns, mountings, and works, lights, engines, and ammunition, is £292,000, or say, £300,000. All my figures, honorable members will notice, are in round numbers. I have them given here in detail, but the alterations are so constant that in estimates for the future

they can only be taken as approximations in every case.

Mr. WILKS.—Those are not your own calculations, are they?

Mr. DEAKIN.—Heaven forbid! A specific acknowledgement ought to be made, of the fact that practically the whole of the material I am now using has been prepared by the indefatigable energy and perseverance of my colleague, the Minister of Defence. It pleases him to affect, in Parliament and elsewhere, to treat his responsibilities lightly; but, although, in the State and here, I have been in several Ministries, I have never had a colleague more thoroughly devoted to his work, or who has given more time and ability to the conduct of his Department. At present our Naval Force is inconsiderable in numbers, and relatively inconsiderable in cost. We are fortunate in having several very excellent officers at the head of affairs, who have done us good service, and whose work is not to be forgotten. They will be associated, while they are serviceable, with any scheme which we propose. We have also a number of men of excellent physique, character, and service, and, so far as they can maintain their efficiency, they will be retained. If our offer to the Admiralty of a thousand Australian seamen is not accepted, we shall have to find some other means of training those who have the taste or disposition for sea life. Owing chiefly to the exertions of philanthropic gentlemen, there are in Australia to-day a number of bodies of naval cadets of a promising character. Some of them consist of very young boys, but really the display they make, their efficiency and grasp of their duties, their management of a boat and guns, and their drill, are excellent, as I have had an opportunity of knowing from personal observation. We propose to extend that system very largely. We find it an admirable antidote to the temptations of street life to boys of a certain age. It gives them a manlier character, discipline, and loyalty which prove of the greatest value afterwards. In that respect, among many others, we believe that we shall be doing good service, outside the cause of defence, in enabling a very much larger number of boys to be trained for sea life, or for any active employment of head and hand. Considerations of time alone compel me to proceed to other branches of our defence. After we have considered harbor and coastal defence,

and naval possibilities—I have already made reference to the forts—we come to those who man the forts—the Military Forces of the Commonwealth. Their outlook here differs very largely from that of the naval service, because land service is much less specialized and may be made much more generally disciplinary to our people as a whole, although it demands in most cases a smaller degree of organization and efficiency. But we cannot afford to speak lightly of our land force, first because of what it has achieved—and its record where it has been tested is admirable—and also because, although not preparing for any expeditionary adventures outside Australia, we must realize that while we remain a mere handful of people, clustered practically in one segment of the continent, any invasion attempted would probably be at a remote part. Our Military Forces would have to be prepared for acting one, two, or more thousands of miles away from the populated centres of the Commonwealth. Consequently that casts an additional burden on us, since, until our population grows faster than it has been growing—and I hope we shall grow much faster—we have the responsibility not only of protecting hearths and homes here, but of guarding the great unoccupied parts of this immense continent. As in the Navy we are making a new departure almost without a precedent, and new to all the Dominions of the Empire, so in connexion with our land forces it appears to the Government that the time has arrived for making a new departure of an equally marked kind, and of a type equally unprecedented under the British flag. While I have no desire to find fault with our existing militia force, which has every appearance of energy, yet there are considerations in respect to it which I think will weigh very seriously with the whole of this community. In the first place, numerically it is absurdly weak. It is now 14 per cent. short of the officers it ought to have, and 10 per cent. short of the numbers of those required in the ranks. The average training of the rank and file is only 1½ years, so frequent are the incomings and the outgoings. In fact, for active service to-morrow, probably we could not count on more than half of the 22,000 odd militia that we have. A force of 1,300 permanent men looks well, but on examination we discover that only about 700 belong to the fighting force. When the Permanent

Force is reduced so much, we can understand the deductions required in calculating the effective strength of the ordinary militia. Out of a population of nearly 1,000,000 men of military age, we have only 22,000 regularly drilled, and, as I have said, for only short periods, and for the most part on parades or in drill-rooms.

Colonel FOXTON.—But a vast number of those who have passed through the ranks are practically a reserve.

Mr. DEAKIN.—Unfortunately, however, they are a reserve of only twelve months' experience, which, as the honorable member knows, rarely amounts to much, and often to very little.

Colonel FOXTON.—The average service is over twelve months.

Mr. DEAKIN.—The average is a year and a half for all, but many go out at the end of twelve months.

Colonel FOXTON.—But a great many do not leave until after the expiration of three years.

Mr. DEAKIN.—And such men, for, perhaps, seven or ten years afterwards may be looked upon as a reserve.

Colonel FOXTON.—And a good reserve, too!

Mr. DEAKIN.—Besides these men there are 40,000 others, of all ages and degrees of physical capacity, who practise more or less with the rifle, but who have no drill, no organization, and no officers. If we distinguish the volunteers from the militia, we find that even a smaller proportion of the former would be effective for immediate service in the field. In point of fact, the volunteers are also short of officers, and are (but partly drilled. What then is the position of the Commonwealth? About one schoolboy in seven is receiving some training as a cadet; about one youth in fifty-five, under nineteen years of age, has seen some service in the militia or the volunteers; and one man in fifty-two is in some way or other connected with the forces. That is to say, one male in every 112 is receiving some kind of drill and military experience for a short period; and, with our present arms, ammunition, and equipment, we should be unable to maintain very few more than the actual number of our militia and volunteers. Yet on this tiny array we expend a sum which this year approaches £800,000. In order, therefore, to have 100,000 men properly equipped, we should require, at the same ratio, to spend probably £1,500,000 more

than we do at present. We must greatly enhance our forces, but we cannot afford to pay more than £2,000,000 a year to that end; and yet that is what the present system necessarily implies for that number. Numerically our force is too weak, and financially it is too expensive. It consists largely of married men, who ought to be in the second and not in the first line. It includes a number of men who, though they can stand ordinary parade, are obviously unfit for campaigning; many of the members of the rifle clubs are grey beards. After our experience it is now plain that no system can meet our necessities except one that appeals to the people as a whole—that calls upon them in the name of citizenship. We are a free people, with political equality and sole authority in a country where all have the opportunity to possess homes of their own. Our position as free men in a free country casts on all the responsibility of undertaking our own defence. Of course, it is recognised that the withdrawal of men in the prime of life, at a time when they are engaged in vocations, and have families depending on them, would be a very serious matter; and the proposals of the Government take this into account. We propose a system of universal training, in order to form a National Guard of Defence, in which every young man in the Commonwealth shall be required to serve during his nineteenth, twentieth, and twenty-first years. This gives us a small fraction of his early manhood, when he is best capable of receiving the benefit and standing the strain of military training. Each young man will be called upon to spend an average of sixteen days per year, not in drill-rooms or on parade-grounds, but in local camps, devoted wholly and solely to continuous practical instruction. By this means it is believed that within three years we shall have in the Commonwealth a body of men sufficiently officered and capable of performing the services which Australia will require from her defenders. Whether they will attain the standard of European nations in regard to the minutiae of deportment or parade, or the precision of their movements, I do not know. But what we do know of our countrymen entitles us to feel well assured that at the end of that period they will suffice in all that is material. In a country of great distances like our own, with whose

Mr. Deakin.

characteristics they are familiar—and with which we shall shortly be thoroughly well informed upon probable points of attack—they will be able to render a good account of themselves, and probably have an advantage over even the best trained troops of Europe, owing to the local conditions under which any conflicts are likely to be waged.

Mr. SALMON.—The training would not be limited to forty-eight days in three years?

Mr. DEAKIN.—That is the minimum of training for infantrymen, but not for officers, artillery, or cavalry. Even on that basis, the cost will be crushing unless the trappings of war are replaced by a Spartan simplicity of uniform and habit, in harmony with the political principles on which our Government is based and our social life is shaped. We have kept closely in mind throughout, the democratic system of military organization in Switzerland, very lucidly described this year by two of our officers, first in the Australian press by Lieut.-Colonel Reay, and next fully reported upon officially by Colonel Bridges. More lately it has been investigated by a Select Committee from the Mother Country. The testimony of all is highly favorable to the results attained by a similar system under absolutely different physical conditions and territorial limitations. The proposals of the Government will, it is calculated, give an establishment of at least 83,000, always in training, supplemented each year by about 30,000 men, an equal number passing into the reserve. In the eighth year, this will mean over 200,000 men available, with full provision for arms, ammunition, and equipment for field artillery and cavalry, organized for service within the Commonwealth. The total cost of this is estimated at less than £250,000 more than is at present expended; whereas a Militia Force half as strong would, on our present basis, cost twice as much, if we could obtain the men. I give the estimated cost without reckoning any dues which this Parliament, on consideration, might see fit to levy on those who for one reason or another do not serve their proper period, making exceptions, of course, of those who for physical or other reasons are unfit to be enrolled. The period for which we make financial estimates is three years, as in the case of

our naval proposals. I have alluded at present only to the National Guard and its national training. Beyond this, however, it is proposed to greatly enlarge the Cadet system by the expenditure of at least an additional £20,000 a year for each of the three years, and to increase the expenditure on the rifle clubs by at least £10,000 each year over the same period. By this means we shall have a very considerable subsidiary force in the cadets and rifle clubs; I shall presently refer to the latter in another aspect. In June, 1906, there were less than 7,000 cadets in the Commonwealth; whereas last year we made provision for nearly 28,000; and this year's Estimates represent a total of about 37,000. It will be seen, therefore, that the advance in this direction, since the present Government came into office, has been very great. We propose to reduce the term of obligatory service in the National Guard for those who have passed through and qualified in the cadet service; that is to say, qualified cadets will be spared those days devoted to the drill and discipline which they have already acquired.

Mr. SALMON.—Cadet drill will count as service?

Mr. DEAKIN.—Yes; in 1906, the rifle clubs represented a membership of 37,000, whereas in November last they had grown to 45,000, an increase in seventeen months of nearly 8,000. We have every reason to believe that this increase will continue. National training for young men will occupy on an average only sixteen days a year for three years. Those who qualify as senior cadets need only put in twelve days a year. I may be asked "What of the present militia?" The whole of its effective strength will be absorbed, being required to supply officers and non-commissioned officers to train the new levies. In this connexion we shall secure an advantage in their higher training by a system to which I shall presently allude. There will be 30,000 men each year entering the present militia regiments by an increase in the number of their companies. The procedure in regard to the National Guard is that in the year in which he reaches eighteen years of age every young man will require to register himself. He will then be subjected to a medical examination, declared fit, unfit, or temporarily unfit, and dealt with accordingly. On joining he will receive his National Guard record—a small parchment book—in

which his service, his promotions, and any comments thereon will be registered. This will be of some value to him in life outside the ranks. Each young man must make himself efficient each year, any year in which he fails to do so will add an additional year to his course. He will have to complete three efficient years before his term will be completed. The uniform will be of the simplest—hat or cap, a badge, a jumper or overall, breeches, leggings and boots. These will be the property of the wearer, and will all be made in Australia. The proposal is that each of the present militia units shall expand to three National Guard units, and shall receive each year one-third of its strength and part each year with one-third of its strength to the reserve. Many of the men who are not fitted for active service can be enlisted for ambulance and transport work. The artillery and other transport corps will require to devote longer periods to their training, and will receive a reasonable allowance for so doing. The officers will be paid for their services because they remain after their three years have expired. Some allowance must be made to them, since, in addition to the camps which they will have to attend for the purpose of training others, they will have to devote certain periods of the year to receiving higher training themselves. The men will be allowed as far as possible to select the branch of the service they prefer. Drill will be simplified. All training will be given in camps, and on ground permitting of the conditions attaching to actual service in the field. They will be carried out in the most practical manner possible.

Colonel FOXTON.—But the artillery training will have to be continuous.

Mr. DEAKIN.—Artillery training of a kind will proceed continuously. When the measure dealing with this question is submitted to the House before the close of the session it will show the details for each arm of the service in that regard. Ultimately we may see a time arrive when, reckoning men under forty we shall have 800,000 who are either in, or have passed through, the ranks. We estimate that these men can be obtained, disciplined, drilled, and made effective for £1,200,000 a year as against the present defence expenditure of £800,000. Every infantryman—three-fourths of the total force—will be armed with a rifle and bayonet with scabbard. At present we have 83,000 rifles of all

kinds. We shall add 20,000 new rifles each year. The cost of these will be £100,000 a year. But these are not to be imported. They will be made locally. We have satisfied ourselves, after careful inquiry, that they can be made here cheaper than they can be purchased abroad. Every rifleman will have a bandolier equipment. It will consist of a sling, water-bottle and straps, great coat, blanket, waterproof sheet, mess tin and haversack. All these will be made locally. One arm in which our present forces are decidedly weak is the field artillery. At present we have sixty guns. The guns associated with the new force will be 240 of the latest type. They will be provided at the rate of sixteen a year, and will cost us, with their etceteras, about £50,000 annually. The waggons and limbers are now being successfully manufactured within the Commonwealth. Artillery ranges are to be secured, on which our gunners will have the advantage of practising with missiles under something approaching service conditions. The British Government have gone to enormous expense to supply these ranges in the United Kingdom. Their acquisition will demand some expenditure, even in this country with its very much larger and cheaper areas; but these ranges are absolutely essential to an efficient field artillery. The gun carriages for the 6.7-in. guns are to be locally made. We attach great importance to the creation of the utmost power of resistance locally, both as to war materials and men. We are at the very beginning of a period of development which I trust will be as thorough and complete as that of Japan. In order to provide against the emergencies of war, it will be necessary to establish an ammunition factory. This means a cordite factory by way of basis. If we can obtain orders for the supply of the Imperial Squadron in Australian waters, it would be of material assistance to us. If we can dispose of an output of 100 tons per year, we can save 3d. per lb. at present prices upon all the cordite that we use. On the other hand, if we can only sell 50 tons a year, we shall have to pay 5d. per lb. more for it. The caps and the fulminate will be made in the same factory as the cordite. The manufacture of cases at a rolling mill is also under consideration. My colleague, the Minister of Defence, has an elaborate proposal to lay before the House in this regard. I am sure that, from the infor-

Mr. Deakin.

mation which has been supplied to us by Mr. Hake, the very capable Inspector of Explosives in Victoria, who recently visited the Mother Country to put himself in touch with the latest developments of this industry, he will be able to satisfy honorable members that it is desirable to establish a cordite factory. I have great pleasure in laying upon the table of the House the report of the result of his investigations in the United Kingdom and elsewhere, and hope that it will prove interesting reading to honorable members. The Minister will be able to show that the establishment of a cordite factory is economically sound. Failing a supply of ammunition, even with 200,000 men available for service, what could be expected of them? I have shown how comparatively slight an increase there will be in the expenditure proposed under this great scheme, and I have also shown that a large portion of it will be expended in this country. Then we come to one of the most serious matters in connexion with this scheme. That is, the provision of a sufficient number of well-trained officers. Because the theory of this force is that the officers are to train their men. The clerical duties at present performed by officers are to be done in future by clerks. We want our soldiers for soldiers' service, not for indoor work. But in order to obtain efficient soldiers a staff of officers must first be efficiently trained; and as we cannot pretend in this Commonwealth to establish a military college in every State, we propose to establish a school of permanent expert instructors. This would consist of three specialists—one whose subjects will be strategy, tactics, and military history; a second, whose subjects will be artillery, field and garrison, and machine guns and theory of musketry; and a third, whose subjects will be engineering in all its branches and topography. These experts, whom we think we can obtain at an estimated cost of £5,000 a year, will travel from State to State at appropriate times, meeting the officers in every State, lecturing to them, and examining them in the subjects which they have been studying.

Mr. KING O'MALLEY.—Is it proposed to include dancing?

Mr. DEAKIN.—We will leave that to the enemy when our troops meet him! For this movable college we shall secure the services of three of the best men available. They will be paid good salaries, and engaged only for such terms as will

enable us to exchange them from time to time as military science is perfected. We hope to have our officers trained so that they will be able to impart to those below them the practical knowledge which they have acquired. They will be well instructed in peace, will lead in war, and fill all commands in the Australian Forces. Of course, it must be remembered that in addition to this we have proceeding, and propose to continue, the temporary exchanges of officers with the Mother Country, with India, with Canada, and with South Africa. That system is likely to prove of great value to us. We are taking every advantage of it. Last year my colleague the Minister of Defence sent seven officers and non-commissioned officers abroad for training. This year he is sending eleven. We shall probably increase the number. We have applied to the Government of India for permission to send more officers there to participate in their military exercises, join their camps, and witness the thoroughly organized military machinery in operation under Lord Kitchener. We have now asked for permission to send militia officers as well as permanent men.

Mr. SALMON.—Hear, hear; that is the right idea!

Mr. DEAKIN.—Ours is a citizen force. The ruling idea is, while setting a high ideal of military training, to provide equal opportunities for all our citizens who will give their time and ability to the service of the Commonwealth in this direction. We hope to be able to send the best of them each year to actual schools of training, such as are provided in connexion with the military manœuvres in India and in the Mother Country. In this way our officers will be brought into association and, in a sense, into competition with highly-trained officers in other parts of the Empire, whilst at the same time we shall be receiving officers from India, Canada, and the United Kingdom, who will criticise us and give us the benefit of their training. We shall learn from them, as we hope they will be able to learn something from us.

Mr. SALMON.—That is the way to raise the status of the militia.

Mr. DEAKIN.—This system of transferring is devised for the purpose of raising the status of the militia. It is upon our citizen soldiery and our citizen officers that we must rely. We recognise that we ought not only to raise the status of our officer abroad, but that we must raise him in

the estimation of those whom he commands, and of those with whom he is allied. We qualify him to achieve this end by putting him in training side by side with the best officers of the British Government in India and elsewhere. We hope in this way to establish a high standard to which our citizens in arms may be encouraged to aspire. The object of these proposals is to give effect to that well-worn aphorism of Bonaparte, that every soldier should feel himself carrying a marshal's bâton in his knapsack. In pursuance of the same end we propose to take certain steps which will remove the artificial distinctions occasionally created. We shall want for our officers the best men we can find—men with the capacity for command, with a taste for military study and exercises, and with ability quite independently of the class in which they are found. We wish these men to have the opportunity of rising to the highest positions we can give them in our National Guard.

Mr. SALMON.—The Government are anticipating my motion.

Mr. DEAKIN.—If we can. I am well aware that at present when any one points to a desirable standard as an ideal, one is at once accused of becoming millennial. It is better to take a high standard than a low one. Many of the heroes of history who have set the highest possible standard for themselves have expected least from their fellows. When we aim at setting a high national standard in this way we are not insinuating that, by the introduction of this scheme, we are going to transform the nature of the people of Australia. Speaking for myself, I am content to trust the Australian people. I believe that they are not only fitted to serve, but to command, and to rival in the arts of war, so far as these can be practised in times of peace, any of like experience against whom they may be pitted. When we have secured a National Guard without a distinction of class, wealth, or position, we hope that interest in our system of military training and the ambition for proficiency in its several branches will, to some extent, take the place of those sports on which our young people look and speculate every Saturday without otherwise participating in them. In one of his most stirring sketches, Kipling dreams of a time when military training will be regarded as the most fascinating of sports. If we can persuade our people that competition in military exercises is better

than looking on at less educational forms of competition, we shall soon see our military and naval duties undertaken cheerfully and carried on under the same conditions of popular interest and approbation as apply in the case of sports and games. I know of no spirit which has such an influence on the English race as this spirit of competition. The clippings from the English newspapers which come to me every week contain at present, in most cases, only about an inch of matter relating to important Australian occurrences, as compared with about a foot of cablegrams devoted to the cricket matches of the English team now in this country. That, I imagine, is largely because of the element of competition, when batsmen and bowler are pitted against each other. There is no reason why we should not stimulate a similar interest in forms of military prowess, as is at present felt in regard to outdoor sports.

Mr. HARPER.—Except in regard to the gate money!

Mr. DEAKIN.—The interest there is that of clubs or players, not of the thousands of spectators who pay, but do not receive. Instructional schools are to be established, at which the interest of our officers will be stimulated as far as possible by the higher forms of teaching. Special attention is to be given to staff rides and local experience, the operations being in the nature of actual service in the field. What we desire to reduce is the slow shooting at fixed targets under conditions which never obtain in actual warfare. In the same way, we want to substitute for parade drill, marching and evolutions in difficult and broken country, so that our troops may know how to use its features, and so as to enable the higher officers to control together artillery, cavalry, and infantry over country known only by maps or reconnaissance. How many of our present officers have been tested in this way? I know some of the best have been thoroughly disheartened for want of opportunities of the kind which they have long been seeking. We have already taken the fullest advantage of the lectures of Colonel Foster, Professor of Military Science in the University of Sydney. He has done in this direction most admirable work, he is doing it still, and for his assistance we are most grateful. Arrangements are being made for specially selected militia officers to take advantage of his course of lectures,

and a special course has just been completed to meet the wishes of militia officers who were not able to participate in the previous classes. That shows how the spirit to which we wish to appeal—the spirit of individual interest, individual initiative and pride in the service of the country may be spread. One of the many important features of the Conference in London was the scheme which Mr. Haldane, as head of the British Army, laid before us, when he invited us to send our officers to the General Staff, there to be received as comrades, to be shown the whole of the operations of what is often termed the brain of the Army, to be tried by being placed in positions of command, and to have thrown open to them for their benefit everything that was being done. That was a most generous offer. In the same way, we hope to establish a General Staff of our own to which the British Government will send its officers to observe what we are doing, to learn something of operations in vast areas of sparsely settled country which they cannot expect to find in Europe, and also to give us the benefit of their knowledge and advice. It is by keeping in touch with the Army, as well as with the Navy, that we hope to keep up the standard, the spirit, and the efficiency to which the honorable member for Laanecoorie has been alluding. Their officers will inspect and report on us, our officers will inspect and report on the Canadian Force, the South African Force, and the Indian Force. By that means we hope to materially benefit. An Intelligence Corps has just been formed, which will prepare the plans, statistics and general information required for operations in any part of the Commonwealth. They will utilize militia officers and citizens, such as surveyors and engineers, who will bring to the aid of the Department the experience and knowledge gained in their ordinary vocations. Their work will be topography, preparation of maps, and information with regard to the country generally, transport, and other matters of imperative importance. They will take up the duties that were intended to be performed by the corps of guides which originated through the representations made by Colonel Kenneth Mackay, of New South Wales, and Colonel Miller, of the Commonwealth service. We attach the greatest importance to the work that will be done by this In-

telligence Department, but in particular to the work that will be done with the Intelligence Department by the General Staff. We believe that the country will not hesitate to offer strong inducements to secure suitable men. In regard to central administration, the present Administrative Board is to be augmented by the addition of two or three experienced militia officers, to be appointed for limited periods, the *personnel* altering possibly by one each year. They will then feel that their knowledge is being utilized, and will be encouraged to extend it. It will create a better feeling between the various branches of the service, and will be valuable to militia officers, who can then learn the difficulties that surround central administration, of which at present they have least appreciation. A medical reserve is being established in which large additions will be made to those who are at present enrolled. In this regard many medical men, medical students, chemists, and citizens willing to be connected with the Ambulance Corps are ready to assist by undergoing the necessary training if an opportunity is given. These and similar opportunities will now be multiplied, to a larger extent, under our new system. When we have established a thoroughly citizen force, it will remain for Parliament to recognise the service rendered. We believe that after the system is fully in operation, both Commonwealth and the States may be fairly asked to give precedence to men who have done service in the ranks—all must do that—who have done it well, with energy and ability. A National Guard's Record ought to be a passport to advancement if in other respects he is well fitted. It is also proposed that after this system has been established a sufficient time the Rifle Clubs shall be recruited only from men who have passed through the ranks. In every way preference where preference can be given ought to be granted to those who have shown special zeal for this form of public service. In the same way, whatever permanent force there is will be recruited from our own men.

Mr. MAHON.—Does the honorable gentleman propose to give them preference in the Public Service?

Mr. DEAKIN.—Yes, other things being equal, especially for general employment.

When every one goes into the ranks the recognition of merit there becomes fair. Then we propose to aid and encourage the competitive spirit by inducing as many military contests, competitions, and tournaments as possible, subsidizing them to such an extent as to make them attractive to the public as well as to those who take part in them. All these things are possible when once we have created a citizen force in which every settlement and town, every family and class is interested, and from which no one is or can be excluded. Long service undertaken voluntarily will be especially appreciated, and recognitions of some kind will be devised. Provision for these is to be made, and also for some regular training for our reserves, though not included in these figures, because this plan in itself will be large enough for present consideration. After men have done their three years' training, it will be very desirable not to let them entirely rust, but to keep them in touch, at stated intervals, with the work which is being done, to attend occasionally even if only for a short time at camps with the National Guard. In the same way officers of the reserves will be induced to attend at camps, where they must be of much assistance to those present, and where they themselves will be brought up-to-date.

Mr. WILKS.—At what age will men be exempt from the reserves? Has it been fixed?

Mr. DEAKIN.—It is proposed to fix the age at forty years.

Mr. ARCHER.—Will it not be necessary to offer some inducement?

Mr. DEAKIN.—In some cases, but I doubt if this inducement will need in the future to be of the same character as at present. Every one will take part, and if we succeed in getting what I call the competitive spirit thoroughly aroused the rest will follow. I feel that I have trespassed upon the patience of the House.

HONORABLE MEMBERS.—No; go on.

Mr. DEAKIN.—I propose to lay upon the table a statement which will show the extra cost, or, in some cases, the reduced cost of each and every item in each of the first three years, as compared with the

Estimates for the present year. Of course founded upon actual data now in our these are only estimates though they are possession—

DETAILS OF ESTIMATED EXPENDITURE.

	1st year.	2nd year.	3rd year.	Estimates, 1907-8.
	£	£	£	£
Central Administration ...	23,000	23,000	23,000	23,000
Head-quarters of Military Districts ...	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,254
Ordnance Department ...	22,000	22,000	22,000	21,452
Permanent Troops ...	85,000	65,000	50,000	105,793
Instructional Staff ...	46,000	46,000	46,000	46,388
Accounts and Pay Department ...	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,198
Rifle Range Staff ...	3,000	3,000	3,000	2,654
Total—Permanent Services ...	200,000	180,000	165,000	220,739
National Guard—Training—				
Pay, including Militia retained ...	93,000	80,000	90,000	115,480
Clothing, &c. ...	90,000	90,000	90,000	64,197
Camps and Schools of Instruction ...	30,000	68,000	85,000	30,460
Central School ...	5,000	5,000	5,000	—
Ammunition annually expended ...	20,000	40,000	60,000	32,203*
Total ...	247,000	283,000	330,000	242,340
Arms ...	100,000	100,000	100,000	106,433
Accountrements, &c. ...	75,000	75,000	75,000	
Stores, general contingencies, &c. ...	32,000	28,000	24,000	
Field Artillery, guns, and reserve ammunition ...	50,000	50,000	50,000	— †
Ammunition, reserve for rifles ...	30,000	30,000	30,000	— ‡
Works and buildings ...	20,000	20,000	20,000	50,000
Repairs, maintenance, and rents ...	26,000	21,000	16,000	31,668
Total ...	342,000	333,000	324,000	233,327
Grand Total, excluding Rifle Clubs and Cadets ...	789,000	796,000	810,000	696,415

Note *—£32,203 includes annual expenditure on Gun and Rifle Ammunition and Reserve Rifle Ammunition.

Note †—Guns are included in arms. — Note ‡—See note *.

I intend to ask the House to order the printing of the memoranda I have read containing the despatch and cables to the Admiralty, Mr. Hake's report, and informa-

tion relating to submarines. I promised to give the figures showing how the Military and Naval expenditure will work out.

GRAND TOTALS (INCLUDING CAPITAL EXPENDITURE).

ESTIMATES, 1907-8.	£	1st year.	2nd year.	3rd year.
		£	£	£
Military (including new special defence provision) ...	1,033,359	1,097,000	1,021,000	1,074,000
Naval Agreement ...	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
Local Naval Forces ...	60,524	60,524	60,524	60,524
	1,293,883			
Presumed unexpended balance ...	125,950	New Naval Expenditure	357,070	414,140
				471,210
	£1,419,833	£1,714,594	£1,695,624	£1,605,734

This table includes expenditure on cadets, rifle clubs, &c., and capital spent upon fixed defences, factories, and works. It will be seen that for this year the actual appropriation proposed is £1,300,000, although £125,000 has been deducted from the full cost, because it is not expected to be expended within the year.

Mr. WILKS.—That includes the Naval Subsidy, I suppose?

Mr. DEAKIN.—The total includes everything. During the present year the total expenditure will be £1,300,000. The first year under the new system of National Training will include a capital expenditure on the rifle factory

and the ammunition factory, but the total expenditure for that year is not expected to much exceed £1,700,000. That is an increase of about £300,000 on what is provided for this year, or £400,000 on what is proposed to be spent during this year. Next year the total will drop a little below £1,700,000, and in the third year it is expected to fall to £1,600,000, any further capital expenditure not being included.

Mr. WILKS.—Will that expenditure be paid out of ordinary revenue?

Mr. DEAKIN.—It will. Consequently, as against the present year's proposed expenditure of £1,400,000, it means in the third year an increase of £200,000, or, allowing for the proportion of the amount on this year's Estimates that we do not expect to expend, it will mean an increase of £325,000. That being so, this scheme which covers both the naval and the military proposals of the Government, including the building of fifteen vessels, the cost of their maintenance, an immense increase in the land forces, an increase in the field artillery, and the expenditure upon fortifications, means, in the third year, according to the best estimates that we can frame, an increase of only £200,000 on our present annual expenditure. If this scheme can be accomplished for that cost as according to our professional advisers we have reason to believe it will be, I do not think the country, having regard to the transformation to be effected on sea and land, will consider it unduly expensive. Finally, I have not spoken so far of what, after all, we must rely upon as the motive power of the new national system—the motive power of every-day working patriotism, a sense of national unity, and of our indebtedness to this community which confers upon its young people so many advantages denied elsewhere. It asks them in return, not for sacrifices such as are made by conscripts sent to barrack life, but for brief, whole-hearted, healthy training. It bids them to be inspired to do more than work for themselves, and to welcome any opportunity of serving the common good. No one will say that open-air training for our young men for three years can do them anything but good. It is not barrack confinement, but camp life under a discipline, which will make them brighter men. If this duty be accepted, as we hope, with intelligent interest, and, in

many cases, with enthusiasm, even though we hope our National Guard may never be employed in actual warfare, it will become not only a great disciplinary power, but a potent factor in fostering that national spirit on which we rely. Those who have worn the uniform, as many of us have, those who have stood shoulder to shoulder in the ranks answering to the volunteer bugle call know how powerfully even such an outward summons appeals. When national training is recognised as part of our national life, and as the discharge of every citizen's obligation, it will accomplish more. What we must and do trust to are not titles and rewards, but voluntary service freely given, a patriotic discharge of a duty to his country which does honour to the man who renders it, and a greater honour the more efficiently it is accomplished. Without patriotism we can do nothing when we come to actual defence, or even in the necessary training and preparation which go before. From this sentiment I by no means exclude those not required to enlist, because of their sex, who, themselves becoming every year more appreciative of the patriotic purpose of our National Guard, will be moved by its generous character. I am perfectly certain that if the horrible contingency arose our camps in war would never lack for nurses, or for aught that woman's patient loving kindness can bestow. Behind these forces we want, as well as the will of the men of our country, the heart of our women, realizing their part in it, and trained in connexion with our ambulance in sufficient numbers. I am sure we can add them to the list, and with their encouragement we shall soon have another enthusiasm imparted to the young men for their three years' martial training. Ours being a citizen soldiery, should appeal to our people as no other can. We cast aside mere-tricious display, the glitter of gold lace, or glamour of a separate caste. We replace them by a high response of confidence in the man who is doing his duty when guarding his home as much as when bread-winning for his family or fathering his children. It is on patriotic feeling we rely; without this it would be idle to propose a citizen soldiery; otherwise we must buy our defence. But a citizen soldiery, inspired by patriotism, as the world's history shows, has with even partially-armed levies again and again proved better than

the best armed mercenaries brought against them. Our ideal is a defence of the people for the people and by the people. It is therefore with every confidence that the Government submits to Parliament and the country for their consideration the programme of naval construction and national training that I have imperfectly outlined. I beg to present the following papers:—

Naval Defence of Australia—Correspondence in reference thereto, between the Commonwealth Government and the Admiralty.

Naval Defence—Opinions with regard to Submarines.

Defence—Mr. C. Napier Hake's investigations in England—Extracts from his Report. and to move—

That the papers be printed.

Mr. FISHER (Wide Bay) [9.53].—I do not presume that it is intended to debate this matter at the present stage, but I think we ought not to enter upon the Christmas vacation without offering the Prime Minister our congratulations on the speech he has just delivered. The subject is a big one, and I do not think I have ever heard the honorable member to greater advantage. With such a subject and with such a speaker I have no doubt that when the time comes for the people of this country to defend themselves they will respond as he desires. I offer the Prime Minister my congratulations upon the manner in which he has set forth the defence policy of the Government.

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT.

CHRISTMAS RECESS—TARIFF—PIANO CIRCULAR—CASUAL HANDS, GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE—DEFENCE.

Mr. DEAKIN (Ballarat—Minister of External Affairs) [9.52].—In moving—

That the House now do adjourn,

I take the opportunity to thank the honorable member for Wide Bay for his kind references to myself. As we are now separating for much-needed recuperation and rest, I wish to offer you, Mr. Speaker, my congratulations and to ask you to convey to the Chairman and the officers of the House our sense of the obligation under which they have placed us by the faithful, able, and assiduous discharge of their duties at all hours

of the day and night during an exceptionally trying session. We hope that you will convey our thanks to all engaged in and about the House, and that you will as is usual arrange that their services shall be recognised as far as possible by extending to them the utmost liberty during the Christmas recess. May I also thank honorable members on all sides for the assistance they have given us. No Government could accomplish and carry on business without that assistance, and the present Administration has often been dependent upon it. I have to express on behalf of my colleagues and myself our recognition, not merely of the invaluable assistance rendered to us by honorable members as part of the fulfilment of parliamentary obligations, but of the many acts of courtesy and kindness extended to us from all sides of the House. There is one personal reference I desire to make before resuming my seat, and that is to my honorable colleague the Treasurer. I am rather gratified that he is not within hearing, and am especially pleased to know that the remarkable work he has accomplished has already been recognised by both sides of the House. I have had better opportunities of knowing what his work has been, and what demands have been made upon him than any other honorable member. He has accomplished a Herculean feat—a feat which practically in connexion with the first Federal Tariff broke down the iron constitution of our old friend the right honorable member for Adelaide, who, most unhappily, is unable to be with us. A task which would have broken down the constitution of any other man has just been completed by the honorable member for Hume with the most resolute and dogged determination, at a personal sacrifice rarely paralleled in Parliament. Under the special circumstances of the case, honorable members will recognise that I may say that even of a colleague, because the praise is most richly deserved.

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN (Eden-Monaro—Minister of Trade and Customs) [9.57].—A question was asked by the honorable member for Dalley in connexion with a statement read in this Chamber a day or two ago, about which I promised to make inquiries. Having done so, I am in a position to clear the matter up. I received a request from Mr. Beale for a copy of the circulars which had been sent to me concerning pianos, and I instructed a clerk

to forward any that I might have. Amongst these circulars was that read by the honorable member for Maranoa or the honorable member for Coolgardie. It was type-written, and marked on it in pencil was "From Allan and Co., 13th September, 1907."

Mr. WILKS.—It was not the only one sent.

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—No. I had requests from scores of industries, asking for circulars, and these were sent, excepting, of course, any marked private and confidential. But of this particular circular I knew nothing until it was read in the House.

Mr. FISHER.—It was by the honorable member's authority that it was sent.

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—Yes. The clerk who sent it could not be held responsible. But the Collector of Customs could not have discovered that it had been sent, because it was one of many, and merely marked with my compliments. But amongst my private letters, I have turned up one from Mr. Beale, dated 29th October, acknowledging the circular, and asking if I saw any reason why he should not reply to it, pointing out to members statements which were contradictory of each other. In answer to that letter, I wrote on the 30th October—

Dear Mr. Beale,

Yours of the 29th October to hand, and contents noted. *Re* the particulars forwarded to you, they came in the way of a circular, and I presume have been placed in the hands of other members. Therefore, I think you are quite within your rights in answering same without any further reference to the author of it. Or why not put your case in similar form, and send it to members? I will be glad to have any representations from you, covering the facts as regards this industry.

That I had written that letter had quite slipped my memory, and when it was stated that the Treasurer had supplied private information, I was naturally indignant, and demanded that the document be placed on the table, so that it might be traced. I had forgotten that I had supplied Mr. Beale with this circular until, meeting him last evening, he said, "You sent the information to me."

Mr. FISHER.—Does the honorable member usually supply copies of his letter-file?

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—Nothing of that kind was done. Many persons interested in industries have asked for cir-

culars, and such as do not appear in the slightest degree confidential have been furnished to them.

Mr. MAHON.—Did the honorable member furnish any other circular to Mr. Beale?

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—I instructed the clerk to send along copies of any circulars I might have; but, so far as I know, I did not see the circular before it was sent.

Mr. FISHER.—Does not the honorable member think that it was a peculiar thing for Mr. Beale to ask for it?

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—No. I find that it is a verbal request. Every time I go to Sydney I am asked for information of this sort by all sorts of persons interested in manufactures.

Mr. FISHER.—That makes it a great deal worse.

Mr. WILSON.—The Minister admits that it was not a circular.

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—No. There is no heading to it, and it is type-written like an ordinary circular. It is not signed by Allan, though it is marked as issued by Allan and Co., Melbourne.

Mr. WILSON.—It contained private notes by Mr. Allan, taken for the purpose of giving information to the Treasurer.

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—That is Mr. Allan's statement. The Treasurer says that Mr. Allan handed him this document. Somehow it came on my table as a circular, and I instructed my clerk to forward a copy of it to Mr. Beale.

Colonel FOXTON.—It was not marked private and confidential?

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—No.

Mr. WILKS.—Did Mr. Beale return it?

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—The clerk sent a copy marked with my compliments; the original has never been out of my office. Evidently the clerk looked upon it as a circular. I wanted to clear the Treasurer of any accusation, and to clear Mr. Beale, who, when he saw this circular, evidently thought that it would be the right thing to ask me whether he could refer to it. In replying I pointed out that the information was in the form of a circular, and that I presumed other members had been supplied with it, and I suggested that he should put his reply before members.

Mr. FISHER.—Innocence abroad!

Mr. WILSON.—Has the Minister no desire to clear Mr. Allan from the imputation of the Treasurer that it was a scoundrel who sent that statement?

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—If Mr. Allan handed the statement to the Treasurer, considering it a private one, he has a right to complain.

Mr. WILSON.—Did not the Minister say that he should be criminally prosecuted?

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—I said that if it was stated that the Treasurer divulged private information he should be prosecuted. That is why I asked that the document be laid on the table. Should I have done that had I thought that there was anything to hide?

Mr. WILSON.—The Minister should apologize to Mr. Allan.

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—I do not think so.

Mr. WILSON.—The Minister said that he should be criminally prosecuted.

Mr. WILKS.—That was in answer to an interjection of mine that if what was said was true the Treasurer should prosecute Mr. Allan.

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—I said that the Treasurer would disprove it, and that he could disprove it in a court of law. I think that my statement acquits Mr. Allan.

Mr. MAHON.—Mr. Allan does not want any acquittal at the Minister's hands. The Minister owes him an apology.

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—I do not know why. I did not receive anything from Mr. Allan. The document which came into my hands was not marked private, and had reference to something before Parliament. It has been my duty to place the facts of the case before honorable members so that they may form their own opinions. What I was most anxious about was that no charge should be laid at the door of the Department. What was done was done in accordance with my instructions; but I had forgotten about the matter, because any number of these circulars have been sent to me.

Mr. FISHER.—Was the copy sent to Mr. Beale paid for?

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—If any member, or manufacturer, or other person asks me for information to which I think he is entitled, it is a pleasure to furnish it. We never think of charging for it.

Mr. MAHON.—Did any one else apply for information in the way that Mr. Beale did?

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—Scores of people have been given information. I have had honorable members and representatives of the press at the offices of the

Department, and have handed documents to them to peruse, so long as they have not been marked "private," or were not confidential in any way. Official files are, of course, dealt with with discretion. But what I wish to do is to clear those to whom some blame appeared to be attached, and to take the blame myself. Whatever the blame may be for what has occurred, it is on my shoulders. I have already quoted the letter of the 29th October, in which I said—

Re the particulars forwarded to you, they came in the way of a circular,

because I had never seen the document, and gave instructions that copies of the circular should be sent—

and I presume have been placed in the hands of other members, and therefore I think you are quite within your rights in answering same without any reference to the author of it. Or why not put your case in similar form, and send it to members?

Honorable members must know that all kinds of representations are made to me. Only to-day representations were made to me concerning the size of wheat bags, and in the ordinary course I would refer them to business persons in the city and have the statements made carefully inquired into by officers of the Department. However, I have stated the facts, and if any blame attaches to any one in the matter, I unreservedly take it upon myself, and I leave it to any unprejudiced men with a knowledge of the facts to say whether I deserve blame or not.

Mr. MAHON.—If the honorable member has Mr. Beale's letter, I should like to see it.

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—Certainly. I have not Mr. Beale's letter with me, but I can let the honorable member see it if he desires to do so.

Mr. MALONEY (Melbourne) [10.8].—Since I asked a question with reference to the casual hands employed in the Government Printing Office, I have learned that some of them have been employed under the State and under the Commonwealth in that Department for fifteen years, and have never known what it is to have a holiday. I hope the Government will make some change in this regard. I believe there are amongst the casual hands six compositors, four readers, and four warehousemen, and when the House has been sitting they have had to work the same hours as the per-

manent hands. I should like to say a word with respect to the Prime Minister's reference to the terrible task which the Treasurer was called upon to perform. The honorable gentleman sat at the table for twenty-two hours at one stretch, and day after day, for over seventy days, in carrying the Tariff through. Should another Tariff be submitted in this House, we shall, if we are sensible men, devise some means by which it may be dealt with in sections.

Mr. WILSON (Corangamite) [10.10].—I am very sorry that at this time, when honorable members should be ready to part with feelings of peace and goodwill towards each other, the matter referred to by the Minister of Trade and Customs should have cropped up.

Mr. DEAKIN.—Was it not very generous of the honorable gentleman to accept the responsibility?

Mr. WILSON.—Not at all; I do not think that there has been any generosity exhibited by the honorable gentleman. On the contrary, I think that the greatest blame attaches to him for permitting private information to be given to a rival firm.

Mr. DEAKIN.—The honorable member is confusing the act with the statement which has now been made.

Mr. WILSON.—If the Prime Minister had been present during the debate which took place on this matter a few evenings ago—

Mr. DEAKIN.—I heard part of it.

Mr. WILSON.—He would have known that the Minister of Trade and Customs protested most vehemently against the action taken by Mr. Allan with regard to the circular throwing the whole of the blame on the man who now from the lips of the honorable gentleman himself is shown to have been perfectly innocent. Honorable members must have felt that a great injustice was done Messrs. Allan and Company, and Mr. George Allan in particular. Honorable members generally at the time the matter was discussed fully acquitted the Treasurer of any blame, and the suspicion as to where the blame rested was transferred to the Minister of Trade and Customs and some of his officers. The Minister has gone into the matter now, but at the time to which I refer he said directly, or in answer to a question, that Mr. George Allan should have been prosecuted criminally for having issued the circular in which he said that some private information which he had given to the Department or to the

Treasurer had leaked out, and had been used for the purpose of supplying information to a trade rival. That sort of thing is to be deprecated, and if the practice were to be continued it would mean that men engaged in business, and particularly in the business of importation, would withhold information which ought to be given to the Department. I think that the Minister of Trade and Customs should by letter or in some other way make reparation in the form of an apology to Mr. Allan, because as he was the cause of the bitterness of feeling it is from him reparation should come.

Mr. MALONEY.—Have any untruths been told? Has Mr. Beale been falsely accusing Mr. Allan?

Mr. WILSON.—I have not said anything about Mr. Beale. I acquit him of all blame. It was Mr. Allan who was accused of being untruthful for making the statement he did in his circular. He was called a scoundrel in this House, and I say that reparation should be made to him, because to my personal knowledge of the last thirty years Mr. Allan and his family have had a reputation in Melbourne that is beyond reproach.

Mr. SALMON.—The Treasurer said he was a scoundrel if he said that he divulged the information.

Mr. WISE.—That is exactly what was said.

Mr. WILSON.—That is only a matter of detail as to the words used.

Mr. SALMON.—Is it?

Mr. WILSON.—The Treasurer said in a moment of heat that the man who issued that circular was a scoundrel, and I say that the matter should be set right by the Minister of Trade and Customs apologizing to Mr. Allan in some way or other, since he has himself admitted that he was to blame. I should like to indorse what the Prime Minister has said with regard to the great work which has been done by the Treasurer. I fought the Tariff through, as well as the Treasurer, and I can only say that the endurance displayed by the honorable gentleman was phenomenal. He carried all his guns on deck from 11 in the morning to nearly 11 o'clock the next morning. He never ceased to be able to use them, either as quick-firers, as pom-poms, or as heavy artillery, at any time of the day or night. The Prime Minister has foreshadowed several different kinds of millenium — the fiscal millenium, the indus-

trial millenium, and to-night the military millenium, and I think that when we are dealing with the latter the honorable gentleman might consider the advisability of putting the Treasurer, in view of the great generalship and skill he has shown, in command of the forces. As a great amount of fighting power and staying capacity has been shown on this side of the chamber, it will be advisable to select the other officers from this quarter. The thanks of the House are due to the Chairman of Committees for the manner in which he has performed his work, and to the officers of the House and the attendants for the way they have discharged their duties under very trying circumstances. I hope that you, Mr. Speaker, all honorable members, and all the officers of the House will enjoy a very happy vacation.

Mr. SALMON (Laanecoorie) [10.16].—Had I known that the question of printing a certain paper was to be put without further debate, I should have said a few words before it was done. I have been very much interested in the Prime Minister's speech, which is the most informative that we have had on defence matters in this chamber since the inauguration of the Commonwealth. I know that we have to thank the Minister of Defence for it in no small degree. As one who has been somewhat severe at times upon that honorable gentleman, I thoroughly appreciate the enormous amount of work which he has done, outside this House, and outside the ken of honorable members generally, in the direction of perfecting the system of organization that is so necessary for defence purposes in Australia. I feel some gratification that at least four matters which I have brought before the House at different times have been adopted by the Government. The formation of a medical reserve will have a potent effect in increasing the value of our defence force, and of giving the medical section the status that we all desire that it should have. The indication that the Government are prepared to promote any officer from the militia, volunteer, or permanent forces to any position in the military forces of the Commonwealth which he seems to be specially fitted to fill, will receive the hearty approbation, not only of this Chamber, but of the whole of the forces of the Commonwealth. Further, the decision which the Government have expressed

to interchange militia as well as permanent officers with others from different parts of the Empire, will be regarded as a great privilege by a large number of men who are only too anxious to give up their time, and even to spend their own money in perfecting themselves in their profession, and the proposal to include militia officers in the Board will give general satisfaction. I heartily indorse the expressions of good-will towards yourself, Mr. Speaker, and those connected with the services of the House for the magnificent fashion in which they have carried through the work of a very arduous session.

Mr. KING O'MALLEY (Darwin) [10.20].—I desire to congratulate the Prime Minister on his speech. It was a great speech on a great occasion by a great man. Of course, I shall be opposed to any military expenditure. I wish also to congratulate the Treasurer on having helped me to enable the members of this Parliament to have the merriest Christmas and the best New Year that they have had for many a day. I trust that, if possible, the Prime Minister will give the officers of the House a month's extra pay, so that they may enjoy themselves.

Mr. DEAKIN (Ballarat—Minister of External Affairs) [10.21].—I shall have much pleasure in bringing under the attention of the Treasurer the cases of casuals to which the honorable member for Melbourne has referred, and I wish every one present a Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year.

Mr. SPEAKER.—In putting the question, I may be allowed to acknowledge the kindly remarks of the Prime Minister and other honorable members. I can express my own conviction, without reserve, that the thanks of the House are indeed due to the Chairman of Committees, the officers at the table, and of the Parliamentary Reporting Staff, and the whole staff of the Parliament. I feel that a most arduous part of the session has been gone through, and that not one word of praise uttered concerning those gentlemen has been over-stated. For my own part, I trust that honorable members may enjoy to the uttermost the holiday which they have so well earned.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

PART I.

SPEECHES.

July 3, 1907, to June 5, 1908.

EXPLANATION OF ABBREVIATIONS.—*Adj.*, motion of adjournment; *ad. rep.*, adoption of report; *amdt.*, amendment; *com.*, committee; *cons. amdt.*, consideration of amendments; *cons. mes.*, consideration of message; *cons. req.*, consideration of requests; *dis.*, order of the day discharged; *expl.*, explanation; *int.*, introductory stages of Bill; *mes.*, message; *m.*, motion; *obs.*, observations; *m.s.o.*, motion to suspend standing orders; *p.o.*, point of order; *q.*, question; *1R.*, *2R.*, *3R.*, first, second, or third reading; *recom.*, recommitted.

Archer, Mr. E. W., *Capricornia* :

Address-in-Reply, *m.*, 129
 Australian Industries Preservation Bill, *2R.*, 9039, 9101.
 Bounties, *address*, 130
 Bounties Bill, *2R.*, 807; *com.* (specification of bounties), 1059; (schedule) (cotton), 1077; (olives), 1120; (palm fruit), 1184; (tobacco), 1225; (fish), 1291
 Budget, 3191
 Cattle, Argentine, *q.*, 6677
 Customs Tariff Bill, *cons. req.*, (Agricultural Machinery and Implements), 10665; (Oils), 10914; (Printing and Stencilling Inks), 11093. *See* Tariff Resolutions (Customs)

Defence :

Cadet System, *address*, 130
 Department of the Interior, *address*, 130
 Federal Administration, *address*, 129
 Federal Finance, *Budget*, 3194
 Immigration, *supply*, 9621-4
 Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway Survey Bill, *2R.*, 733
 Land Tax, *Budget*, 3197
 Lights and Beacons, *address*, 131
 London Offices of Commonwealth, *supply*, 3671
 Mail Service, Queensland, petition, 1056
 Mail Steamer, *Bingera*, *q.*, 10463
 Manufactures Encouragement Bill, *2R.*, 6278
 New Protection, *Budget*, 3193
 Old-age Pensions, *Budget*, 3197; *m.*, 9342
 Parliament, Press Reports of Proceedings, *Budget*, 3198
 Parliamentary Allowances Bill, *m.*, 1923; *2R.*, 1985; *com.* (amount of allowance), 2002
 Prorogation, *q.*, 11053
 Protective Policy, Effect of, *Budget*, 3192
 Public Service :
 Queensland Promotions, *m.*, 10136
 Retirement of Officer, *q.*, 8813
 Quarantine Bill, *com.* (scope of quarantine), 1533; (port of entry), 1564; (examination of imported stock), 1724, 1756, 1761; (power to destroy diseased animals), 1725
 Queensland Railways, *Budget*, 3196
 Shipping Combine, *adj.*, 3969
 States Debts, *Budget*, 3195
 F.6950.

Archer, Mr. E. W.—*continued*.

Sugar Industry :
 Black Labour in, *Budget*, 3191
 Casual Labourers, *q.*, 10878
 Supply :
 External Affairs (Miscellaneous), 9621
 Works and Buildings, External Affairs (London Offices), 3671
 Tariff : *m.*, 3191
 Tariff Resolutions (Customs) :
 Agricultural, Horticultural and Viticultural Machinery and Implements, *n.c.i.*, 6054, 6551
 Agricultural, Horticultural and Viticultural Machinery and Implements, *cons. req.*, 10665
 Droppers, 6116
 Engines, 6704
 Glass, 6934
 Manufactures of Paper, 7204
 Oils, *cons. req.*, 10914
 Pianos, 7356
 Printing and Stencilling Inks, 7243, 7245, 7246, 7251, 7258; *cons. req.*, 11093
 Rails, &c., 6818, 6828
 Sheepwashes, 6990
 Sugar, 4674, 4764
 Wicker, Bamboo, and Cane, 7108, 7109
 Wire Netting (*p.o.*, 4573), 4575, 4576
 (*See* Customs Tariff Bill)
 Tariff Resolutions (Excise) :
 Golden Syrup, 4767
 Telegrams, Delayed, *q.*, 8813, 8925

Atkinson, Mr. L., *Wilmot* :

Address-in-Reply, *m.*, 188
 Australian Industries Preservation Bill, *2R.*, 9036; *com.*, (persons to answer questions and produce documents), 9223
 Bounties Bill, *2R.*, 991; *com.* (schedule), 1083; (mohair), 1096; (coffee), 1199
 Budget, 3294
 Customs Tariff Bill, *cons. req.* (Hay and Chaff), 10539; (Wire Netting), 10772; (Roofing Tiles), 10901; (Oils), 10918; (Insecticides), 11004; (Timber), 11136; (Curtains and Blinds), 11440. *See* Tariff Resolutions (Customs)

Atkinson, Mr. L.—*continued.*

- Defence :
 Coastal, *address*, 191
 Military Regulations, *q.*, 9192
 Naval Agreement, *address*, 191
 Federal Administration, *address*, 188
 Grain Bags, *q.*, 11051
 Immigration, *address*, 189
 Imperial Conference, *address*, 189
 Income Tax, Payment by Federal Officers, *address*, 191
 Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway Survey Bill, 2R., 718
 Land Taxation, *address*, 189
 London Offices, *supply*, 3672
 Mail Contract, Cancelled, *address*, 190
 Mail Service to Europe, *m.*, 6494
 Northern Territory, *address*, 190
 Parliamentary Allowances Bill, 2R., 1979; *com.* (amount of allowance), 2009
 Preferential Trade, *address*, 190
 Preferential Voting, *address*, 191
 Quarantine Bill, *com.* (scope of quarantine), 1517; (interpretation), 1540; (ports of entry), 1551; *cons. amds.*, 8948
 Responsible Government, *address*, 188
 Shipping Ring, British, *q.*, 10785
 Supply :
 Works and Buildings (Trade and Customs), 3443; (External Affairs), 3672
 Surplus Revenue Bill, 2R., 11745; *q.*, 11788
 Tariff Revision, *address*, 188
 Tariff : *m.*, 3294
 Congratulatory Telegrams, *q.*, 2996
 Tariff Resolutions (Customs) :
 Candles, 4951
 Curtains and Blinds, *cons. req.*, 11440
 Hay and Chaff, 5426; *ad. rep.*, 7454; *cons. req.*, 10539
 Iron, Plate and Sheet, 6547
 Insecticides, *cons. req.*, 11004
 Manufactures of Paper, 7188
 Oils, *cons. req.*, 10918
 Potatoes, 5341
 Rock Drills, 6783
 Roofing Tiles, *cons. req.*, 10901
 Stearine and Paraffine, 5140
 Timber, undressed, 7076, 7096; *cons. req.*, 11136
 Traction and Portable Engines, 6685
 Wire Netting, *cons. req.*, 10772
 (See Customs Tariff Bill)
 Tasmanian Mail Service, *q.*, 11017
 Trawler, *supply*, 3443; *q.*, 5238, 11261

Bamford, Hon. F. W., *Herbert :*

- Bounties Bill, *com.* (schedule) (rice), 1192; (coffee), 1201; *recom.* (specification of bounties), 1386, 1387; *q.*, 5415.
 Coastal Surveys, *q.*, 4519
 Commonwealth Currency, *q.*, 2235
 Commonwealth Savings Bank, *q.*, 407
 Contract Immigrants, *q.*, 502, 1281; *adj.*, 1743, 2344
 Customs Tariff Bill, *cons. req.*, (Sago and Tapioca), 10408; (Gloves), 10578; (Manufactures of Metal), 10706; (Wire-netting), 10760; (Timber), 11038, 11165. See Tariff Resolutions (Customs)
 Defence :
 Officers' Alien Servants, *q.*, 11627
 Small Arms and Ammunition Factory, *q.*, 6356

Bamford, Hon. F. W.—*continued.*

- Thursday Island Fort, Explosion at, *q.*, 10750, 11627
 Disputed Elections and Qualification. Bill, *com.* (pending petitions), 6381
 Federal Capital, *q.*, 8814
 Grain Bags, Size of, *q.*, 6228, 7415, 11051
 Immigrants, Spanish, *q.*, 4647, 7113
 Immigration Restriction Act, *adj.*, 244
 Mails :
 Mail Contract, Cancelled, *q.*, 9766
 Papua, Solomon Islands and New Hebrides, *q.*, 3508, 3509
 Railway Carriage of, *q.*, 11158
 Manufactures Encouragement Bill, *int.*, 3014
 Old-Age Pensions, *m.*, 9324
 Papua :
 Administration of, *supply*, 9412
 Conflict Group, Purchase of, *q.*, 7248
 Telegraphic Communication with, *q.*, 405
 Post Offices :
 Cairns, *Ways and Means*, 5693
 Postal :
 Promotions, Queensland, *q.*, 5240
 Registered Letter, non-delivery of, *q.*, 9193
 Printing Machinery, *supply*, 3597
 Public Service :
 Age Retirements, *m.*, 9194
 Classification, *q.*, 1975
 North Queensland : Extra Living Allowance, *q.*, 9009
 Public Works Estimates, *q.*, 1866
 Quarantine Bill, 2R., 527; *com.*, (order to perform quarantine), 1720; (power to destroy diseased animals), 1729
 Queensland Coast, Lighting of, *supply*, 9889
 Session, Close of, *q.*, 11790
 Shipping Combine, *q.*, 3585
 Silver Coinage, *q.*, 2235
 Sittings of House, *q.*, 6729
 Supply :
 External Affairs (Administration), 9412; (Miscellaneous), 9724
 Home Affairs (Works and Buildings), 9880
 Works and Buildings (Treasury), 3507
 Tariff :
 Kerosene, Flash Point of, *q.*, 11180
 Opium, Smuggling of, *q.*, 2565
 Tariff Resolutions :
 Agricultural, Horticultural, and Viticultural Machinery and Implements, *n.e.i.*, 6550
 Citrus Fruits, 5333
 Coffee, 5261, 5263, 5264
 Eggs, 5265
 Gloves, *cons. req.*, 10578
 Iron, Plate and Sheet, 6546
 Lead, Sheet and Piping, 6049
 Machinery, &c., 6735
 Manufactures of Metal, *cons. req.*, 10706
 Manufactures of Paper, 7191
 Piece Goods, Woollen (*p.o.*), 5840
 Sago and Tapioca, *cons. req.*, 10498
 Stearine and Paraffine, 5152
 Sugar, 4682
 Timber, Undressed, 7035, 7106; *cons. req.*, 11038, 11165
 Tobacco, Manufactured, *n.e.i.*, 4294
 Tool Handles, 7122
 Wire Netting, 4540; *cons. req.*, 10760
 (See Customs Tariff Bill)
 Tropical Diseases in Australia, *supply*, 9724
 Year-Book, *q.*, 10607
 Wireless Telegraphy, *q.*, 11327

Batchelor, Hon. E. L., Boothby:

Agricultural Implement Making Industry, *adj.*, 12167
 Australian Industries Preservation Bill, 22., 9101
 Bounties Bill, 22., 919; *com.* (specification of bounties), 1058; (schedule) (cotton) 1076, (mohair) 1096, (olives) 1115, (palm fruit) 1184, (coffee) 1202, 1207, (tobacco) 1226
 Braddon Section, *Budget*, 3037
 Budget, 3035, 3105
 Business, Order of, *m.*, 2804; *q.*, 10078
 Chairman of Committees, *supply*, 82, 83; *m.*, 316
 Customs Prosecution, *q.*, 9089
 Customs Tariff Bill, *cons. req.* (Sago and Tapioca), 10497; (Hay and Chaff), 10529; (Bags and Sacks), 10571, 10572; (Hats and Caps), 10601; (Arms), 10658; (Kitchen Utensils), 10707, 10708; (Locks), 10777, 10793; (Standards, Steel Fencing), 10799; (Oils), 10887, 10894, 10975, 10992; (Ammonia), 11001; (Curtains and Blinds), 11439, 11442; (Motive Power Machinery and Appliances), 11537; (Pulley Blocks), 11541; (Articles made from Aluminium), 11544; (Timber), 11573; *m.*, 11427 (*see* Tariff resolutions (Customs).)
 Customs Taxation, *Budget*, 3044
 Defence:
 Artillery Practice at Nairne, *q.*, 10700
 Harbor and Coastal, *supply*, 3337
 Electoral Department:
 Electoral Act, Amendment of, *supply*, 9770-1
 Postal Officials as Returning Officers, *m.*, 701
 Rolls, *q.*, 11259, 11330
 Excise Tariff (Agricultural Machinery) Act, *q.*, 7113
 Excise Tariff (Spirits) Act, *adj.*, 4142; *q.*, 4647, 4648, 4748, 5238, 5328, 5691, 7027, 7297, 7298; *Ways and Means*, 5698
 Federal Expenditure, *Budget*, 3041
 Government Printing Office, *supply*, 9971
 House, Rights of, *m.*, 11427
 Immigration, *supply*, 9696-9
 Invalid and Old-age Pensions Bill, *com.* (qualifications), 11967; (disqualifications), 11968, 11970, 11972
 Land Tax, Progressive, *supply*, 9698; *q.*, 10878
 Mail Service to Europe, *m.*, 6454
 New Protection, *Budget*, 3045, 3105; *adj.*, 4142; *q.*, 4647, 4648, 4748; *Ways and Means*, 5698
 Northern Territory, *q.*, 194
 Old-age Pensions, *Budget*, 3035
 Parliament, reflections on, *expl.*, 10975; *obs.*, 10993
 Parliamentary Allowances Bill, *com.* (amount of allowance) 1996, (conscientious scruples) 2011
 Pianos, Exhibit in Parliament House, *q.*, 7114
 Postal Department:
 Administration, Royal Commission as to, *q.*, 9477; *supply*, 10245; *m.*, 10425
 Chinese Helmets, *q.*, 6593, 6675
 Expenditure in South Australia, *supply*, 11393
 Mail Motor Cars, *q.*, 4086, 10752, 11526, 11791

Batchelor, Hon. E. L.—continued.

Post Offices, Expenditure upon, *supply*, 3335;
 South Australian Officials, *q.*, 2566, 2890;
 Letter Carriers and Mail Cart Drivers, *q.*, 9846
 Stamp Printing, *supply*, 9972, 11395
 Telegraphic Messages Abroad, *q.*, 9389, 12153
 Post Offices:
 Northam, *supply*, 3533, 3538
 Unley, *q.*, 5497
 Postal Rates Bill, *q.*, 882
 Public Service:
 Administration of, *supply*, 9775-6
 District Allowances, *supply*, 11376; *q.*, 11919
 Increments, *Budget*, 3042
 Retiring Age, *supply*, 10246
 Quarantine Bill, 22., 528, *com.* (scope of quarantine) 1532, (State laws and regulations), 1772; *cons. amds.*, 8942
 Quorum Rules, Breach of, *p.o.*, 6800
 Sittings of House, *q.*, 6416
 Stamp Printing Machinery, *q.*, 298, 314, 406
 Sugar Bounty Act, *Budget*, 3036
 Supply Bill (No. 1), *m.*, 82, 83
 Supply Bill (No. 1) 1908-9, 22., 12180, 12183
 Supply:
 External Affairs (Miscellaneous), 9696
 Home Affairs (Electoral Office), 9770; (Public Service Commissioner), 9775
 Postmaster-General (Central Staff), 10245;
 (Expenditure in South Australia), 11393
 Treasury (Government Printer), 9971; (District Allowances), 11376
 Works and Buildings (Home Affairs), 3335;
 (Trade and Customs), 3437; (Post and Telegraphs), 3515, 3533, 3538, 3591
 Surplus Revenue: Monthly Balances, *q.*, 11785
 Tariff: *m.*, 3035, 3105; *ad. rep.*, 7454
 Revenue from, *Budget*, 3038
 Tariff Resolutions (Customs):
 Ale, Porter, and other Beer, (*p.o.*, 4122), 4126
 Ammonia, *cons. req.*, 11001
 Arms, 6036, 6037; *cons. req.*, 10658
 Articles for official use of States Governors, 7404, 7418, 7421
 Articles made from Aluminium, *cons. req.*, 11544
 Bicycles, 7275, 7281
 Bolts, 6113
 Carbon, Bisulphide, 7392
 Chain, *n.e.i.*, 6113
 Cosies and Cushions, 5741
 Cotton Asbestos, 7399
 Cycle Parts, Plated, 7283
 Cycle Parts, *n.e.i.*, 7284
 Curtains and Blinds, *cons. req.*, 11439, 11442
 Dates, 5332
 Droppers, 6832
 Furniture, 7017
 Graphite, 6858
 Hats and Caps, *cons. req.*, 10601
 Hay and Chaff, 5363; *cons. req.*, 10529
 Kitchen Utensils, *cons. req.*, 10707, 10708
 Lamps and Lampware, 6038
 Lead, Sheet and Piping, 6052
 Live Stock, 4770
 Locks and Staples, 6114; *cons. req.*, 10777, 10793
 Machinery and Parts thereof, 6107
 Manures, 7366, 7372
 Motive Power Machinery and Appliances, 6641, 6662; *cons. req.*, 11537

Batchelor, Hon. E. L.—*continued.*

Tariff Resolutions (Customs)—*continued.*

- Oils, *cons. req.*, 10887, 10894, 10975, 10992
- Paints and Colours, 6880
- Peel, 5333, 5336
- Piece Goods, 5923
- Pulley Blocks, *p.o.*, 11541
- Rice (uncleaned), 5528
- Saccharin, 6975
- Sago and Tapioca, *cons. req.*, 10497
- Salt, Gypsum, and Manure Bags, 5645; *recom.*, 5735, 5736, 5737; *cons. req.*, 10571, 10572
- Screws, *n.e.i.*, 6770
- Standards, Steel Fencing, *cons. req.*, 10799
- State Imports, 7439
- Stone and Marble, 6960
- Sugar, 4701, 4766
- Tanks, 6624
- Timber, undressed, 7083, 7087, 7089; *cons. req.*, 11573
- Tobacco, (manufactured, *n.e.i.*), 4212; (unmanufactured), 4303
- Traction and Portable Engines, 6684
- Vehicles, 7292
- Wine, *n.e.i.*, 4141
- Wire Netting, 4460, 4576
(See Customs Tariff Bill)
- Tariff Resolutions (Excise):
- Saccharin, 4766
- Tobacco, hand-made, strand, 4305
- Tasmanian Cable, *q.*, 11707
- Telephones:
- Charges, Reduction of, *q.*, 880
- Indexing of List., *q.*, 3586
- Norwood and Unley Exchanges, *q.*, 1090, 5520
- Rates, Anomalies in, *q.*, 978; *supply*, 3515
- Trawler, *supply*, 3437
- Wages Boards, *Budget*, 3111
- Weather Forecasts, *q.*, 8926, 9091, 9480

Best, Senator Hon. R. W., Victoria:

- Additional Appropriation Bill, 1907-8, *m.s.o.*, 11473; Schedule (Postmaster-General), 11620, 11621
- Additional Appropriation (Works and Buildings) Bill, 1907-8, *m.s.o.*, 11622; 2R., 11622, 11690
- Additional Appropriation (Works and Buildings) Bill, 1905-6 and 1906-7, *m.s.o.*, 11623
- Address-in-Reply, *m.*, 53
- Adjournment, *adj.*, 6416
- Adjournment: Easter, *q.*, 10252, 10369
- Adjournment, Special, *m.*, 9, 4893, 6353, 6415, 7052, 7786, 7790, 10072, 10300, 10399, 10962, 11321, 11323, 11384, 11697, 12149; *supply*, 5878
- Agriculture, Department of, *q.*, 8365, 8482, 8505, 8506
- Agricultural Implement Workers, *q.*, 5177
- Agricultural Show, *adj.*, 2962
- American Fleet, *q.*, 8554, 9138, 9236; *obs.*, 9421; *q.*, 11301, 11468, 11469, 11470, 11983, 12102; *obs.*, 9951
- Anglo-Japanese Treaty, *q.*, 5858; *supply*, 5876
- Antarctic Expedition, *q.*, 7702, 7754, 7849

Best, Senator Hon. R. W.—*continued.*

- Appropriation Bill, *m.s.o.*, 10260; 2R., 10261; *com.*, (Parliament), 10286, 10289; (External Affairs) 10290, 10291, 10293, 10296, 10299, 10303; (Attorney-General), 10303; (Treasury), 10371; (Defence), 10384, 10386, 10388; (Postmaster-General), 10390; 3R., 10399
- Appropriation (Works and Buildings) Bill, 1R., 3706; 2R., 3798, 3925; *com.*, Schedule (Defence), 3930, 3931, 4037, 4038, 4041, 4043, 4045; (Postmaster-General), 4047, 4048, 4049; (Treasury), 4056, 4059, 4062; (External Affairs), 4063, 4065, 4078; 3R., 4144
- Asiatics, Registration of, *q.*, 9422
- Australia, Map of, *q.*, 5466; Advertising, *supply*, 10303; *q.*, 11218, 11302, 11472; *supply*, 12144, 12145
- Australian Men of Letters Fund, *supply*, 10302
- Australian Industries Preservation Act, *q.*, 4035, 6294, 7569, 7653; *adj.*, 4278
- Australian Industries Preservation Bill, *int.*, 1R., 4144; 2R., 4365, 4911; *com.* (burden of proof), 4918, (persons to answer questions and produce documents), 5013, 5015, 5021, 5094, 5108, 5110, (production of documents), 5111, (documents may be impounded), 5112; *m.*, 5113; *ad. rep.*, 5178, 5193; 3R., 5285; *q.*, 5978; *cons. amds.* (persons to answer questions and produce documents), 10071
- Anti-Trust, and Commerce Laws, *q.*, 11303
- Bananas, Inspection Fees, *q.*, 4472, 4707
- Bible Reading in State Schools, *q.*, 2283, 2514
- Bicycle Industry, *q.*, 5978, 6294, 7569
- Bills of Exchange Bill, *int.* and 1R., 250; *com.* (application of State laws), 671, 673, 676
- Boot Machinery Trust, *q.*, 828, 934
- Bounties, Western Australia, *q.*, 5175, 5284
- Bounties Act, *q.*, 7653, 9138
- Bounties Bill, *com.*, (appropriation), 2765; (minimum wage), 2771; (regulations), 2856, 2860; (rice, uncleaned), 3475; (*p.o.*, 3470, 3481), 3483; *ad. rep.*, 4585; *recom.*, 4839
- British Goods, Certificates of value, *m.*, 1957; *q.*, 7928
- Budget, *adj.*, 1594; *q.*, 1684
- Bulgarian Immigrants, *q.*, 8075-6
- Business:
- Conduct of, *adj.*, 485, 487, 585, 7564; *obs.*, 651; *supply*, 1862, 1932
- Order of, *m.*, 31, 32, 34; *adj.*, 157, 766, 1713, 2888, 4621; *m.*, 5395; *adj.*, 5782, 8284, 10919, 11909, 12038; *obs.*, 3365
- Cabinet Changes, *q.*, 7544, 7569; *obs.*, 7652
- Cables, *supply*, 1862, 1952
- Cattle, Argentine, *q.*, 5981
- Chinese, Influx of, *q.*, 6061, 7927; *adj.*, 9008; *q.*, 9236-7, 10370
- Cigar Boxes, *q.*, 5083
- Coal Combine, *adj.*, 3688; *q.*, 3800, 4035
- Coal Miners, Maitland, *q.*, 8229, 8309
- Coast Defence Appropriation Bill, 2R., 12106
- Coastal Trade, *q.*, 564
- Collins, Captain, *q.*, 1928; *supply*, 10296
- Colonial Oil Coy., Action of, *adj.*, 2789
- Commerce Act, *q.*, 132, 7754; *supply*, 6352
- Commercial Agents, *q.*, 8554
- Commercial Congress, *q.*, 9353

Best, Senator Hon. R. W.—*continued.*

Commonwealth, Advertising Resources of, *sup-
ply*, 5892, 6349; *q.*, 6407, 11218, 11302,
11384, 11472; *supply*, 10303, 12144, 12145
Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration
Act, *q.*, 7926
Commonwealth Gazette, supply, 10290
Commonwealth and States, Financial Relations
of, *address*, 58; *q.*, 746, 7974-6, 7976, 11381
Commonwealth Salaries Bill, *int.*, 132; *1R.*,
250; *2R.*, 500; *com.* (taxation by States of
Commonwealth salaries), 954, 955, 956, 1047,
1568, 1572, 1581, 1583; *ad rep.*, 1704; *3R.*,
1828; *cons. amdt.*, 4084
Commonwealth Salaries Act, *q.*, 7567
Commonwealth Year Book, q., 9422
Confectionery Trade, *adj.*, 3407
Constitution Alteration (Senate Elections) Act,
q., 9237
"Contingencies," *supply*, 1949, 1950
Contract Immigrants, *q.*, 650, 830, 1929
Cotton, Production, *q.*, 650, 830
Criminal Appeals Bill, *m.*, 2561; *2R.*, 3493
Criminal Appeals, *q.*, 1567
Customs Act, Breaches of, *q.*, 3463
Customs Conference, Pretoria, *q.*, 10921
Customs and Excise Revenue, *q.*, 11581, 11986,
12102
Customs Frauds, Adelaide, *q.*, 249, 1131
Customs Launch, Sydney, *supply*, 3931
Customs Leakages, *q.*, 6294, 6409
Customs Revenue, Tasmania, *q.*, 933, 934
Customs Tariff Amendment Bill, *2R.*, 12102
Customs Tariff Bill, *1R.*, 7545, 7552; *m.s.o.*,
7553, 10830, 10840; *q.*, 10919; *m.*, 10922,
11580, 11678, 11687; *2R.*, 7553; *com.*,
(Application of Tariff), 9950; (Schedule B),
9950; *m.s.o.*, 10041-2, 11581; *m.*, 11583;
ad. rep., 10042; *recom.*, 10048
Schedule:
Adding and Computing Machines, 8625;
cons. req., 10937
Agricultural, Horticultural, and Viticul-
tural Machinery and Implements,
8587, 8588, 8590
Agricultural, Horticultural, and Viticul-
tural Machinery and Implements,
n.e.i., 8575, 8579
Aluminium, 9173; *cons. req.*, 10940
Ammonia Condenser Coils, 9169, 9170;
cons. req., 11237
Ammunition, 8555
Animals, 7654
Anodes and Hooks, 9173
Antimony, 9171
Apparel and Attire, 8194
Apparel and Attire, *n.e.i.*, 8213
Apparel and Attire, woollen or silk,
8118
Arms, 8556, 8557, 8558, 8559, 8560; *cons.*
req., 10934
Articles, *n.e.i.*, 8217
Artificial Plants, Flowers, and Fruits,
8351, 8352
Bags and Sacks, 8218, 8219
Baskets of Rush and Straw, 9899
Bicycles, *cons. req.*, 11315
Biscuits, 7667, 7681
Blankets, 8232, 8233; *cons. req.*, 10925
Blankets for Printing Machines, 9946
Blue, 7686, 7695, 7696; *cons. req.*, 10844
Boats, Launches and Yachts, 9901
Boots, &c., 9662

Best, Senator Hon. R. W.—*continued.*

Customs Tariff Bill (Schedule)—*continued.*

Boots, Rubber, 9665
Brass, viz., Scrap, &c., 9173
Brasswork and Gun-metal Work, 8764
Broom, Corn, Millet, 7697
Brushes, 9903
Butter and Cheese, 7699, 7700
Cameras, &c., 9936
Candles, 7705, 7711, 7712
Carpets, 8261, 8268; *cons. req.*, 10925,
11592
Chaff Cutters and Horse Gears, 8579,
8580
Churns, &c., 8581
Coal Cutting Machines, *cons. req.*,
10941, 11596
Coir Mats, 8276
Combined Corn Sheller, Husker, and
Bagger, 8581
Combs, 9654
Confectionery, 7721, 7741, 7747, 7749;
cons. req., 10855
Copper, 9173
Corks, 9926
Cosies and Cushions, 8279, 8281, 8282,
8284
Cotton Asbestos, &c., 9939
Crust or Rough Tanned Goat, &c., 9678
Curled Hair and Curled Fibre, 9899
Curtains and Blinds, *n.e.i.*, 8287; *cons.*
req., 10926, 11589
Cutlery of all kinds, *n.e.i.*, 8598; *cons.*
req., 10936
Dutiable Machinery and Machine Tools,
8721
Dynamos and Electrical Machines, *cons.*
req., 10943, 10947
Earth and Rock Cutting Machinery,
8785, 8787, 8795, 8796
Electrical and Gas Appliances, 8891,
9042, 9044, 9046, 9053, 9060-1; *cons.*
req., 10948, 10950, 11596
Electrical Machines and Parts thereof,
8798, 8804, 8810, 8869, 8872, 8882,
8885, 8886; *cons. req.*, 11589, 11590,
11591
Electrotypes and Stereotypes, 9169
Engines, *n.e.i.*, 8665, 8667, 8668, 8670,
8676, 8694
Explosives, 9926, 9927
Fancy goods, 9650, 9653
Fibro and Glazed Bricks, *cons. req.*,
11235
Fire Brigade Appliances, 9940
Fire Extinguishers, 8773
Filters, 9900
Fish, *cons. req.*, 10856
Fishing and Rabbit Nets, 9917
Fringes and Textile Materials, not for
Attire, 8334
Fruits and Vegetables, 7809
Fumigators, Atomisers, &c., 9925; *cons.*
req., 11316
Furniture, *n.e.i.*, *cons. req.*, 11242
Furs and other Skins, 8289
Glass, *cons. req.*, 11235
Gloves, 8293, 8294, 8295, 8296-7; *cons.*
req., 10927, 11592
Glue, *cons. req.*, 11235
Goods Repaired Abroad, 9945
Goods Returned to Commonwealth, 99

Best, Senator Hon. R. W.—*continued.*Customs Tariff Bill (Schedule)—*continued.*

Grain and Pulse, not prepared or manufactured, 7891
 Grain and Pulse, prepared or manufactured, 7895; *p.o.*, 7900
 Hats, Caps, and Bonnets, 8300, 8318, 8321
 Hay and Chaff, *cons. req.*, 10856-7
 Infants' Food, 8063
 Insecticides, *cons. req.*, 11238, 11599
 Iron, Plate and Sheet, 8562, 8563
 Iron and Steel, 9189
 Iron and Steel Tubes, 9086, 9087, 9088
 Iron Pipes, &c., 9073, 9074
 Jewellery, unfinished, 9654
 Jewellery, known as Rolled Gold, &c., 9655
 Jewellery, being machine-made chain, &c., 9655
 Jewellery, *n.e.i.*, 9656
 Kinematographs, &c., 9657
 Lamps and Lampware, 8568, 8571
 Lantern Slides, &c., 9930, 9931, 9933, 9934, 9935; *cons. req.*, 11317
 Locomotives, Traction and Portable Engines, 8662
 Leather, *cons. req.*, 11309, 11310
 Leather, Rubber, and Composition Belting, 9675, 9677, 9678
 Liquorice, 7755, 7759, 7760; *cons. req.*, 10855
 Locks, 9173, 9176; *cons. req.*, 10958
 Machinery and Parts thereof, 8607
 Machinery and Machines and Machine Tools, *n.e.i.*, 8703, 8709 (*p.o.*, 8711, 8715), 8718, 8719, 8720
 Manufactures of Metal, *n.e.i.*, 8724, 8725, 8734, 8736, 8740, 8757, 8761, 8762, 8763
 Mangles, &c., 8573
 Manures, 9903
 Matches and Vestas, 7978; *cons. req.*, 10867
 Metals and Machinery (Division VIa.), 9187
 Military Band and Orchestral Musical Instruments, 9899
 Motive Power Machinery and Appliances (except electric), 8626, 8628, 8630, 8633, (*p.o.*, 8645, 8648), 8654, 8657; *cons. req.*, 10938
 Mustard, *cons. req.*, 10868
 Nails, 8603, 8607
 Oars and Sculls, 9902
 Oilmen's Stores, *n.e.i.*, 8041, 8043, 8055, 8062; *cons. req.*, 10870
 Oils, *cons. req.*, 11222, 11224, 11226, 11227, 11230, 11598
 Outside Packages, *n.e.i.*, 9948
 Paint Boxes, 9654
 Paper, *cons. req.*, 11311, 11314, 11315
 Parasols, Sunshades, and Umbrellas, 8325
 Passengers' Personal Effects, 9941
 Pens and Pencils, *cons. req.*, 11315
 Pianos, 9893, 9896
 Pickles, *cons. req.*, 10871
 Piece Goods used in manufacture of waterproof cloth, *cons. req.*, 11320

Best, Senator Hon. R. W.—*continued.*Customs Tariff Bill (Schedule)—*continued.*

Piece Goods, 8119, 8121, 8124, 8127, 8150, 8151, 8157, 8166, 8170, 8182, 8183, 8187, 8189, 8190, 8192; *cons. req.*, 10923-4, 11594
 Pins not of Gold or Silver, 9178
 Plates and Sheets of any metal (except tin), 9170
 Platinum Bars, 9178
 Printing Roller Composition, *cons. req.*, 11236
 Pulley Blocks, *cons. req.*, 10938, 10939, 10940, 11596
 Rails &c., 9063, 9071, 9072; *cons. req.*, 10951
 Rice Root, 7698; *cons. req.*, 10871
 Roasting Dishes, *cons. req.*, 11235, 11599
 Rock Boring Machines, *cons. req.*, 10941
 Roofing Tiles, *cons. req.*, 11234
 Rubber and other Hose, 9666
 Rubber manufactures, *n.e.i.*, 9670, 9672, 9674
 Sago and Tapioca, 7659
 Saws, *n.e.i.*, 8763
 Scientific Instruments, 9947
 Sewing and Embroidery Silks and Twists, 9923
 Screws, 8777, 8778, 8781; *cons. req.*, 10941, 11589
 Sheet Lead and Lead Piping, 8572; *cons. req.*, 10935, 11588
 Slipper Forms, &c., 9663, 9664, 9665; *cons. req.*, 11309
 Socks and Stockings, 8334, 8336, 8338, 8339
 Solid Spirit Heaters, 7712
 Spectacles and Spectacle Frames, 9658
 Spices, *cons. req.*, 10874
 Stained Glass Windows, 9936-7; *cons. req.*, 11317, 11318, 11607
 Standards, &c., 9178, 9181, 9182, 9183; *cons. req.*, 10959, 11598
 Stearine, Paraffine Wax, &c., 7714; *cons. req.*, 10845, 10854
 Steel and Steel Rimmed Wheels, 9183, 9184, 9186-7; *cons. req.*, 10961
 Stone and Marble, *cons. req.*, 11235, 11589
 Stripper Harvesters, 8582, 8584, 8585
 Surgical Appliances, 9940; *cons. req.*, 11320
 Surgical, Dental, and Veterinary Instruments, &c., 9943, 9944; *cons. req.*, 11320
 Talking machines, &c., 9657
 Tartaric Acid, *cons. req.*, 11241
 Tea, *cons. req.*, 10921
 Tents, Tarpaulins, Sails, and Flags, 8347
 Timber (*p.o.*, 9423), 9424, 9459, 9472; (*p.o.*, 9552); *cons. req.*, 11242, 11253, 11255, 11256, 11257, 11304, 11308, 11599
 Tobacco (unmanufactured), *cons. req.*, 10841, 10843
 Trimmings and ornaments, *n.e.i.*, for Attire, 8348, 8349
 Type, Printers', 8764
 Vehicles, *cons. req.*, 11316
 Waddings and Cotton Wool, 8327
 Watch Bands Clock Main and Hair springs, &c., 9656; *cons. req.*, 11309

Best, Senator Hon. R. W.—*continued.*

Customs Tariff Bill (Schedule)—*continued.*

- Watches, Clocks, &c., 9656
- Weighing Machines, &c., *n.e.i.*, 8619-20, 8621
- Wire Netting, 9140
- Wire, *n.e.i.*, 9187; *cons. req.*, 11222
- Works of Art, 9936-7; *cons. req.*, 11317, 11318, 11607
- Yarns, 9920, 9922
- Darling Island Store, *supply*, 3930
- Decimal Coinage, *q.*, 10369
- Defence :
 - Albany and Townsville Forts, *supply*, 10384
 - Beuley, F. W., *supply*, 11620
 - Brisbane Rifle Range, *supply*, 4037, 4038, 4041
 - Commandant, Western Australia, and Rifle Clubs, *supply*, 10384
 - Dove, Major, *supply*, 10388
 - Field Artillery, *supply*, 4061, 4062
 - Gunboat *Protector*, *supply*, 4043
 - Hoad, Major-General, *q.*, 6191
 - Inspector-General's Report, *supply*, 10384
 - Instructional Officers, *supply*, 1949, 10384
 - Lyons, Capt., *supply*, 10386
 - Militia, Supply of Boots to, *supply*, 5875
 - Militiamen, Insulting Behaviour of, *supply*, 10384-5
 - Naval Agreement, *q.*, 1131, 2514, 10252
 - Naval Officers' Reports, *supply*, 10384
 - Naval Policy, *q.*, 5177, 5367, 5466
 - North Fremantle Fort, *supply*, 4043
 - Policy, *q.*, 5560
 - Rifle Clubs and Associations, *supply*, 1949, 4045
 - Thursday Island, *supply*, 10384
 - Torpedoes, Practice, *supply*, 4062
 - Uniforms, Western Australia, *supply*, 10384
- Disputed Elections and Qualifications Bill, *int.*, 5284; *2r.*, 5467, 5594, 5596; *com.* (pending petitions), 5596, 5597, 5599 (amendment of Principal Act), 6648 (qualifications and vacancies), 5649, 5657, 5660, 5661, 5664; *re-com.* (pending petitions), 5775, 5776, 5777, 5779, 5981 (qualifications and vacancies), 5982, 5983; *m.s.o.*, 5986; *q.*, 5858, 5981
- Disputed Senate Election, South Australia, *q.*, 7753, 8286, 9421
- Dissent from Ruling, *obs.*, 3151
- Dissent from Ruling : Admissibility of Request (Excise Tariff Bill), *m.*, 10022
- Electoral Bill, *supply*, 1864, 6351
- Empire Free-trade, *q.*, 11468
- Estimates, *q.*, 7976
- Excise Procedure Bill, *m.*, 4477
- Excise Tariff Bill, *1r.*, 7545; *ad. rep.*, 10040; *obs.*, 11688
- Excise Tariff (Agricultural Machinery) Act, *q.*, 3049, 3149, 4362, 5175, 5284, 5560, 5857, 5981, 6180; 6205, 7543, 7567; 7568, 10919, 10920-1, 11220; *adj.*, 5751
- Excise Tariff (Spirits) Act, *adj.*, 4619; *q.*, 5857, 6189, 6205, 7566, 8364
- Excise Tariff (Starch) Bill, *2r.*, 12105
- Federal Capital, *address*, 58; *q.*, 5079, 7552; *q.*, 6407, 8029, 9537; *m.*, 7755, 10369
- Fidelity Guarantee Fund, *q.*, 11471
- Fisheries Conference, *q.*, 2844
- Freight Charges, Preferential, *q.*, 649, 650, 3798
- Fremantle Dock, *q.*, 6191

Best, Senator Hon. R. W.—*continued.*

- Freeman and Wallace, Messrs., *q.*, 7567, 8076, 8221, 8286
- Fruit Export Regulations, *q.*, 7849
- Fruit Inspection Fees, *q.*, 5178
- Garran, Mr., Visit to London, *q.*, 3901
- German Convict Settlement, Pacific, *q.*, 7791, 7841
- Glucose, *q.*, 8285
- Governor-General, Appointment of Earl of Dudley, *obs.*, 9352
- Grain, Shipment of, *q.*, 1568
- Grain Bags, size of, *q.*, 7565, 7566
- Hansard, *q.*, 5284
- Hardie, Mr. Keir, *q.*, 4245
- Harvesters, Price of, *q.*, 9796
- High Commissioner, *q.*, 3797, 3798, 7571, *supply*, 10293
- High Court :
 - Appeals to, *q.*, 829
 - Tipstiffs, *supply*, 10303
- Historical Records of Australia, *supply*, 10296
- House Committee, *m.*, 30
- Immigration, *q.*, 29, 1689, 3900, 4244, 4245, 4365, 4472, 5178; Restriction in Canada, *q.*, 8508
- Immigration Leagues, *q.*, 8156, 8230, 8231, 8285
- Immigration Restriction Act, *q.*, 1131, 1471, 1688, 1689, 5858, 5980, 9633, 10291, 10920, 11221, 12101
- Imperial Conference, *address*, 58; *q.*, 563, 649, 2405, 2512
- Income Tax, Victoria, *obs.*, 1233; *m.*, 1276
- Indian Remounts, *q.*, 8867, 10253
- Invalid and Old-age Pensions Bill, *2r.*, 11995; *com.* (age of recipients), 12026, (disqualifications), 12028, (invalid pensions disqualifications), 12031, 12032, 12033, (claimants to pensions), 12035
- Judiciary Bill, *int.*, 132; *1r.*, 250; *2r.*, 487, 869; *com.* (matter in which jurisdiction of High Court is exclusive), 939, 941; (appellate jurisdiction), 943, 951; *q.*, 3901
- Jumbunna Mines, *q.*, 8104
- Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway Survey, *q.*, 3463, 8229
- Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway Survey Bill, *1r.*, 745; *adj.*, 879; *q.*, 931, 932, 3463; *2r.*, 1023, 1033; *p.o.*, 1025, 1031, 1032; *com.* (power to survey route), 1474, 1503; (appropriation), 1509; *3r.*, 1703
- Kanakas, Repatriation of, *supply*, 6349
- Laboratory, *supply*, 3931
- Laing and Sons, Sir James, *q.*, 7926, 8230
- Land, Alienated and Unalienated, *q.*, 4707
- Land Settlement, *q.*, 4244, 4705, 4706, 5082
- Legislation, Federal and State, *q.*, 564
- Library Committee, *m.*, 30
- Linlithgow, Death of Marquis of, *m.*, 8504
- Linotype Operators, *m.*, 5397
- London Offices of Commonwealth, *q.*, 3683, 3796, 4144, 4362, 4470, 4706, 5177, 5857, 7544, 7701, 8104; *supply*, 4063, 4065, 4078, 5885
- Lone Hand, *supply*, 12145
- Mail Contract, Cancelled, *address*, 53; *q.*, 249, 649, 931, 1131; *supply*, 1951; *q.*, 2513, 2743, 3558, 4363, 4462, 4706, 4895, 7542, 8230, 8672, 8868, 11220

Best, Senator Hon. R. W.—*continued.*

Mails :

- European : Special Train, *q.*, 745, 746; *adj.*, 768; Late Deliveries, *q.*, 6297, 6408
 Pacific Islands Service, *supply*, 5885, 5886
 Tasmanian, *supply*, 1954
 Mail Service to Europe, *q.*, 4462, 4706, 5560, 5746, 5858, 5978, 6060, 6294, 6410, 7542, 7652; *m.*, 6089, 6092, 6191, 6214
 Maitland Coal Miners, *adj.*, 8359; *q.*, 8672
 Marine Surveys, *supply*, 5884; *q.*, 7702, 8868, 11864
 Matches, Manufacture of, *q.*, 8309
 Mauger, Mr., Speech by, *q.*, 8507
 May and Millar, Messrs., Payment of Excise by, *q.*, 3049, 3149
 Mildura Industrial Dispute, *q.*, 7843
 Ministers, Rumoured Disagreement of, *q.*, 7925-6
 Navigation Bill, *q.*, 472, 2405, 3145, 7623, 8285, 8864, 8979, 9422, 10253, 10918, 10919; *adj.*, 2789, 9007; *int.*, 1R., 3149; 2R., 3234
 Navigation Commission's Report, *m.*, 2787
 Navigation Conference, *q.*, 8, 563
 New Guinea, German, *q.*, 11678
 New Hebrides, *q.*, 4245, 4708, 4895, 8867; *supply*, 5893
 New Protection, *q.*, 6295, 7796, 11382, 11473; *supply*, 7552
 New South Wales, Fires in, *q.*, 3364
 New Zealand, Dominion, *q.*, 3795; *m.*, 3811
 Nimrod Polar Expedition, *q.*, 7702, 7754, 7849
 Northern Territory, *q.*, 828, 830, 1130, 1232, 1330, 3145, 5084, 8554, 8616, 8699, 9041, 9421, 9422; *adj.*, 9739; *supply*, 1948
 North West Coast, Survey of, *q.*, 7702
 Officers' Compensation Bill, *q.*, 7753; 2R., 10051; *com.* (Appropriations), 10058, 10059, 10060, 10061, 10065, 10066, 10069, 10070; *m.s.o.*, 10070-1
 Old-age Pensions Appropriation Bill, 2R., 12126
 Old-age Pensions, *q.*, 9422, 12100
 Opium, Importation of, *q.*, 745; smuggling of, *q.*, 4895, 5011, 8699; *adj.*, 9008
 Opposition, The, *q.*, 5176; *obs.*, 6293
 Pair Book, Entries in, *m.*, 3503
 Paper, Printing of, *m.*, 746
 Paper Pulp, *q.*, 9631
 Papers, Library Table, *q.*, 933
 Papua :
 Administration of, *q.*, 8700; *supply*, 10299
 Alleged Massacre of Natives, *q.*, 9237
 Appointment of Administrator, *q.*, 11678; *adj.*, 11701
 Boundary of, *q.*, 11301, 11678
 Copper Fields, Report on, *q.*, 353
 Lands Survey and Mines Department, Report by, *q.*, 7701
 Ordinances, *q.*, 9353
 Parliamentary Allowances Bill, 1R., 2032; 2R., 2071; 3R., 2180
 Parliamentary Papers Bill, *m.s.o.*, 11866
 Parliamentary Privilege Committee, *q.*, 11217
 Patent and Trade Marks Cases, *q.*, 11301, 11985
 Patents Act, *q.*, 9139
 Patents Office, *q.*, 1689
 Port Davey, Communication with, *q.*, 5178
 Portfolios, Rearrangement of, *obs.*, 1130
 Portugal, Assassination of King and Crown Prince, *obs.*, 7791, *q.*, 7795, 7841

Best, Senator Hon. R. W.—*continued.*

Postal :

- Administration, *supply*, 1863, 7552, 9006, 10390; Royal Commission, *re.*, *q.*, 9136-7;
 Cabinet Committee of Inquiry, *adj.*, 9522; *q.*, 9632, 9735, 7796, 8428, 11220, 11580
 Country Postmasters, *q.*, 11219
 Fire in Melbourne, Replacement of Stores, *q.*, 8423
 Hobart Service, *q.*, 11301-2, 11473
 Post Offices :
 Brisbane, Extension of, *supply*, 4048
 Early Closing of, *q.*, 6409
 Melbourne, Extension of, *supply*, 4047
 Savings Banks, *supply*, 11621
 Sites for, *supply*, 4048
 Sydney, Additional Appointments, *q.*, 7796
 Port Pirie, *supply*, 4048; *q.*, 5176
 Preferential Trade, *address*, 58; (*Tariff*), 7559-60-1
 Printing Committee, 935
 Printing Office, *q.*, 830, 5859, 7793, 8076, 8104-5; *supply*, 1947, 4056, 4059, 6352, 10371
 Prisoners, Defence of, *supply*, 10303
 Privilege : Select Committee on Procedure, *m.*, 10004, 10011, 10255, 10260; *ad. ref.*, 11990
 Prorogation, Services of Officers, *adj.*, 12149
 Public Service Commissioner, *q.*, 3365
 Public Service :
 Customs Officers' Salaries, *q.*, 11581
 Fidelity Guarantee Fund, *q.*, 11471
 Inquiry Boards, *q.*, 8700
 Quarantine, States, Cost of, *q.*, 1816, 4243, 5011
 Quarantine Bill, *q.*, 829, 934, 8482
 Quebec Celebrations, *obs.*, 9421
 Queensland : Japanese Treaty, *q.*, 5561
 Questions, *p.o.*, 8154
 Railway Rates, Differential, *q.*, 12101
 Revenue, Refunds of, *supply*, 138, 1929, 1952;
 Excise and Customs, *q.*, 10370
 Revenue, Alleged Leakage in Tasmania, *q.*, 7753, 7850
 Revenue Losses, Tasmania and Western Australia, *q.*, 8365
 Royal Commissions, Witnesses before, *q.*, 8
 Sailors, Sick, *q.*, 10920-1
 Seamen's Compensation Bill, *int.*, 11581
 Seamen, Injured, Compensation to, *q.*, 3462, 3463, 10918
 Seat of Government Bill, *q.*, 2845, 12101
 Secret Drugs, Cures and Foods, *q.*, 8286
 Senate :
 Adjournment of, *m.*, 6297
 Election in South Australia, Disputed, *q.*, 12101
 Electric Bells, *supply*, 5881
 Leave of Absence, *m.*, 6297
 Papers and Correspondence, *supply*, 5881
 Position and Rights of, *m.*, 11581; *obs.*, 11678, 11687
 President of, First, *m.*, 3366
 Printing Committee, *m.*, 38, 7848
 Session, 1908-9, *q.*, 12101
 Session, Duration of, *q.*, 4036, 11579;
 Business of, *q.*, 7796
 Sitting, Suspension of, *obs.*, 6414, 8002; *m.*, 8156
 Sittings of, *m.*, 30, 7572, 7573, 8076; *supply*, 1862
 Standing Orders Committee, *m.*, 35, 36, 38

Best, Senator Hon. R. W.—*continued.*

Vacancy in South Australia, *q.*, 28, 2068, 5011, 5083, 12101; *m.*, 2311, 2512; Committee's Report, *m.*, 4723, 4835

Shipping :
 Differential Rates, *q.*, 8029
 Differential Treatment of, *q.*, 11983, 12100
 Rebates, *q.*, 11985
 Ring, *q.*, 10828

Ships' Stores, *q.*, 10251

Silver, Coinage of, *q.*, 8229, 8309

Snake-bite, Antidote to, *q.*, 3900, 3901

Stamp Board, *supply*, 5906

Stamps, Printing of, *q.*, 7565

Standing Orders, Suspension of, *q.*, 12100

Starch, *q.*, 2514, 3556, 3683

Stationery : Government Printer, *q.*, 2514, 2615

Statutory Rules and Regulations, *q.*, 11219

Steam-ship *Afric*, *q.*, 8866, 8979

Stripper Harvesters, *q.*, 1927, 2055

Sunshine Harvester Works Employés, *supply*, 8994

Sugar Industry :
 Bounty, *q.*, 2179, 2614, 3364, 10920
 Cane Fields, Labour in, *q.*, 5176, 5284, 5367, 5467, 5560; Wages in, *q.*, 6190, 11471-2
 Excise and Bounty, *q.*, 4796
 Immigrants, *q.*, 1689, 1816
 Surtax in South Africa, *q.*, 9138, 9537, 10253; *supply*, 10399

Supply, Term of Grant, *supply*, 1948

Supply Bill (No. 1), *m.s.o.*, 39; *IR.*, 137

Supply Bill (No. 1) 1908-9, *2R.*, 12140, 12143; *com.* (schedule), 12145, 12146, 12147

Supply Bill (No. 2), *m.s.o.*, 1815; *IR.*, 1833, 1861; *2R.*, 1929, 1931; *com.* (issue and application), 1937; (schedule), 1947, 1948, 1949, 1950, 1951; *ad. rep.*, 1952; *3R.*, 1953, 1954

Supply Bill (No. 3), *IR.*, 5860, 5875; *2R.*, 5877; *com.* (schedule), 5881, 5884, 5885, 5886, 5892, 5906; *3R.*, 5907

Supply Bill (No. 4), *m.s.o.*, 6300; *IR.*, 6300, 6347; *2R.*, 6347; *com.* (issue and application), 6347

Supply Bill (No. 5), *m.s.o.*, 8900; *com.* (Trade and Customs), 8994; (Postal), 9006

Surplus Balances, *q.*, 353

Surplus Revenue Bill, *q.*, 11381; *2R.*, 11866; *com.* (commencement), 11903, 11908

Tariff, *q.*, 1023, 1684, 1814

Bills Relating to, *q.*, 11863

Commission's Reports, *q.*, 2032, 2405, 2511

Duties, Refunds of, *q.*, 5980

Officers, Services of, *adj.*, 11698

Papers, *obs.*, 2211

Passing of, *q.*, 3364, 4036, 4143, 4580

Preference, *q.*, 11468

Public Servants, *q.*, 3464

Reopening of, *q.*, 11863

Revenue from, *q.*, 7791, 7926

Seizure of Uncustomed Goods, Action by New South Wales Government, *obs.*, 2099; *q.*, 2178; *supply*, 5875

State Imports, Liability to Duty, *q.*, 2406

Statistics, *re*, *q.*, 7542-3, 7570-1, 7794

Textile Machinery, *q.*, 10920

Thanks to Senators, *obs.*, 11688; to Officers, *adj.*, 11698

Tasmania, Cable Communication with, *supply*, 1951

Tasmania, Customs Revenue, *q.*, 3462

Telegrams, Delivery of, *supply*, 1863

Best, Senator Hon. R. W.—*continued.*

Telegraphic and Telephonic :
 South Melbourne, Storage Shed, *supply*, 4048

Telephone Line, Plain Creek Central Mill Company's, *supply*, 12147

Tillett, Mr. Ben., *q.*, 5082

Tobacco Industry :
 Combine, Action of, *adj.*, 2046; *q.*, 2068, 2513, 2615, 3049, 3684, 4706; *m.s.o.*, 3050; *m.*, 3056

Employés in, *q.*, 564

Waste, *q.*, 649, 830

Tokio International Exhibition, *q.*, 11384

Trawler, *q.*, 8230

Treasurer's Advance, *supply*, 138, 12141

Treasurer, Resignation of, *obs.*, 1130

Tropical Australia, Diseases in, *supply*, 6348

Trusts and Combines in Australia, *q.*, 472, 7566, 7653, 8507, 8555

Trust Funds, *q.*, 10252

Unification, *q.*, 7653

Usher of Black Rod, *supply*, 10286, 10289

Vanilla, *q.*, 1023

Victoria and Singapore : Steamship Service, *q.*, 5648, 5746

Votes, Lapsed, *supply*, 138

Wharf Labourers' Strike, New South Wales, *q.*, 9041

Wines for New Zealand, *q.*, 11472

Wire Netting, *q.*, 1926, 2405

Wireless Telegraphy, *supply*, 4049; *q.*, 6189

Women's Work Exhibition, *q.*, 4245

Workmen's Compensation Bill, *q.*, 5177, 6061

Bowden, Mr. E. K., *Nepean :*

Address-in-Reply, *m.*, 167

American Fleet, *q.*, 9474, 11180

Antarctic Expedition, *m.*, 7493

Australian Industries Preservation Bill, *com.*, (persons to answer questions and produce documents), 9223

Bankruptcy Bill, *q.*, 1089

Bounties Bill, *2R.*, 908; *com.* (schedule), (cotton), 1080, (cotton seed), 1109, (olives), 1108, (coffee), 1199, 1203

Budget, 3199

Commonwealth and States, Financial Relations of, *Budget*, 3200

Customs Stations, Border, *supply*, 9990

Customs Tariff Bill, *q.*, 9100; *cons. req.* (Sago and Tapioca), 10496, (Confectionery, *n.e.i.*), 10514, 10516, (Herbs, dried), 10520, (Hay and Chaff), 10528, (Matches and Vestas), 10552, (Mustard) 10555, (Apparel and Attire), 10564, (insecticides), 11565. (*See* Tariff Resolutions.)

Deakin, Mr., Health of, *q.*, 2563

Defence :
 Ammunition, Defective, *q.*, 3301, 3422, 3620, 3733, 7116; *supply*, 3603

Government Policy, *q.*, 8927, 9009

Guns, Lights and Emplacements, *supply*, 3746

Naval Agreement, *address*, 169

Officers' Allowances for Quarters, *m.*, 9481; *q.*, 10077

Rifle Range, Flemington, *q.*, 10609, 10653

Small Arms Factory, *address*, 169; *q.*, 6023, 6356, 11792

Disputed Senate Election, South Australia, *supply*, 9888

Fanning Island, *q.*, 6835

Bowden, Mr. E. K.—*continued.*

Federal Administration, *address*, 167
 Federal Capital, *address*, 168; *Budget*, 3207; *g.*, 5238, 7111, 7460, 9952, 10074. (*See* Seat of Government Bill.)
 Government, Financial Policy of, *Budget*, 3199
 Immigration Restriction Act, *supply*, 9990
 Iron Bounties Bill, *g.*, 5690
 Iron Industry, *Budget*, 3209; *g.*, 11789
 Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway Survey Bill, *address*, 168
 Land Tax, *Budget*, 3203
 Lighthouses, Queensland, *address*, 170
 London Offices, *supply*, 3675
 Mail Contract Cancelled, *address*, 167; *g.*, 9842
 Mail Service to Europe, *g.*, 5415, 5690, 6006
 Manufactures Encouragement Bill, *2k.*, 6169; *adj.*, 7414; *g.*, 5690, 11789
 Maranoa Farmers' Association, *expl.*, 501
 Meteorological Department, *supply*, 9879
 Mint, *g.*, 10178-9
 Murwillumbah, Fire at, *g.*, 3420
 New Hebrides, *g.*, 1596; *supply*, 9419
 New Protection, *Budget*, 3206
 Northern Territory, *address*, 169
 Opium, Sale of, *g.*, 2234; Smuggling of, *g.*, 9099
 Pacific Islands: Preferential Trade, *g.*, 8929
 Parliament, Press Reports of Proceedings, *Budget*, 3199
 Parliamentary Allowances Bill, *com.* (amount of allowance), 1998
 Papua:
 Administration of, *address*, 169; *g.*, 4310, 9091; *supply*, 9419-20, 9490, 9491-9493, 9503, 9505
 Administrator, Appointment of, *g.*, 11523
 Boundary of, *g.*, 11323, 11385
 Civil Service, *supply*, 9419; *m.*, 11390
 Importation of Birds and Animals, *supply*, 9420
 Land Regulations, *g.*, 8816; *m.*, 9298; *supply*, 9420
 Mail Service, *supply*, 11358
 Natives, Massacre of, *g.*, 10606, 11181
 Natives, Recruiting of, *supply*, 9420
 Ordinances, *g.*, 4310, 11182
 Wireless Telegraphy, *g.*, 4311
 Petherick, Mr., *g.*, 2567
 Post and Telegraph Department:
 Administration, *supply*, 11402
 Appointment of Additional Inspector, New South Wales, *g.*, 9193
 Lineman's Hours, *g.*, 9299, 9479
 Semi-official post offices, *g.*, 9193
 Sydney Railway Station, Late Fee Letter Box, *g.*, 10653
 Telephone Lists, *g.*, 9299
 Post Offices:
 Bellingen, Kurri Kurri, Coff's Harbor, Lithgow, and Katoomba, *supply*, 3524; Lithgow, *g.*, 6009; Lithgow and Katoomba, *supply*, 9881; *g.*, 12153
 Primary Industries, *Budget*, 3202
 Printing Committee's Report, *m.*, 9298
 Public Works Department, *supply*, 9881
 Public Works Expenditure, *m.*, 7508
 Quarantine Bill, *com.* (scope of quarantine), 1525, (persons to be vaccinated), 1735, 1738
 Rabbit Destruction, *g.*, 10081
 Salvation Army Settlements, *g.*, 1596

Bowden, Mr. E. K.—*continued.*

Seat of Government Bill, *g.*, 9952. (*See* Federal Capital.)
 Secret Drugs, Cures, and Foods, *supply*, 9982
 Sittings of House, *g.*, 6131
 Standing Orders, *g.*, 6834
 Statistics, *supply*, 9875
 Supply:
 External Affairs (Administration), 9419; (Papua), 9490, 9491, 9503, 9505, 11358
 Home Affairs (Census and Statistics), 9875; (Meteorological Branch), 9879, 9881; (Miscellaneous), 9888
 Postmaster-General (Miscellaneous), 11401
 Treasury (Government Printer), 9082
 Trade and Customs (Miscellaneous), 9990
 Works and Buildings, (Post and Telegraphs), 3450, 3524; (Defence), 3603, 3746; (External Affairs), 3675
 Supply Bill (No. 2), 1809
 Supply Bill (No. 4), *com.* (schedule), 6290
 Tahiti, *g.*, 3105
 Tariff, *m.*, 3199:
 Curios, Duty on, *g.*, 5329
 Seizure of Uncustomed Goods, by New South Wales Government, *g.*, 2230
 Wheat, Relanding of, *g.*, 6099
 Tariff Resolutions (Customs):
 Apparel and Attire, *cons. req.*, 10564
 Arms, 6036, 6038
 Bananas, 5340
 Belting, 7167
 Bottles, *n.e.i.*, 6944
 Bronzing and Metal Powders, 6860
 Bullion and Coin, 7150
 China and Porcelain, 6808
 Confectionery, 5250; *cons. req.*, 10514, 10516
 Corn Flour, 5355
 Currants, 5278, 5282
 Explosives, 7381
 Fire and Glazed Bricks, 6010
 Glycerine and Lanoline, 6999
 Grain and Pulse, 5358
 Graphite, 6859
 Hay and Chaff, 5362, 5442, *cons. req.*, 10528
 Herbs, Dried, *cons. req.*, 10520
 Insecticides, 6989; *cons. req.*, 11006, 11565
 Lamps and Lampware, 6042, 6048
 Leather, Rubber and Composition Belting, 7167
 Manilla Board, 7237, 7238
 Matches and Vestas, *cons. req.*, 10552
 Musical Instruments, 7358
 Mustard, *cons. req.*, 10555
 Oilmen's Stores, 5525
 Olive Oil, 6863, 6868
 Opium, 6996
 Perfumery, 6998
 Potato Flour, 5344
 Regalia (*p.o.*, 5639), 5640, 5641
 Rice (uncleaned), 5529, 5532
 Rubber manufactures, 7160, 7162, 7163
 Sago and Tapioca, *cons. req.*, 10496
 Sheepwashes, 6980
 Stay Paper and Cloth, 7268
 Stationery, unmanufactured, 7243
 Stone and Marble, 6062
 Strawboard, 7233
 Tea, 5464
 Timber, undressed, 7101, 7102, 7104, 7105, 7106, 7107
 Tissue Paper, 7242

Bowden, Mr. E. K.—*continued.*

Tariff Resolutions (Customs)—*continued.*

Wall and Ceiling Parts, 7399

Wicker, Bamboo, and Cane, 7110

Works of Art, 7398

(See Customs Tariff Bill.)

Tariff Resolutions (Excise):

Cigars, 4306

Telephones:

Bureaux, *q.*, 7460

Cabinets, *q.*, 4309

Charges, Reduction of, *q.*, 880

Katoomba and Lithgow Trunk Lines, *supply*, 6290

Rates, Anomalies in, *supply*, 3459

Victoria, Population of, *Budget*, 3205

Woollen Industry, *Budget*, 3204

Brown, Mr. J. T., Indi:

Address-in-Reply, *m.*, 350

Adjournment, *obs.*, 6567

Agricultural Show, *q.*, 2688

Bounties Bill, 2*r.*, 817; *com.*, (*p.o.*), 1198, (schedule) (tobacco), 1225, 1226

Braddon Section, *Budget*, 3116

Budget, 3112

Business, Order of, *adj.*, 3047

Commonwealth Expenditure, *address*, 351

Customs Tariff Bill, *cons. req.*, (Arms) 10660,

(Rock Drills) 10714, (Electrical and Gas

Appliances) 10743, (Wire Netting), 10760,

(Oils) 10817, 10889; (timber) 11163; (rebate)

11195, 11203. (See Tariff Resolutions (Customs).)

Defence:

Naval Agreement, *address*, 351

Excise Procedure Bill, 2*r.*, 7487

Federal Capital, *q.*, 10073

Federal Expenditure, *supply*, 1777; *Budget*, 3112

Grain Bags, Size of, *q.*, 6227, 7461

Imperial Conference, *address*, 351

London Offices of Commonwealth, *supply*, 3647, 3674

Manufactures Encouragement Bill, 2*r.*, 6271

New Protection, *Budget*, 3112

Northern Territory, *Budget*, 3116

Parliamentary Allowances Bill, *m.*, 1899; *com.*

(amount of allowance), 2008

Parliamentary Candidates, Expenses of, *q.*, 977

Quarantine Bill, 2*r.*, 552; *com.* (commencement), 1417, (interpretation), 1540, 1541, (ports of entry), 1558

Quorum Rules, Breach of, *expl.*, 6801

Standard Oil Company, *Budget*, 3116

Supply Bill (No. 2), *m.*, 1777

Supply:

Works and Buildings, (External Affairs), 3647, 3674

Tariff, *m.*, 3112:

Anomalies, *q.*, 2996

Government Intentions as to passing of, *adj.*, 3047

Information, Leakage of, *Budget*, 3114

Tariff Resolutions (Customs):

Agricultural, Horticultural, and Viticultural Machinery and Implements, *n.e.i.*,

6053, 6550, 6557, 6563-4

Agricultural, Horticultural, and Viticultural Machinery and Implements, 6583

Arms, *cons. req.*, 10660

Blacking, 6811

Brown, Mr. J. T.—*continued.*

Tariff Resolutions (Customs)—*continued.*

Combined Corn Sheller, Husker, &c., 6566

Currants, 5282

Electrical and Gas Appliances, *cons. req.*, 10743

Engines, 6712

Explosives, 7382

Fish, 5266

Gloves, 5940

Lamps and Lampware, 6045

Meats, *n.e.i.*, 5456

Motive Power Machinery and Appliances, 6646

Nails, 6597, 6618

Oils, 6873; *cons. req.*, 10817, 10889

Pianos, 7355

Pickles, 5463

Rebate for Home Consumption, 11195, 11203

Rock Drills, 6787; *cons. req.*, 10714

Sausage Casings, 5459

Stay Paper and Cloths, 7268

Steam Road Rollers, 6678, 6710

Tanks, 6622, 6625

Timber, undressed, 7065, 7097; *cons. req.*, 11163

Type, Printers, 6761

Wire Netting, 4452; *cons. req.*, 10760

Yarns, 7375

(See Customs Tariff Bill)

Wangaratta Train Service, *q.*, 11154

Brown, Hon. T., Calare:

Absent Voters, *supply*, 2903

Australasian Press Association, *q.*, 7117

Australia, Advertising Resources of, *q.*, 7026

Australians, Repatriated, *supply*, 11359

Budget, 2835, 2905

Celluloid, *q.*, 10702

Commonwealth Elections, *supply*, 11365, 11366

Commonwealth Statistics, *supply*, 9875

Commonwealth and States, Financial Relations of, *Budget*, 2906, 11280

Commonwealth Salaries Bill, *com.* (taxation by States of Commonwealth salaries), 3892

Customs Tariff Bill, *cons. req.*, (Piece Goods) 10630, (Socks and Stockings) 10649, (Agricultural Machinery and Implement) 10666,

10667, (Manufactures of Metal) 10706, (Rock Drills) 10714, (Electrical and Gas Appliances)

10747; (wire netting) 10766; (Oils) 10826, 10886; (Paper) 11076; (Rebate) 11204;

(Stained Glass Windows) 11576; (see Tariff Resolutions (Customs))

Customs Department, New South Wales, Officers, *q.*, 10081, 10310

Defence:

Australian Light Horse, *supply*, 5799

Injured Soldiers, Compensation to, *supply*, 11390

"Electricon," The, *q.*, 10787

Electoral, *supply*, 9888, 11365

Federal Capital, *q.*, 5237; *supply*, 6289, 9888

Freeman and Wallace, Messrs., *supply*, 11332

Government Defence Policy, *supply*, 10120-23

Government Printing Office, *supply*, 9970

Harvesters, Price of, *q.*, 9584

Immigration, *Budget*, 2912; *supply*, 9624-6, 9725; *q.*, 9765, 10401; Russian Jews, *q.*,

10756; Undesirable, *q.*, 11096; League of Australasia, *q.*, 11320, 11707; America to

Great Britain, *q.*, 6727

Brown, Hon. T.—continued.

- Land Monopoly, *Budget*, 2911
- Manufactures Encouragement Bill, *q.*, 6229
- Meteorological Department, *supply*, 9879
- Papua :
 - Native Labour, *supply*, 9507
 - Administration, *supply*, 6289, 9506-8; *q.*, 11324
- Post and Telegraph Department :
 - Administration, *supply*, 9966, 11279
 - Contract Offices, *supply*, 10167
 - Extension Works, *q.*, 11054
 - Hart, Mr. Bruce, *q.*, 2793
 - Inland Mails, *supply*, 11391
 - Mail Contracts, *supply*, 10168
 - Post Offices, Hours of Business, *Ways and Means*, 5705
 - Prohibited Correspondence, New Zealand, *q.*, 5782, 6025, 6422
 - Royal Commission *re* Administration, *m.*, 10448
 - Sunday Duty, *q.*, 11708
 - Telegraph Messengers, *q.*, 883
 - Telegraphic Construction, *q.*, 6025
 - Telegraphic Delays, *q.*, 6024, 7117
 - Telegraphists, Promotion of, *q.*, 5804; Hours of, *q.*, 6421
 - Trundle Mail Service, *q.*, 4411
- Public Service :
 - Administration, *supply*, 9783-4; *q.*, 10130
 - Customs Officers' Sick Leave, *q.*, 11704
 - Oxenham, Mr., Promotion of, *supply*, 10225-6, 10233-4, 10251
 - Regrading, *q.*, 10653
 - Retiring Age, *supply*, 10224
- Rabbit Destruction, *q.*, 5520, 6356, 6674, 7300; *supply*, 9983, 11376
- State Officers and Federal Work, *supply*, 9731
- Stripper Harvesters, *q.*, 7028, 7297
- Supply Bill (No. 3), *m.*, 5799
- Supply Bill (No. 4), *com.* (schedule), 6289
- Supply :
 - Attorney-General (High Court), 9731
 - Defence (Central Administration), 10120-3; (Miscellaneous), 11390
 - External Affairs (Papua), 9506; (Miscellaneous), 9624, 9725, 11358
 - Home Affairs (Public Service Commissioner), 9783; (Census and Statistics), 9875; Meteorological Branch, 9879; (Miscellaneous), 9888, 11365
 - Trade and Customs (Central Staff), 9983; (Miscellaneous), 11376
 - Treasury (Administration), 9066; (Government Printer), 9970; (Miscellaneous), 11375
 - Postmaster-General (Central Staff), 10167, 10223, 10233, 10251; (Inland Mails), 11391
- Surplus Revenue, Monthly Balances, *q.*, 11738
- Surplus Revenue Bill, 2R., 11764
- Tariff Commission, *Budget*, 2835
- Tariff, *m.*, 2835, 2905 :
 - Confectionery Duties, *q.*, 5239
 - Consideration of, *m.*, 4350
 - Petition, *m.*, 3409
 - Seizure of Uncustomed Goods by New South Wales Government, *Budget*, 2908
 - Sheep Shearing Machine Gear, *q.*, 5329
 - State Imports, Taxation of, *Budget*, 2909
 - Wire Netting Industry, *Budget*, 2837; *q.*, 3422

Brown, Hon. T.—continued.

- Tariff Resolutions (Customs) :
 - Agricultural, Horticultural, and Viticultural Machinery and Implements, *n.e.i.*, 6561
 - Agricultural, Horticultural, and Viticultural Machinery and Implements, *cons. reg.*, 10666, 10667
 - Ale, Porter and other Beer, 4024, 4123
 - Apparel and Attire, 5613
 - Bacteriological Products and Serum, 6993
 - Bags, Sacks, Packs, &c., 5644, 5645, *recom.*, 5736
 - Bananas, 5339
 - Blue, 4787
 - Buggy Shafts, 7128
 - Coffee, 5263
 - Confectionery, 5159
 - Eggs in Shell, 5265
 - Electrical and Gas Appliances, *cons. reg.*, 10747
 - Engines, 6719-20
 - Fish, 5268
 - Fodder, 5348
 - Furniture, 7006
 - Glycerine and Lanoline, 6998
 - Grain and Pulse, 5358
 - Hay and Chaff, 5358, 5439
 - Live Stock, 4768, 4769, 4772
 - Machinery, &c., 6736
 - Manufactures of Metal, *cons. reg.*, 10706
 - Marine Engines, 6566
 - Mining Engines, 6795
 - Motive Power Machinery and Appliances, 6655, 6670
 - Oils, *cons. reg.*, 10826, 10886
 - Opium, 6994
 - Paper, *cons. reg.*, 11076
 - Perfumery, 6997
 - Pianos, 7346
 - Piece Goods, *cons. reg.*, 10630
 - Rebate for Home Consumption, 11204
 - Rock Drills, *cons. reg.*, 10714
 - Sheep Shearing Machines, 6579, 6587
 - Socks and Stockings, *cons. reg.*, 10649
 - Stained Glass Windows, *cons. reg.*, 11576
 - State Imports, 7438
 - Stripper Harvesters, 7441
 - Strippers, 7449
 - Stearine and Paraffine, 5157
 - Sugar, 4764
 - Tanks, 6622
 - Traction and Portable Engines, 6687, 6720
 - Timber, undressed, 7054, 7091, 7105, 7107
 - Type, Printers', 6757, 6764
 - Vehicles, 7288, 7291, 7292
 - Wire netting, 4429, 4572, 4579; *ad. ref.*, 7453; *cons. reg.*, 10766
(*See* Customs Tariff Bill)
 - Tariff Resolutions (Excise) :
 - Cigarettes, 4317
 - Transferred Officers, Rights of, *ways and means*, 4863
 - Wealth, Distribution of, *Budget*, 2913
- Cameron, Senator Lt.-Col. Hon. C. St. C., Tasmania :**
- Address-in-Reply, *m.*, 10
 - Commonwealth and States, Financial Relations of, *address*, 12
 - Customs Tariff Bill—
 - Schedule :
 - Agricultural, Horticultural and Viticultural Machinery and Implements, 8594
 - Oils, 8428

Cameron, Senator Lt.-Col. Hon. C. St. C.—
continued.
 Detence :
 Imperial, *address*, 10
 Military Forces, *address*, 11
 Federal Capital, *address*, 12
 Federal Salaries, State Taxation of, *address*,
 12
 Imperial Conference, *address*, 10
 Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway Survey
 Bill, 2R., 1173
 Mail Contract, Cancelled, *address*, 12
 Navigation Conference, *address*, 10
 Northern Territory, *address*, 10
 Parliamentary Allowances Bill, 2R., 2091
 Printing Committee, *ad. rep.*, 7846
 Tariff Revision, *address*, 10

Carr, Mr. E. S., Macquarie :

Address-in-Reply, *m.*, 108
 Australia, Defence of, *supply*, 3609
 Australian Industries Preservation Bill, 2R.,
 9033; *com.* (burden of proof), 9206, (persons
 to answer questions and produce documents),
 9222
 Bounties Bill, 2R., 902; *com.* (appropriation),
 1000
 Budget, 2740, 2807
 Customs Tariff Bill, *cons. req.* (Manufactures
 of Metal, *n.e.i.*), 10695; (Oils), 10818, 10827,
 10882, 10885, 10982, 10997, 11113; (Stone
 and Marble), 11000; (Printing Inks), 11093.
 (See Tariff Resolutions (Customs))
 Defence :
 Cadets, Treatment of, *q.*, 11792
 Rifle Ranges, *supply*, 3449
 Volunteer Rifle Corps, *supply*, 5790
 Eastern Extension Cable Coy., *q.*, 10788, 10967,
 11921
 Federal Capital, *address*, 108; *supply*, 8861
 Immigration, *q.*, 4518; *supply*, 8968
 Land Taxation, *Budget*, 2807
 Mail Service to Europe, *m.*, 6496
 Manufactures Encouragement Bill, 2R., 6277;
 q., 11789
 New Protection, *Budget*, 2741, 2807; *adj.*,
 2842; *q.*, 2890, 3173
 Northern Territory, *supply*, 3450
 Old-age Pensions, *m.*, 9344
 Papua :
 Administration of, *address*, 108; *supply*,
 9396-9404
 Drummond, Mr., Case of, *q.*, 11524, 12199
 Parliamentary Allowances Bill, *m.*, 1910
 Parliamentary Witnesses Bill, *com.* (disobeying
 summons), 11783
 Post and Telegraph Department :
 Royal Commission *re* administration, *m.*,
 10446; Ministerial Statement, *m.s.o.*, 11633
 Temporary Employés, *q.*, 6814
 Preferential Trade (Tariff), 4942
 Protective Duties, *expl.*, 9347
 Quarantine Bill, *cons. amds.*, 8947
 Supply :
 Works and Buildings (Defence), 3440, 3450
 3609; (Post and Telegraphs), 352;
 Supply Bill (No. 3), *m.*, 5799
 Supply Bill (No. 5), *m.*, 8861
 Supply :
 Parliament (Queen's Hall), 8964
 External Affairs (Administrative), 8968,
 9396

Carr, Mr. E. S.—continued.

Surplus Revenue Bill, 2R., 11755
 Tariff, *m.*, 2740, 2807, *ad. rep.*, 7455
 Tariff Resolutions (Customs) :
 Agricultural, Horticultural, and Viticultural
 Machinery and Implements, *n.e.i.*, 6555
 Apparel and Attire, 5621, 5624, 5627
 Bags, Sacks, &c., *recom.*, 5736, 5737
 Candles, 4942
 Carpets, 5738
 Confectionery, 5249
 Corn Flour, 5355
 Glue, 6951, 6954
 Hats, Caps, and Bonnets, 5954, 5958
 Hay and Chaff, 5432
 Lamps and Lampware, 6044
 Lead, Sheet and Piping, 6052
 Manufactures of Metal, *n.e.i.*, *cons. req.*,
 10695
 Manures, 7364, 7374
 Naphthaline, 6977
 Oils, 6864, 6866, 6868; *ad. rep.*, 7455; *cons.*
 req., 10818, 10827, 10882-5, 10982, 10997,
 11113
 Peel, 5335
 Piece Goods, 5822, 5828, 5841, 5842, 5853
 Printing and Stencilling Inks, 7262; *cons.*
 req., 11093
 Printing Roller Composition, 6956
 Sheepwashes, 6984, 6992
 Socks and Stockings, 5936
 Stearine and Paraffine, 5146
 Stone and Marble, 6957; *cons. req.*, 11000
 Sugar, 4703
 Type, Printers', 6759, 6765
 Wire-netting, 4437, 4571
 (See Customs Tariff Bill)
 Tariff Resolutions (Excise) :
 Glucose, 4641, 4644
 Starch, 5550
 Telephones :
 Bathurst Exchange, *q.*, 1089
 Sydney to Orange, *supply*, 3527

Catta, Mr. J. H., Cook :

Address-in-Reply, *m.*, *adj.*, 243, 317
 Adjournment, Special, *m.*, 741
 American Fleet, *q.*, 11419
 Barristers, Alleged Combine, *q.*, 6729, 10081
 Bounties Bill, 2R., 989; *com.* (schedule), (cot-
 ton), 1071; *expl.*, 1082; (fish), 1300
 Budget, 3293; *expl.*, 3297
 Coal Mines, Nationalisation of, *q.*, 5910
 Commonwealth Salaries Bill, 2R., 3875
 Customs Tariff Bill, *cons. req.* (oils), 10820
 (See Tariff Resolutions, Customs)
 Defence :
 Arsenal and Small Arms Factory, *adj.*, 743
 Australian Navy, *address*, 324
 Cadets, *q.*, 5329
 Cadet Bands, *q.*, 5239
 Naval Agreement, *address*, 320
 Naval Ship-building Yards, *q.*, 10483
 Rifle Ranges, Miniature, *q.*, 5329
 Thursday Island Fort, Gun Explosion, *q.*,
 12040
 Division List, Error in, *adj.*, 827
 Federal Capital, *address*, 325; *q.*, 8814, 10179
 Franco-British Exhibition, *q.*, 9842
 Government Printing Office, Sydney, *q.*, 6132,
 6594, 6813

Catts, Mr. J. H.—*continued.*

Immigrants, *adj.*, 1231, 9420
 Immigration League, New South Wales, *q.*, 881, 928; *adj.*, 929
 Invalid and Old-age Pensions Bill, *com.* (deputy Commissioner), 11963; (qualifications), 11966; (disqualifications), 11969, 11971; (conditions), 11975, 11976; (reference to magistrate), 11979; (State pensioners), 11982
 Judiciary Bill, *adj.*, 3970
 Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway Survey Bill, *m.*, 625; *adj.*, 827
 Labour Party, Platform and Pledge, *address*, 323
 Land Monopoly, *address*, 324
 Land Tax, *address*, 319
 Manufactures Encouragement Bill, *2r.*, 6235
 National Bank, *q.*, 11019
 New Protection, *q.*, 10132, 10963, 11420
 New Protection (Tariff), 4020
 Northern Territory, *address*, 325; *m.*, 470; *q.*, 1280, 4519; *adj.*, 3362
 Old-age Pensions, *address*, 325
 Papua :
 Land Scandals, *q.*, 9956
 Personal Explanation, *adj.*, 3970, 4361; *obs.*, 4556
 Post and Telegraph Department :
 Additional hands, Sydney, *supply*, 10430
 Boy Labour, *supply*, 10431-2
 Cabinet Committee, *supply*, 10420
 Control by Commissioners, *supply*, 10433
 Increments, *q.*, 7464
 Letter Carriers, *supply*, 10165-6, 10429; *q.*, 11526
 Public Telephone Bureaux, *q.*, 11708
 Royal Commission *re* administration, *m.*, 10427; *m.s.o.*, 11635; *q.*, 12042
 Temporary Employees, *supply*, 10430-1; *q.*, 11181
 Preferential Trade (Tariff), 4888
 Printing Machinery, *supply*, 3505
 Public Service :
 Appeal Boards, *supply*, 10432-3
 Dyer, Mr. E. J., case of, *supply*, 4860, 10163
 Retiring Allowances, *supply*, 4860, 10162; *q.*, 12043
 Public Works Expenditure, *m.*, 7505
 Questions without notice, *q.*, 11707
 Responsible Government, *address*, 322
 Sittings of House, *m.*, 6514
 Socialism, *address*, 318, 321
 Sydney Post Office :
 Overtime, *q.*, 6814, 6968
 Telegraphists, *q.*, 10080
 Supply :
 Postmaster-General (Central Staff), 10163
 Works and Buildings (Treasury), 3505
 Tariff : *m.*, 3293; *expl.*, 3297, 4361
 Consideration of, *m.*, 4348
 Entries, passing of, *q.*, 4622
 New Protection, *q.*, 8816
 Referendum, *obs.*, 4018; *q.*, 11326
 Tariff Resolutions (Customs) :
 Ale, Porter, and other Beer, 4014
 Articles for Official Use of States Governors, 7404
 Candles, 4888
 Cardboard, 7236
 Clay Smoking Pipes, 7396
 Coffee, 5260
 Confectionery, 5250

Catts, Mr. J. H.—*continued.*

Electrical Machinery, 6801, 6803
 Fish, 5274
 Furniture, 7013
 Glue, 6955
 Hats, Caps, and Bonnets, 5976
 Hay and Chaff, 5442
 Licht-pausrohpaper, 7268
 Millboard, 7235, 7236
 Oils, *cons. req.*, 10820
 Opium, 6995
 Paraffine Wax, 5139
 Pianos, 7343
 Rails, &c., 6822
 Rice (uncleaned), 5525
 Stay Paper and Cloth, 7268
 Strawboard, 7224
 Sugar, 4696
 Wire Netting, 4532, 4556
 (See Customs Tariff Bill)
 Tariff Resolutions (Excise) :
 Glucose, 4642
 Trade Union Legislation, *q.*, 11704
 Transferred Officers, rights of, *ways and means*, 4860
 Year-Book, *q.*, 11920

Chanter, Hon. J. M., *Riverina* :

Adjournment, Dinner, *q.*, 3854
 Australian Men of Letters Fund, *q.*, 10179
 Australasian Press Association, *q.*, 7117
 Bounties Bill, *2r.*, 911; *com.* (schedule), (olives) 1110, (coffee) 1199, *p.o.* 1313
 Braddon Section, *Budget*, 3177
 Budget, 3175
 Business, Order of, *m.*, 2804
 Commonwealth and States, Financial Relations of, *Budget*, 3189
 Customs Tariff Bill, *cons. req.* (Rice Root) 10504, (Hay and Chaff), 10521, 10527, 10542, (Mustard) 10556, (Hats and Caps) 10600.
 (See Tariff Resolutions, Customs)
 Defence :
 Government Policy, *q.*, 8813
 Naval Agreement, *Budget*, 3191
 Royal Australian Artillery, Commanding Officers, *q.*, 2691
 Disputed Elections and Qualifications Bill, *2r.*, 6375; *com.* (pending petitions), 6380, 6382, (qualifications and vacancies), 6386 (Crown to pay costs in certain cases), 6388
 Dissent from Ruling : Admissibility of Amendment (Tariff Resolutions), *m.*, 7003
 Dissent from Ruling : Reading of Newspaper Extracts (Estimates), *m.*, 10211
 Electoral (Disputed Returns) Bill, *inf.*, 1612; *2r.*, 2574
 Elections, Voided, *q.*, 10180, 11421
 Federal Capital, *Budget*, 3190
 Fiscal Issue, *Budget*, 3175
 Freeman and Wallace, Messrs., *q.*, 10079, 10132, 10134; *adj.*, 10129; *supply*, 10204-21, 11330; *q.*, 11626-7, 11704; *expl.*, 11913-4, 12190; *m.*, 12044
 Government, Position of, *expl.*, 10471
 Iron Industry, *Budget*, 3184
 Lascars : Commonwealth Legislation, *q.*, 1975
 Mail Charges, Railway, *q.*, 4200
 Mail Steamers, Passenger Rates, *q.*, 1975
 Military Board, *q.*, 11977
 New Protection, *Budget*, 3180

Chanter, Hon. J. M.—*continued.*

Post and Telegraph Department :

Chinese Helmets, *q.*, 6675
 Contract Offices, *supply*, 10171
 Country Services, *supply*, 10171
 Deniliquin Post Office, Overtime, *q.*, 2795,
 3733
 Gunbower Telephone Service, *supply*, 10172
 Hay to Darlington Point Service : Tenders,
supply, 10175-6
 Junce and Narandera Offices, *q.*, 5692, 6405,
 6406
 Penny Postage, *supply*, 10173
 Postage : Surcharges, *supply*, 10174
 Postal and Telegraphic Centres, *supply*,
 10172
 Postal Prohibitions, *q.*, 12043
 Postmistress, Daysdale, *q.*, 2348
 Royal Commission *re* administration, *m.*,
 10459; *supply*, 10471; *m.s.o.*, 11634
 Sweating : *supply*, 10168
 Sydney Post Office, Sweating in, *q.*, 10310
 Telegrams, Delivery of, *supply*, 10168-9
 Telegraphic Delays, *q.*, 7117
 Urana, Lockhart, Berrigan, and Jerilderie
 Post Offices, Revenue from, *q.*, 12153
 Public Service : Administration of, *supply*,
 9786, 10168
 Political Influence, *supply*, 10169-70
 Promotions, *supply*, 10169-70
 Rabbit Destruction, *q.*, 3969, 4519, 5328, 5417,
 6406, 6674
 Shipping Combine, *adj.*, 3941
 Sitings of House, *q.*, 976
 State Officers and Federal Work, *supply*, 9733
 Sugar Industry, *Budget*, 3182, 3187
 Supply :
 Attorney-General (High Court), 9733
 Home Affairs (Public Service Commissioner),
 9786
 Postmaster-General (Central Staff), 10168,
 10175, 10204
 Tariff Commission, Recommendations of Pro-
 tectivist Section of, *Budget*, 3183
 Tariff : *m.*, 3175
 New South Wales, Industrial Prosperity,
q., 6677
 Petition, *m.*, 3418
 Recommittals, *adj.*, 7414
 Seizure of Uncustomed goods by New South
 Wales Government, *adj.*, 2344
 Wire Netting, *q.*, 2997, 3174, 4842
 Tariff Resolutions (Customs) :
 Explosives, 7391
 Hats and Caps, *cons. req.*, 10600
 Hay and Chaff, 5425, 5441, 5443; *cons.*
req., 10521, 10527, 10542
 Machinery, &c., 6744
 Manures, 7361, 7367, 7369
 Mustard, *cons. req.*, 10556
 Oils, 6869, 6873 (*p.o.*, 6875)
 Rice Root, *cons. req.*, 10504
 Roofing Tiles, 6909
 Saws, *n.e.i.*, 6750
 Sheep Shearing Machines, 6580
 Strawboard, 7230
 Surgical, Dental, and Veterinary Appli-
 ances, 7407
 Timber, undressed, 7082, 7094
 Tobacco, manufactured, *n.e.i.*, 4281
 Traction and Portable Engines, 6697
 Wire Netting, 4420, 4572 (*p.o.*, 4575), 4578
 (See Customs Tariff Bill)

Chanter, Hon. J. M.—*continued.*

Transferred Properties, *Budget*, 3186
 Victoria, Progress under Protection, *Budget*,
 3179
 White Australia Policy, *Budget*, 3187

Chapman, Hon. Austin, Eden-Monaro :

American Canned Meats *q.*, 9952
 Australia, Advertising of, *supply*, 9983
 Australian Industries Preservation Bill, *2r.*,
 9038
 Bounties Act, *q.*, 11390
 Budget and Tariff Proposals, *adj.*, 2686
 Butter Grading, *q.*, 1413, 4649
 Celluloid, *q.*, 10702
 Commerce (Trade Descriptions) Bill, *int.*,
 6133
 Commonwealth Savings Banks, *q.*, 407
 Customs Department :
 Audit Staff, *supply*, 9991
 Border Stations, *supply*, 9984-5
 Breweries, Registration of, *q.*, 9480
 Customs Bonds, *q.*, 2348
 Entries, Adelaide, *q.*, 4085, 8815, 8816, 9580,
 10180, 10310, 10703
 Export Entries, *q.*, 10756
 Fraud, *q.*, 6354
 Landing Officers' Leave, *q.*, 2235
 Law Costs, *supply*, 9992
 Leave, Recreation, *q.*, 10081, 10310
 Officers, Sick Leave, *q.*, 11704
 Officers, Sydney, *q.*, 4279, 4280
 Oversea Ships' Stores, *supply*, 9993
 Overtime, Melbourne, *q.*, 3969, 5238
 Seizure of Goods, *q.*, 6024, 6132
 Undermanning, *q.*, 11257-8, 11624
 Customs Tariff Bill, *cons. req.* (Hats and
 Caps), 10590, 10618; (Parasols, &c.), 10619,
 10620; (Piece Goods), 10623, 10624, 10627,
 10628, 10629, 10630; (Waddings, &c.), 10630,
 10631, 10635, 10640; (Socks and Stockings),
 10642, 10643. (See Tariff Resolutions, Cus-
 toms)
 Departmental Estimates, Reduction of, *expl.*,
 11705
 Divisions (*p.o.*, 6965)
 Domestics, Importation of, *adj.*, 2686
 Engine Driver, Salary of, *supply*, 9990
 Excise Tariff Act, *q.*, 2236, 2347
 Excise Tariff (Agricultural Machinery) Act,
q., 3268, 4748, 4927, 5520, 5691, 6229, 6354,
 6811, 7026, 7113, 7115, 7171, 7296, 8817;
adj., 5558; *ways and means*, 5707
 Excise Tariff (Spirits) Act, *q.*, 4647, 4648,
 4748, 4749, 5238, 5328, 5691, 7027, 7297,
 7298; *ways and means*, 5707
 Federal Capital, *adj.*, 308; *q.*, 10965, 11181
 Fruit and Fruit Buckets, *q.*, 11329
 Geraldton Trade, *supply*, 9997
 Grain Bags, Size of, *q.*, 6227, 6228, 6355,
 7415, 7461, 7462, 9767, 9845, 10610, 10700,
 10753, 10787, 10970, 11051-2
 Guns, Importation of, *q.*, 11016, 11054
 Harvesters, Price of, *q.*, 9583, 9584-5, 9767
 Horses, Importation from Western Australia,
q., 11916
 Immigration Restriction Act, *supply*, 9988
 Iron, Exportation of, *q.*, 6407
 Jam Manufacturers, Combine of, *q.*, 9956,
 10576, 10970

Chapman, Hon. Austin—*continued.*

Kanakas, Repatriated, *supply*, 11379
 London Offices of Commonwealth, *supply*, 3666
 Letter Carriers, Boys, *q.*, 504
 Mail Steamers: Cold Storage on, *adj.*, 245, 601; *q.*, 408, 588, 590; Telephone Inquiries *re*, *q.*, 774
 Mails:
 Casino-Grafton Service, *q.*, 407
 Mail Service to Europe, *q.*, 80, 297
 Mail Contract, Cancelled, *q.*, 193, 352, 404, 502, 881, 988, 1087
 Manure Combine, *q.*, 11056
 Mauger, Mr., *q.*, 158
 Millers' Association, *q.*, 11795
 Morphia, Price of, *q.*, 10750
 New Hebrides, *q.*, 2121
 New Protection, *q.*, 1281, 4647, 4648, 4748, 4749, 7116; *supply* (*p.o.* 3320); *ways and means*, 5707
 Officers Compensation Bill, *m.*, 7495
 Old-age Pensions, *q.*, 880
 Opium, sale of, *q.*, 2234, 3970; Smuggling of, *q.*, 9100, 10135, 11525
 Pacific Islands, Trade with, *q.*, 1378
 Papua:
 Telegraphic Communication with, *q.*, 405
 Parliament, Reflections on, *obs.*, 10988
 Patent and Proprietary Medicines, *q.*, 1087, 1749, 4519, 4622, 4649, 4842, 4926, 5129, 5497, 6023, 8815
 Patents Act, British, *q.*, 9208, 11157
 Personal Explanation, 2656
 Pianos, Disclosure of Official Information, *q.*, 7415, 7462; *expl.*, 7536
 Postal Administration (Sydney), *q.*, 988
 Postal Rates Bill, *q.*, 297, 882, 10524; *int.*, 774
 Produce, Grading of, *q.*, 4958
 Public Service:
 District Allowances in Western Australia, *adj.*, 2686
 Promotions, *supply*, 9985
 Temporary Assistance, *supply*, 11379, 11380
 Quarantine Bill, *cons. amts.*, 8939, 8941, 8955, 8959
 Quarantine, *supply*, 9984
 Rabbit Destruction, *q.*, 5328, 5417, 6407, 6674, 10081
 Rat Destruction, *q.*, 6675
 Secret Drugs, Cures and Foods, *q.*, 10309
 Shipping Combine, *adj.*, 3966
 Shipping, Differential Treatment of, *q.*, 11916, 11922
 Shipping Intelligence, *q.*, 928
 Stamp Printing Machinery, *q.*, 298
 Stripper Harvesters, *q.*, 7028, 7297, 7418, 9767
 Sugar Industry:
 Bounty, *q.*, 3300
 Casual Labourers, *q.*, 10878
 Rebates, *q.*, 5240, 5417
 Wages, *q.*, 11325
 Supply:
 Trade and Customs (Central Staff), 9983; (Quarantine), 9984; (Victoria), 9985; (Immigration), 9988, 9990; (South Australia), 9991, 9992, 9993, 9994, 9996; (Western Australia), 9997; (Temporary Assistance), 11379; (Tariff Decisions), 11380
 Works and Buildings (Home Affairs), *p.o.*, 3320; (Post and Telegraph), 3458, 3510, 3546, 3553; (External Affairs), 3666

Chapman, Hon. Austin—*continued.*

Tariff:

Absorbent Cotton, *q.*, 10752
 Administration of, *supply*, 9983
 Agricultural Implement Makers in South Australia, Payment of Excise, *q.*, 2688, 2790, 2791
 Art Paper, Imitation, *q.*, 10878, 11019
 Bonded Goods, *q.*, 5131
 British Goods, Taxation of, *q.*, 1868, 2236
 Butter Boxes, Rebate of Duty on, *q.*, 2564, 2567, 6591, 6676, 7025, 7026
 Cancellation of Carriers' Licences, *q.*, 2687
 Cases, Duty on, *q.*, 2233, 2347
 Chairs, Duty on, *q.*, 2564, 2688
 Commission's Reports, *q.*, 2655, 2791, 2890, 2891, 3172, 6419
 Committees' Decisions, Circulation of, *q.*, 6812
 Condensed Milk, Increase of Price, *q.*, 2564
 Curios, Duties on, *q.*, 5329
 Customs Duties, Duplication of, *q.*, 6674
 Dates, Importation of, *q.*, 11390
 Decisions, *supply*, 11380
 Duties, Refund of, *q.*, 7300
 Employment, Effect on, *q.*, 10609
 Entries, Passing of, *q.*, 4622
 Excess Duty, Refund of, *q.*, 2889, 2997
 Exemptions, *q.*, 1976
 Foreign-made goods, *q.*, 11056
 Goods, Consumption and Manufacture of, *q.*, 1752; increased prices by Sydney firms, *q.*, 2792
 Goods in Transit, Duties on, *q.*, 1747, 1748
 Hat Bands, Leather, *q.*, 4748; *adj.*, 4794; *supply*, 4844
 Hat Making Machinery, *q.*, 6720, 6813
 Imports, Clearances of, *q.*, 1868; Classification of, *supply*, 9996
 Increased Prices, *q.*, 2564, 2792
 Industries, Stimulus to, *q.*, 9090
 Information as to, *q.*, 1974
 Items, Explanation of, *q.*, 3734, 3972
 Kerosene, Duty on, *q.*, 2563, 2688, 7298, 7299, 9685; Flash Point of, *q.*, 11180
 King's Warehouses, *q.*, 2680, 2690
 Labour Conditions, *q.*, 1281
 Lining Boards, *q.*, 4200
 Machinery Rebates, *q.*, 6813
 Magazines, Duty on, *q.*, 1865, 2312, 2565
 Opium, Smuggling of, *q.*, 2565, 2566
 Paints, Duties on, *q.*, 2232
 Petition, *m.*, 3412
 Pianos, Importation of, *q.*, 7113, 7170, 7251
 Printing Paper, Duty on, *q.*, 2791-2, 11055, 11095-6; *expl.*, 11178
 Re-exports, Drawback on, *q.*, 11329
 Removal from Bond, *q.*, 1865
 Shearing Machine Gear, Duty on, *q.*, 5320
 South African Preference, *q.*, 11919, 11920
 Tartaric Acid, *q.*, 11098
 Tea, Duty on, *q.*, 1517
 Temporary Assistants, *supply*, 11379, 11380
 Timber Duties, Rebate on Exported Fruit and Butter Cases, *q.*, 6421
 Tobacco, Duties on, *q.*, 1868
 Treacle, Seizure of, *q.*, 6675
 Tweed, Increased Price in New South Wales, *q.*, 2792
 Wheat, Re-Importation of, *q.*, 5600
 Wheels and Axles, Duty on, *q.*, 2312, 268-

Chapman, Hon. Austin—*continued.*

Tariff—*continued.*

Wholesale Business Firms, Increase of Prices by, *q.*, 1868
Wire-netting, *q.*, 4842, 5238
Tariff Resolutions (Customs):
Ale, Porter and other Beer, *p.o.*, 4121-2
Blue, 4786
Hats and Caps, *cons. req.*, 10590, 10618
Lasts and trees, 7127
Manufactures of paper, 7190
Oils, *cons. req.*, 10988
Socks and Stockings, *cons. req.*, 10642, 10643
Parasols, &c., *cons. req.*, 10619, 10620
Piece Goods, *cons. req.*, 10623, 10624, 10627, 10628, 10629, 10630
Sp.rits, 4135
Timber, undressed, 7090
Tobacco, Manufactured, *n.e.i.*, 4238, 4287
Waddings, &c., *cons. req.*, 10630, 10631, 10635, 10640
Wine, *n.e.i.*, 4201
(See Customs Tariff Bill.)
Telegraph Messengers, *q.*, 883
Telephones:
Charges, Reduction of, *q.*, 208, 880
Long Distance Rates, *q.*, 501, 590, 976
Rates, Anomalies in, *q.*, 578, 979; *adj.*, 981; *supply*, 3458, 3510
Sydney to Melbourne, *supply*, 3546, 3553
Undergrounding of Wires, *q.*, 150, 978
Young Exchange, *q.*, 80, 81
Trawler, *q.*, 5691

Chataway, Senator T. D.. Queensland.

Additional Appropriation Bill, 1907-8, *schedule*, 11619
Additional Appropriation (Works and Buildings) Bill, *ar.*, 11690
Address-in-Reply, *m.*, 261
Agriculture, Dept. of, *q.*, 8365
American Fleet, *q.*, 11470
Appropriation Bill, *com.*, Schedule (Home Affairs), 10308, *ar.*, 10394
Appropriation (Works and Buildings) Bill, *com.*, Schedule (Defence), 4041; (Treasury), 4054; (External Affairs), 4076, 4083
Australia, Map of, *supply*, 10308; advertising of, *q.*, 11303, 11472; *supply*, 12144
Australian Industries Preservation Bill, *com.* (persons to answer questions and produce documents), 5037, 5085, 5106; *ad. rep.*, 5183
Bills of Exchange Bill, *com.* (protection of banker paying fraudulently altered cheque), 758, 2060, 2061, 2067, 2104, 2204; (application of State laws), 1585, 1706; (presentment of cheque for payment), 2060
Bounties Act, *q.*, 7653
Bounties Bill, *ar.*, 2635; *com.* (appropriation), 2768; (bounties), 2769, 2770; (notice), 2779, 2781; (regulations), 2786, 2851, 2862, 2864; (schedule), (cotton), 3067, 3069; (New Zealand flax), 3071; (jute), 3158, 3257; (mohair), 3371; (copra), 3394; (rice uncleaned), 3464, 3488; (rubber), 3489, 3576; (coffee), 3582, 3709, 3722, 3723; (tobacco leaf), 3729, 3825, 4260; (fish preserved), 4264; (dates), 4385; *ad. rep.*, 4585; *recom.*, 4837; (coffee), 4896; (tobacco leaf), 4899
Business, Conduct of, *adj.*, 7564
Census and Statistics, *supply*, 6350
Chinese, *q.*, 6061

Chataway, Senator T. D.—*continued.*

Coal Combine, *adj.*, 3701
Commercial Agents, *q.*, 8554; *supply*, 8919
Commonwealth Expenditure, *address*, 263
Commonwealth Salaries Bill, *com.* (taxation by States of Commonwealth salaries), 956
Commonwealth Year-book, *adj.*, 9190
Customs Administration, *supply*, 1858
Customs Conference, Pretoria, *q.*, 10921
Customs Department, North Queensland, *supply*, 138
Customs Tariff Bill, *ar.*, 7607
Schedule:
Adding and Computing Machines, 8625
Agricultural, Horticultural, and Viticultural Machinery and Implements, *n.e.i.*, 8574
Ammonia (*p.o.*, 9251)
Ammonia Condenser Coils, 9169, 9170
Antimony, 9171
Apparel and Attire, 8209
Arrowroot, 7950
Artificial Plants, Flowers, and Fruits, 8349, 8352
Bags and Sacks, 8218
Bananas, 7840, 7850
Blankets for Printing Machines, 9946
Blue, 7685, 7696
Bottle Stoppers, *n.e.i.*, 8501
Carbide of Calcium, 9256, 9263, 9267
Carbonic Acid Gas, 9253
Chaff Cutters and Horse Gears, 8580
Coffee and Chicory, 7767
Coses and Cushions, 8284
Cotton Seed, 8095
Electrical and Gas Appliances, 9057, 9060; *cons. req.*, 10950
Electrical Machinery and Parts thereof, 8802
Fancy Goods, 9651, 9652
Fish, 7784
Fruits and Vegetables, 7822
Glassware, *n.e.i.*, 8488
Grain and pulse, prepared or manufactured, 7917, 7919
Hats, Caps, and Bonnets, 8208
Hay and Chaff, 7938; *cons. req.*, 10866
Insecticides, 9291, 9292-3; *cons. req.*, 11240
Lantern Slides, &c., 9931, 9933 (*p.o.*, 9935)
Machinery, Machines, and Machine Tools, *n.e.i.*, 8709, 8710
Manufactures of Metal, *n.e.i.*, 8725, 8740, 8745, 8762
Matches and Vestas, 7981, 8003
Metals and Machinery (Division VI.A), 9188
Motive Machinery and Appliances (except electric), 8627, (*p.o.*, 8650), 8652
Milk, 8019
Nuts, 8034, 8035, 8036, 8037
Oils, 8388, 8444; *cons. req.*, 11224
Plates and Sheets of any metal (except tin), 9170
Printing Roller Composition, 8523
Rails, &c., 9063; *cons. req.*, 10951
Rice, 8081, 8086; *cons. req.*, 10873
Sago and Tapioca, 7661
Scientific Apparatus, 8495
Tanks, 8617
Tents, Tarpaulins, Sails, and Flags, 8347
Timber, 9422, (*p.o.*, 9423), 9448, 9452, 9453; *cons. req.*, 11242, 11600, 11603

Chataway, Senator T. D.—*continued.*Customs Tariff Bill (Schedule)—*continued.*

- Tobacco, Manufactured, 7639, 7644
- Trimings and Ornaments, n.e.i., for Attire, 8349
- Type, Printers', 8769
- Waddings and Cotton Wool, 8330
- Watch and Clock Hair and Main Springs, &c., 9657
- Watches and Clocks, n.e.i., 9656
- Wood, articles made of, n.e.i., 9575

Defence:

- Military and Naval Appointments, *q.*, 4471
- Rifle Clubs, Grants to, *supply*, 4041
- Rifle Ranges, *supply*, 11690
- Thursday Island Fort, Explosion at, *supply*, 11620, 11678, 12146
- Disputed Elections and Qualifications Bill, *com.* (qualifications and vacancies), 5653; *q.*, 5858, 5981
- Dissent from Ruling: Admissibility of Request (Customs Tariff Bill), *m.*, 9251
- Election Expenses Reimbursement Bill, 2R., 12149
- Electoral Rolls, Publication of, *q.*, 9633; *supply*, 11619
- Estimates, *q.*, 7976
- Excise Tariff (Agricultural Machinery) Act, *adj.*, 5760

- Fire Insurance, *supply*, 12145
- Grain Bags, Size of, *q.*, 7565, 7566
- Harvesters, Excise Tariff, *q.*, 1927
- Immigrants, *q.*, 4365, 4471
- Immigration Leagues, *q.*, 8231
- Immigration Restriction Act, *q.*, 1689
- Immigration, *q.*, 29; *address*, 261, 264
- Invalid and Old-age Pensions Bill, 2R., 12012; *com.* (disqualifications), 12030; (invalid pensions), 12032
- Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway Survey Bill, 2R., 1155
- Linotype Operators, *m.*, 3836
- London Offices of the Commonwealth, *supply*, 4076, 4083; *q.*, 4470

Mails:

- Northern Territory, *q.*, 830, 931, 1130
- Vancouver Service, *address*, 267; *supply*, 1858
- Mail Service to Europe, *q.*, 5560, 5978; *m.*, 6210
- New Hebrides, *q.*, 4708, 4895
- Officers Compensation Bill, 2R., 10056; *com.* (appropriations), 10058, 10060

Papua:

- Administration, *supply*, 8920
- Steam Service to, *q.*, 1926
- Parliamentary Allowances Bill, 2R., 2107
- Parliamentary Gardens, *supply*, 12144
- Parliamentary Papers Bill, *com.* (publishing parliamentary papers), 12135; (no action for libel), 12136, 12137
- Parliamentary Witnesses Bill, *com.* (preventing witnesses giving evidence), 766
- Personal Explanation, 8867
- Petition: Kerosene, Flash Point of, *m.*, 10251

Postal:

- Administration, *supply*, 139, 1857, 8918, 9001, 9006; Cabinet Committee of Inquiry, *adj.*, 9527
- Postal and Telegraph Associations, *q.*, 7704
- Stamps, Sale of, *q.*, 5082
- Telegraphic Communication, Queensland, *q.*, 9041, 9136

Chataway, Senator T. D.—*continued.*

- Privilege: Select Committee on Procedure, *m.*, 10099; *q.*, 11216; *m.*, 11983; *ad. rep.*, 11987

Public Service:

- Customs Officers Salaries, *q.*, 11881
- District Allowances, *q.*, 7977, 8483; *supply*, 12147
- Inquiry Boards, *q.*, 8672, 8700
- Leave, *q.*, 7571
- Printing Committee, *m.*, 1566, 4468, 8226
- Printing Office, *supply*, 4054
- Quarantine Bill, 2R., 5195; *com.* (ports of entry), 5322 (*p.o.*, 5991)
- Questions, *p.o.*, 8156
- Submarine Bells, *supply*, 12146

Sugar Industry:

- Bounty, *q.*, 2178, 2614, 3364, 10920
- Cane Fields, Labour in, *q.*, 5367; Wages in, *q.*, 6190, 11472
- Excise and Bounty, *q.*, 4796
- Surtax in Cape Colony, *q.*, 9138, 9537, 10253; *adj.*, 10309; *supply*, 10394
- Wages in Queensland, *address*, 261
- Supply Bill (No. 1), 1R., 138
- Supply Bill (No. 1) 1908-9, 2R., 12141; *com.* (Schedule) (Parliament House and Gardens) 12144, 12145, (Defence—Thursday Island) 12146

- Supply Bill (No. 2), 1R., 1857

- Supply Bill (No. 5), 1R., 8919; *com.* (Postal) 9001, 9006

- Surplus Revenue Bill, 2R., 11884
- Telegrams, Delivery of, *supply*, 1858
- Telephone Exchange, Nanango, *q.*, 11864
- Telephone Line, Plane Creek Central Mill Company's, *supply*, 12147
- Telephone Service, *q.*, 650, 1470, 1566
- Tillett, Mr. Ben, *q.*, 5081
- Tobacco Combine, *q.*, 3149
- Treasurer's Advance, *supply*, 12141
- Tropical Australia, Diseases in, *supply*, 6348
- Vanilla, *q.*, 1023
- Weather Reports, Queensland, *q.*, 247

Clemons, Senator Hon. J. S.—*Tasmania:*

- Additional Appropriation Bill 1907-8, 1R., 11475
- Adjournment, Special, *m.*, 10072, 11321
- Agricultural Show, *adj.*, 2962
- Anti-Trust and Commerce Laws, *q.*, 11303
- Australian Industries Preservation Bill, 2R., 4908; *cons. amds.* (persons to answer questions and produce documents), 10071
- Australian Timber, *q.*, 11382
- Bills of Exchange Bill, *com.* (signature essential to liability), 747; (notice of dishonour), 748; (presentment of cheque for payment), 749, 2055, 2056; *recom.*, 2407, 2409, 2411; (protection of banker paying fraudulently altered cheque), 753; (protest when notary not accessible), 763; (application of State laws), 1587, 1706, 1965, 1967, 1972; *recom.*, 2407

- Blakney, Mr. E. A., Case of, *q.*, 7752

- Bookkeeping Period, *supply*, 1842, 6300

- Bounties Bill, *com.* (minimum wage), 2771; (offences against Act), 2771, 2773; (notice), 2780, 2783; (regulations), 2846, 2853, 2856, 2860; (schedule), (cotton), 2958; *m.*, 2962; (tobacco leaf), (*p.o.*, 4163, 4167); *recom.*, 4838; (tobacco leaf), 4897

Clemons, Senator Hon. J. S.—*continued.*

British Goods, Certificates of Value, *m.*, 1961
 Budget Papers, *adj.*, 1714
 Business, Order of, *adj.*, 1712
 Collins, Captain, *q.*, 1814, 1928
 Commonwealth and States, Financial Relations of, *q.*, 7974-5, 11381
 Commonwealth Salaries Bill, *com.* (taxation by States of Commonwealth salaries), 1569, 1574; (salary of Governor-General), 1584; 32., 1822
 Customs Tariff Bill, Schedule :
 Adzes, Axe Handles, &c., 9639
 Agricultural, Horticultural, and Viticultural Machinery and Implements, *n.e.i.*, 8577
 Agricultural, Horticultural and Viticultural Machinery and Implements, 8593
 Apparel and Attire 8194, 8200
 Arms, 8559
 Arrowroot, 7949, 7951
 Biscuits, 7674, 7684
 Blankets (*p.o.*, 8233), 8240, 8255, 8258
 Blankets for Printing Machines, 9947
 Blue, 7686, 7688, 7695, 7697
 Boots, Rubber, &c., 9665
 Broom Corn Millet, 7697
 Brushes, 9903
 Buckets and Tubs, 9649
 Butter and Cheese, 7698, 7700
 Carpets, 8263, 8273
 Coffee and Chicory, 7771, 7775
 Coir Mats and Matting, 8275, 8276
 Confectionery, 7720, 7736, 7747
 Cotton, Asbestos, &c., 9939
 Curtains and Blinds, *n.e.i.*, 8288, 8289
 Cutlery, *n.e.i.*, 8598
 Doors, 9639, 9640
 Dried Herbs, 7880
 Earth and Rock Cutting Machinery, &c., 8782, 8795, 8796
 Electrical Machinery and Parts thereof, 8800, 8804, 8809, 8870, 8872, 8873, 8884, 8885, 8887
 Engines, &c., *n.e.i.*, 8665, 8666, 8667, 8670, 8671, 8685, 8694, 8695
 Fancy Goods, 9650, 9651
 Filters, 9899
 Fish, 7800
 Fruits and Vegetables, 7817, 7828, 9949
 Fruits, Citrus, 7829
 Fumigators, Atomisers, &c., 9924; *cons. reg.*, 11316
 Furs and other Skins, 8289, 8290, 8292
 Gloves, 8293, 8294, 8295, 8296, 8297
 Goods repaired abroad, 9944
 Grain and Pulse, not prepared or manufactured, 7891, 7892
 Grain and Pulse, prepared or manufactured, 7894, 7906, 7916, 7918, 7919, 7920
 Green Ginger, 7832
 Hay and Chaff, 7935
 Honeys, Jams, and Jellies, 7945
 Hops, 7948, 7949
 Infants' Food, 8063
 Iron, Plate and Sheet, 8564
 Isinglass, 8064
 Leather, *cons. reg.*, 11310
 Leather, Rubber and Composition Belting, 9675, 9676
 Liquorice, 7755, 7759, 7761
 Locomotives, Traction and Portable Engines, 8662, 8664

Clemons, Senator Hon. J. S.—*continued.*

Customs Tariff Bill (Schedule)—*continued.*
 Machinery, Machines, and Machine Tools, *n.e.i.* (*p.o.*, 8710-1, 8713)
 Malt Extract, 7956, 7957
 Manures, 9904
 Matches and Vestas, 7960, 7969, 7987, 8001, 8009
 Meats, Poultry, and Game, 8011, 8012, 8015
 Milk, 8021
 Mustard, 8030
 Mustard Seed, 8030
 Nails, 8600, 8605, 8610
 Nuts, 8032, 8034, 8035, 8036, 8038
 Oars and Sculls, 9902
 Oils, *cons. reg.*, 11224
 Oilmen's Stores, *n.e.i.*, 8040, 8041, 8047, 8057, 8059
 Onions, 7885
 Paper, *cons. reg.*, 11314
 Passengers' Personal Effects, 9941, 9942
 Peel, preserved, 7833
 Photograph Frames, 9641
 Pianos, 9895
 Piece Goods, 8161, 8166, 8177, 8178, 8184, 8187, 8189, 8191
 Rice, 8067, 8069, 8082, 8086, 8087
 Rice Root, 7698
 Rubber and other Hose, 9665, 9668
 Rubber Manufactures, *n.e.i.*, 9670
 Timber, 9547, (*p.o.*, 9549, 9550, 9552), 9555, 9556
 Tool Handles, 9635, 9638
 Sago and Tapioca, 7660
 Salt, 8080, 8093
 Saws, *n.e.i.*, 8763
 Scientific Instruments, 9947
 Screws, 8781, 8782
 Sewing and Embroidery Silks and Twists, 9923
 Sheep, 7656
 Slipper Forms, 9664, 9665
 Soap, 8096, 8097
 Sparklets, 8100
 Spectacles and Spectacle Frames, 9660
 Stained Glass Windows, 9938-9; *cons. reg.*, 11317
 Straw, 7944
 Surgical Appliances, 9940, 9944
 Vegetables, dried, 7875, 7878
 Vegetables, *n.e.i.*, 7872
 Wire, *n.e.i.*, *cons. reg.*, 11222
 Works of Art, 9938, 9939
 Yarns, 9919, 9921, 9922
 Dissent from Ruling: Admissibility of Request (Excise Tariff Bill), *m.*, 10020-2, 10025
 Divisions, *p.o.*, 8165
 Excise Tariff (Agricultural Machinery) Act, *supply*, 6303
 Excise Tariff (Spirits) Act, *adj.*, 4618; *q.*, 8364
 Excise Tariff Bill, *com.*:
 Schedule :
 Glucose (*p.o.*, 10014), 10020, 10027
 Tobacco, manufactured, *n.e.i.*, 10015, 10019
 Glucose, *q.*, 8285
 Grain, Shipment of, *q.*, 1568
 Harvesters, Manufacture of, *q.*, 1927
 Immigration Restriction Act, *q.*, 1471, 1689
 Judiciary Bill, 22., 859
 Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway Survey, *q.*, 8229

Clemons, Senator Hon. J. S.—*continued.*

Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway Survey Bill, *com.* (power to survey route), 1481, 1504; (appropriation), 1508; 3R., 1689; *p.o.*, 1606

Mails:

European, Special Train, *q.*, 745, 746
Tasmanian, *q.*, 745, 1815, 1929, 2845, 2941, 11301, 11473; *supply*, 1953

Mail Service to Europe, *q.*, 6294

Murray, Mrs., Case of, *q.*, 6407

Navigation Bill, *adj.*, 2787

New Protection, *adj.*, 4618

Officers Compensation Bill, *com.* (appropriations), 10065

Post Offices:

Launceston, *q.*, 7848, 8029, 9735, 10003

Springfield, *q.*, 6407

Printing Committee, *m.*, 1566; *p.o.*, 7845; *ad. rep.*, 8221

Privilege: Select Committee on Procedure, *m.*, 10005

Public Service:

Classification and Promotion, *q.*, 7752

Pulsford, Senator, Leave of Absence to, *m.*, 1330

Quarantine Bill, *com.* (State aid in carrying out Act), 5319; (ports of entry), 5321, 5323, 5481, 5482, 5483, 5487

Revenue, Alleged Leakage in Tasmania and Refund to, *q.*, 7850

Senate:

Accommodation for Members, *supply*, 8984-5

Adjournment of, *m.*, 6298

Leave of Absence, *m.*, 6298

Sittings of, *m.*, 8077

Vacancy in South Australia, Committee's Report, *m.*, 4832, 4836

Standing Orders, Suspension of, *adj.*, 10072-3

Statutory Rules and Regulations, *q.*, 11219

Supply Bill (No. 2), 1R., 1841; *com.* (issue and application), 1932; (period of expenditure), 1947; (schedule), 1947, 1948; *ad. rep.*, 1953; 3R., 1952

Supply Bill (No. 4), 1R., 6300

Supply Bill (No. 5), *com.*, Schedule (The Parliament), 8984-5

Supply, Term of Grant, *supply*, 1947, 1948

Tariff, *q.*, 1684

Commission's Reports, *q.*, 2032, 2405, 2511; *expl.*, 2513

Telegraph Charges, *q.*, 2615, 2845, 2846

Tobacco Industry:

Combine. Action of, *adj.*, 2040; *m.*, 3058.

Wireless Telegraphy, *q.*, 2031, 11383, 11468

Cook, Hon. J. H.—*continued.*

Electoral Rolls, *q.*, 9847, 11258-9, 11327, 11330

Federal Capital, *q.*, 10463

Governor-General's Establishment, *supply*, 9885-6

Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway Survey, *q.*, 9093, 9191, 9388, 10756, 10785

Legal Tender, *petition*, 1412

Letter Carriers and Mail Drivers, South Australia, *q.*, 9846

Lighthouses, *supply*, 9886

Mahon, Mr., pairs for, *expl.*, 6512

Mail Contract: Cancelled, *q.*, 10701

Map of Australia, *supply*, 9890

Pairs, *expl.*, 6794, 10605, 10704, 11578

Post Offices:

Port Pirie and Mount Gambier, *q.*, 11917, 12042

Post and Telegraph Department:

Expenditure, *supply*, 11404

Mail Motor Cars, *q.*, 10752

Secretary, *q.*, 10609

Sydney Railway Station, Late Fee Letter Box, *q.*, 10653, 10752

Telegraph Wire, *q.*, 10701

Telephone Tunnels, *q.*, 10609

Transfers of Officers, *q.*, 10653

Public Service:

Inquiry Boards, *supply*, 9775

Vacancies in, *q.*, 9684

Public Service Bill, 2R., 12056

Public Works Department, *supply*, 9789-91

Railway Gauge, Uniform, *q.*, 9298

Sittings of House, *m.*, 6512

Supply:

Home Affairs (Electoral Office), 9768; (Public Service Commissioner), 9775; (Public Works Staff), 9780; (Census and Statistics), 9875, 9876; (Governor-General's Establishment), 9885, 9886; (Miscellaneous), 9890; (Electoral Office), 11365

Works and Buildings (Home Affairs), 11404

Tariff, *p.o.*, 3297; *expl.*, 3298

Tariff Resolutions:

Chain Blocks, *cons. req.*, 11539

Electric Machines, *cons. req.*, 11447

Furniture n.e.i., 11013

Hats and Caps, *expl.*, 10605

Insecticides, *cons. req.*, 11008, 11564

Leather, *cons. req.*, 11070

Manufactures of Metals, *cons. req.*, 10704

Oils, *cons. req.*, 10887

Paper, *cons. req.*, 11083

Pens n.e.i., *cons. req.*, 11168

Piece Goods (Woollen), *cons. req.*, 11461, 11464

Roofing Tiles, *cons. req.*, 10903

Tobacco, unmanufactured, *cons. req.*, 10406
(See Customs Tariff Bill.)

Temperature Records, *q.*, 8928, 9098

Transferred Properties, *q.*, 11921

Trawler, building of, *q.*, 11261

Victoria, Population and Representation of, *q.*, 10525

Weather Forecasts, *q.*, 8926, 9091

Year-Book, *q.*, 10607, 10652

Cook, Hon. J. Hume, Bourke:

Budget, *p.o.*, 3207; *expl.*, 3208

Commonwealth Statistics, *supply*, 9875

Customs Tariff Bill, *cons. req.* (Tobacco, unmanufactured), 10496; (Oils), 10887; (Roofing Tiles), 10903; (Insecticides), 11008, 11564; (Leather), 11070; (Paper), 11083; (Furniture, n.e.i.), 11013; (Pens, n.e.i.), 11168; (Electric Machines), 11447; (Piece Goods), 11461, 11464; (Chain Blocks), 11539; Manufactures of Metals, *cons. req.*, 10704.
(See Tariff Resolutions (Customs).)

Disputed Senate Election, Expenses of, *supply*, 11365, 11366

Electoral Act, Amendment of, *supply*, 9768

Cook, Hon. Joseph, Parramatta:

Address-in-Reply, *m.*, 85
 Adjournment, Christmas, *q.*, 7459
 Adjournment, Special, *expl.*, 468; *m.*, 2026, 6504; *obs.*, 5745; *adj.*, 6067
 Advertising Contract, *supply*, 11361
 Age, Misrepresentation by, *expl.*, 5210
 Agricultural Implement Making Industry, *adj.* (*p.o.*, 12159), 12164
 Antarctic Expedition, *m.*, 7492
 Australia, Advertising, *supply*, 11359
 Australian Indebtedness, *Budget*, 2452
 Australian Industries Preservation Act, *q.*, 10524
 Australian Industries Preservation Bill, *2r.*, 9038, 9106; *com.* (definition), 9131; (burden of proof), 9201; (persons to answer questions and produce documents), 9216, 9220, 9223, 9232; *recom.*, 9392; *3r.*, 9585; (*p.o.*, 9589)
 Australian Men of Letters Fund, *supply*, 9521
 Beale, Mr., Report by, *adj.*, 3104
 Bills and Statistics, Printing of, *m.*, 2229
 Bookkeeping System, *Budget*, 2464
 Bounties Bill, *2r.*, 787; *com.* (appropriation), 997, 1019; (specification of bounties), 1057; (*p.o.*, 1072; (schedule), (mohair), 1099, 1100; (palm fruit), 1182; (fish), 1297, 1307; *p.o.*, 1315; (dried fruits), 1317; *p.o.*, 1317; *3r.*, 1400; *cons. amds.*, 6401, 6402
 Budget, *q.*, 977, 1716; *obs.*, 1678; *adj.*, 1743; *m.*, 2451; *p.o.*, 3293, 3297; *obs.*, 3294
 Business, Order of, *m.*, 469; *adj.*, 563, 1678, 6186; *m.*, 2795; *q.*, 3622, 7169; Progress of, *adj.*, 5236; *supply*, 5784; Conduct of, *adj.*, 6521
 Cable Connexions, *q.*, 12153
 Campbell-Bannerman, Death of Sir H., *obs.*, 10522
 Carruthers, Mr., Public Utterances of, *supply*, 3439
 Catts, Mr., Conduct of, *adj.*, 3971
 Chairman of Committees, *supply*, 82
 Coal and Shipping Combine, *q.*, 3971
 Coastal Defence Appropriation Bill, *m.*, 12077, 12093
 Combines and Trusts, *q.*, 3971
 Commerce Act, *supply*, 6290
 Commonwealth Elections, *supply*, 11366
 Commonwealth Salaries Bill, *adj.*, 2343
 Commonwealth and States, Financial Relations of, *Budget*, 2458; *supply*, 3326, 11270; *adj.*, 10784; *q.*, 6420, 10875, 10964
 Commonwealth Statistics, *supply*, 9876
 "Contingencies," *supply*, 5785
 Customs Tariff Amendment Bill, *com.* (short title), 12054; (South African preference), 12054; *m.s.o.*, 12054
 Customs Tariff Bill, *3r.*, 7465; *expl.*, 7468; *cons. req.* (*p.o.*, 10485), 10492; (Sago and Tapioca), 10500; (Blue), 10501; (Confectionery), 10515; (Hay and Chaff), 10522, 10530, 10545; (Matches and Vestas), 10550; (Nuts), 10558; (Tea), 10560; (Apparel and Attire), 10564, 10566; (Bags and Sacks), *p.o.*, 10573; (Curtains and Blinds), 10577, 11439, 11440, 11442; (Gloves), 10579; (Hats and Caps), 10583, 10599; (Manufactures of Metal, *n.e.i.*), 10686, 10698; (Coalcutters), *p.o.*, 10731; (Rock Boring Machines, *n.e.i.*), *p.o.*, 10733; (Electrical Machines), 10734, 10741; (*p.o.*,

Cook, Hon. Joseph—continued.

10735, 10738, 10741, 11451; (Furniture), 11013; (Roasting Dishes), 10905; (Paper), 11073, 11085, 11088; (Oils), 10985, 11110; (Piece Goods), 11461, 11462, 11463, 11464; (*p.o.*, 11528); (Stained Glass Windows), 11577, 11578; *m.*, 11434. (See Tariff Resolutions, Customs.)
 Defence:
 Administration, *supply*, 10094-98
 Clerk, Case of, *supply*, 5785
 Cordite Factory, *supply*, 3739
 Cox, Col., Case of, *supply*, 10091, 10105; *q.*, 11386
 Easter Encampment, Leave to Telegraphists, *q.*, 10079, 10131
 Expenditure, *Budget*, 2462
 Government Policy, *supply*, 3605, 3607
 Harbor and Coastal, *supply*, 3677
 Imperial, *address*, 94
 Military Board, *supply*, 10095
 Military Boots, *q.*, 9478
 Military Officers, Leave of Absence, *q.*, 9481
 Military Promotions, *q.*, 5600, 6594
 Naval, *supply*, 3615, 11408, 11417
 Naval Agreement, *address*, 96; *q.*, 1378
 Rifle Ranges, Buffalo Hill, *q.*, 9009, 10701; Parramatta, *supply*, 10091; Ryde, *supply*, 10092-3
 Victorian Torpedo Practice, *q.*, 3269
 Disputed Elections and Qualifications Bill, *supply*, 6283; *2r.*, 6372
 Dissent from Ruling, *m.*, 11546
 Echuca Election, *supply*, 8965
 Estimates, Additional, *q.*, 10078; *supply*, 11268; *obs.*, 11418
 Excise Procedure Bill, *2r.*, 7477
 Excise Tariff (Agricultural Machinery) Act, *q.*, 5909, 6130
 Excise Tariff Bill, *m.*, 11215; *cons. req.* (amylc alcohol), 11215. (See Tariff Resolutions, Excise)
 Excise Tariff (Starch) Bill, *2r.*, 12056
 Exports Oversea, *Budget*, 2451
 Federal Administration, *address*, 87
 Federal Capital, *supply*, 8862; *q.*, 9091, 9842, 10074
 Federal Finance, *Budget*, 2459, 2465; *supply*, 3321, 11268
 Freeman and Wallace, Messrs., *supply*, 11346
 Government, Position of, *adj.*, 10461; *supply*, 10473, 11271; *expl.*, 10481, 10482
 Government Printing Office (*p.o.*, 9975)
 Harvesters, Price of, *q.*, 9583, 9584
 High Commissioner, *address*, 88
 Honorary Ministers, Official Expenses of, *supply*, 9482, 9486
 House, Rights of, *m.*, 11434
 Immigration, *supply*, 9630, 9690-6, 9724; *p.o.*, 11387
 Immigration: America to Great Britain, *q.*, 6727
 Imperial Conference, *address*, 89; *supply*, 11361
 Imports, *Budget*, 2452
 Invalid and Old-age Pensions Bill, *2r.*, 11953
 Inter-State Trade, *Budget*, 2451
 Judiciary Bill, *adj.*, 2343; *p.o.*, 3760; *2r.*, 3759, 3762, 3791
 Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway Survey Bill, *m.*, 559, 561; *p.o.*, 631

Cook, Hon. Joseph—*continued.*

Labour Party, Platform of, *obs.*, 9346; *expl.*, 9350, 9351
 Land Settlement, *supply*, 8976
 Land Tax, *Budget*, 2454
 London Offices of Commonwealth, *supply*, 1802, 1804, 1809, 1810, 1811, 1875, 3617, 3622, 3661, 3663, 3673, 3740, 3749, 11361
 Mail Service to Europe, *address*, 88; *m.*, 6400, 6422; (*p.o.*, 6500, 6501)
 Mail Contract Cancelled, *q.*, 404, 2651, 7027
 Mail Steamers: Cold Storage on, *adj.*, 596
 Manufactures Encouragement Bill, *q.*, 5910; *m.*, 5914; *com.* (Regulations), 12177; (Schedule), 12179
 Murray Waters, *q.*, 503
 New Hebrides, *m.*, 470; *q.*, 3268, 3301; *supply*, 9725
 New Protection, *address*, 87; *Budget*, 2471; *supply*, (*p.o.*, 3319)
 New South Wales Expenditure by Carruthers Government, *supply*, 3358; *expl.*, 3411
 New Works and Buildings, *Budget*, 2461
 Northern Territory, *m.*, 469; *q.*, 4413
 Officers' Compensation Bill, *m.*, 7495
 Old-age Pensions, *address*, 87; *Budget*, 2457, 2458; *m.*, 9310, 9346
 Old-age Pensions Appropriation Bill, *m.*, 12095; *2R.*, 12096; *com.* (appropriation), 12096
 Opposition, Absence of Leader of, *address*, 85
 Pacific Islands, *supply*, 1804, 1809, 1812, 9512
 Papers, *obs.*, 11328
 Papua:
 Administration of, *supply*, 1804, 9404-5
 Papua Bill, *2R.*, 1415
 Parliament:
 Candidates' Expenses, *supply*, 11216
 Reflections on, *obs.*, 10985, 11110
 Sweating, *q.*, 6813
 Ventilating and Sewering, *supply*, 8964
 Parliamentary Allowances Bill, *q.*, 1866; *m.*, 1920, 1924; *2R.*, 1990; *com.* (amount of allowance), 2001, (commencement of Act), 2009, 2010
 Personal Explanation, 2652
 Postal Department:
 Administration of, *supply*, 11270
 Cabinet Committee to Inquire into Administration of, *q.*, 9843; *supply*, 10236-40;
 Royal Commission *re* (*p.o.*, 10402-3); *m.*, 10427, 10460; *supply*, 10473, 11404; *m.s.o.*, 11633; *expl.*, 10481-2
 Post Office, Northam, *supply*, 3536
 Post and Telegraph Department, *Budget*, 2460, 2462; *supply*, 11404
 Preferential Trade, *Budget*, 2475
 Preferential Trade (Tariff), 5047, 5132, 5133, 5627, 5638, 5744
 Premiers' Conference, Reports, *m.*, 470; *q.*, 10964
 Prime Minister, *q.*, 3621; *obs.*, 3735
 Privilege: Select Committee on Procedure, *q.*, 10075, 10077; *m.*, 10128, 11701
 Public Service:
 Administration of, *supply*, 9785-6
 Gratuities, *q.*, 7464
 Public Service Act, *Budget*, 2460
 Public Service Bill, *2R.*, 12057

Cook, Hon. Joseph—*continued.*

Quarantine Bill, *2R.*, 510; *com.* (commencement), 1417; (interpretation), 1539; (ports of entry), 1557; (power to destroy diseased animals), 1727; (examination of imported animals), 1761, 1765, 1766; (State laws and regulations), 1770; *cons. amds.*, 8943
 Quorum Rules, Breach of, *obs.*, 6801
 Rabbit Destruction, *supply*, 11380
 Rifle Ranges, *supply*, 3450, 3451
 Seat of Government Bill, *q.*, 9952
 Secret Drugs, Cures, and Foods, *adj.*, 3104; *supply*, 9978
 Session, Close of, *q.*, 11260
 Shipping Combine, *adj.*, 3944
 Sittings of House, *m.*, 28, 6506; *adj.*, 6186; *q.*, 6417, 6676, 6810
 Small Arms Factory, *adj.*, 3683
 Standing Orders, Suspension of, *p.o.*, 9482
 States Debts: Premiers' Conference, *q.*, 10904
 State Officers and Federal Work, *supply*, 9731
 States, Direct Taxation in, *Budget*, 2456
 Sugar Bounty, *Budget*, 2457
 Sunshine Railway Collision, *obs.*, 10483
 Supply:
 Attorney-General (Crown Solicitor's Office), 9731
 Defence (Central Administration), 10091, 10105
 External Affairs (Administrative), 8976, 9404, 9486; (Mail Service, Pacific Islands), 9512; (Miscellaneous), 9521, 9630, 9690, 9724, 9725
 Home Affairs (Public Service Commissioner), 9785; (Census and Statistics), 9876; (*p.o.*, 11365)
 Parliament (Ventilation of House), 8404; (Contingencies), 8965
 Postmaster-General (Central Staff), 10168, 10236
 Trade and Customs (Quarantine), 9084; (Rabbit Destructor), 11380
 Treasury (Government Printer), (*p.o.*, 9075), 9978
 Works and Buildings (Trade and Customs), 3439, 3441; (Defence), 3450, 3451, 3605, 3607, 3615, 3617, 3677, 3739, 11408; (Post and Telegraphs), 3456, 3510, 3536, 3599; (External Affairs), 3622, 3661, 3663, 3673; (Home Affairs), 3321, 3357, 11404
 Supply Bill (No. 1), *m.*, 81; *com.*, 84
 Supply Bill (No. 2), *m.*, 1776, 1802; *ad. rep.*, 1875
 Supply Bill (No. 3), *m.*, 5784
 Supply Bill (No. 4), *m.*, 6282; *com.* (schedule), 6290
 Supply Bill (No. 5), *m.*, 8862
 Supply Bill (No. 1) 1908-9, *m.*, 12097; *2R.*, 12180
 Surplus Revenue, *adj.*, 11734; *q.*, 11786
 Surplus Revenue Bill, *2R.*, 9866, 9875; *m.*, 11670; *com.* (commencement), 11861
 Tariff: *m.*, 2451; *p.o.*, 3293; *obs.*, 3294
 Amendments, *obs.*, 7440, 10501; *m.*, 10503; *obs.*, 10558
 Anomalies, *obs.*, 7452
 British Preference, *q.*, 2791
 Commission's Reports, *Budget*, 2467; *q.*, 3172
 Consideration of, *q.*, 3587, 3588, 6523; *m.*, 4341, 4358, 4360
 Goods in Transit, Duties on, *supply*, 1875
 Hat and Woollen Industries, *adj.*, 4705

Cook, Hon. Joseph—*continued.*

Tariff—*continued.*

Information as to, *supply*, 1776; *q.*, 1974
 Machinery Duties, *expl.*, 4843
 Old and New Rates of Duty, *q.*, 1715
 Petition, *m.*, 3409
 Progress Report to Senate, *m.*, 10817
 Revenue from, *supply*, 3323, 11269
 Seizure of Uncustomed Goods by New South
 Wales Government, *q.*, 2231; Cancellation
 of Carriers' Licences, *supply*, 2004
 Senate's requests, 9100
 Tariff Resolutions (Customs):
 Adding and Computing Machines, 6632
 Adze, Axe, and Scythe Handles, 7125
 Agricultural, Horticultural, and Vincultural
 Machinery and Implements, *n.e.i.*, 6556,
 6559, 6564-5
 Ale, Porter, and other Beer, 4025 (*p.o.*,
 4120-1), 4124, 4131
 Almond Kernels, 5462
 Ammonia, 6969, 6970
 Apparel and Attire, 5608, 5627, *n.e.i.*, 5629;
 cons. req., 10564, 10566
 Articles for official use of State Governors,
 7404, 7419, 7429
 Bags and Sacks, *recom.*, 5737; *cons. req.*
 (*p.o.*, 10573)
 Bananas, 5340
 Bicycles, 7274
 Biscuits, 4778
 Blacking, 6853
 Blankets, 5728
 Blankets, Rubber or Wool, for Printing
 Machines, 7407
 Blue, 4785; *cons. req.*, 10501
 Boots and Shoes, 7154, 7155, 7156, 7158
 Bottles, *n.e.i.*, 6947
 Bronze and Metal Powders, 6860
 Brushmakers' Woodware, 7118
 Buckets and Tubs, 7139, 7140
 Cameras, &c., 7394, 7395
 Candles, 4928, 4944, 4969, 5047, 5132; *expl.*,
 5133
 Casks, Barrels, &c., 7135
 Chairs, 7000
 Chaffcutters and Horse Gears, 6564
 China and Porcelain, 6897, 6900
 Clay Smoking Pipes, 7396
 Coalcutting Machines, *cons. req.* (*p.o.*) 10731
 Coir Mats, 5739
 Confectionery, 5159, 5217 (*p.o.*, 5218), 5228;
 cons. req., 10515
 Condensed Milk, 5515
 Copying Apparatus, 7378
 Corn Flour, 5352, 5357
 Cosies and Cushions, 5744
 Cotton Yarn, 7375, 7376, 7377
 Curtains and Blinds, *cons. req.*, 10577, 11439,
 11440, 11442
 Electrical Articles and Materials, 6810
 Electrical and Gas Appliances, 6809
 Electrical Machinery, 6800, 6807; *cons. req.*,
 10734, 10741 (*p.o.*, 10735, 10738, 10741),
 11451
 Engines (*p.o.*, 6705), 6712, 6713
 Explosives, 7382
 Feathers (undressed), 5635, 5636, 5638;
 (dressed), 5638
 Flypapers, 6993
 Fumigators, &c., 7379
 Furniture, 7011, 7019, 7020; *cons. req.*, 11013
 Glass, 6918, 6921
 Glassware, 6924

Cook, Hon. Joseph—*continued.*

Tariff Resolutions (Customs)—*continued.*

Gloves, 5940; *cons. req.*, 10579
 Glue, 6951
 Graphite, 6858, 6859
 Gummed Paper, 7241
 Hats, Caps, and Bonnets, 5955, 5956, 5957,
 5959, 5960, 5965, 5966, 5967, 5969, 5970,
 5971, 5973, 5974, 5975, 5976; *cons. req.*,
 10583, 10599
 Hay and Chaff, 5422, 5429, 5441, 5442 (*p.o.*,
 5442); *cons. req.*, 10522, 10530, 10545
 Imitation Gold, &c., 7147
 Incandescent Mantles, 5977
 Iron and Steel, 6839, 6841
 Iron, Plate and Sheet, 6526
 Isinglass, *n.e.i.*, 5462
 Jewellery, Unfinished, 7144, 7145, 7146
 Lasts and Trees, 7127
 Leather Manufactures, *n.e.i.*, 7163
 Leather, Rubber and Composition Belting,
 7165, 7167
 Liquid Removers of Paints and Varnishes,
 6894, 6895
 Live Stock (*p.o.*, 4772, 4773)
 Machinery and Machines and Machine Tools,
 6722-3, 6730
 Mangles, &c., 6549
 Manufactures of Metal, 6746; *cons. req.*,
 10686, 10668
 Manufactures of Paper, 7175, 7180, 7182,
 7183, 7184, 7195, 7204, 7211, 7212, 7215,
 7216, 7222, 7223
 Manures, 7373
 Marine Engines, 6655
 Matches and Vestas, *cons. req.*, 10550
 Meats and Poultry (fresh or smoked), 5454,
 (potted or concentrated) 5455, (soup) 5456,
 (preserved by cold process) 5456, 5459
 Mining Engines, 6789, 6793, 6799
 Motive Power Machinery and Appliances,
 6653, 6656, 6665
 Nails, 6600, 6608, 6609, 6614, 6617
 Naphthaline, 6978
 Nuts, *cons. req.*, 10558
 Oilmen's Stores, 5523, 5524
 Oils, 6682, 6866, 6868, 6869, 6874; *cons. req.*,
 10985, 11110
 Opium, 6994
 Paints and Colours, 6884, 6886, 6889, 6890,
 6891, 6892
 Paper, *cons. req.*, 11073, 11085, 11088
 Peel, 5334
 Perambulators and Go-carts, 7282, 7283
 Photograph Frames, &c., 7125, 7126
 Photographic Accessories, 7395
 Pianos, 7348, 7352, 7355, 7357
 Pickles, 5463
 Pictures, 7398
 Piece Goods used in manufacture of Rubber
 Cloth, Rebate on, 7412
 Piece Goods (*p.o.*, 5849), 5852, 5853, 5856,
 5915, 5918, 5926; *cons. req.*, 11461, 11462,
 11463, 11464; *p.o.*, 11528
 Printing and Stencilling Inks, 7245, 7257
 Printing Paper, 7215
 Rails, &c., 6815, 6823, 6829
 Rebate for Home Consumption, 11194,
 11196, 11200, 11212, 11213
 Regalia (*p.o.*, 5639)
 Reader and Binder Twine, 7377, 7378
 Rice, *n.e.i.*, 5534

Cook, Hon. Joseph—*continued.*Tariff Resolutions (Customs)—*continued.*

- Roasting Dishes, *cons. req.*, 10905
 Rock Boring Machines, *n.e.i.*, *cons. req.* (*p.o.*, 10733)
 Roofing Tiles, 6909
 Saccharine, 6976
 Sago and Tapioca, *cons. req.*, 10500
 Salt, 5536
 Salt, Gypsum and Manure Bags, *recom.*, 5735, 5736
 Sausage Casings, 5460
 Saws, *n.e.i.*, 6751
 Scientific Instruments, 7410, 7411
 Screws, *n.e.i.*, 6709, 6772
 Sheep-shearing Machines, 6586
 Sheepwashes, 6985, 6988, 6992
 Shooks, 7137
 Smoking Pipes, 7396
 Socks and Stockings, 5935
 Stained Glass Windows, *cons. req.*, 11187, 11577, 11578
 State Imports, 7429
 Stationery, Manufactured, 7243
 Stone and Marble, 6963, 6965, 6966
 Strawboard, 7229
 Stripper Harvesters, 6570, 6573
 Sugar, 4752, 4765
 Surgical Appliances, 7400; *cons. req.*, 11192
 Tanks, 6622
 Tartaric Acid, *cons. req.*, 11011
 Tea (in packets), (*p.o.* 5465); *cons. req.*, 10560
 Timber, 7024, 7079, 7082, 7084, 7094, 7100, 7103; *cons. req.*, 11058-9, 11139
 Tool Handles, 7119, 7124
 Type, Printers', 6758, *expl.*, 6768
 Varnishes, 6892
 Vehicles, 7285, 7292-3
 Vesta and Match Boxes, 7241
 Watches, Clocks, &c., 7150, 7151
 Weighing Machines (*p.o.*, 6630), 6632
 Wicker, Bamboo, and Cane, 7109
 Wire Netting (*p.o.*, 4574)
 Woollen and Hat Machinery, 6722
 Yarns, 7377
 (*See* Customs Tariff Bill.)
 Tariff Resolutions (Excise):
 Amylic alcohol, *cons. req.*, 11215
 Cigarettes, 4323
 Golden Syrup, 4767
 (*See* Excise Tariff Bill.)

Telephones:

- Discontinuance of, *q.*, 9954
 Rates, Anomalies in, *q.*, 979, 6726; *adj.*, 979, 987; *supply*, 3456, 3510
 Sydney to Melbourne, *supply*, 3550
 Trade, *Budget*, 2453
 Transferred Properties, *Budget*, 2466; *q.*, 11786
 Treasurer's Advance, *supply*, 84
 Trawler, *supply*, 3441
 Victorian Coal Mines, *q.*, 7208
 Votes, Spending of, *supply*, 11271

Coon, Mr. J., *Batman:*

- Address-in-Reply, *m.*, 27
 Adjournment, Special, *m.*, 12203
 Boots and Shoes, *Budget*, 2834
 Bottle Making Industry, *Budget*, 2831
 Budget, 2830

Coon, Mr. J.—*continued.*

- Customs Tariff Bill, *cons. req.*, (Hats and Caps), 10605, 10614; (Socks and Stockings), 10653; (Manufactures of Metal, *n.e.i.*), 10696; (Rock Drills), 10717, 10727; (Wire Netting), 10767; (Locks), 10797; (Wire *n.e.i.*), 10812; (Oils), 10987, 11117; (Paper), 11072, 11080; (Stained Glass Windows), 11187, 11575, 11577; (Piece Goods), 11464, 11532; (Hoists), 10685. (*See* Tariff Resolutions (Customs).)
 Easter Encampment, *q.*, 9581
 Electoral Act, *address*, 28
 Hirsch, Mr. Max, *q.*, 405
 Imperial Conference, *address*, 27
 Industrial Legislation, Uniform, *m.*, 2567
 Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway Survey Bill, *2r.*, 734
 Manufactures' Encouragement Bill, *com.* (authority to pay bounties), 12170
 Mining Machinery, *Budget*, 2833
 New South Wales, Progress under Protection, *Budget*, 2831
 Parliament, reflections on, *obs.*, 10987
 Penny Postage, *address*, 28
 Post and Telegraph Department:
 Instrument Fitters, *q.*, 11158
 Pottery Trade, *Budget*, 2832
 Preferential Voting, *address*, 28
 Tariff Revision, *address*, 27
 Tariff Resolutions (Customs):
 Apparel and Attire, *n.e.i.*, 5630
 Bicycles, 7270
 Blacking, 6854
 Blue, 4781
 Boots and Shoes, 7155
 Bottles, *n.e.i.*, 6945
 Candles, 4885, 4950
 China and Porcelain, 6898, 6901
 Confectionery, 5225, 5252
 Engines, 6716
 Explosives, 7388
 Furniture, 7005
 Glassware, 6926
 Gloves, 5940
 Hats, Caps, and Bonnets, 5971; *cons. req.*, 10605, 10614
 Hoists, patent, *cons. req.*, 10685
 Lasts and Trees, 7126
 Locks, *cons. req.*, 10797
 Machinery, &c., 6732, 6742
 Manufactures of Metal, *cons. req.*, 10696
 Matches, 5451
 Mining Engines, 6780
 Motive Power Machinery and Appliances, 6663
 Nails, 6613
 Oils, *cons. req.*, 10987, 11117
 Paper, *cons. req.*, 11072, 11080
 Piece Goods, Woollen, 5827; *cons. req.*, 11464, 11532
 Rock Drills, *cons. req.*, 10717, 10727
 Socks and Stockings, *cons. req.*, 10653
 Stained Glass Windows, *cons. req.*, 11187, 11575, 11577
 Steam Road Rollers, 6686
 Weighing Machines, 6628
 Wire, *n.e.i.*, *cons. req.*, 10812
 Wire netting, 4525; *cons. req.*, 10767
 Wool Scouring Machines, 6722
 (*See* Customs Tariff Bill.)
 United Kingdom: Imports and Exports, *Budget*, 2831

Croft, Senator J. W., Western Australia :

Appropriation Bill, *com.* (Postmaster-General), 10389
 Customs Tariff Bill, Schedule :
 Animal Foods, 7921
 Coffee and Chicory, 7761, 7779, 7780
 Cutlery, *n.e.i.*, 8599
 Dutiable Machinery and Machine Tools, 8721
 Electrical and Gas Appliances, 8890, 9043, 9056, 9060
 Fish, 7805
 Fruits and Vegetables, 7813
 Grain and Pulse (prepared or manufactured), 7914, 7919
 Iron and Steel Tubes, 9087
 Machinery and Machines and Machine Tools, *n.e.i.*, 8705
 Manufactures of Metal, *n.e.i.*, 8724, 8729, 8739, 8761-2
 Pigs, 7657
 Rails, &c., 9071, 9072
 Sparkling Wine, 7631
 Weighing Machines, *n.e.i.*, 8621
 Defence :
 Military Leather Equipment, *q.*, 9042
 Immigrants, *q.*, 5178
 Immigration Restriction Act, *q.*, 1131, 1471, 1688
 Mail Contracts, Oversea, *m.*, 4497
 Opium, Smuggling of, *q.*, 5011; *adj.*, 9007
 Patents Office, *q.*, 1689
 Post and Telegraph Department :
 Administration, Western Australia, *supply*, 10389
 Printing Office, *q.*, 7793
 Spencer, Mr., Land Claim, *q.*, 5283
 Stores, Tenders for, *q.*, 9041
 Tasmanian Customs Revenue, 933
 Tillet, Mr. Ben, Statement by, *q.*, 4705
 Western Australia; Postal Facilities, *adj.*, 4924
 Wharf Labourers' Strike, New South Wales, *q.*, 9041
 Year-Book, Printing of, *q.*, 4707

Crouch, Hon. R. A., Corio :

Antarctic Expedition, *q.*, 10875
 Australia, Advertising of, *supply*, 9983; *q.*, 11050-1; *p.o.*, 10880
 Australian Industries Preservation Bill, *com.* (definition), 9130; (burden of proof), *p.o.*, 9134-5
 Beale, Mr., Report by, *adj.*, 3098, 3899
 Board of Trade, Correspondents, *q.*, 4957
 Bouchard, Commodore, Reception of, *q.*, 9099, 9299
 Bounties Act, *q.*, 11390
 Bounties Bill, *com.* (schedule), (cotton), 1079; (fish), 1299, 1302; *p.o.*, 1315; (dried fruits), 1317; (second schedule), 1322, 1323
 Business, order of, *adj.*, 3047
 Coal Miners' Strike, *q.*, 6131
 Collins, Captain, Duties of, *q.*, 7111
 Colonial Office, *q.*, 5130, 6406, 11736; Dominions Department, *q.*, 9389
 Commonwealth Salaries Bill, *1r.*, (*p.o.*), 1926, 3860; *adj.*, 3047; *2r.*, 3876; *com.* (taxation by States of Commonwealth Salaries), 3885, 3896, 3897
 Commonwealth Servants, State Taxation of, *q.*, 1279

Crouch, Hon. R. A.—continued.

Commonwealth Services : Old-age Pensions, *q.*, 11526
 Commonwealth and States, Financial Relations, *q.*, 11420
 Copyright Bill, *q.*, 5130
 Customs Stations, Border, *supply*, 9984
 Customs Tariff Bill, *cons. req.* (Motive Power, Machinery and Appliances, except electric), 10677; (Electrical Machines), *p.o.*, 10739; (Oils), 10825, 11109; (Chemical compounds), 11010; (Paper), 11072, 11080. (*See* Tariff Resolutions (Customs).)
 Defence :
 Administration, *supply*, 10084-91; *q.*, 11793
 Armament Artificers, *q.*, 2450
 Arsenal : New Garden City, *q.*, 9767
 Artillery Ranges, *q.*, 6024
 Cadets Instructional Staff, *q.*, 988
 Cordite and Small Arms Factory, *supply*, 3739; *q.*, 3621, 8818, 11329
 Defence Bill, *q.*, 9193
 Discharge Fees, *q.*, 9685, 11097
 European Military Systems, *q.*, 2347
 Field Artillery, *q.*, 11261
 Government Policy, *supply*, 8833
 Governor-General's Establishment, *supply*, 9885
 Guns, Lights, and Emplacements, *supply*, 3744
 Instructional Staff Commissions, *q.*, 11793
 Instruction, Courses of, *q.*, 2123
 Lang, Bombardier, *q.*, 2313, 2348; *adj.*, 2343, 2511
 Marriage Regulations, *q.*, 4311
 Married Establishment, *q.*, 989
 Medical Examination, *q.*, 4310, 4748
 Military Board, *supply*, 10084-87
 Military Correspondence, *q.*, 1089
 Military Forces, Daily Rations, *q.*, 4927, 5240; Enlistment, *q.*, 7249
 Military Officers, Permanent, *m.*, 4087; Uniforms, *q.*, 10401
 Military Staff Clerks, *q.*, 10789
 Military Stores, *q.*, 7116
 Ordnance Equipment, *supply*, 3611, 3612
 Permanent Artillery Band, Victoria, *supply*, 10125
 Recruits, Treatment of, *q.*, 11920
 Rifle Ranges, *supply*, 3452
 Royal Australian Artillery; Bombardiers, *q.*, 2348; Commanding Officers, *q.*, 2691; Interruption of Training Operations, *q.*, 9686; Increases, *q.*, 11793
 Training Grounds for Troops, *supply*, 3452
 Uniforms, *q.*, 11056
 Victorian Easter Encampment, *q.*, 9581, 10609, 10787; Payment of Militia, *q.*, 9581, 9955; Transport Delays, *q.*, 10484, 11097, 11182
 Dissent from Ruling; Admissibility of Amendment (Tariff Resolutions), *m.*, 7092
 Excise Procedure Bill, *com.* (interpretation), 7488; (employment of counsel), 7489; (powers of authority to whom application referred), 7490
 Excise Tariff (Agricultural Machinery) Act, *q.*, 6230
 Export Entries, *q.*, 10756
 Federal Capital, *q.*, 10179
 Foreign Governments; Communication with, *q.*, 10181
 Freeman and Wallace, Messrs., *supply*, 11124

Crouch, Hon. R. A.—*continued.*

- Governor-General, Appointment of Earl of Dudley, *q.*, 9388
 Honorary Ministers, Official Expenses of, *supply*, 9482-3
 Honours, Australian Recommendations for, *q.*, 1751
 Immigration, *adj.*, 1328; *supply*, 1788, 9608-9; *q.*, 10179
 Immigration: Restriction of Asiatics, *q.*, 10483
 Imperial Conference, *q.*, 5416
 Income Tax, *q.*, 1279, 6811
 Invalid and Old-age Pensions Bill, *com.*, (qualifications), 11968, (disqualifications), 11970, 11971, 11973, (invalid pensions), 11978, (accumulated property), 11979, (appeal), 11980, (forfeiture), 11981, (instalments payable to persons other than pensioners), 11981, (instalments may be forfeited), 11981
 Japanese Mail Steamers, *q.*, 9585
 Judiciary Bill, *adj.*, 3047; *2R.*, 3792; *com.* (exclusive jurisdiction of High Court), 3794, (causes pending), 3795
 Labour Caucus, *p.o.*, 10968-9
 Lascars, Commonwealth Legislation, *q.*, 1975
 Lighthouses, *supply*, 9886
 Mail Services:
 Reduced, *q.*, 6131
 Melbourne Hospital Site, *q.*, 8815
 Millers' Association, *q.*, 11795
 Netherland Indies, Trade with, *q.*, 2998
 New Protection, *q.*, 1281, 5802; *adj.*, 1744
 Northern Territory Accounts, *supply*, 9970
 Officers Compensation Bill, *m.*, 7501
 O'Halloran, Mr., case of, *supply*, 9730, 9733
 Old-age Pensions, *m.*, 9345
 Opium Smuggling, *q.*, 10125
 Papua:
 Natives, Taxation of, *q.*, 6813
 Parliament:
 Reflections on, *obs.*, 11109
 Sewering, *ways and means*, 4847
 Parliamentary Allowances Bill, *m.*, 1893; *com.* (amount of allowance), 1998, 2004; (commencement of Act), 2010
 Parliamentary Papers Bill, *2R.*, 11672; *com.* (no action for libel), 11674, (authority to Government Printer to publish), 11675
 Penny Postage, *q.*, 882
 Personal Explanation, 10732
 Plummer, Mr. John, *p.o.*, 10880; *q.*, 11050
 Postal Rates Bill, *q.*, 882
 Postal Department:
 Bacchus Marsh Post Office, *q.*, 5601
 Cabinet Committee to inquire into administration of, *q.*, 9844
 Postmistress, Portarlington, *q.*, 9470
 Royal Commission, *supply*, 10455
 Telephone Bureau, Barwon Heads, *q.*, 11626
 Preferential Trade (Tariff), 4068, 5062
 Premiers' Conference, *q.*, 10785
 Quarantine Bill, *com.* (master to notify out break), 1624
 Referendum as to Religious Instruction in State Schools, *q.*, 2688
 Repatriated Australians, *adj.*, 1128
 Secret Drugs, Cures and Foods, *adj.*, 3098
 States Officers, Services by, *supply*, 9730, 9733; *q.*, 10078
 Supply Bill (No. 2), *m.*, 1788
 Supply Bill (No. 5), *m.*, 8832

Crouch, Hon. R. A.—*continued.*

- Supply:
 Attorney-General (High Court), 9730, 9733
 Defence (Central Administration), 10084, 10125
 External Affairs (Administrative), 9482; (Miscellaneous), 9608
 Home Affairs (Governor-General's Establishment), 9885; (Miscellaneous), 9886
 Treasury (Audit Office), 9970
 Trade and Customs (Central Staff), 9983; (New South Wales), 9984
 Works and Buildings (Defence), 3452, 3611, 3612, 3739, 3744; (Post and Telegraphs), 3554
 Supreme Courts, Reciprocity, *q.*, 10075
 Telephone Numbers, *q.*, 2234
 Tariff:
 Amendment of, *m.*, 10504
 Cases, Duty on, *q.*, 2347
 Commission's Reports, *q.*, 1749
 Goods in Transit, Duties on, *q.*, 1745
 Kerosene, Duties on, *q.*, 2563
 Labour Conditions, *q.*, 1281; *adj.*, 1744
 Petition, *p.o.*, 3408; *m.*, 3409, 3414
 South Africa, Preferential, *q.*, 11919, 11920
 Western Australian Parliament, Resolution by, *q.*, 5690
 Tariff Resolutions (Customs):
 Apparel and Attire, 5625
 Bags and Sacks, 5641
 Blacking, 6855, 6856
 Blankets, 5721
 Blankets, rubber or wool, for printing machines, 7407
 Candles (*p.o.*, 4954), 4968, 5062
 Chemical Compounds, *cons. req.*, 11010
 Condensed Milk, 5510
 Cordage, 7378
 Cosies and Cushions, 5741
 Electrical Machines, *cons. req.* (*p.o.* 10739)
 Explosives, 7387, 7390
 Fancy Goods, 7140
 Fish, 5266, 5275
 Glass, 6919
 Glue, 6953, 6955
 Harness Dressing, 6857, 6858
 Hats, Caps, and Bonnets, 5959, 5966
 Jewellery, Imitation Gold, 7147
 Leather Manufactures, *n.e.i.*, 7163
 Leather, Rubber, and Composition Belting, 7164, 7167
 Licht-pausrohpapier, 7269
 Manufactures of Paper, 7190, 7221
 Motive Power Machinery and Appliances (except electric), *cons. req.*, 10677
 Oils, *cons. req.*, 10825, 11109
 Paints and Colours, 6885, 6888
 Paper, *cons. req.*, 11072, 11089
 Piece Goods, 5855
 Regalia (*p.o.*, 5640)
 Salt, *n.e.i.*, 5539
 Spectacle Frames, 7153
 Timber, 7086, 7092
 Tin Plates, 6118
 Vehicles, 7285
 Wire Netting (*p.o.*, 4555)
 (See Customs Tariff Bill)
 Tariff Resolutions (Excise):
 Starch, 5553, 5557
 Telephones:
 Essendon to Keilor, *q.*, 9954
 Geelong to Warrnambool and Port Fairy, *supply*, 3554
 Wren, Mr., Stoppage of Letters to, *q.*, 5691

Deakin, Hon. A., Ballarat :

Aborigines, Western Australia, *q.*, 7115, 7116
 Address-in-Reply, *m.*, 24
 Adjournment, Christmas, *q.*, 5519, 5520, 6729,
 6834, 7299, 7416, 7459; *adj.*, 7536
 Adjournment, Special, *m.*, 5497, 7491, 10461,
 11734
 Agricultural Bureau, *q.*, 11328
 Allegiance, Oath of, *q.*, 9093
 All Night Sittings, *q.*, 6024
 "All-Red Route," *obs.*, 93
 American Fleet, *q.*, 9089, 9474; *obs.*, 9474,
 9951, 10607, 11180; *q.*, 11419, 11525; *adj.*,
 11300
 Antarctic Expedition, *m.*, 7491; *q.*, 10875
 Attorney-General, *q.*, 10786
 Australia, Advertising Resources of, *q.*, 7026,
 10523, 10576, 10607, 10652, 10753, 10754,
 10755, 10756, 10786, 10879, 10964, 11097,
 11156, 11261, 11388-9; *supply*, 9515, 9714-24
 Australian Historical Records, *supply*, 9490
 Australian Industries Preservation Bill, *q.*,
 9192; *3R.*, 9589
 Australian Men of Letters Fund, *q.*, 4647,
 10179; *supply*, 9518, 9520
 Australians, Repatriated, *supply*, 11364
 Bank Clerks, *q.*, 11155
 Beale, Mr., Statement by, *q.*, 8926
 Board of Trade, Correspondents, *q.*, 4957
 Business, Conduct of, *q.*, 5519; *supply*, 5786;
 Order of, *q.*, 7169, 7170, 7416, 7461, 10078;
m., 10126; *adj.*, 9039
 Cable Code, *q.*, 9843
 Campbell-Bannerman, Sir Henry, Death of,
obs., 10522
 Cattle, Argentine, *q.*, 5911, 6678
 Chairman of Committees, *q.*, 80; *supply*, 83
 Chinese, Influx of, *q.*, 8816, 9845
 Chinese Sailors, *q.*, 11180
 Closure, *q.*, 6593
 Coal and Shipping Combine, *q.*, 3971
 Coal Mines, Nationalization of, *q.*, 5910
 Coal Miners' Strike, *q.*, 6024, 6094
 Coastal Surveys, *q.*, 4519
 Coinage, *q.*, 11424
 Collins, Captain, *q.*, 7111, 7112, 9476; *supply*,
 9489
 Colonial Office, *q.*, 5130, 5803, 6094, 6406,
 11736; Dominions Department, *q.*, 9389
 Combines and Trusts, *q.*, 3971
 Commonwealth newspaper, *q.*, 10703
 Commonwealth Statutes, *q.*, 11182
 Conciliation and Arbitration Court, *q.*, 5046
 Contract Labour, *q.*, 5046
 Count Out, *m.*, 7251
 Crimean and Indian Mutiny Veterans, *q.*,
 6593, 9092
 Customs Tariff Bill, *m.*, 11424, 11435 (*See*
 Tariff Resolutions, Customs)
 Defence :
 Defence Bill, *q.*, 9193, 9389, 11420
 Easter Encampment, leave to telegraphists,
q., 10079
 Government Policy, *obs.*, 7509
 Naval Agreement, *q.*, 4309, 5237, 7461, 8815,
 10310, 10523
 Naval Construction, *q.*, 4308, 4309
 Naval Depot, *q.*, 8815
 Naval Proposals, *q.*, 9686, 9767; *supply*,
 11408, 11410, 11417
 Taxation for, *q.*, 11420, 11628
 Tenders, *q.*, 10608

Deakin, Hon. A.—continued.

Department of External Affairs, Expenditure
 by, *supply*, 9406, 9482
 Disputed Elections and Qualifications Bill, *q.*,
 6095
 Dry Farming, *q.*, 9765
 Empire Free-trade, *q.*, 6120
 Empire, Cohesion of, *q.*, 11154-5
 Excise Tariff Acts, *q.*, 6096, 6097, 6098
 Excise Tariff (Agricultural Machinery) Act,
q., 4927, 5801, 5908, 5909, 6130, 6131, 6229,
 6230, 7294, 7295, 7296; *adj.*, 6359
 Excise Exemptions, *q.*, 4200
 Excise Procedure Bill, *q.*, 6812
 Fanning Island, *q.*, 6835
 Federal Capital, *q.*, 5237, 5238, 7111, 7460,
 8814, 8927, 9091, 9475, 9766, 9842, 10073-4,
 10132, 10135, 10179, 10401 (*See* Seat of
 Government Bill)
 Federal Servants and Income Tax, *q.*, 11327
 Financial Relations of Commonwealth and
 States, *q.*, 9582, 9390, 9846, 10524, 10875,
 11328, 11420
 Foods, Impure, *q.*, 9765
 Foreign Governments, Communication with,
q., 10181
 Franco-British Exhibition, *q.*, 9009, 9842, 10751
 Freeman and Wallace, Messrs., *q.*, 10079,
 10132-4; *adj.*, 10129; *supply*, 11338
 German Islands, Pacific, *q.*, 6814, 7250
 Governor-General, Appointment of Earl of
 Dudley, *obs.*, 9387; *q.*, 9388
 Government, Position of, *m.*, 10451; *adj.*,
 10462; *supply*, 10464, 10478; *expl.*, 10481
 Harvesters, Price of, *q.*, 9583-4
 High Commissioner, *q.*, 5416, 9091; *supply*,
 9489
 Honorary Minister, *obs.*, 8818
 Honorary Ministers, Official Expenses of,
supply, 9485
 House, Rights of, *m.*, 11424, 11435
 Immigration, *q.*, 4518, 8938, 9091, 9765,
 10180, 10179-80, 10401; *adj.*, 9420; *supply*,
 9608, 9714-24; *q.*, 10877-8, 10905, 11006,
 11386-9; League of Australasia, *supply*,
 9725; *q.*, 10401, 11330, 11708
 Immigration : America to Great Britain, *q.*,
 6727, 6728
 Immigration Restriction Act : Pearl Fisheries,
q., 9582; Asiatics, *q.*, 10483; Russian Jews,
q., 10756
 Immigrants, Spanish, *q.*, 4647, 7114
 Imperial Conference, *q.*, 5416; *supply*, 11361
 Imperial Institute, *supply*, 9404
 Inspector-General of Customs, *q.*, 8817
 International Agricultural Institute, *supply*,
 9627
 Iron Industry :
 Japan, *q.*, 6593
 Lithgow, *q.*, 7027, 7417, 11420, 11790
 Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway Survey
 Act, *q.*, 4086, 4958, 5328, 7112, 7113, 7463,
 8027
 Kanakas, Repatriation of, *q.*, 9684; *supply*,
 9688-90
 Kingston, Right Hon. C. C., Leave of
 Absence to, *m.*, 5803, 10652; Death of, *m.*,
 11046, 11049
 Labour Party, Resignation of Leader, *obs.*,
 5326
 Land for Settlement, *q.*, 9765, 10130, 10179-80,
 10877-8
 Land Tax, *q.*, 9390, 10878, 11419, 11628

Deakin, Hon. A.—*continued.*

Leave of Absence, *m.*, 10652
 Linnithgow, Death of Marquis of, *m.*, 8818, 8819
 Logue, Cardinal, *q.*, 11154-5
 London Docks, *q.*, 6726, 6685
 London Offices of Commonwealth, *q.*, 5208, 5209, 6676, 7299, 9952, 11097
 Mail Service to Europe, *q.*, 4309, 4519, 4623, 4957, 5237, 5416, 5497, 5520, 5690, 5801, 5908, 6024, 6096, 6132, 6229, 6354, 6728, 10785; *m.*, 6118, 6128, 6401; *adj.*, 6439
 Mail Contract, Cancelled, *q.*, 79, 80, 5908, 6098
 Mails:
 North-West Coast Service, *q.*, 10784
 Manufactures Encouragement Bill, *q.*, 6594, 7027, 11420, 11742, 11790
 Manures Combine, *q.*, 7417
 Marine Surveys, *q.*, 7249, 8929-30
 Medical Degrees, Registration of, *q.*, 10574
 Melbourne Cup Day, *q.*, 5416
 Melbourne Hospital Site, *q.*, 8815
 Messengers, Late Hours, *q.*, 6812
 Ministerial Relations, *q.*, 11706
 Mint, *q.*, 10179
 Monopolies and Trusts, *q.*, 7414
 Municipal Rates: Commonwealth Payments, *q.*, 11795
 Navigation Bill, *q.*, 9089, 9192
 Navy, Rabbits for, *q.*, 10875
 New Hebrides, *q.*, 6418, 8818, 10700, 10788, 10877, 11326
 New Protection, *q.*, 5208, 5328, 6095, 6211, 7300, 7415, 7463, 9583-4, 10112, 10063, 11420-1
 New Zealand Dominion, *m.*, 3852; Freights on State Importations, *q.*, 5802
 Norfolk Island Bill, *q.*, 9957; *int.*, 11795
 Northern Territory, *q.*, 4519, 6728, 7112, 9480, 10524, 10786
 Old-age Pensions, *m.*, 9306, 9350; *q.*, 9390; *adj.*, 10482; *expl.*, 10066
 Olympian Games, *q.*, 9388
 Opposition Leader, Thanks to, *adj.*, 11863
 Orion, s.s., loading of, *q.*, 11260
 Pacific Cable, *q.*, 4086
 Pacific Islands:
 Mail Service, *supply.*, 9512
 Preferential Trade, *q.*, 8929
 Papua:
 Aboriginal Natives, Removal of, *q.*, 4309, 4310, 6725; Taxation of, *q.*, 6813
 Administration of, *q.*, 9091, 9476, 11324; *supply.*, 9394, 9413, 9491, 9496
 Administrator, Appointment of, *q.*, 9476, 9763; *adj.*, 9795; *q.*, 10077, 10178, 11324-5, 11522-3
 Appointments, *q.*, 4959
 Boundary of, *q.*, 10065, 11324, 11385
 Drummond, Mr., *q.*, 10878, 11524, 11742
 Indentured Labour, *q.*, 11744
 Land Regulations, *q.*, 8816, 11523, 11524; *m.*, 9298
 Land Scandals, *q.*, 9957, 10077, 10131, 10575, 11421-4, 11522-4, 11742
 Land Settlement, *q.*, 4646, 10606, 10607, 10652
 Mail Service, *q.*, 9953; *supply.*, 11360-1
 McGregor, Sir William, *q.*, 10077
 Native Mortality, *q.*, 9766
 Natives, Massacre of, *q.*, 10606, 11158, 81

Deakin, Hon. A.—*continued.*

Papua—*continued.*
 Ordinances, *obs.*, 9582; *q.*, 11182
 Smith, Mr. S., *q.*, 11422, 11522-4
 Suspension of Surveyor-General, *q.*, 9763
 Treasurer, Appointment of, *q.*, 10178
 Wireless Telegraphy, *q.*, 11327
 Parliament:
 Alleged Corruption of, *q.*, 8928; *adj.*, 9294; *q.*, 9844, 10075-6, 10401; *obs.*, 11102
 Criticism of, *q.*, 11522
 Sweating, *q.*, 6813
 Ventilation and Sewering of, *supply.*, 8664
 Patent and Proprietary Medicines, *q.*, 6355
 Pearling Fleets: Western Australia, *q.*, 81
 Philippines, The: Importation of Butter, *q.*, 5210, 6727
 Pianos, Exhibit in Parliament House, *q.*, 7114
 Piano Industry, *q.*, 11261
 Port Davy Light, *q.*, 4955
 Post Offices:
 Northam, *q.*, 9581, 9765
 Postal Department:
 Administration, Royal Commission as to, *q.*, 9477; *m.*, 10401, 10406, 10451 (*p.c.*, 10403), 10464, 10478; *expl.*, 10481; *q.*, 11385, 11522; Ministerial Statement, 11637
 Cabinet Committee to inquire into Administration, *q.*, 9477, 9843, 9844, 10078; Placing of, in commission, *q.*, 11524
 Postal, Telegraphic and Telephonic Systems, *q.*, 7458, 7459
 Preferential Trade (Tariff), 4993
 Preferential Trade, *q.*, 4956
 Premiers' Conference, *q.*, 10785, 11787, 11788
 Prime Minister, Congratulations, *obs.*, 3735
 Printing, *q.*, 4310
 Printing Committee's Report, *m.*, 9298
 Printing Office, Temporary Employees, *adj.*, 7540
 Private Members' Business, *q.*, 8926
 Privilege: Select Committee on Procedure, *q.*, 9844; *m.*, 9953, 10127, 10129, 11701; *q.*, 10075-7, 10401
 Public Service:
 Examinations, *q.*, 7549
 Increments, *q.*, 7026, 7171, 9581
 Regrading of, *q.*, 10653
 Transferred Officers: Pensions, *q.*, 9481
 Public Service Act, Amendment of, *q.*, 10310
 Quebec Celebrations, *obs.*, 9474
 Questions without Notice, *q.*, 10080, 11707, 11744, 11793
 Rabbit Destruction, Dr. Danysz's Experiments, *obs.*, 6520
 Rabbit Pest, *q.*, 4519
 Roosevelt, President, *q.*, 10757
 School Children, Medical Inspection, *q.*, 3972
 Scottish Fishermen, *q.*, 10965
 Seat of Government Bill, *q.*, 9952, 11096, 11703; *2R.*, 10311 (*See* Federal Capital)
 Secret Drugs, Cures and Foods, *m.*, 7508; *supply* (*p.o.*, 9969), 9979; *q.*, 9092, 9580, 9845, 9956, 10309-10, 11159, 11261, 11521
 Session, Business of, *obs.*, 8930; *adj.*, 9630, 10177; Close of, *q.*, 10180, 11261, 11525-6, 11703-4; *adj.*, 11784; *q.*, 11790
 Shipping and Coal Combine, *q.*, 3971
 Shipping Ring, British, *q.*, 10785-6
 Sitings of House, *m.*, 28, 6131, 6506, 8863; *q.*, 6416, 6417, 6676, 6729
 South Seas, German Navy in, *q.*, 11628

Deakin, Hon. A.—continued.

Standing Orders, *q.*, 6421, 6834
 State Borders, Hospitals near, *q.*, 9194
 States Debts, *q.*, 9764, 10700, 10964
 Stock Quarantine, *q.*, 3732
 Suez Canal Dues, *q.*, 10181
 Sunshine Harvester Works, *q.*, 7463
 Sunshine Railway Collision, *obs.*, 10482
 Supply Bill (No. 3), *m.*, 5786
 Supply :
 Parliament, 8964, 11300
 External Affairs (Administration), 9394,
 9404, 9406, 9413, 9482; (Executive), 9485;
 (London Offices), 9489; (Historical
 Records), 9490; (Papua), 9491, 9496,
 9512; (Miscellaneous), 9515, 9518, 9520,
 9627, 9688, 9714, 9725; (Mail Service,
 Pacific Islands), 11360, 11361; (Repa-
 triated Australians), 11364
 Treasury (*p.o.*, 9069), 9979
 Works and Buildings (Defence), 11408,
 11410, 11417
 Supreme Courts: Reciprocity, *q.*, 10075
 Surplus Revenue, Monthly Balances, *adj.*,
 11736; *q.*, 11741
 Surplus Revenue Bill, *q.*, 11788, 11789; *com.*
 (commencement), 11862; *obs.*, 11863
 Tahiti, *q.*, 3734
 Tariff :
 Alteration of Duties, Transmission of News
 to England, *q.*, 9476-7
 Confectionery Duties, *q.*, 5239
 Consideration by Senate, *q.*, 5131, 6023
 Fodder Duties, *q.*, 5239, 6355
 Hat Mill Machinery, *q.*, 6676
 Kerosene Duty, *q.*, 7298, 7299, 7414, 7458
 New Protection, *q.*, 8816
 New South Wales, Industrial Prosperity,
 q., 6677
 Preference, *q.*, 11703
 Referendum, *q.*, 11326
 Reopening of, *q.*, 11789
 Western Australian Parliament, Resolution
 by, *q.*, 5690
 Wheat, Re-importation of, *q.*, 6099
 Wire-netting, Seizure of, *q.*, 4309
 Tariff Resolutions (Customs):
 Candles, 4993
 Coffee, 5261
 Oils, *cons. req.*, 11102
 Governors' Stores, 7419
 Stripper Harvesters, 6572
 (See Customs Tariff Bill)
 Tenders, British Preference, *q.*, 10608, 11525,
 11627
 Tobacco Industry, Nationalization of, *q.*,
 10752
 Trade Union Legislation, *q.*, 11704
 Transcontinental Railway: Brennan Mono
 Rail, *q.*, 8027
 Transferred Properties, *q.*, 11703
 Trawler, *q.*, 5238
 Treasurer, Pressure on, *q.*, 11707
 Victorian Coal Mines, *q.*, 7028
 Victoria, Population and Representation of,
 q., 10484
 Victorian Railways, Electrification of, *q.*,
 6727
 Western Australia :
 Proposed New State, *q.*, 11743
 Settlers in, *q.*, 9766
 Wireless Telegraphy, *q.*, 11320
 Women's Work Exhibition, *q.*, 4646; *adj.*,
 4955

de Largie, Senator Hon. H., Western Australia:

Address-in-Reply, *m.*, 250
 Appropriation Bill, *com.* (Parliament), 10286,
 10287; (External Affairs), 10291, 10295;
 (Attorney-General), 10303; (Home Affairs),
 10304, 10307, 10309; (Postmaster-General),
 10390, 3R., 10396
 Australia, Map of, *supply*, 10307; Advertising,
 q., 11302
 Australian Industries Preservation Bill, 2R.,
 4604; *com.* (persons to answer questions and
 produce documents), 5028; *ad. rep.*, 5190
 Bookkeeping Period, *supply*, 6306
 Bounties, *address*, 252
 Bounties Bill, 2R., 2520; *com.* (tobacco leaf),
 4256; (fish, preserved), 4265
 British Goods, Certificates of Value, *m.*, 1962
 Business :
 Conduct of, *adj.*, 586
 Cables, *supply*, 1952
 Coastal Defence Appropriation Bill, 2R., 12111
 Collins, Captain, *supply*, 10295
 Commonwealth Mail Steamers, *m.*, 2211;
 expl., 2941
 Commonwealth Salaries Bill, *com.* (taxation by
 States of Commonwealth salaries), 1050
 Conciliation and Arbitration Court, *supply*,
 10303
 Customs Tariff Bill, 1R., 7549; *m.*, 11683.
 Schedule :
 Artificial Plants, Fruits and Flowers, 8351
 Bananas, 7840, 7868
 Candles, 7710
 Carbide of Calcium, 9269
 Casks, Barrels, &c., 9644
 Coffee and Chicory, 7773
 Corks, 9926
 Earth and Rock Cutting Machinery, &c.,
 8787, 8791, 8797
 Electrical Machinery and Parts thereof,
 8801, 8804, 8873, 8874, 8876
 Engines, *n.e.i.*, 8666, 8668, 8671, 8673, 8680,
 8691, 8695
 Fish, 7805
 Fruits and Vegetables, 7809
 Furniture, *n.e.i.*, 9364
 Glass, bent, bevelled, &c., 8485, 8488
 Gloves, 8293; *cons. req.*, 10927
 Graphite or Plumbago, 8372
 Hops, 7948
 Iron Pipes, &c., 9083
 Iron, Plate and Sheet, 8563
 Locomotives, Traction and Portable, 8663
 Machinery, Machines and Machine Tools,
 n.e.i., 8703
 Manufactures of Metal, *n.e.i.*, 8735 (*p.o.*,
 8749)
 Matches and Vestas, 8004
 Motive Power Machinery and Appliances
 (except electric), 8626, 8638 (*p.o.*, 8645)
 Hats, Caps, and Bonnets, 8324
 Oils, 8409, 8413, 8438, 8446, 8448; *cons.*
 req., 11227, 11231, 11232
 Paints and Colours (*p.o.*, 8458), 8460
 Piece Goods, *cons. req.*, 11595
 Rails, &c., 9069
 Socks and Stockings, 8335
 Stained Glass Windows, 9936; *cons. req.*,
 11318
 Stone and Marble, 8544, 8547
 Tanks, 8615

de Largie, Senator Hon. H.—*continued.*Customs Tariff Bill (Schedule)—*continued.*

Tea, 8111

Timber, 9439, 9471, 9541, 9546 (*p.o.*, 9549, 9552); *cons. req.*, 11256

Vegetables, dried, 7879

Vehicles, 9825, 9828, 9829

Works of Art, 9936

Defence Bill, 2r., 5673

Defence :

Cadet System, *m.*, 5981Coastal Defence Vessels, *q.*, 2179Naval Experts, Report of, *q.*, 5466Uniforms, *q.*, 5859, 6295Disputed Elections and Qualifications Bill, 2r., 5592; *com.* (qualifications and vacancies), 5663; *recom.* (petitions pending), 5776, 5779Electoral Office, *supply*, 10304Excise Tariff (Agricultural Machinery) Act, *adj.*, 5762Excise Tariff Procedure Bill, *recom.*, 5383Immigration, *address*, 256Immigration Leagues, *q.*, 8230-1Immigration Restriction Act, *supply*, 10291; *q.*, 12101Imperial Conference, *address*, 259Industrial Awards, *q.*, 8103, 8154

Invalid and Old-age Pensions Bill, 2r., 12016

Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway Survey Bill, *address*, 251; *q.*, 932; *com.* (power to survey route), 1488; 3r., 1698Kanakas, Repatriation of, *supply*, 12144Land Tax, *address*, 254Lighthouses, *supply*, 10309, 12145London Offices of Commonwealth, *supply*, 10295Maitland Coal Miners, *adj.*, 8357

Mails :

European Service, *m.*, 6204Western Australia, North-west Coast, *supply*, 10396Marine Surveys, *m.*, 650; *supply*, 5880, 5884; *q.*, 7702, 8868, 11864, 11985Neild, Senator Colonel, Personal Explanation by, *p.o.*, 8027North-West Coast, Survey of, *q.*, 7702, 11864

Officers' Compensation Bill, 2r., 10057

Old-age Pensions, *address*, 251Parliament House : Entertainment of Strangers, *q.*, 6059

Parliamentary Allowances Bill, 3r., 2193

Patents Act, *q.*, 9139

Personal explanation, 7843

Postal Department :

Administration, *supply*, 7549Cabinet Committee of Inquiry, *adj.*, 9529Portugal, Assassination of King and Crown Prince, *q.*, 7794, 7795; *expl.*, 7843Printing Committee, *ad rep.*, 8226

Privilege :

Select Committee on Procedure, *m.*, 10010, 10259Preferential Freight Charges, *q.*, 650Preferential Trade, *address*, 260

Public Service :

Leave of Absence, *supply*, 10390Quarantine Bill, 2r., 4409; *com.* (provisions), 6078, 6085Questions, *p.o.*, 8154Revenue Losses, Tasmania and Western Australia, *q.*, 8365de Largie, Senator Hon. H.—*continued.*

Senate :

Adjournment of, *m.*, 6299, 7788Leave of Absence, *m.*, 6299Rights of, *obs.*, 11683Standing Orders Committee, *m.*, 35, 38Socialism, *address*, 252, 255

Sugar Industry :

Cane Fields, Labour in, *q.*, 5367, 5368,5370, 5560; *obs.*, 5369

Supply Bill (No. 1) 1908-9, (schedule) 12144, 12145

Supply Bill (No. 2), *com.* (issue and application), 1944; *ad. rep.*, 1952Supply Bill (No. 3), 2r., 5879; *com.*, Schedule, 5884, 5885

Supply Bill (No. 4) 1r., 6306

Surplus Revenue Bill, 2r., 11886

Sweating in Queensland and Tasmanian Industries, *address*, 258Tasmania, Survey of Coast, *supply*, 5885; *q.*, 11985Tobacco Industry Combine, Action of, *adj.*, 2040Transcontinental Railway, *q.*, 7541, 7927, 8505Usher of Black Rod, *supply*, 10286, 10287

Dobson, Senator Hon. H., Tasmania :

Agriculture, Department of, *q.*, 8482Appropriation (Works and Buildings) Bill, 2r., 3910; *com.*, schedule (Defence), 3033; (External Affairs), 4071Australian Industries Preservation Bill, 2r., 4504; *com.* (persons to answer questions and produce documents), 5021, 5090; (production of documents), 5111Bills of Exchange Bill, *com.* (application of State laws), 670, 672, 1585, 1965; (protection of banker paying fraudulently altered cheque), 2198, 2205, 2206, 2208, 2209; *recons.* (State Stamp Duty), 2291Bounties Act, *q.*, 9138Bounties Bill : 2r., 2434; *com.* (appropriation), 2766, 2767, 2768; (bounties), 2769; (offences against Act), 2774; (notice), 2777, 2783, 2786; (schedule) (cotton), 2864, 2867, 2872, 3060; (New Zealand flax), 3075, 3157; (jute), 3165; (sisal hemp), 3267; (copra), 3397; (rice, uncleaned), 3471, 3474, 3487; (rubber), 3562; (fish, preserved), 4275; (dates), 4383Business, Order of, *m.*, 5395; Conduct of, *adj.*, 7563Commonwealth Salaries Bill, *com.* (taxation by States of Commonwealth salaries), 956, 1579; 3r., 1827Compulsory Voting, *q.*, 650Cotton Production, *q.*, 650

Criminal Appeals Bill, 2r., 2553

Customs Tariff Bill, 2r., 7613; *com.*, Schedule :

Bananas, 7853

Blankets, 8233, 8234

Bottles, *n.e.i.*, 8500

Carbide of Calcium, 9267

Carpets, 8273

Churns, &c., 8581

Confectionery, 7727, 7749, 7741, 7744

Cosies and Cushions, 8281

Earth and Rock Cutting Machinery, *ac.*, 8796

Fish, 7783

Furniture, *n.e.i.*, 9354

Dobson, Senator Hon. H.—*continued.*

Customs Tariff Bill (Schedule)—*continued.*

Grain and Pulse, prepared or manufactured, (p.o., 7904), 7908, 7914
Hats, Caps, and Bonnets, 8320, 8323
Machinery, Machines, and Machine Tools, n.e.i., 8707, 8720-1
Manufactures of Metal, n.e.i., 8724, 8729; (p.o., 8749), 8751, 8758
Matches and Vestas, 7971, 7993
Motive Power Machinery and Appliances (except Electric), 8627, 8653
Oilmen's Stores, n.e.i., 8060
Oils (p.o., 8395), 8397, 8447, 8449
Onions, 7887
Paints and Colours, 8457
Parasols, Sunshades, and Umbrellas, 8326
Printing Roller Composition, 8521
Spices, 8099
Stearine, Paraffine Wax, &c., 7718
Stone and Marble, 8545
Timber, 9426, 9454
Type. Printers', 8764, 8769, 8772
Weighing Machines, n.e.i., 8624
Wire Netting, 9167
Wood, articles made of, n.e.i., 9570

Defence :

Barracks and Rifle Ranges, *supply*, 3933
Expenditure, *supply*, 3935
Government Policy, q., 5560; *supply*, 8997-8
Torpedo Boats, Tenders for, q., 1928, 2179
Defence Act Amendment Bill, m., 1330; *int* and *ir.*, 1814, 2R., 2873
Dissent from Ruling: Relevancy of Amendment (Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway Survey Bill), 1514
Disputed Elections and Qualifications Bill *expl.*, 3796; *adj.*, 5781
Excise Procedure Bill, *com.* (assessors), 5119; (employment of counsel), 5122; *recom.*, 5386
Federal Capital, *supply*, 1835, 6331
Federal Expenditure, *supply*, 1833
Finance, State and Federal, q., 746
Fisheries Conference, q., 2844
Hardie, Mr. Keir, q., 4245
High Commissioner, *supply*, 1834
High Court :
Appeals to, q., 829
Judiciary Bill, 2R., 853; *com.* (appellate jurisdiction), 942, 949
Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway Survey, q., 8221
Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway Survey Bill, q., 932; p.o., 1023; 2R., 1148; *com.*, (power to survey route), 1471, 1490, 1505, 1507; (construction of railway), 1513
Life Assurance and Old-age Pensions, Compulsory, m., 4174
London Offices of Commonwealth, *supply*, 4071
Mail Service to Europe, q., 5746; m., 6202
Navigation Bill, q., 8154, 8285, 8864
New Protection, *supply*, 6328, 7706
Northern Territory, *supply*, 1835; q., 8554, 8616
Old-age Pensions, *supply*, 1835
Opposition, The, *supply*, 6328
Pair Book, Entries in, m., 3506
Parliamentary Allowances Bill, 2R., 2097, 2099; 3R., 2180

Dobson, Senator Hon. H.—*continued.*

Postal Department :

Cabinet Committee of Inquiry into Administration, *adj.*, 9534
Public Service :
Classification and Promotion, q., 8365, 8698, 9742
Public Service Commissioner, q., 3365
Quarantine, q., 5367
Quarantine Bill, 2R., 4403; *com.* (parts), 5304; (State aid in carrying out Act), 5306; (vessels to carry disinfecting apparatus), 5994; (provisions), 6069, 6077, 6078, 6086
Questions, p.o., 8156, 8231
Senate :
Members' Papers, Accommodation for, *supply*, 8983
President of, First, m., 3368
Vacancy in South Australia, *expl.*, 3796; Committee's Report, m., 4808
Session, Business of, q., 7796
Stripper Harvesters, q., 2055
Supply Bill (No. 2), 1R., 1833; schedule (Post and Telegraph Department), 1951
Supply Bill (No. 4), 1R., 6328
Supply Bill (No. 5), *com.*, schedule (The Parliament), 8983, (Defence), 8997
Tariff :
Duties, Refunds of, q., 5980
Passing of, q., 3364, 4035, 4580
Statistics, q., 7570
Tasmania, Cable Communication with, *supply*, 1951; q., 2179, 2406, 4470, 5559, 7623
Telegrams, Delivery of, q., 7623, 7702
Tobacco Industry :
Combine, Action of, *adj.*, 2041
Trawler, q., 8230
Weather Forecasts: Tasmania, q., 7568

Edwards, Hon. R., *Oxley* :

Arrowroot and Cornflour, increased duty, *petition*, 1180
Bounties Bill, *com.* (schedule) (cotton), 1073, (rice), 1195
Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway Survey Bill, 2R., 723
Mail Service to Europe, *petition*, 1086; q., 5416, 5520, 5690; m. 6502
Mail Contract Cancelled, q., 193
Parliamentary Allowances Bill, *com.* (amount of allowance), 2008
Post Office, Northam, *supply*, 3538
State referendum at Federal elections, Bible reading in State schools, *adj.*, 3970
Sugar Bounty, q., 3299
Supply :
Works and Buildings (Post and Telegraphs), 3538
Tariff Resolutions (Customs) :
Apparel and Attire, articles n.e.i., 5632
Bananas, 5340
Carbide of Calcium, 6971
Corn Flour, 5351
Fancy Goods, 7141, 7142
Feathers (undressed), 5638
Fish, 5272
Glass, 6912, 6927, 6932
Jewellery, Imitation Gold, &c., 7147
Leather, Rubber, and Composition Belting, 7168
Manufactures of Paper, 7202, 7221
Oils, 6872

Edwards, Hon. R.—*continued.*

Tariff Resolutions (Customs)—*continued.*

Paints and Colours, 6887
Piece Goods, 5813, 5920
Sheepwashes, 6981
Socks and Stockings, 5931
Timber, undressed, 7051
Tool Handles, 7122, 7123
Trimmings and Ornaments, 5938
Telegraphic Delays, Inter-State, *q.*, 4647

Ewing, Hon. T. T., Richmond:

Bouchard, Commodore, Reception of, *q.*, 9099, 9299
Coal Lumpers' Strike, New South Wales:
Speech of Minister at Lithgow, *q.*, 772
Coast Defence Appropriation Bill, *m.*, 12076, 12083; *com.* (appropriation), 12094
Defence:
Adamstown Militia, Dismissal of, *q.*, 9581;
Rifle Range, *q.*, 10077
Administration, *supply*, 10099; *q.*, 11793
Adult Military Training, *m.*, 2236; *supply*, 3610
Albany Forts, *q.*, 9845
Ammunition, Defective, *q.*, 2235, 3422, 3621, 3733, 7117
Appointments: Advice of Experts, *supply*, 10087
Armament Artificers, *q.*, 2450
Arsenal: New Garden City, *q.*, 9767
Artillery Practice at Nairne, *q.*, 10701
Artillery Ranges, *supply*, 3453; *q.*, 6024
Bayonets, *q.*, 4842
Bendigo Infantry Battalion, *q.*, 1867
Buley, F. W., *supply*, 11390
Cadet Bands, *q.*, 5239
Cadet Corps, *q.*, 11181
Cadets Instructional Corps, *q.*, 988
Cadet Uniforms, *q.*, 23, 11793; *adj.*, 192
Cadets, *q.*, 3586, 3936, 5329, 6228, 6674, 9090, 10131, 11792; Bendigo, *q.*, 11097
Cadets, Physical Examination, *q.*, 7248; *supply*, 10083
Commander Colquhoun and Engineer Clarkson, *q.*, 1749, 1750
Cordite Factory, *supply*, 3737, 3738, 11417; *q.*, 8818, 9389, 11329
Corowa Cadet Corps, *q.*, 5328
Cox, Colonel, Case of, *supply*, 10100-2; *q.*, 11386
Crimean and Indian Mutiny Veterans, *q.*, 11792-3, 11920, 12040
Crouch, Captain, Case of, *q.*, 11703
Derwent Infantry Regiment, *q.*, 2122
Discharge Fees, *q.*, 9685, 11097
Empire Rifle Matches, *q.*, 11019
European Military Systems, *q.*, 2347
Field Artillery Force, *q.*, 11261
Field Artillery Guns, *q.*, 9479, 10077; *supply*, 10082
Field Artillery Ranges, *q.*, 1505, 1506
Government Policy, *supply*, 3606, 10001-3; *q.*, 1087, 8812, 8813, 8926, 8927, 9009; Criticism of, *q.*, 11702-3, 11743, 12040, 12041
Guns, Lights and Emplacements, *supply*, 3447, 3741, 3748
Hanks, Lance-Sergeant, *q.*, 1076
Harbor Defence, *q.*, 9479
Heidelberg Camp, *q.*, 7248, 7297
Imperial Defence Committee's Report, *q.*, 588

Ewing, Hon. T. T.—*continued.*

Defence—*continued.*

Instructional Staff Commissions, *q.*, 11793
King's Regulations, *q.*, 883
Lang, Bombardier, *q.*, 2314; *adj.*, 2344; *q.*, 2348
Le Mesurier, Col., *q.*, 11793
Light Horse Brigade Camp, *q.*, 6595
Light Horse, New "Service" Bridle, *q.*, 3852
Majors' Examination, *q.*, 6232
Marriage Regulations, *q.*, 4311
Married Establishment, *q.*, 989
Medical Examination, *q.*, 4310, 4748
Medical Reserve Corps, *q.*, 6968, 10609
Military Appointments, *q.*, 4200
Military Board, *q.*, 1977, 3589, 3972, 7458; *supply*, 3606
Military Boots, *q.*, 9478
Military Bridles, *q.*, 9389
Military Staff Clerks, *q.*, 10789
Military Correspondence, *q.*, 1089
Military Engineer, *q.*, 2997
Military Forces, Daily Rations, *q.*, 4927, 5240; Training of, *q.*, 6025; Enlistment, *q.*, 7249; Oath of Fidelity, *q.*, 9299
Military Instructors, Sydney, *q.*, 2123
Military Officers, Uniforms, *q.*, 10401; Statements in Parliament, *q.*, 12043
Military Promotions, *q.*, 975, 5600, 6594; *supply*, 5795
Military Regulations, *q.*, 9192
Military Stores, *q.*, 7116
Military Garrison Artillery, Western District, *q.*, 10464
Militia Officers, Active Service by, *q.*, 2122, 2234, 2996
Morris' Tubes, *q.*, 9478
Musketry Returns, *q.*, 3735, 3972
Navy, *q.*, 4411
Naval Agreement, *q.*, 12040, 12041
Naval Depot, *q.*, 8938; *adj.*, 9040
Naval Forces, Medals for, *q.*, 9953; Returning Age, *q.*, 7116, 10462
Naval Shipbuilding Yard, *q.*, 10484
New South Wales Easter Encampment: Transport delays, *q.*, 10484
Ninth Australian Light Horse, *q.*, 9194, 11385, 12156
Non-Commissioned Officers, *q.*, 11920-1
Northern Rifle Association, *q.*, 10080
Officers' Alien Servants, *q.*, 10750, 11627, 12156-7
Officers' Allowance for Quarters, *q.*, 10077
Ordnance Equipment, *supply*, 3612
Pensions, *q.*, 11386
Recruits, Treatment of, *q.*, 11920-1
Reserve Officers, *q.*, 4519
Rifle Association Competitions, *q.*, 2995, 3621
Rifle Clubs, Accommodation for, *q.*, 9585; Country, *q.*, 11158; West Shelbourne, 8926
Rifle Ranges, *supply*, 3451; *q.*, 5329, 6228; Buffalo Hill, *q.*, 9009, 10701; Parramatta, *supply*, 10102; Ryde, *supply*, 10102; Flemington, *q.*, 10609, 10653; Singleton, *q.*, 10701
Rifles and Ball Cartridges, *q.*, 9478
Rifles, Supply of, *q.*, 1753, 2995, 5237, 11920; Re-boring of, *q.*, 9479

Ewing, Hon. T. T.—*continued.*

Defence—*continued.*

Royal Australian Artillery, Bombardiers, *q.*, 2348; Commanding Officers, *q.*, 2691; Interruption of Training Operations, *q.*, 9686; Increases, *q.*, 11793
 Russell, Lieut., *q.*, 1752, 1976
 School Cadets, Second Battalion, *q.*, 1089
 Secret Information, *q.*, 12156-7
 Shergold, Bombardier, *q.*, 9955
 Small Arms and Ammunition Factory, *q.*, 158, 3621, 6023, 6356, 6419, 9389; *supply*, 3678, 3682, 5796, 11792; *adj.*, 743
 Tenders, *supply*, 10082; *q.*, 10608
 Thursday Island Fort, Explosion at, *q.*, 10750, 11627, 12040; *supply*, 11369-70
 Torres Strait, *supply*, 11369
 Training Grounds for Troops, *supply*, 3453
 Ulverstone Rifle Range, *q.*, 2449
 Uniforms, *q.*, 11056
 Victorian Easter Encampment, *q.*, 9581, 10609, 10787; Cadets Food Supply, *q.*, 9955; Payment of Militia, *q.*, 9581, 9955; Unattached Officers, *q.*, 10080; Transport Delays, *q.*, 10484, 11097, 11182
 Victorian Scottish Regiment, *q.*, 6232
 Victorian Torpedo Practice, *q.*, 3269, 3421
 War Vessels, Order for, *q.*, 1749
 Williamstown Rifle Butts, *q.*, 9581
 Wounded Soldiers, Treatment of, *q.*, 11791
 Officers' Compensation Bill, *m.*, 7498
 "Pairs," *expl.*, 6794
 Supply:
 Defence (Central Administration), 10001, 10082, 10083, 10087, 10099; (Compensation), 11390
 Home Affairs, 11369
 Works and Buildings (Defence), 3447, 3451, 3453, 3606, 3610, 3612, 3678, 3682, 3737, 3741, 3748, 11417
 Supply Bill (No. 3), *m.*, 5795
 Union Jack, *q.*, 10969
 Women's Exhibition, Rifle Matches, *q.*, 6673

Fairbairn, Mr. G., *Fawcner* :

Address-in-Reply, *m.*, 105
 Adult Military Training, *m.*, 2260
 Australian Industries Preservation Bill, *com.* (persons to answer questions and produce documents), 9197; *3R.*, 9590
 Banking Legislation, *address*, 106
 Bounties Bill, *com.* (schedule), (cotton), 1071; (mohair), 1095; (sunflower seed), 1187; (fish), 1203; *recom.* (specification of bounties), 1381; *3R.*, 1402
 Budget, 2989, 2999
 Business, Order of, *m.*, 2797
 Cable Code, *q.*, 9842
 Customs Tariff Bill, *cons. req.* (Sago and Tapioca), 10499; (Mustard), 10556; (Socks and Stockings), 10645; (Oils), 10883; (Leather), 11069; (Insecticides), 11564 (See Tariff Resolutions Customs)

Defence :

Cadets, *q.*, 9090
 Military Bayonets, *q.*, 4842
 Naval Agreement, *Budget*, 3001
 Electoral Departments, *q.*, 3300
 Electoral Reform, *address*, 105
 Excise Tariff (Agricultural Machinery) Act, *q.*, 6130, 6229; *adj.*, 6356
 Federal Capital, *address*, 107
 F.6950.—R

Fairbairn, Mr. G.—*continued.*

Harvesters, Price of, *q.*, 9584
 Immigration, *Budget*, 2990, 2992, 3000; *q.*, 10877
 Iron Industry, *Budget*, 3004
 Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway Survey Bill, *m.*, 618
 Labour Party's Caucus, *q.*, 10876, 10969
 Land Settlement, *Budget*, 2991; *q.*, 10877
 London Offices, *supply*, 3648, 3671
 Mail Contract Cancelled: Guarantee, *q.*, 8816
 Manufactures Encouragement Bill, *com.* (schedule), 12178
 New Protection, *q.*, 9584
 Northern Territory, *address*, 106
 Old-age Pensions, *Budget*, 3005
 Parliamentary Allowances Bill, *m.*, 1889; *com.* (amount of allowance), 1994
 Parliamentary Witnesses Bill, *com.* (refusal to answer questions), 12071
 Postal Administration, *supply*, 10136-9; *m.s.o.*, 11635
 Postal Officials as Returning Officers, *q.*, 706
 Preferential Trade (Tariff), 5134, 5166, 5256
 Quarantine Bill, *2R.*, 553; *com.* (scope of quarantine), 1429; (examination of imported animals), 1767; *cons. amds.*, 8958
 States Debts, *Budget*, 3002
 Supply :
 Postmaster-General (Central Staff), 10136
 Works and Buildings (Treasury), 3592; (External Affairs), 3648, 3671
 Surplus Revenue Bill, *2R.*, 11808
 Tariff, *supply*, 2089, 2999
 Bottles and Cases, duty on, *q.*, 5496
 Goods, consumption and manufacture of, *q.*, 1752
 Tariff Resolutions (Customs) :
 Ale, Porter, and other Beer, 4103
 Ammonia, 6969
 Arms, 6038
 Barley, 5346
 Blue, 4783
 Candles, 4946, 5134
 China and Porcelain, 6897
 Combined Corn Sheller, Husker, and Bagger, 6566
 Confectionery, 5165, 5225, 5255, 5256
 Droppers, 6831
 Fish, 5270
 Hay and Chaff, 5436
 Insecticides, *cons. req.*, 11564
 Leather, *cons. req.*, 11069
 Machinery and Machine Tools, &c., 6745
 Machinery and Parts thereof, 6104
 Malt, 5445
 Mustard, *cons. req.*, 10556
 Nails, 6617
 Oils, *cons. req.*, 10883
 Sago and Tapioca, *cons. req.*, 10499
 Saws, *n.e.i.*, 6753
 Sheepwashes, 6988
 Soap, 5545
 Socks and Stockings, *cons. req.*, 10645
 Stearine and Paraffine, 5136
 Traction and Portable Engines, 6683
 Wire Netting, 4527
 (See Customs Tariff Bill.)
 Tariff Resolutions (Excise) :
 Cigarettes, 4315
 Glucose, 4641

Fairbairn, Mr. G.—*continued.*

Telephones :

- Line Repairers, *q.*, 12152
- Rates, Anomalies in, *adj.*, 984
- Wages Boards, *Budget*, 2991
- Walpole, Mr. R. S., *q.*, 11018

Findley, Senator E., *Victoria:*

- Additional Appropriation Bill, 1907-8; schedule (Home Affairs), 11617
- Address-in-Reply, *m.*, 354
- Adjournment, Special, *m.*, 7787, 11322
- Agricultural Implement Workers, *q.*, 5177; *expl.*, 5466; *adj.*, 5494; *supply*, 6304
- American Fleet, *q.*, 11470
- Appropriation Bill, *com.* (External Affairs), 10290, 10302; (Attorney-General), 10303; (Treasury), 10370
- Appropriation (Works and Buildings) Bill, 2R., 3921; *com.* schedule (Trade and Customs), 3931; (Defence), 4043; (Postmaster-General), 4047, 4048, 4051, 4058
- Australia, Advertising of, *q.*, 11302
- Australian Men of Letters Fund, *supply*, 10302
- Australian Industries Preservation Bill, 2R., 4590
- Bills of Exchange Bill, *com.* (good faith), 758
- Boot Machinery Trust, *q.*, 828, 934
- Bounties Bill: 2R., 2643; *com.* (appropriation), 2765; (schedule) (cotton), 2960; (New Zealand flax), 3071, 3077; *p.o.*, 3149; (jute), 3168, 3261; (copra), 3398; (rice, uncleaned), 3478; (rubber), 3563; (coffee), 3710; (tobacco leaf) (*p.o.*, 4163), 4169, 4254; *recom.* (tobacco leaf), 4900
- Bulgarian Immigrants, *q.*, 8075
- Business, Conduct of, *adj.*, 486
- Chinese, Influx of, *q.*, 7927; *adj.*, 9008
- Coal Combine, *adj.*, 3698
- Coast Defence Appropriation Bill, 2R., 12107
- Colonial Oil Company, action of, *adj.*, 2787
- Commerce Act, *supply*, 6352
- Commonwealth, Advertising Resources of, *supply*, 5886, 6348, 6349
- Commonwealth Gazette, *supply*, 10290
- Commonwealth Salaries Bill, *com.* (taxation by States of Commonwealth salaries), 1043, 1054, 1576
- Confectionery Trade, *adj.*, 3406
- "Contingencies," *supply*, 1048, 1950, 1952
- Contract Immigrants, *q.*, 650, 830
- Customs Launch, Sydney, *supply*, 39, 1
- Customs Tariff Bill, 1R., 7550; *m.*, 11679; Schedule :
 - Adding and Computing Machines, 8625
 - Agricultural, Horticultural, and Viticultural Machinery and Implements, *n.e.i.*, 8574
 - Ammonia, 9245, 9247; (*p.o.*, 9249, 9250)
 - Antimony, 9171
 - Apparel and Attire, 8209
 - Artificial Plants, Flowers, and Fruits, 8350
 - Bags and Sacks, 8218
 - Bananas, 7852, 7872
 - Basketware, *n.e.i.*, 9572.
 - Bicycles, &c., 9817
 - Biscuits, 7672
 - Carpets, 8265
 - Coffee and Chicory, 7763, 7772
 - Confectionery, 7729
 - Cycle Parts, 9824

Findley, Senator E.—*continued.*Customs Tariff Bill (Schedule)—*continued.*

- Electrical and Gas Appliances, 8888, 9045, 9048, 9049, 9052, 9061; *cons. req.*, 10949, 10955, 11596
- Electrical Machinery and Parts thereof, 8799, (*p.o.*, 8810), 8873, 8877
- Electrotypes and Stereotypes, 9168, 9169
- Engines, *n.e.i.*, 8681
- Explosives, 9927
- Fish, 7806
- Fruits and Vegetables, 7808, 7810, 9948
- Furniture, *n.e.i.*, 9362, 9384
- Glassware, *n.e.i.*, 8491, 8492
- Gloves, 8294
- Grain and Pulse (prepared or manufactured), *p.o.*, 7806, 7903
- Hats, Caps, and Bonnets, 8309
- Hogsheads, second-hand, 9646, 9647, 9648
- Hops, 7947.
- Iron Pipes, &c., 9080
- Lantern Slides, &c., 9931, 9933
- Locks, 9173, 9174, 9176
- Manufactures of Metal, *n.e.i.*, (*p.o.*, 8748)
- Manures, 9912, 9917
- Matches and Vests, 7980, 8000, 8007
- Meats, Poultry, and Game, 8017
- Milk, 8025
- Nails, 8605
- Nuts, 8032, 8034, 8035
- Oilmen's Stores, *n.e.i.*, 8056
- Oils, 8427
- Onions, 7885
- Paint Boxes, 9654
- Paints and Colours, 8450, 8453, 8457, 8461, 8462, 8469
- Paper, 9680, 9681, 9683, 9743, 9744, 9745, 9749, 9758, 9759, 9760, 9801, 9802; *cons. req.*, 11311, 11313
- Paper Patterns, 9807
- Perambulators, &c., 9823
- Piece Goods, 8120, 8124, 8149, 8160, 8176, 8190
- Printers' Matrices, 9168, 9169, 9801, 9802
- Printing Ink, 9803, 9804, 9806
- Printing Roller Composition, 8520
- Rails, &c., 9066
- Rice, 8072; *cons. req.*, 10872, 10930
- Rice Root, 7698
- Sago and Tapioca, 7659
- Slipper Forms, 9663
- Socks and Stockings, 8342
- Sparkling Wine, 7625
- Stearine, Paraffine Wax, &c., 7713
- Stripper Harvesters, 8582
- Tanks, 8613
- Tea, 8103, 8105, 8113, 8114
- Timber, 9471, (*p.o.*, 9551), 9553, 9555; *cons. req.*, 11601
- Tobacco, manufactured, 7636, 7643
- Tobacco, unmanufactured, 7646
- Type, Printers', 8765, 8770
- Waddings and Cotton Wool, 8326, 8327, 8331, 8333
- Weighing Machines, *n.e.i.*, 8623.
- Wicker, Bamboo, and Cane, 9564, 9568
- Wigs, 8353
- Wire Netting, 9158
- Wood, articles made of, *n.e.i.*, 9574, 9576
- Defence :
 - Berringa Rifle Club, *q.*, 2616, 5978, 7841
 - Brishane Rifle Range, *supply*, 4043
 - Guides, Corps of, *supply*, 8998-9

Findley, Senator E.—continued.

Defence—continued.

Thursday Island, *supply*, 1950; Gun Explosion, *q.*, 11678
 Warlike Stores, *supply*, 9000-1
 Dissent from Ruling: Relevancy of Amendment (Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway Survey Bill), 1515; Admissibility of Amendment (Bounties Bill), 3152; Admissibility of Request (Customs Tariff Bill), *m.*, 9249
 Electoral Rolls, *supply*, 11617, 11618; *q.*, 11984
 Excise Tariff Bill, *com.* (Schedule):
 Glucose, 10037
 Tobacco, manufactured, *n.e.i.*, 10019
 Excise Tariff Procedure Bill, *com.* (employment of counsel), 5123; *recom.*, 5380
 Excise Tariff (Agricultural Machinery) Act, *adj.*, 5758; *q.*, 6189, 6295; *supply*, 6304, 7550
 Excise Tariff (Spirits) Act, *adj.*, 4616; *q.*, 5857, 6189, 6295, 7566
 Federal Capital, *address*, 355
 High Court:
 Tipstuffs, *supply*, 10303
 Immigration, *q.*, 4244; *supply*, 5887
 Immigration League, Victoria, *q.*, 8230
 Invalid and Old-age Pensions Bill, *com.* (invalid persons disqualifications), 12031, 12032, (claimants to pensions), 12036, (cancellation of pension certificates), 12038
 Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway Survey Bill, *p.o.*, 1029; *2R.*, 1355; *com.* (power to survey route), 1486
 Kanakas, Repatriation of, *supply*, 8987.
 Laboratory, *supply*, 3931
 Land Monopoly, *address*, 369
 Linotype Operators, *m.*, 3833
 Mails:
 European: Special Train, *q.*, 745; *adj.*, 767
 Pacific Islands, Service to, *supply*, 5885, 5886
 Mildura Fruit Industry, *supply*, 7550
 Neild, Senator Col., Personal Explanation by, *obs.*, 8026
 New Protection, *adj.*, 4617; *q.*, 6189, 6295, 11382; *supply*, 7550
 Northern Territory, *address*, 357; *q.*, 828, 1130; *supply*, 1048
 Officers Compensation Bill, *2R.*, 10053
 Opium, Importation of, *q.*, 745; Smuggling of, 4895; *adj.*, 9008
 Opposition, The, *q.*, 5176
 Pair Book, Entries in, *q.*, 3501; *m.*, 3504; *p.o.*, 3506
 Paper Pulp, *q.*, 9631.
 Parliamentary Allowances Bill, *2R.*, 2109; *3R.*, 2184
 Parliamentary Gardens, *supply*, 5882
 Parliamentary Papers Bill, *com.* (no action for libel), 12131
 Parliamentary Witnesses Bill, *com.* (disobedience of summons), 764; (resisting apprehension), 765
 Petition, *m.*, 7925
 Postal Department:
 "Allowance" Post Offices, *q.*, 8617, 8697
 Boy Labour, *q.*, 1470
 New Sheets, Postage on, *q.*, 1688
 Post Offices, Sites, *supply*, 4048
 Post Offices:
 East Brighton, *q.*, 8616, 8607

Findley, Senator E.—continued.

Printing Committee, Report of. *m.*, 681; (*p.o.*, 4465), 4467; *ad rep.*, 8223
 Printing Office, *q.*, 830, 583, 5859, 779-3, 8104-5; *supply*, 1947, 4051, 4058, 8988-91, 10370
 Privilege: Select Committee on Procedure, *m.*, 10007; (*p.o.*, 10013)
 Public Service:
 Clerical Division, Transfers to, *q.*, 5176
 Regulations, *m.*, 688, 692; *q.*, 1684
 Telegraphists: Sunday Work, *q.*, 8864, 8865
 Remuneration of Labour Definition Bill, *m* 4841
 Senate, Rights of, *obs.*, 11679
 Standing Orders, Amendment of, *m.*, 2621
 Statistics, *q.*, 1130, 1131
 Sugar Industry:
 Foreign Labour, Importation of, *address*, 367
 Supply Bill (No. 2), *com.* (issue and application), 1943; (schedule), 1947; *3R.*, 1953
 Supply Bill (No. 3), *com.* schedule (External Affairs), 5885, 5886; (Parliament), 5882
 Supply Bill (No. 4), *1R.*, 6304; *com.*, 6348-9-52
 Supply Bill (No. 5) *com.* (External Affairs), 8987; (Treasurv), 8088, 8089; (Defence), 8908, 8999, 9000
 Sweating:
 Tasmanian Industries, *address*, 360
 Victorian Industries, *address*, 364
 Tasmania, Customs Revenue, *q.*, 3462
 Telephone Directories, *q.*, 11865
 Tobacco Industry:
 Combine, Action of, *adj.*, 2037; *m.s.o.*, 3050; *m.*, 3057
 Employés in, *q.*, 564
 Trawler, *supply*, 3931
 Trusts in Australia, *q.*, 472
 United Kingdom, Poverty in, *address*, 358
 Woolf, Mr. Joseph, *expl.*, 5466, 5494
 Year-Book, Printing of, *q.*, 4707

Fisher, Hon. A., Wile Bay:

Address, *adj.*, 468
 Adjournment, Special, *expl.*, 468; *m.*, 742, 6504, 12202
 Agricultural Implement Making Industry, *adj.*, 12158
 Antarctic Expedition, *m.*, 7492
 Australia, Map of, *adj.*, 648
 Australian Industries Preservation Bill, *2R.*, 9017; *3R.*, 9587
 Bounties Bill, *com.* (schedule) (mohair), 1093, 1102; (olives), 1125; (coffee), 1204, 1217; (dates), 1310; (dried fruits), 1311, 1316, 1317, 1318; *p.o.*, 1312, 1314; (second schedule), 1323; *recom.*, 1379; (appropriation), 1380; (specification of bounties), 1382; (regulations), 1390, 1392; *cons. amds.*, 6402
 Bravery, Reward of, *m.*, 697
 Business:
 Order of, *m.*, 469; *adj.*, 1083; *m.*, 2796
 Transaction of, *supply*, 5787
 Campbell-Bannerman, Sir Henry, Death of, *obs.*, 10523
 Chairman of Committees, *m.*, 316
 Coast Defence Appropriation Bill, *m.*, 12085
 "Contingencies," *supply*, 5787
 Customs Frauds, *q.*, 6354

Fisher, Hon. A.—*continued.*

Customs Tariff Bill, *cons. reg.* (Bags and Sacks), 10571; (Oils), 10983, 10994; (Timber), 11022, 11126, 11150, 11152, 11160, 11165, 11509, 11573; (Stained Glass Windows), 11575, 11577. (*See* Tariff Resolutions (Customs).)

Defence:

Clerk, Case of, *supply*, 5787

Government Policy, *obs.*, 7536, *supply*, 8828

Naval Expenditure, *supply*, 11410

Disputed Elections and Qualifications Bill, 2R., 6374; *com.* (pending petitions), 6382; (Crown to pay costs in certain cases), *p.o.*, 6388

Election Expenses Reimbursement Bill, *com.* (appropriation), 12197, 12198

Estimates, *supply*, 6283

Excise Tariff Bill, *m.*, 11215

(*See* Tariff Resolutions (Excise).)

Excise Tariff (Agricultural Machinery) Act,

q., 5801, 5909; *adj.*, 6364; *q.*, 7294

Federal Capital, *supply*, 8829.

Federal Expenditure, *supply*, 1778

Government, Position of, *supply*, 10472

Harvesters, Price of, *q.*, 9583

Invalid and Old-age Pensions Bill, 2R., 11933; *com.* (qualifications), 11965; (appeal), 11980

Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway Survey Bill, 2R., 732

Kingston, Right Hon. C. C., Death of, *m.*, 11048

Labour Party, Resignation of Leader, *obs.*, 5327

Land Settlement, *supply*, 8976, 8977

Linlithgow, Death of Marquis, *m.*, 8819

Log Timber, Duty on, *q.*, 1715

London Offices of Commonwealth, *supply*, 3649

Mail Service to Europe, *m.*, 6430; Queensland Subsidy, *supply*, 10249

Mail Steamers: Cold Storage on, *adj.*, 597

Manufactures Encouragement Bill, *m.*, 5913, 6033; 2R., 6133; *com.* (regulations), 12174

Officers Compensation Bill, *m.*, 7496

Old-age Pensions, *q.*, 9298; *m.*, 9300

Old-age Pensions Appropriation Bill, 3R., 12096

Paper, Printing of, *m.*, 770

Parliament:

Gardens, *supply*, 8966

Reflections on, *obs.*, 10983, 10994

Parliamentary Allowances Bill, *com.* (amount of allowance), 1993, 1998; (conscientious scruples), 2011

Parliamentary Gardens, *supply*, 8966

Parliamentary Witnesses Bill, *com.* (execution of warrant), 11781

Papua:

Administration of, *supply*, 9393-4

Native Mortality, *supply*, 8977

Patent and Proprietary Medicines, *adj.*, 895

Personal Explanation, 6524

Post and Telegraph Department:

Ministerial Statement, 11666

Royal Commission *re* Administration, *m.*, 10427; *supply*, 10472

Postal Rates Bill, *int.*, 774

Preferential Trade (Tariff), 4561-3

Prime Minister, Health of, *adj.*, 1083

Privilege: Select Committee on Procedure, *m.*, 10128

Public Service, *supply*, 8829

Public Works Expenditure, *m.*, 7504

Pulmonary Phthisis, *adj.*, 1681

Fisher, Hon. A.—*continued.*

Quarantine Bill, *com.* (no person to quit vessel), 1718; (quarantine surveillance), 1719, *cons. amds.*, 8940

Repatriated Australians, *adj.*, 1327

Session, Length of, *supply*, 8828, *obs.*, 8934

Shipping, Combine, *adj.*, 3946

Sittings of House, *q.*, 6417; *m.*, 6507; *expl.*, 6524

Small Arms Factory, *supply*, 3681

Standing Orders, Suspension of, *m.*, 8863

Sunshine Railway Collision, *obs.*, 10483

Supply:

External Affairs (Administrative), 8976, 8977, 9393

Parliament (Parliamentary Gardens), 8960

Postmaster-General (Central Staff), 10249, 10250

Works and Buildings (Post and Telegraphs), 3523; (External Affairs), 3649; (Defence), 3681, 11410

Supply Bill (No. 1), *m.* (*p.o.*), 83

Supply Bill (No. 1) 1908-9, 3R., 12196

Supply Bill (No. 2), *m.*, 1778; *ad. rep.*, 1874

Supply Bill (No. 3), *m.*, 5786

Supply Bill (No. 4), *m.*, 6283

Supply Bill (No. 5) *m.*, 8828

Surplus Revenue Bill, 2R., 11709

Tariff: *q.*, 1715

Butter Boxes, *q.*, 7026

Consideration of, *m.*, 4358

Petition, *m.*, 3416

Seizure of Uncustomed Goods by New South Wales Government, *q.*, 2231

Tariff Resolutions (Customs):

Ale, Porter, and other Beer, *p.o.*, 4121

Bags and Sacks, *cons. reg.*, 10571

Bananas, 5337

Blue, 4790

Carpets, 5738

Coffee, 5260

Cosies and Cushions, 5740

Droppers, 6831, 6832

Engines, 6711

Glue, 6954, 6956

Hats, Caps, and Bonnets, 5975

Incandescent Mantles, 5977

Iron and Steel, 6837, 6840

Lead, Sheet and Piping, 6051

Manufactures of Paper, 7205, 7209

Motive Power Machinery and Appliances, 6672

Oils, *cons. reg.*, 10983, 10994

Piece Goods (*p.o.*, 5849), 5852, 5854

Printing and Stencilling Inks, 7262

Rice (uncleaned), 5529

Saccharine, 6975

Salt, Gypsum, and Manure Bags, *recom.*, 5731

Stained Glass Windows, *cons. reg.*, 11575, 11577

Steel Rimmed Wheels, 6832

Stone and Marble, 6958, 6962, 6964

Sugar, 4650, 4666

Tea (in packets) (*p.o.*, 5465)

Timber, 7021, 7028, 7066, 7071, 7079

(*p.o.*, 7095), 7107, 7108; *cons. reg.*, 11022, 11126, 11150, 11152, 11160, 11165, 11560, 11573

Wine, *n.e.i.*, 4141

Wire Netting, (*p.o.*, 4455, 4575), 4561, 4577. (*See* Customs Tariff Bill.)

Fisher, Hon. A.—*continued.*

- Tariff Resolutions (Excise) :
 - Golden Syrup, 4767
 - Tobacco, *p.o.*, 4305
 - (See Excise Tariff Bill.)
- Telegraph Pole Dressers, *supply*, 10250
- Telegraphic Communication : Queensland, *q.*, 9089
- Townsville State Election, *supply*, 2902
- Treasurer's Advance : Works, *supply*, 12196
- Women's Work Exhibition, *supply*, 1874

Forrest, Rt. Hon. Sir John, P.C., G.C.M.G., *Swan* :

- Adjournment, Christmas, *q.*, 6728
- Australian Industries Preservation Bill, 2R., 9031; *com.* (persons to answer questions and produce documents), 9224; *recom.*, 9392
- Banking Bill, *q.*, 501
- Bounties Bill, *int.*, 562
- Budget, *q.*, 977; *m.*, 2349
- Business, Order of, *adj.*, 3047
- Chairman of Committees, *supply*, 81, 82
- Coast Defence Appropriation Bill, *m.*, 12086; *com.* (appropriation), 12094, 12095; *ad. rep.*, 12096; 2R., 12096; 3R., 12097
- Collins, Captain, *supply*, 9488
- Commonwealth and States, Financial Relations of, *Budget*, 2354; *supply*, 3341; *q.*, 9099, 9390, 9846, 10524; *expl.*, 10967; *q.*, 11016
- Commonwealth Statutes, *q.*, 11182
- Crimean and Indian Mutiny Veterans, *q.*, 6593, 9092
- Customs Frauds, Adelaide, *q.*, 694
- Customs Tariff Bill, *cons. reg.* (*p.o.*, 10484, 11380); (Hay and Chaff), 10530; (Apparel and Attire), 10569; (Bags and Sacks), *p.o.*, 10571; (Hats and Caps), 10601; (Parasols), 10623; (Waddings, &c.), 10632; (Agricultural Machinery and Implements), 10663 (*p.o.*, 10664); (Motive Power Machinery and Appliances, except Electric), *p.o.*, 10674-5, 11538; (Rock Drills), 10716; (Rock Boring Machines), *p.o.*, 10732; (Standards, Steel Fencing), 10799 (*p.o.*, 10801); (Oils), 10803; (Insecticides), 11005; (Furniture), 11014; (Timber), *p.o.*, 11026-7, 11060; (Paper), 11082; (Rebate), 11212; (Standards and Pillars), *m.*, 11427, 11548. (See Tariff Resolutions, Customs.)

Defence :

- Albany Forts, *q.*, 9845
- Crimean and Indian Mutiny Veterans, *q.*, 6593, 11792, 11920
- Harbor and Coastal, *supply*, 3341
- Naval Agreement, *Budget*, 2357
- Wounded Soldiers, Treatment of, *q.*, 11791
- Policy, *Budget*, 2356
- Departmental Increments, *Budget*, 2349
- Departmental Estimates, Reduction of, *expl.*, 11625, 11704; *q.*, 11707
- Diver Hughes, Decoration of, *adj.*, 2994
- Election Expenses Reimbursement Bill, *com.* (appropriation), 12197
- English Mails, Late Delivery of, *q.*, 9843
- Excise Tariff (Agricultural Machinery) Act, *q.*, 6230

Forrest, Rt. Hon. Sir John, P.C., G.C.M.G.—*continued.*

- Federal Capital, *adj.*, 305. (See Seat of Government Bill.)
- Federal Finance, *Budget*, 2349; *supply*, 11275
- Freeman and Wallace, Messrs., *supply*, 11349
- Fremantle, Freight Charges from London, *q.*, 3422
- Grain Bags, Size of, *q.*, 6355
- Honorary Ministers, Official Expenses of, *supply*, 9485
- House, Rights of, *m.*, 11427
- Immigration, *supply*, 9708-9710
- Invalid and Old-age Pensions Bill, *q.*, 12039; 2R., 11942; *com.* (qualifications), 11968
- Judiciary Bill, *m.*, 3768
- Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway Survey Bill, *m.*, 629; *cons. amdt.*, 2018; *q.*, 2121, 2996, 4086
- Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway Survey Act, *q.*, 4958, 7112, 10756
- Kingston Tariff, Votes on, *adj.*, 3231; *expl.*, 3300
- Kingston, Right Hon. C. C., Death of, *m.*, 11048
- Labour Party, *supply*, 3347; *expl.*, 10876
- Land Taxation, *q.*, 9389
- London Offices, *supply*, 3617
- Mail Service to Europe, *m.*, 6471; *q.*, 6728
- Manufactures Encouragement Bill, *com.* (authority to pay bounties), 12173; (regulations), 12175; (Schedule), 12177, 12179
- Marine Surveys, *q.*, 7249, 8929
- Mining Machinery, Duty on, *supply*, 3344
- Navigation Commission's Report, *q.*, 3173
- Northern Territory, *q.*, 9100, 9480
- Notice of Motion, Withdrawal of, *adj.*, 9352
- Old-age Pensions and Braddon Section, *expl.*, 2654
- Old-age Pensions, *m.*, 9337; *q.*, 9389
- Old-age Pensions Appropriation Bill, *ad. rep.*, 12096; *com.* (appropriation), 12096
- Papua :
 - Drummond, Mr., Case of, *q.*, 12199
- Parliamentary Allowances Bill, *m.*, 1915, 1925; *com.* (amount of allowance), 2006
- Parliament, Cost of, *q.*, 502
- Parliamentary Witnesses Bill, *com.*, (escape from custody), 11781; (execution of warrant), 11781; (disobeying summons), 11782, 11783
- Personal Explanation, *adj.*, 192, 3231; *obs.*, 1180, 3300
- Postal Department :
 - Administration, *q.*, 11524
 - Expenditure, *supply*, 11275; *q.*, 11625; *expl.*, 11625
 - Ministerial Statement, *m.s.o.*, 11629
 - Postal Notes and Orders, *q.*, 11917
- Post Office, Northam, *supply*, 3533; *q.*, 9581, 9765
- Preferential Trade, *Budget*, 2361; (Tariff), 5075; 5134
- Protection, *Budget*, 2360
- Public Service Act, *Budget*, 2350
- Public Service Increments, *q.*, 988; *Budget*, 2350
- Railway Employés, *expl.*, 3589
- Recess, Duration of, *q.*, 12200
- Revenue Refunds, *supply*, 84

Forrest, Rt. Hon. Sir John, P.C., G.C.M.G.—
continued.

Seat of Government Bill, 2R., 10329. (*See*
Federal Capital.)

Stamp Printing Machinery, *q.*, 406, 503

States Debts, *Budget*, 2355; *supply*, 3342

Sugar Bounty, *Budget*, 2351

Supply :

External Affairs (Executive Council), 0485;
(London Offices), 9488; (Miscellaneous),
9708

Works and Buildings (Home Affairs), 3341;
(Post and Telegraphs), 3533; (Defence),
3615; (External Affairs), 3617

Supply Bill (No. 1), *m.*, 81; *com.*, 84, 85

Supply Bill (No. 1), 1908-9, *m.*, 12097, 2R.,
12188; (*p.o.*, 12195)

Surplus Revenue Monthly Balances, *adj.*,
11734, 11744; *q.*, 11736, 11738, 11741, 11784,
11788; *expl.*, 11787

Surplus Revenue Bill, *q.*, 9479; 2R., 9856,
11715, 11723; *obs.*, 9875; *p.o.*, 11670

Tariff Information, *adj.*, 1682

Tariff Revision, *q.*, 407; *expl.*, 1180

Tariff : *m.*, 2349

Gloves, Duty on, *q.*, 2566; manufacture of,
q., 2689

Hay and Chaff, *q.*, 6132

Items, Explanation of, *q.*, 3733, 3972

Tariff Resolutions (Customs) :

Agricultural, Horticultural, and Viticultural
Machinery and Implements, *cons. req.*,
10663 (*p.o.*, 10664)

Ale, Porter, and other Beer, 4003, 4127

Apparel and Attire, *cons. req.*, 10569

Bags and Sacks, *cons. req.*, (*p.o.*, 10571)

Blue, 4786

Brushmakers' Woodware, 7118

Candles, 5075, 5134

Droppers, 6831

Fish, 5276

Furniture, *cons. req.*, 11014

Hats and Caps, *cons. req.*, 10601

Hay and Chaff, *cons. req.*, 10530

Iron, Plate and Sheet, 6545

Insecticide, *cons. req.*, 11005

Marine Engines, 6647

Mining Engines, 6789

Motive Power Machinery and Appliances,
6647; *cons. req.* (*p.o.*, 10674-5), 11538

Oils, *cons. req.*, 10893

Paper, *cons. req.*, 11082

Parasols, *cons. req.*, 10623.

Rails, &c., 6825

Rebate for Home Consumption, *cons. req.*,
11212

Rock Boring Machines, *cons. req.*, (*p.o.*,
10732)

Rock Drills, *cons. req.*, 10716

Saws, *n.e.i.*, 6750, 6751

Sheepwashes, 6988

Standards, Steel Fencing, *cons. req.*, 10799
(*p.o.*, 10801), 11548

Timber, *cons. req.* (*p.o.*, 11026-7), 11060

Tobacco (unmanufactured), 4302

Tool Handles, 7123

Type, Printers', 6765 (*expl.*, 6768)

Waddings, &c., *cons. req.*, 10632

Wire Netting, 4428

(*See* Customs Tariff Bill.)

Tariff Resolutions (Excise) :

Cigars, 4306

Tobacco, *p.o.*, 4305

Forrest, Rt. Hon. Sir John, P.C., G.C.M.G.—
continued.

Tasmanian Cable, *q.*, 11707, 12153

Telephone Directories, *q.*, 4411

Transferred Properties, *Budget*, 2359

Treasurer, Resignation of, *obs.*, 1085

Treasurer's Advance, *supply*, 84, 85; *p.o.*,
12197

Votes, Spending of, *supply*, 10276

Women's Work Exhibition, *expl.*, 1866

Foster, Mr. F. J., New England :

Address-in-Reply, *m.*, 122

Bounties Bill, 2R., 995

Budget, 2339

Conciliation and Arbitration Act, *address*
125

Customs Tariff Bill, *cons. req.* (Hay and
Chaff), 10540; (Mustard), 10556; (Tea),
10561; (Hats and Caps), 10584, 10586, 10616;
(Agricultural Machinery and Implements),
10664, 10669; (Cutlery), 10673; (Rock
Drills), 10724; (Wire Netting), 10774. (*See*
Tariff Resolutions (Customs).)

Defence :

Australian Policy, *address*, 123

Federal Capital, *address*, 122; *supply*, 1878

Immigration, *supply*, 1795

Invalid and Old-age Pensions Bill, *com.*,
(qualifications), 11965; (conditions), 11975,
11976; (instalments may be forfeited), 11982

Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway Survey
Bill, *m.*, 642

Labour Party, *address*, 124

Land Tax, *address*, 127

Manufactures Encouragement Bill, 2R., 6247

Mining Industry, *Budget*, 2340

Northern Territory, *address*, 128

Old-age Pensions, *address*, 127

Parliament, Criticism of, *q.*, 11521-2

Parliamentary Allowances Bill, 2R., 1983

Post and Telegraph Department :

Administration, *supply*, 10160

Telephone Construction, *supply*, 10159

Quarantine Bill, *com.* (fumigation of vessels),
1622; (persons may be vaccinated), 1736

States Debts, *address*, 125

Supply, Postmaster-General (Central Staff),
10159

Supply Bill (No. 2), *m.*, 1795; *ad. rep.*,
1878

Tariff Revision, *address*, 125

Tariff : *m.*, 2339

Consideration of, *m.*, 4341

Wire Netting, Importation of, *q.*, 2314

Tariff Resolutions (Customs) :

Agricultural, Horticultural and Viticultural
Machinery and Implements, *cons. req.*,
10664, 10669.

Apparel and Attire, 5609

Bananas, 5338

Barley, 5347

Candles, 4879

Coffee, 5262

Condensed Milk, 5511

Confectionery, 5244, 5258

Corn Flour, 5357

Cutlery, *cons. req.*, 10673

Dates, 5330

Droppers, 6114

Electrical Machinery, 6807

Fancy Goods, 7141

Fish, 5276

Foster, Mr. F. J.—continued.

Hats and Caps, *cons. req.*, 10584, 10586, 10616
 Hay and Chaff, 5429, *cons. req.*, 10540
 Imitation Jewellery and Precious Stones, 7148, 7150
 Meats, Poultry, and Game, 5459
 Mining Engines, 6789
 Mustard, *cons. req.*, 10556
 Pianos, 7342
 Piece Goods, Woollen, 5817; Cotton, 5917
 Potatoes, 5343
 Rice (uncleaned), 5511
 Rock Drills, *cons. req.*, 10724
 Sheepwashes, 6989
 Sheepshearing Machines, *cons. req.*, 10669
 Standards, 6116
 Stearine and Paraffine, 5150
 Tea, *cons. req.*, 10561
 Tin Plates, 6117
 Traction and Portable Engines, 6686
 Wire Netting, 4455; *cons. req.*, 10774
 (See Customs Tariff Bill.)
 Trusts and "Dumping," *Budget*, 2342
 Women's Work Exhibition, *supply*, 18-9

Fowler, Hon. J. M., Perth :

Adjournment, Christmas, *q.*, 5519
 Bounties Bill, *com.* (schedule) (olives), 1125
 Budget, 2589
 Business, Order of, *m.*, 2803
 Government Property, Insurance of, *q.*, 6834
 International Reply Coupons, *q.*, 5908
 Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway Survey Bill, *m.*, 646
 Letter Carriers, Western Australia, *q.*, 6676
 Mail Service to Europe, *m.*, 6492
 New Protection, *Budget*, 2600
 Patent and Proprietary Medicines, *q.*, 889
 Preferential Trade (Tariff), 5257
 Quarantine Bill, *2R.*, 530
 Socialism, *Budget*, 2591
 Tariff, *m.*, 2589 :
 Commission's Reports, *expl.*, 2563; Work of Commission, *Budget*, 2589, 2592
 Consideration of, *m.*, 4347; *q.*, 5519
 "Dumping," *Budget*, 2598
 Mining Machinery, Duty on, *Budget*, 2600
 Petition, *m.*, 3415
 Protest by Western Australia, *q.*, 4955
 Western Australia, Effect of Tariff, *q.*, 6677
 Tariff Resolutions (Customs) :
 Agricultural, Horticultural, and Viticultural Machinery and Implements, *n.e.i.*, 6551
 Ale, Porter, and other Beer, 4105
 Amylic Alcohol, 4138
 Apparel and Attire, 5611
 Arms, 6037
 Blankets, 5729
 Candles, 4886, 4952
 Coffee, 5262
 China and Porcelain, 6901
 Confectionery, 5159, 5210, 5215, 5257
 Currants, 5282
 Glass, 6917
 Glassware, 6924
 Glucose, 4630
 Iron, Plate and Sheet, 6537
 Lead, Sheet and Piping, 6049
 Machinery and Parts thereof, 6106
 Motive Power Machinery and Appliances, 6661, 6666

Fowler, Hon. J. M.—continued.

Tariff Resolutions (Customs)—*continued.*
 Piece Goods, 5922
 Rice (uncleaned), 5528, 5533
 Salt, 5536, *n.e.i.*, 5537
 Soap, 5546
 Tobacco (manufactured, *n.e.i.*), 4210, 4235, 4300; (clippings and cuttings), 4303
 Traction and Portable Engines, 6700
 Type, Printers, 6766
 Wine, *n.e.i.*, 4140, 4202
 Wire Netting, 4538
 Telephones, Undergrounding of Wires, *q.*, 158
 Wireless Telegraphy, *q.*, 6505

Foxton, Col. Hon. J. F. G., Brisbane :

Address-in-Reply, *m.*, 236
 Australian Industries Preservation Bill, *com.* (burden of proof), 9198
 Bounties Bill, *2R.*, 903; *com.* (schedule) (olives), 1066, 1127; (rice), 1194; *recom.* (specification of bounties), 1387; *3R.*, 1411
 Braddon Section, *Budget*, 3007, 3012
 Budget, 3006
 Customs Tariff Bill, *cons. req.* (scientific instruments), 10926; (timber), 11041; (watch springs), 11060, 11063; (printing inks), 11092; *m.*, 11428. (See Tariff Resolutions (Customs).)
 Cypher Telegrams, *q.*, 1868
 Defence :
 Naval Agreement, *address*, 244
 Ordnance Equipment, *supply*, 3613
 Denton Hat Mills, *Budget*, 3019
 Excise Tariff Act, *q.*, 2236
 House, Rights of, *m.*, 11428
 Immigration, *Budget*, 3020
 Imperial Conference, *address*, 236
 Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway Survey Bill, *m.*, 643
 London Offices of Commonwealth, *supply*, 3651
 Mail Service to Europe, *q.*, 5237, 6023; *m.*, 6127. (*p.o.*, 6501)
 Mail Contract, Cancelled, *address*, 237
 Queensland Service, *petition*, 588, 769
 Manufactures Encouragement Bill, *2R.*, (*p.o.*, 6232, 6235)
 Northern Territory, *address*, 239
 Officers' Compensation Bill, *m.*, 7498
 Papua, Administration of, *supply*, 9509-9511
 Parliament, Reflections on, *obs.*, 10994
 Parliamentary Allowances Bill, *m.*, 1911; *2R.*, 1089
 Personal Explanation, 6548
 Postal Department, Ministerial Statement, *m.s.o.*, 11628
 Premiers' Conferences, *Budget*, 3013
 Public Service :
 Administration of, *supply*, 9777-8
 District Allowances, *supply*, 11373
 Quarantine Bill, *2R.*, 532; *com.* (scope of quarantine), 1449; (interpretation), 1543; (ports of entry), 1560, 1565
 Railway Stationmasters as Postmasters, *q.*, 9954
 Responsible Government, *address*, 241
 Standing Orders, Amendment of, *supply*, 83
 Sugar Bounty Act, *Budget*, 3011
 Sugar Industry :
 Bounty and Excise, *Budget*, 3024
 Importation of Foreign Labour, *address*, 236
 Labour, Scarcity of, *Budget*, 3021, 3426

Foxton, Col. Hon. J. F. G.—*continued.*

Supply :

- External Affairs (Administrative), 9509
- Home Affairs (Public Service Commissioner), 9777; (District Allowances), 11372
- Works and Buildings (Home Affairs), 3426, (Defence), 3613; (External Affairs), 3651

Tariff, *Budget*, 3006

Tariff Resolutions (Customs) :

- Articles, the property of the Commonwealth, 7400
- Articles for official use of States Governors, 7403, 7404
- Bananas, 5338
- Blue, 4782
- Cotton Yarn, 7377
- Feathers (undressed), 5635
- Hats, Caps, and Bonnets, 5962, 5973
- Iron, Plate and Sheet, *expl.*, 6548
- Lamps and Lampware, 6041
- Manufactures of Paper, 7216, 7222
- Oils, *cons. req.*, 10994
- Paper Bags, 7234
- Piece Goods, 5815, 5921, 5927
- Printing and Stencilling Inks, 7246; *cons. req.*, 11092
- Regalia, 5639, 5641
- Salt, Gypsum and Manure Bags, 5642, 5644, 5645, 5646; *recom.*, 5732
- Sausage Casings, 5461
- Scientific Instruments and Apparatus, 7409; *cons. req.*, 10906
- State Imports, 7400, 7422, 7440
- Stearine and Paraffine, 5143
- Surgical, Dental and Veterinary Appliances, 7406
- Sugar, 4699
- Timber, *cons. req.*, 11041, 11063, 11141
- Tobacco, manufactured, *n.e.i.*, 4214
- Watch Springs, *cons. req.*, 11060, 11063
- Works of Art, 7398
(*See Customs Tariff Bill.*)
- Townsville, State Election, *supply*, 2901
- Wages Boards, *Budget*, 3023

Fraser, Senator Hon. S., *Victoria* :

- Additional Appropriation Bill 1907-8, 1R., 11498
- Bills of Exchange Bill, *com.* (protection of banker paying fraudulently altered cheque), 2196
- Customs Tariff Bill, *com.*, Schedule :
 - Apparel and Attire, 8197
 - Electrical and Gas Appliances, 9060
 - Fish, 7806
 - Glue, 8512
 - Machinery, Machines, and Machine Tools, *n.e.i.*, 8705
 - Oilmen's Stores, *n.e.i.*, 8049
 - Pianos, 9896
 - Rice, 8085
- Financial Relations, *supply*, 11498
- Old-age Pensions, *supply*, 11500
- Parliamentary Allowances Bill, 3R., 2181
- Senate :
 - Standing Orders Committee, *m.*, 37
 - Standing Orders, *Amdt. of.*, *m.*, 2624

Frazer, Mr. C. E., *Kalgoorlie* :

- Aborigines, Treatment of in Western Australia, *adj.*, 471
- Address-in-Reply, *m.*, 159
- Adjournment, Christmas, *q.*, 7300
- Adjournment, Special, *m.*, 2026
- Antarctic Expedition, *m.*, 7492
- Australians, Repatriated, *supply*, 11364
- Bounties, *address*, 164
- Bounties Bill, *int.*, 561, 562; *com.* (appropriation), 1001; (schedule) (copra), 1106, (tobacco), 1228, (fish), 1303; *cons. amdt.*, 6403 (mohair), 6403; *cons. mes.*, (copra), 6439
- Braddon Section, *Budget*, 2582
- Budget, 2507, 2579; *p.o.*, 3034
- Business, Order of, *m.*, 2797; Conduct of, *adj.*, 11466
- Chinese, Influx of, *q.*, 8816; *supply*, 9395
- Customs Tariff Bill, 3R., 7468; *cons. req.*; (Agricultural Machinery), 10661; (Motive Power Machinery and Appliances, except Electric), 10675, 10676, 10684, 11534, 11535; (Pulley Blocks), 10685; (Rock Drills), 10722; (Rock-boring Machines), 10731; (Electrical Machines), 10740, 10743, 11444, 11450; (Oils), 10882; (Roasting Dishes), 10904, 11558; (Timber), 11149, 11452; (Rebate for Home consumption), 11198, 11208; (Curtains and Blinds), 11440; (Blankets), 11534. (*See Tariff Resolutions (Customs.)*)
- Commonwealth Expenditure, Unauthorized, *supply*, 11407-8
- Defence :
 - Naval Agreement, *Budget*, 2511
 - Policy, *Budget*, 2510
- Disputed Elections and Qualifications Bill, *com.* (pending petitions), 6383, (qualifications and vacancies), 6388
- Dissent from Ruling, Admissibility of Amendment (Tariff Resolutions), *m.*, 7093
- Excise Tariff (Agricultural Machinery) Act, *supply*, 6281; *q.*, 7295
- Federal Capital, *address*, 163; *supply*, 9887
- Federal Finances, *Budget*, 2579, 2580
- Fire Insurance Bill, *int.*, 980; 2R., 1596; *q.*, 2566
- Forrest, Sir John, *address*, 159, 161
- Freeman and Wallace, Messrs., *q.*, 10133-4; *supply*, 11345
- Horses, Importation from Western Australia, *q.*, 11916
- Immigration Restriction Act, *m.*, 1596
- Irvine, Mr. W. H., Fiscal Views of, *Budget*, 2507
- Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway Survey Bill, *address*, 164; *cons. amdt.*, 2024
- Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway Survey Act, *q.*, 7463
- Land Tax, *address*, 165
- Lunatic, Landing of at Fremantle, *q.*, 502
- Mail Service to Europe, *q.*, 5801; *m.*, 6460
- Mail Contract, Cancelled, *address*, 162; *q.*, 79, 404, 502, 881, 1087, 2313
- Manufactures Encouragement Bill, 2R., 6167; *adj.*, 6522
- New Protection, *Budget*, 2589; *q.*, 10132
- Northern Territory, *address*, 162
- Old-age Pensions, *address*, 161; *q.*, 352; *Budget*, 2581; *m.*, 9318
- Papua :
 - Administrator, Appointment of, *q.*, 10178
 - Land Administration, *q.*, 11421-2

Frazer, Mr. C. E.—continued.

Parliamentary Allowances Bill, *com.* (amount of allowance), 1999; (conscientious scruples), 2015; *expl.*, 2017
 Post and Telegraph Department :
 Administration, *supply*, 10150, 11281
 Telephone Guarantees, *supply*, 10150
 Telephone Subscribers Supplementary Lists, *q.*, 11743
 Royal Commission *re* Administration, *m.*, 10403-5, 10455
 Sydney-Melbourne Telephone Line, *q.*, 11179
 Post and Telegraph Conveniences, Western Australia, *q.*, 1595
 Preferential Trade, *Budget*, 2589
 Privilege: Select Committee on Procedure, *m.*, 11702
 Public Service :
 Commissioner, *supply*, 10151
 District Allowances, *supply*, 10151-2, 11282, 11367; *q.*, 11919
 Increments, *Budget*, 2509; *q.*, 2689
 Inland Officers, *supply*, 10153
 Retiring Age, *supply*, 10176
 Public Works Estimates, *q.*, 2312
 Quarantine Bill, *cons. amdt.*, 8957
 Repatriation, *supply*, 11364
 Savings Bank Funds, *supply*, 11391
 Stamps, Design for, *q.*, 4957, 4958
 States Debts, *address*, 161; *Budget*, 2584
 Sugar Industry :
 Bounty, *Budget*, 2500
 Importation of Foreign Labour, *address*, 163
 Supply :
 External Affairs (Administration), 9395, 11364
 Home Affairs (Miscellaneous), 9887, 11367
 Trade and Customs, *p.o.* 9987-8
 Postmaster-General (Central Staff), 10150, 10176; (Money Orders), 11391
 Works and Buildings (Home Affairs), 11407, 11408
 Supply Bill (No. 4), *m.*, 6281
 Surplus Revenue Bill, *2r.*, 11796
 Tariff, Consideration of, *q.*, 2791; *m.*, 4344, 4356, 4359 (*p.o.*, 4330)
 Tariff : *q.*, 975; *m.*, 2507, 2579; *ad rep.*, 7451
 Commission, Work of, *Budget*, 2586
 Tobacco Duties, *adj.*, 4243
 Tariff Resolutions (Customs) :
 Agricultural, Horticultural, and Viticultural Machinery and Implements, *n.e.i.*, 6558
 Agricultural, Horticultural and Viticultural Machinery, 6590; *cons. req.*, 10661
 Ale, Porter, and other Beer, 4127
 Blankets, *cons. req.*, 11534
 Candles, 4947, 4954
 Cardboard and Pasteboard, 7235, 7236
 Casks, Barrels, &c., 7133
 China and Porcelain, 6900
 Corks, 7380
 Curtains and Blinds, *cons. req.*, 11440
 Cyanide of Potassium, 6978
 Earthenware, 6902, 6904
 Electrical Machinery, 6804; *cons. req.*, 10740, 10743, 11444, 11450
 Engines, 6715, 6718
 Explosives, 7382, 7383, 7387
 Fuse, 6382-3
 Glucose, 4623, 4625, 4626
 Hay and Chaff, 5365
 Iron and Steel, 6841, 6844
 Iron, Plate and Sheet, 6525, 6544

Frazer, Mr. C. E.—continued.

Tariff Resolutions (Customs)—*continued.*
 Lamps and Lampware, 6043, 6044
 Lead, Sheet and Piping, 6050
 Machinery, &c., 6743
 Machinery and Parts thereof, 6107
 Mining Engines, &c., 6776, 6797, 6798
 Motive Power Machinery and Appliances (except electric), 6664, 6672; *cons. req.*, 10675, 10676, 10684, 11534, 11535
 Oils, 6861, 6868; *cons. req.*, 10882
 Paper, Surface Coated, 7239
 Pianos, 7340, 7356
 Printing and Stencilling Inks, 7254
 Pulley Blocks, *cons. req.*, 10685
 Rails, &c., 6819, 6823
 Rebate for Home Consumption, *cons. req.*, 11198, 11208
 Roasting Dishes, 6910, 6911; *cons. req.*, 10904, 11558
 Rock Boring Machines, *cons. req.*, 10731
 Rock Drills, *cons. req.*, 10722
 Rubber Manufactures, 7160
 Scientific Apparatus, 6900
 Timber (*p.o.*, 7096); *cons. req.*, 11149, 11452
 Tobacco, unmanufactured, *n.e.i.*, 4284
 Tool Handles, 7123
 Vehicles, 7290
 Weighing Machines, 6630, 6632
 Wire Cloth, &c., *ad. rep.*, 7450
 (See Customs Tariff Bill.)
 Tariff Resolutions (Excise) :
 Glucose, 4640
 Starch, 5554
 Tobacco Industry, Nationalization of, *q.*, 10752
 Western Australia: Survey of North-west Coast, *q.*, 2450

Fuller, Hon. G. W., Illawarra :

Australian Industries Preservation Bill, *com.* (definition), 9133; (burden of proof), 9206
 Bounties Bill, *adj.*, 648; *2r.*, 818; *com.* (schedule), (olives) 1065, 1113, (coffee) 1216; *recom.* (specification of bounties), 1381
 Budget, 2314
 Customs Tariff Bill, *recom.*, 10815; *cons. req.* (scientific apparatus), 10908-9; (oils), 10903, 11111; (timber), 11128
 Federal Capital, *supply*, 1880; *q.*, 9766, 10965
 Immigration, Land, *q.*, 10878
 Land Tax, Progressive, *q.*, 10878
 Manufactures Encouragement Bill, *2r.*, 6260; *com.* (authority to pay bounties), 12168, 12173; (schedule), 12178
 Mail Steamers: Cold Storage on, *adj.*, 606
 New Protection, *q.*, 4200
 Northern Territory, *q.*, 158
 Parliament, Reflections on, *obs.*, 10993, 11111
 Patents Applications, *m.*, 12200
 Patent Medicines and Secret Drugs, *adj.*, *p.o.*, 3091
 Postal and Telegraphic :
 Administration, *q.*, 10874
 Letter Box, Wollongong, *q.*, 12041-2
 Sweating in Country Offices, *q.*, 5320
 Telephone Communication, Sydney to Wollongong, *q.*, 8929
 Supply Bill (No. 2), *ad. rep.*, 1880
 Sydney-Wollongong Telephone Line, *q.*, 7249
 Tariff Commission, *expl.*, 897, 2312; *adj.*, 1678; *q.*, 1716, 1748; *expl.*, 2561
 Tariff : *m.*, 2215
 Imports, Value of Dutiable, *adj.*, 4107

Fuller, Hon. G. W.—*continued*.

Tariff Resolutions (Customs):

Apparel and Attire, 5601
 Blue, 4781, 4782
 Blankets, 5720
 Candles, 4932, 4951
 Corn Flour, 5354
 Cylinders for Anhydrous Ammonia, &c., 6113
 Hats, Caps, and Bonnets, 5960, 5961, 5970
 Hay and Chaff, 5419, 5437; *m.*, 10815
 Iron, Plate and Sheet, 6538
 Meat (preserved by cold process), 5457
 Motive Power Machinery and Appliances, 6634, 6659, 6672
 Nails, 6604, (*p.o.*, 6611), 6613 6619
 Oils, *cons. reg.*, 10993, 11111
 Paraffine Wax, 5135, 5147
 Piece Goods, 5805, 5830
 Scientific Apparatus, *cons. reg.*, 10908-9
 Socks and Stockings, 5932, 5934, 5935
 Steam Road Rollers, 6700
 Timber, 7064, 7095; *cons. reg.*, 11128
 Traction and Portable Engines, 6678, 6702
 Weighing Machines, 6628
 Wire Netting, 4413, 4424

Fysh, Hon. Sir P. O., K.C.M.G., Denison:

Budget, 2967
 Commonwealth, Prosperity of, *Budget*, 2970
 Customs Tariff Bill, *cons. reg.*, *p.o.*, 10503;
 (Hats and Caps), 10582, 10587. (*See* Tariff
 Resolutions, Customs.)
 Departmental Expenditure, *Budget*, 2972
 Federal Finance, *Budget*, 2971
 Government, Financial Policy of, *Budget*,
 2977
 High Commissioner, *Budget*, 2972
 Immigration, *Budget*, 2972
 Land Taxation, *Budget*, 2976
 London Offices of Commonwealth, *supply*, 3656
 Old-age Pensions, *Budget*, 2971
 Oversea Trade, *Budget*, 2970
 Penny Postage, *Budget*, 2973
 States Debts, *Budget*, 2977
 Supply:
 Works and Buildings (External Affairs),
 3656
 Surplus Revenue, Distribution of, *q.*, 10462
 Surplus Revenue Bill, *2r.*, 11802
 Tariff, *m.*, 2967
 Amendment of (*p.o.*, 10503)
 Commission, Work of, *Budget*, 2967
 Tariff Resolutions (Customs):
 Ale, Porter, and other Beer, 3997
 Apparel and Attire, 5604
 Hats, Caps, and Bonnets, 5963, 5971; *cons.*
reg., 10582, 10587
 Piece Goods, 5818, 5852, 5919
 Stearine and Paraffine, 5137
 Waddings, &c., 5928
 (*See* Customs Tariff Bill.)
 Tasmanian Mail Service, *q.*, 11791
 White Australia Policy, *Budget*, 2969, 2975

Givens, Senator T., Queensland:

Address-in-Reply, *m.*, 267
 Adjournment, Special, *m.*, 11323
 American Fleet, *q.*, 11470
 Appropriation Bill, *com.*, (Parliament) 10285,
 (External Affairs) 10292, 10296, 10301, (De-
 fence) 10383; *3r.*, 10392
 Australia, Advertising, *q.*, 11303
 Bills of Exchange Bill, *com.* (application of
 State laws), 674, 678, 1588, 1969, 1973;
 (protection of banker paying fraudulently
 altered cheque), 751, 2064, 2197, 2207;
 (protest when notary not accessible), 759,
 762; *recom.*, 2417; (First Schedule), 2283,
 2284, *recons.*, (State Stamp Duty), 2284,
 2290; (post dated cheque), 2297
 Bounties Bill, *2r.*, 2537, (schedule), (cotton),
 2960
 Business: Conduct of, *adj.*, 485, 585, 1712
 Coast Defence Appropriation Bill, *2r.*, 12120
 Commonwealth and States, Financial Rela-
 tions of, *address*, 291
 Customs Tariff Amendment Bill, *com.* (rates of
 duty), 12103
 Customs Tariff Bill, *recom.*, 11684; Schedule:
 Apparel and Attire, 8197, 8210, 8211
 Apparel and Attire, *n.e.i.*, 8211, 8212, 8216
 Articles made of Aluminium, &c., *cons.*
reg., 10940
 Bayonets, Swords, &c., 8349
 Blacks, &c., 8474, 8476
 Bottle Stoppers, *n.e.i.*, 8496
 Buggy Shafts, 9641
 Carpets, *cons. reg.*, 10925
 Ceramic Transfers, 9806
 Combs, 9653
 Fancy Goods, 9651, 9652
 Fishing and Rabbit Nets, &c., 9918
 Glass, 8494
 Globes, Geographical, &c., 9813
 Gloves, *cons. reg.*, 10928, 10929, 10933, 11592
 Liquid Removers of Paint and Varnish,
 8472
 Motive Power Machinery and Appliances,
cons. reg., 10939
 Oils, 8388, 8390, 8395
 Paints and Colours, 8458
 Paper, 9762, 9799, 9800
 Pianos, 9898
 Piece Goods, 8139, 8160, 8185, 8189
 Rails, *cons. reg.*, 10951, 10956
 Scientific Apparatus, 8495
 Socks and Stockings, 8340, 8346
 Spectacles and Spectacle Frames, 9658
 Steel Wheels, *cons. reg.*, 10961
 Timber, 9434, 9556, 9560, 9563; *cons. reg.*,
 11242, 11256, 11304, 11306, 11308, 11600
 Tobacco, unmanufactured, *cons. reg.*, 10843
 Tool Handles, 9634, 9635, 9638
 Trimmings and Ornaments, *n.e.i.*, for At-
 tire, 8348, 8349
 Waddings and Cotton Wool, 8328
 Wicker, Bamboo, and Cane, 9569
 Yarns, 9922
 Defence:
 Expenditure, *address*, 286
 Instructional Staff, *supply*, 10383-4
 Division List, Error in, *expl.*, 9646
 Electoral Act: Interference with Voters, *adj.*,
 2448
 Excise Tariff (Agricultural Machinery) Act,
supply, 6339, 6342
 High Commissioner, *supply*, 10292

Givens, Senator T.—continued.

Income Tax, Payment by Federal Officers, *address*, 283
 Income Tax, Victoria, *m.*, 1276; *p.o.*, 1275
 Invalid and Old-age Pensions Bill, *2r.*, 12017
 Judiciary Bill, *2r.*, 865; *com.* (appellate jurisdiction), 948
 Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway Survey Bill, *2r.*, 1132, *com.* (short title), 1377, (power to survey route) 1480
 Land Monopoly, *address*, 288
 Land Tax, *address*, 290
 Mail Contract, Cancelled, *address*, 282
 Navigation Bill, *q.*, 272
 New Protection, *supply*, 6339, 6340
 Northern Territory, *address*, 282
 Old-age Pensions, *address*, 276, 285
 Paper, Printing of, *m.*, 132, 157, 746
 Papua:
 Administration of, *supply*, 10296, 10301
 Appointment of Administrator, *q.*, 11678; *adj.*, 11698
 Native Labour, *adj.*, 11699
 Parliamentary Allowances Bill, *2r.*, 2112
 Parliamentary Papers Bill, *com.*, (no action for libel), 12136
 Penny Postage, *address*, 290
 Post and Telegraph Department:
 Administration, *supply*, 10392
 Sydney to Melbourne Telephone, *q.*, 11219, 10829-30
 Printing Committee, *m.*, 1566; *ad. rep.*, 8226
 Quarantine Bill, *com.* (ports of entry) (*p.o.*, 5991); (persons may be vaccinated), 6224
 Registered Letter, Delayed Delivery of, *m.*, 8156; *q.*, 9735; *supply*, 10392
 Senate:
 Adjournment of, *m.*, 6299
 Leave of Absence, *m.*, 6299
 Rights of, *obs.*, 11684
 Usher of Black Rod, *supply*, 10285
 Statistics, Printing of, *q.*, 1131
 Sugar Industry:
 Position in Queensland, *address*, 268, 278; *supply*, 6340
 Wages in Plantations, *q.*, 11382, 11471
 Supply Bill (No. 2), *com.* (issue and application), 1939
 Supply Bill (No. 4), *1r.*, 6338
 Surplus Balances, *q.*, 353
 Tariff Revision, *address*, 275
 Women's National League of Australia, *supply*, 6339

Glynn, Hon. P. McM., Angus:

Australian Industries Preservation Bill, *com.* (burden of proof), 9195; (persons to answer questions and produce documents), 9214
 Bankruptcy Bill, *q.*, 4086
 Brunties Bill, *2r.*, 802; *com.* (appropriation), 1005; (specification of bounties), 1058, 1059; (conditions of bounty), 1061; (regulations), 1061; (schedule), 1063, 1073; (fish), 1305; (second schedule), 1319; *recom.* (appropriation), 1380; (specification of bounties), 1382, 1387, 1388; (regulations), 1392
 Budget, 2396
 Cattle, Argentine, *q.*, 5911
 Chairman of Committees, *supply*, 84; *m.*, 315
 Commonwealth Salaries Bill, *2r.*, 3867; *com.* (taxation by States of Commonwealth salaries), 3886, 3888, 3892
 Corn and Flour Sacks, *q.*, 10610, 10722

Glynn, Hon. P. McM.—continued.

Customs Entries, Adelaide, *q.*, 4085, 9580, 10703
 Customs Tariff Bill, *cons. reg.*, (Sago and Tapioca) 10497, (Apparel and Attire) 10569, (Bags and Sacks), *p.o.*, 10571, (Hats and Caps) 10602, (Arms) 10657, (Agricultural Machinery and Implements) 10663, (Rock Boring Machines) *p.o.*, 10733, (Electrical Machines) *p.o.*, 10735, 10741, (Locks), 10794, (Oils) 10885, 10982, (Timber) 11021, (Stained Glass Windows) 11183, 11189. (*See* Tariff Resolutions (Customs).)
 Defence Policy, *supply*, 3598
 Disputed Elections and Qualifications Bill, *2r.*, 6373; *com.* (pending petitions), 6379, 6386; (qualifications and vacancies), 6387
 Dissent from Ruling: Admissibility of Amendment (Tariff Resolutions), *m.*, 7094
 Electoral Rolls, *q.*, 11327
 Excise Duties, *q.*, 1715
 Excise Procedure Bill, *2r.*, 7484; *com.* (employment of counsel), 7488
 Excise Tariff (Agricultural Machinery) Act, *q.*, 5909, 6230, 7295; *adj.*, 6362
 Excise Tariff (Spirits) Act, *q.*, 4648
 External Trade, *Budget*, 2398
 Federal Capital, *adj.*, 304. (*See* Seat of Government Bill.)
 Federal Finance, *Budget*, 2396; 2398
 Federal Officers and State Income Tax, *q.*, 11327
 Fire Insurance Bill, *2r.*, 1616
 Honorary Ministers, Official Expenses of, *supply*, 9486
 Immigration, *supply*, 9597, 9600
 Imperial Conference, Report, *m.*, 769
 Judiciary Bill, *2r.*, 3774; *com.* (exclusive jurisdiction of High Court), 3792, 3793; (causes pending), 3794
 Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway Survey Act, *q.*, 7112, 9191
 Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway Survey Bill, *m.*, 614, 640; *com.* (power to survey route), 738, 739
 London Docks, *q.*, 6726, 9684
 London Offices of Commonwealth, *supply*, 3631; *q.*, 5208, 5209
 Mail Contract, Cancelled, *q.*, 404
 Mining Industry, *Budget*, 2400
 New Protection, *q.*, 3268, 3302, 3421, 4648; *supply* (*p.o.*), 3319; *ways and means*, 5697
 Northern Territory, *q.*, 158, 1280, 7112
 Pairs, *expl.*, 6794
 Paper, Printing of, *m.*, 769
 Parliamentary Allowances Bill, *m.*, 1904; *2r.*, 1081
 Parliamentary Elections, Reimbursement, *supply*, 11216
 Parliamentary Witnesses Bill, *2r.*, 3898; *com.*, (refusal to answer questions), 12069
 Patent Medicines, *q.*, 879; *adj.*, 886
 Petition, Signatures, *obs.*, 3410, 3412
 Pianos, Exhibit in Parliament House, *q.*, 7114
 Post and Telegraph Department:
 Expenditure in South Australia, *q.*, 11626
 Post and Telegraph Act, *q.*, 4958
 Preferential Trade, *q.*, 590, 604
 Preferential Trade (Tariff), 4959, 4967, 4968, 4969, 4970, 5073
 Privilege, Select Committee on Procedure, *ad. rep.*, 12051

Glynn, Hon. P. McM.—*continued.*

Quarantine Bill, 2*r.*, 525; *com.* (commencement), 1417; (scope of quarantine), 1421, 1465; (interpretation), 1541; (ports of entry), 1550, 1560, 1563; (exemptions), 1619; (disinfected apparatus), 1619; (master to notify outbreak of disease), 1717; (examination of imported animals), 1723, 1729, 1755, 1766; (persons to be vaccinated), 1734; (State laws and regulations), 1768, 1774; *cons. amds.*, 8952

Rabbit Virus, *q.*, 503

Railway Rates, Differential, *q.*, 12039

Seat of Government Bill, *m.*, 647. (*See* Federal Capital.)

Senate: Vacancy in South Australia, *q.*, 404

Sugar Bounty, *Budget*, 2397

Supply:

External Affairs (Administrative), 9486; (Miscellaneous), 9597

Parliament (Senate), 11216

Works and Buildings (Home Affairs), 3332; (Defence), 3598; (External Affairs), 3631

Surplus Revenue Bill, 2*r.*, 11798

Tariff: *m.*, 2396; *ad. rep.*, 7451

Committee's Decisions, Circulation of, *q.*, 6811

Customs Duties, Duplication of, *q.*, 6674

Excess Duty, Refund of, *q.*, 2889, 2997

Goods in Transit, duties on, *q.*, 1747

Imports, clearance of, *q.*, 1868

Increased Duties: Requests by Senate, *obs.*, 10569, 10602

Items, Consideration of, *q.*, 3587

Kerosene, Duty on, *q.*, 2563

Magazines, Duty on, *q.*, 2312, 2565, 3421

Petition, *m.*, 3410, 3412

Printing Paper, Duty on, *q.*, 2791

Revenue, *supply*, 3332

Seizure by New South Wales Government of uncustomed goods, *q.*, 2120, 2232

Tariff Resolutions (Customs):

Agricultural, Horticultural, and Viticultural Machinery and Implements, *cons. req.*, 10663

Ale, Porter and other Beer, 4009, 4119 (*p.o.*, 4121)

Apparel and Attire, *n.e.i.*, 5628, 5632; *cons. req.*, 10569

Arms, *cons. req.*, 10657

Bags and Sacks, *cons. req.*, (*p.o.*, 10571)

Bananas, 5338

Biscuits, 4778

Blankets, 5718

Bicycles, 7274, 7281

Bottles, *n.e.i.*, 6942, 6947

Candles, 4874, 4959, 5071

Carbide of Calcium, 6971

Chairs, 7001, 7010

China and Porcelain, 6901

Cigarettes, 4304

Condensed Milk, 5515

Cycle Parts, Plated, 7283

Earthenware, 6904

Electrical Machines, *cons. req.*, (*p.o.*, 10735, 10741)

Engines (*p.o.*, 6706)

Glass, 6914, 6915, 6921

Glue, 6953

Hats and Caps, *cons. req.*, 10602

Hay and Chaff, 5364, 5429 (*p.o.*, 5442)

Locks, *cons. req.*, 10794

Machinery and Machines and Machine Tools, 6735

Glynn, Hon. P. McM.—*continued.*

Tariff Resolutions (Customs)—*continued.*

Manufactures of Metal, 6746

Manures, 7364

Matches, 5453

Musical Instruments, 7358

Oils, *cons. req.* (*p.o.* 10885), 10982

Peel, 5334

Pianos, 7330, 7346, 7353

Piece Goods, 5811, 5853

Rails, &c., 6814

Roasting Dishes, 6911

Rock Boring Machines, *cons. req.*, (*p.o.*, 10733)

Saccharine, 6974, 6976

Sago and Tapioca, *cons. req.*, 10497

Salt, Gypsum and Manure Bags, *ad. rep.*, 7451; *cons. req.*, (*p.o.*, 10571)

Sausage Casings, 5460

Spirits, 4136

Stained Glass Windows, 6910; *cons. req.*, 11183, 11189

State Imports, 7423-33

Sugar, 4635, 4644, 4751

Timber, 7037, 7080, 7084, 7086; *cons. req.*, 11021

Tobacco, Manufactured, *n.e.i.*, 4206, 4301, (unmanufactured), 4303

Type, Printers', 6755

Vehicles, 7287

Wine, *n.e.i.*, 4141, 4142

Wire Netting, 4544; (*p.o.*, 4574, 4577) (*See* Customs Tariff Bill)

Tariff Resolutions (Excise):

Glucose, 4642

Tobacco, Manufactured, *p.o.*, 4305

Telegraph Messengers, *ways and means*, 5697

Telephone Guarantees, *q.*, 4749

Transcontinental Railway, *q.*, 7112, 9191

Transferred Officers' Rights, *q.*, 11260

Wire Netting, *q.*, 1974

Gould, Senator Lt.-Col. Hon. A. J., *New South Wales:*

Appropriation Bill, *com.*, schedule: The Parliament, 10285-6-7

Australian Industries Preservation Bill, 2*r.*, 4611; *com.* (power of Comptroller-General to question, &c.), 5099

Bills of Exchange Bill, 2*r.*, 665; *com.* (application of State laws), 672, 678; (protection of banker), 757, 2065, 2207; (presentment of cheque), 2058; *recom.*, new clause, (State Stamp Duty), 2295

Bounties Bill, *com.*, new clause (supply of information by applicant), 2784; *recom.*, First Schedule (tobacco), 4898

Commonwealth Salaries Bill, *com.* (Taxation by States), 1047

Customs Tariff Bill, *com.*, Schedule:

Blue, 7686

Engines, Mine Ventilating Fans, 8690

Glass, 8486, 8493

Hay and Chaff, 7942

Motive Power Machinery, 8634, 8658

Oilmen's Stores, 8049

Oils, 8425

Spices, 8099

Stained Glass Windows, 8486, 9939; *cons. req.*, 11318

Wire Netting, 9153-8

First President of the Senate, *m.*, 3368

Gould, Senator Lt.-Col. Hon. A. J.—*continued*.
Invalid and Old-age Pensions Bill, *com.* (persons disqualified), 12028.

Pair Book, Entries in, *m.*, 3504

Parliament: Electric Bells, *supply*, 5881;
Gardens, *supply*, 5882; Accommodation for
Senators, *supply*, 8082; Clerk of the Par-
liaments: Usher of the Black Rod, *supply*,
10285-6-7

Parliamentary Papers Bill, *com.* (no action
for publishing Parliamentary Papers), 12132
President, Rights of Debate of the, *obs.*, 665,
668

Quarantine Bill, *com.* (arrangements with
State Governments: stations, &c.), 5312;
(powers of Commonwealth), 5324, 5397

Supply Bill (No. 3), *com.*, Schedule: The
Parliament, 5881-2

Supply Bill (No. 5), *com.*, Schedule: The
Parliament, 8982

See PRESIDENT, The (Subjects)

Gray, Senator J. P., New South Wales:

Additional Appropriation Bill, 1907-8, 12.,
11515

Additional Appropriation (Works and Build-
ings) Bill 1907-8, *com.*, schedule (Home
Affairs), 11696

Address-in-Reply, *m.*, 370

Adjournment, Special: Women's Work Exhi-
bition, *m.*, 4894

Advertising Australia: *Standard* Supplement,
q., 11218, 11302

Appropriation (Works and Buildings) Bill,
22., 3901; *com.*, schedule (Defence), 4061

Assassination of King of Portugal, *p.o.*, 7795

Australian Industries Preservation Bill, *com.*
(power of Comptroller-General to question,
&c.), 5035

Bills of Exchange Bill, *com.* (application of
State laws), 676, 679; *recom.*, new clause,
(post-dated cheque), 2298

Bounties Bill, 22., 2419; *com.*, first schedule
(copra), 3398; (tobacco), 4172, 4261; *recom.*,
first schedule (tobacco), 4901; *adj.*, 6353

British Party Politics: Australian inter-
ference, *address*, 372

Business, Conduct of, *adj.*, 487; order of, *q.*,
10919, 11579-80

Coal Combine, *adj.*, 3700

Customs Certificates: British Goods, *m.*, 1964

Customs Tariff Bill, *com.*, Despatch of Busi-
ness, *p.o.*, 7904; Schedule:

Agricultural, &c., Machinery and Imple-
ments, 8578

Ammonia, &c., 9244; *expl.*, 9245

Arrowroot, 7954

Bananas, 7863

Biscuits, 7677

Blankets, &c., 8238

Bottles, 8501-2

Carbide of Calcium, 9265-7

Carpets, &c., 8274

Coir Mats, &c., 8276

Confectionery, 7731

Cornflour, 7912

Engines, 8678

Electrical Machines, &c., 8875; *cons. req.*,
10946

Fire Extinguishers, 8773

Fish, 7807

Fruits, Dried, 7823

Gray, Senator J. P.—*continued*.

Customs Tariff Bill (Schedule)—*continued*.

Furniture, 9379

Galvanized Iron, &c., 8564

Glue, &c., 8512

Hats, &c., 8317

Hay and Chaff, 7937; *cons. req.*, 10860

Herbs, Dried, 7883-4

Hogsheads, second-hand, 9648

Insecticides, Sheep-washes, &c., 9283, 9290

Locks, 9176

Locomotives, Traction Engines, &c., 8662

Malt Extract, 7960

Manufactures of Metal, *n.e.i.*, 8727, 8752,
8760

Matches, 7970

Meats, &c., 8012, 8017

Milk, 8022

Mine Ventilating Fans, 8678

Motive Power Machinery, 8637; (*p.o.*, 8651)

Musical Instruments, 9833

Mustard, 8031

Mustard Seed, 8029

Nuts, 8033-9

Oilmen's Stores, 8043

Oils, 87-9, 8399; *cons. req.*, 11225

Onions, 7884

Paper, &c., 9761; patterns, 9809

Pianos, 9834, 9841, 9893-9

Piece Goods, 8131

Potatoes, 7888

Printing Roller Composition, 8521-4

Rails, &c., 9064

Rice, 8082

Sheep Shearing Machines, 8596

Spectacles, &c., 9660

Stripper Harvesters, 8582

Tallow, &c., 8376-7, 8381

Tea, 8108, 8116

Timber, 9549

Tool Handles, &c., 9638

Type, &c., 8770

Vegetables, 7873

Weighing Machines, &c., 8620

Wicker, &c., 9570

Wood, articles of, *n.e.i.*, 9578

Days and Hours of Meeting, *m.*, 8077

Defence:

Ammunition Waggon, *supply*, 4061

Compulsory Service, *address*, 374

Lithgow: Land for Small Arms Factory,
supply, 11696

Military Training Colleges, *supply*, 11516

Naval Agreement, *address*, 374

Defence Bill, 22., 5679

Dissent from Ruling: Admissibility of Re-
quest (Customs Tariff Bill), *m.*, 8651

Dissent from Ruling: Right of Reply to
Ministerial Statement (Customs Tariff Bill),
m., 7904

Federal Capital, *address*, 375

Finance, Commonwealth and State, *supply*,
3901, 11515

Imperial Conference, *address*, 370

Industrial Conditions, *address*, 370, 372

Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway Survey
Bill, *address*, 375; 22., 1159

London Offices of Commonwealth, *supply*,
3901-3

Mail Contract, Cancelled, *address*, 373

Mail Service to Europe, *m.*, 6207

Maitland Coal Miners: Postmaster-General'
adj., 8362

Gray, Senator J. P.—*continued.*

Northern Territory, *address*, 374; *q.*, 8699
 Officers Compensation Bill, 2R., 10055; *com.*
 (payments), 10059
 Post and Telegraph Department:
 Disorganization: Committee of Inquiry,
adj., 9531
 Sydney General Post Office: Underman-
 ning, *q.*, 6296; *supply*, 6308
 Preferential Trade, *address*, 371; *q.*, 11468
 Public Servants: Tariff, *q.*, 3404
 Public Service: Commission of Inquiry,
supply, 8922
 Quarantine Bill, *com.* (powers of Common-
 wealth), 5668
 Supply Bill (No. 2), *com.* (application), 1946
 Supply Bill (No. 4), 1R., 6308
 Supply Bill (No. 5), 1R., 8922
 Telephone Connexion: Riverina, *q.*, 9742,
 9892
 Tobacco Combine: Tariff, *p.o.*, 2035; *adj.*,
 2042; *q.*, 2068, 3684, 4705

Groom, Hon. L. E., *Darling Downs* :

Amending Bills, *q.*, 12039
 Australian Industries Preservation Bill, 2R.,
 8660, 9126; *com.* (definition), 9130; (amend-
 ment of Principal Act), 9132; (burden of
 proof), 9133, 9211; (power of Comptroller-
 General to question, &c.), 9215-6-7, 9227-9,
 9233-4; *recom.* (power of Comptroller-
 General to question, &c.), 9391-2; *m.s.o.*,
 9481; 3R., 9595; *q.*, 10524
 Bankruptcy Bill, *q.*, 1088, 1089, 1281, 4086
 Barristers' Combine, Alleged, *q.*, 6729, 10082
 Bounties Bill, 2R., 775; *com.* (appropriation),
 999, 1001; *q.*, 1056; *com.* (specification of
 bounties), 1058, 1060; (regulations), 1062;
 first schedule, 1064, 1065, 1068; (N.Z. flax),
 1090; (flax and hemp), 1092; (jute), 1092;
 (mohair), 1094; (copra), 1105; (cotton seed),
 1107; (olives), 1121; (palm fruit), 1182;
 (peanuts), 1185; (sunflower seed), 1186;
 (rice), 1188, 1197; (coffee), 1202; (tobacco),
 1220, 1225, 1226, 1227; (preserved fish), 1294,
 1301, 1302; (dried fruits), 1310; *p.o.*, 1311-
 4; (dried fruits), 1316; (combed tops), 1319;
 second schedule, 1319, 1320, 1322;
recom., 1378; (appropriation), 1380; (speci-
 fication of bounties), 1381, 1382, 1383,
 1386, 1388; (conditions of bounty), 1389;
 (regulations), 1389, 1391; *q.*, 5415; *cons.*
amdt., 6401-2-3-4-5, 6439
 Bounties: Expert Committee's Report, *adj.*,
 648
 Citizens' Life Assurance Company, *q.*, 12200
 Coal Miners: Conciliation and Arbitration
 Act., *q.*, 2233
 Commonwealth Salaries Bill, 2R., 3862, 3879;
com. (Taxation by States), 3883, 3886, 3888,
 3891, 3895, 3897; *m.s.o.*, 3897
 Conciliation and Arbitration Act, *expl.*, 3589;
q., 4927
 Constitution, questions involving interpretation
 of the, *obs.*, 1181
 Consumption: Prohibited Immigrants, *adj.*,
 1683; *q.*, 2314
 Wright Bill, *q.*, 5130
 Customs Administration:
 Protection: Adelaide, *q.*, 9089, 9090; *adj.*,
 4 Prisoners, *supply*, 9727

Groom, Hon. L. E.—*continued.*

Disputed Elections and Qualifications Bill, *q.*,
 6131; 2R., 6370; *com.* (pending petitions),
 6378-9, 6382; (qualifications and vacancies),
 6387; new clause (payment of costs) *p.o.*,
 6388; *m.s.o.*, 6389
 Electoral Law, infraction of, at Barwon,
 Corio, *q.*, 194
 Estimates, Additional, *supply*, 11365
 Excise Procedure Bill, 2R., 6056; *com.* (ex-
 clusion of lawyers) 7488
 Excise Tariff (Agricultural Machinery) Act, *q.*,
 4926
 High Court, Authority of, *q.*, 9388; Travelling
 Expenses, *supply*, 9727; Mr. O'Halloran's
 Services, *supply*, 9728, 9732
 High Court Cases: Commonwealth Costs, *q.*,
 11742
 Imports, Taxation of State, *supply*, 6291
 Income Tax: *Webb v. Oultrim* judgment, *q.*,
 773; petitions to Privy Council, *q.*, 6811
 Invalid and Old-age Pensions Bill, 2R., 11922;
com. (deputy Commissioners), 11963; (who
 may receive pensions), 11966; (persons dis-
 qualified), 11970-3; (necessary conditions),
 11974-5; (occasional short absences), 11977;
 (invalid pensions: commencement), 11978;
 (persons disqualified), 11978; (limit of pen-
 sion), 11979; (pension claim), 11979; (refer-
 ence to magistrate), 11979; (investigation by
 magistrate), 11980; (appeal or fresh evi-
 dence), 11980; (ascertainment of pension for
 subsequent years), 11981; *q.*, 12038
 Judiciary Bill, 2R., 3749; *m.*, 3765; *com.*
 (exclusive jurisdiction of High Court), 3793;
 new clause (causes pending), 3795; 3R.,
 3855
 Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway Survey
 Bill, *int.*, 559, 606; 2R., 718; *adj.*, 744;
cons. amdt., 2017
 Leave of Absence to Members, *m.*, 7491
 Life Assurance Legislation, *q.*, 12200
 Mail Contract, Cancelled, *q.*, 4279
 Marine Insurance Bill, *int.*, 4959
 Meteorology: Forecasts, *q.*, 9480
 New South Wales Government: Seizure of
 Wire Netting, *supply*, 6291; judgment of
 High Court, *q.*, 11742
 Papua Bill, 2R., 1414
 Papua: Purchase of Conflict Group, *q.*, 7248
 Parliamentary Allowances Bill, *com.* (com-
 mencement), 2009
 Parliamentary Papers Bill, 2R., 11671; *com.*
 (publication of parliamentary papers),
 11672; (no action for libel for publishing
 copies, &c.), 11675; new clause (authority to
 publish), 11675; *recom.* (no action for pub-
 lishing parliamentary papers), 11780; *cons.*
amdt., 12198
 Parliamentary Witnesses Bill, 2R., 3897; *com.*
 (short title), 11780; (preventing witnesses
 from giving evidence), 11782-4, 12066;
 (penalty for refusing to answer questions),
 12069, 12071-5
 Photographic Materials Trust, *q.*, 11050
 Privilege: Select Committee on Procedure,
ad. reps., 12048
 Public Service:
 Temporary Assistance, *supply*, 11365
 Transferred Officers' Rights, *q.*, 11260

Groom, Hon. L. E.—*continued.*

Quarantine Bill, 2R., 541; *com.* (exemption of vessels and goods), 1619; (disinfecting apparatus on vessels), 1619; (fumigation of vessels to destroy vermin), 1620; (vessels to enter first port of entry), 1622; (master to notify outbreak of disease), 1624, 1717; (quarantine surveillance), 1718; (order to perform quarantine), 1720; (performance of quarantine by vessel), 1721; (release from quarantine), 1721; (animals or plants to be landed at declared ports), 1722; (examination of imported animals), 1722, 1724, 1742, 1753, 1759, 1764, 1766; (power to destroy diseased animals), 1725, 1730; (power to destroy diseased plants), 1730; (importing contrary to proclamation), 1732-3; (inquiries by quarantine officer), 1733; (vaccination of quarantined persons), 1733, 1740, 1741; (entering other than first port of entry, having disease on board), 1741; new clause (repeal of State laws), 1767, 1773, 1774

Railway Rates, Differential, *q.*, 12030

Seat of Government Bill, *int.*, 647; 2R., 10321

Senate Election: South Australia, *q.*, 404; *supply*, 8858

State Export Subsidies, *q.*, 1181

State Officers: Compensation for Commonwealth Work, *supply*, 9728, 9732; *q.*, 10078

Supply:

Attorney-General (Secretary's Office), 9725-6-7, 11365; (Crown Solicitor's Office), 9727; (High Court), 9727-8, 9732

Supply Bill (No. 4), *com.*, Attorney-General: (State Importations), 6291

Supply Bill (No. 5), *int.*, 8858

Surplus Revenue Bill, 2R., 11724; *com.* (payments to Trust Accounts), 11862

Tariff, *adj.*, 1684

Kerosene duties: Refunds, *q.*, 7299

Tariff Resolutions (Customs):

Vehicles, 7289

Walpole, Mr. R. S., statements by, *q.*, 11018

Guthrie, Senator R. S., South Australia:

Adjournment: Leave of absence, *m.*, 6299

Advertising Australia: Immigration, *supply*, 5891, 6350

Afric, S.S., *q.*, 8865, 8979

Appropriation (Works and Buildings) Bill, *com.* (Post and Telegraph), 4048; (Telegraphs and Telephones), 4040; (External Affairs), 4081; 3R., 4154

Business of next Session, *q.*, 12101

Coal Combine, *adj.*, 3606

Coast Defence Appropriation Bill, 2R., 12115

Compensation to Injured Seamen, *q.*, 3462, 3559, 10018

Customs Administration:

Frauds at Adelaide, *q.*, 249

Leakages, alleged, *q.*, 6293, 6409

Port Adelaide Officers, *q.*, 1131

Customs Tariff Bill, *com.*, Schedule:

Electrical and Gas Appliances, 8890, 9058

Fire Extinguishers, 8774

Fish, 7783-4, 7804

Iron and Steel Pipes, 9088

Liquorice, 7758-9

Locomotives, Traction Engines, &c., 8663

Oils, 8426

Salt, 8080, 8090

Timber, 9440

Weighing Machines, &c., 9522

Guthrie, Senator R. S.—*continued.*

Defence:

Protector, *supply*, 12147

Tenth Australian Infantry Regiment, *q.*, 8423

Disputed Elections and Qualifications Bill, 2R., 5591; *recom.* (pending petitions), 5276

Grain Bags, Weight of, *q.*, 1567

Inter-State Commission: Differential Railway Rates, *q.*, 12101

London Offices of Commonwealth, *supply*, 4081, 4154

Mail Contracts:

Cancelled, *q.*, 249, 3558, 4363, 4462

Differentiation against Unionists, *m.*, 4500

Mail Service to Europe, *m.*, 6208

Marine Signal Stations, South Australia, *supply*, 4049

Navigation Bill, *supply*, 5879; *q.*, 7623, 8863-4, 8978

Navigation Conference, *q.*, 8

Papers: Printing Committee, *m.*, 133, 934, 4468, 8225

Post and Telegraph Offices:

Port Pirie Post Office, *supply*, 4048; *q.*, 5176

Postal Service:

Moonta Mines, *q.*, 8286

Port Pirie, *q.*, 29, 132

Public Service:

Overtime Payments, *q.*, 7792

Quarantine Bill, 2R., 5300; *com.* (scope of quarantine), 5304; (powers of Commonwealth), 5473, 5479; new paragraph (exclusion of consumptives), *p.o.*, 5992; (exemption of vessels), 5993; (disinfecting apparatus on vessels), 5993-4-5; (vessel to enter first port of entry), 5995-6; (hoisting of quarantine signal), 5997; (master to notify outbreak of disease), 5998; (signal), 5998, 6226; (no person to quit vessel subject to quarantine), 6000-1-2; (power to destroy diseased animals), 6066; (liability of owners, &c., for provisions for quarantined persons), 6071, 6079; (persons able to support themselves), 6217-9; (quarantine signals), 6226; (owners liable for services of medical officer), 6220

Senate Vacancy: South Australia, *p.o.*, 8; Committee's Report, *q.*, 3556; High Court Judgment, *q.*, 7753

Shipping: Differential Treatment, *q.*, 11083

Statutory Rules, *supply*, 4154; *obs.*, 4155

Strangers, presence of, *p.o.*, 8778

Supply Bill (No. 3), 2R., 5879; *com.*, External Affairs: (advertising Australia), 5891

Supply Bill (No. 4), *com.*, External Affairs: (advertising Australia), 6350

Supply Bill (No. 1) 1908-9, *com.*, Schedule, Defence: (South Australia), 12147

Telegraph and Telephone Service:

"Party" Telephones, South Australian, *q.*, 29, 131, 247

Pinnaroo Railway Telegraph Line, *q.*, 1020

Telegraphic Delay: Kingscote, *q.*, 11218, 11985-7

Telegraphic Money Orders, *supply*, 4154; *q.*, 5979

Telephone Rates, *q.*, 472

Voting Machines, *m.*, 1271.

Wireless Telegraphy, *supply*, 4049; *q.*, 11222

Workmen's Compensation Bill, *q.*, 5177, 6061

Hall, Mr. D. R., Werriwa:

- Australian Industries Preservation Bill, 2r., 917
- Defence:
 - Cadet Corps, *q.*, 11180
- Estimates, Additional, *supply*, 11292
- Federal Capital, *q.*, 3508, 3733
- Government, position of the, *supply*, 10451
- Labour Party's Caucus, *q.*, 10876, 10967
- New Protection, *q.*, 6095
- Parliament House: Sewering, *q.*, 12039
- Post and Telegraph Department: New South Wales, *supply*, 8834, 11292
- Post and Telegraph Department: Royal Commission, *supply*, 10451
- Supply Bill (No. 5), *int.*, 8834
- Tariff Resolutions (Customs):
 - Apparel and Attire, 5630
 - Wire Netting, 4523
- Telephone and Telephone Service:
 - Telephone Attendants: New South Wales Elections, *q.*, 1866
 - Telephone Facilities: Guarantees, *supply*, 11293
 - Telephones, Young; *q.*, 80, 81

Harper, Hon. R., Mernda:

- Customs Tariff Bill, *cons. req.*, (locks), 10780; (paints and colours), 10896-8; (oils), 10911, 11115, 11551-4; (log band saws), *p.o.*, 11543 (*See* Tariff Resolutions (Customs))
- Light Horse Brigade Camp, *q.*, 6555
- New Hebrides: Joint Court, *q.*, 10788
- Post and Telegraph Department: Ministerial Statement, *m.s.o.*, 11636
- Surplus Revenue Bill, 2r., 11829
- Tariff Resolutions (Customs):
 - Cocoa and Chocolate, 5257
 - Cocoa Butter, &c., 5259
 - Coffee, 5261
 - Glue, &c., 6950-3
 - Locks, *cons. req.*, 10780
 - Log Band Saw, *cons. req.*, *p.o.*, 11543
 - Machines and Machinery, 6707, 6711
 - Milk, Condensed, &c., 5502, 5519
 - Oils, 6868; *cons. req.*, 10911, 11115, 11551-4
 - Paints and Colours, *cons. req.*, 10896-8
 - Potato Flour, 5345-6
 - Strawboard, 7228
 - Tin Plate, 6117
 - Weighing Machines, &c., 6628 (*See* Customs Tariff Bill)
- Tariff Resolutions (Excise):
 - Glucose, 4636
 - Starch, 5549, 5550, 5552, 5556

Hedges, Mr. W. N., Fremantle:

- Address-in-Reply, *m.*, 165
- Advertising Australia, *supply*, 9628
- American Fleet, *q.*, 11180
- Australian Provident Fund, *Budget*, 3034
- Bounties Bill, *com.*, schedule (peanuts), 1185; (rice), 1198; *recom.* (specification of bounties), 1382, 1387, 1389
- Budget*, 3025
- Customs Department:
 - Bonds, *q.*, 2348, 2690
 - Sale of Seized Goods, *q.*, 6132

Hedges, Mr. W. N.—continued.

- Customs Tariff Bill, *cons. req.*, (Motive-power Machinery), 10680-3, 11535-8; (Rock-drills) 10711; (Rails, &c.), 10749; (Standards, &c.), 10803; (Steel and Steel-rimmed Wheels, 10805; (Wire Gauze), 10807, 10813-5; (Fibre-cement, &c.), 10902; (Crucibles, &c.), 10904, 11556, 11561; (Stone and Marble), 11000; (Paper), 11080; (Timber), 11145-7, 11160-5-4; (Axles), 11175; (Curtains, &c.), 11442; Electrical Machines), 11445-7. (*See* Tariff Resolutions (Customs).)
- Defence:
 - Morris Tubes, *q.*, 9478
- Departmental Methods, *supply*, 11289
- Dry Farming, *q.*, 9765
- Estimates, Additional, *supply*, 11289
- Excise Procedure Bill, *com.* (exclusion of lawyers), 7490
- Forrest, Sir John, *address*, 165
- Immigration: Land Settlement, *supply*, 9628
- Invalid and Old-age Pensions Bill, 2r., 11956; *com.* (necessary conditions), 11973-5
- Iron and Steel Industry, *Budget*, 3027
- Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway Survey Bill, *int.*, 626
- London Offices, *supply*, 3658
- Mail Service to Europe, *m.*, 6490; *q.*, 881
- Manufactures Encouragement Bill, *com.*, (schedule), 12180
- Mining Machinery, *Budget*, 3030
- Northam Post Office, *supply*, 3534
- Old-age Pensions, *address*, 166; *Budget*, 3034; (*see* Invalid and Old-age Pensions Bill.)
- Olive, Coconut, and Mineral Oils, *q.*, 1716
- Parliamentary Allowances Bill, 2r., 1990
- Preferential Trade, *Budget*, 3033
- Public Debt: Australia, *Budget*, 3027
- Quarantine Bill, *com.*, (scope of quarantine), 1463; (importing contrary to proclamation), 1732
- Secession Movement, *Budget*, 3033
- Secret Drugs, Cures and Foods: Mr. Beale's Report, *q.*, 10309
- Supply:
 - External Affairs (Miscellaneous), 9628
 - Works and Buildings (Post and Telegraph), 3534; (London Offices), 3658
- Surplus Revenue Bill, 2r., 11757
- Tariff, *m.*, 3025:
 - Indexed Copies of Old, *q.*, 2687
 - Wheels and Axles, *q.*, 2312, 2687; *Budget*, 3029
- Tariff Commission's Reports, *q.*, 6419
- Tariff Resolutions (Customs):
 - Agricultural &c., Machinery and Implements, 6564
 - Arms, 6034-5
 - Axles, *cons. req.*, 11175
 - Blacking, &c., 6852
 - Buggy Shafts, 7130
 - Chairs, 7000
 - Crucibles, &c., *cons. req.*, 10904, 11556, 11561
 - Curtains, &c., *cons. req.*, 11442
 - Earthenware, 6905
 - Electrical Machines, *cons. req.*, 11445-7
 - Explosives, 7381-6, 7390
 - Fibre-cement, &c., *cons. req.*, 10902
 - Galvanized Iron, 6545
 - Kerosene, 6871
 - Mining Machinery, Rock Drills, 6785, 6792, 6798; *cons. req.*, 10711

Hedges, Mr. W. N.—continued.

Tariff Resolutions (Customs)—continued.

Motive Power Machinery, &c., 6659, 6669;
cons. req., 10680-3, 11535-8
 Musical Instruments, 7358
 Nails, 6612, 6617, 6621
 Paper, &c., *cons. req.*, 11080
 Pianos, 7342
 Rails, &c., 6821; *cons. req.*, 10749
 Road Rollers, Traction Engines, &c., 6701-2
 Roofing Tiles, 6908
 Saws, 6749-50-1
 Standards, &c., *cons. req.*, 10803
 State Importations, 7430
 Steel and Steel-rimmed Wheels, *cons. req.*,
 10805
 Stone and Marble, 6962; *cons. req.*, 11000
 Tanks, 6625
 Timber, 7075, 7091, 7102; *cons. req.*, 11145-7,
 11160-5-6
 Tool Handles, 7121-4
 Weighing Machines, &c., 6628-9
 Wire Gauze, *cons. req.*, 10807, 10813
 Woollen Piece Goods, 5813
 (See Customs Tariff Bill.)
 Voting Machines, *q.*, 2890
 Western Australia: Survey of North-West
 Coast, *q.*, 2450
 Wireless Telegraphy, *q.*, 12154
 Wire Netting, *Budget*, 3030

Henderson, Senator G., Western Australia :

Additional Appropriation (Works and Build-
 ings) Bill, 1907-8, *com.*, schedule (Home
 Affairs), 11694
 Address-in-Reply, *m.*, 291
 Adjournment Special, *m.*, 7789
 Australian Industries Preservation Bill, 2R.,
 4513; *com.* (power of Comptroller-General
 to question, &c.), 5017; *ad. rep.*, 5192
 Bounties Bill, *address*, 294; 2R., 2752; *com.*,
 new clause (prevention of monopoly), 2776-7;
 first schedule (cotton), 2871; (jute), 3159,
 3263; (mohair), 3370; (rubber), 3575; (coffee),
 3577, 3712; (tobacco), 4174; (fish), 4262
 Chinese: Influx to Western Australia, *q.*, 9236
 Coal Combine, *adj.*, 3695
 Commonwealth Mail Steamers, *m.*, 681
 Customs Department Promotions, *m.*, 564
 Customs Tariff Bill, *com.*, Schedule :
 Arrowroot, 7951
 Bananas, 7858
 Brasswork, &c., 8764
 Carpets, &c., 8260-4
 Coffee, 7765
 Electrical and Gas Appliances, 8889, 8895
 Electrical Machinery, 8802; *cons. req.*,
 10944
 Explosives, 9928-9
 Fish, 7807
 Fruits, dried, 7820
 Furniture, 9378
 Lantern Slides, &c., 9934
 Machines, n.e.i., and Machine Tools, 8708
 Manufactures of Metal, n.e.i., 8761-3
 Manures, 9916
 Matches, 7999, 8007
 Mine Ventilating Fans, 8677
 Mining Machinery, 8789, 8796
 Motive Power Machinery, 8635
 Rice, 8074
 Sago and Tapioca, 7660

Henderson, Senator G.—continued.

Customs Tariff Bill (Schedule)—continued.

Tallow, &c., 8385
 Tea, 8102-7
 Timber, 9455, 9545; *cons. req.*, 11605
 Tool Handles, &c., 9637
 Weighing Machines, &c., 8621-2; *cons. req.*,
 10937
 Wood, Articles of, n.e.i., 9578
 Days of Sitting, *adj.*, 7789
 Defence :
 Lithgow: Land for Small Arms Factory,
supply, 11694
 Maribyrnong: Land for Cordite Factory,
supply, 11694
 Defence Bill, 2R., 5688
 Electoral Act, *address*, 296
 Interference with Voters, *adj.*, 2446; *q.*,
 3364, 4362
 Excise Tariff Procedure Bill, *com.*, new clause
 (exclusion of lawyers), 5126
 Imperial Conference, *address*, 292
 Invalid and Old-age Pensions Bill, 2R., 12014
 Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway Survey
 Bill, *address*, 296; 2R., 1143; *q.*, 11217
 Mail Contracts :
 Differentiation against Unionists, *m.*, 4502
 Mail Service to Europe, *m.*, 6205
 Maitland Coal Miners: Postmaster-General,
adj., 8361
 Navigation Conference, *address*, 293
 Northern Territory, *address*, 295
 Officers' Compensation Bill, *com.* (payments),
 10062-7
 Old-age Pensions, *address*, 294; (see Invalid
 and Old-age Pensions Bill)
 Parliament House: Garden, *supply*, 5883-4;
 Entertainment of Strangers, *q.*, 6060; *adj.*,
 6092; Accommodation, *supply*, 8983
 Parties, position of, *address*, 292
 Post and Telegraph Department :
 Cue: Postmaster, *q.*, 6206
 Preferential Trade, *address*, 293
 Printing Committee, *m.*, 39; *obs.*, 680; *m.*,
 680, 934, 935, 1566, 1567, 2180, 2283, 3148,
 3464, 3797, 4463, 4469, 5647, 6293, 7843-6,
 8221-7, 8673; *obs.*, 9297; *q.*, 9353; *m.*, 9353,
 10255
 Privilege: Select Committee upon Procedure,
ad. rep., 11994
 Quarantine Bill, 2R., 5299; *com.*, (arrange-
 ments with State Governments: stations,
 &c.), 5306; (powers of Commonwealth), 5666;
 new paragraph (exclusion of consumptives),
p.o., 5991
 Senate Vacancy: South Australia, *m.*, 4802;
q., 9353
 Standing Orders Committee, *m.*, 37
 Supply Bill (No. 2), *com.*, (application), 1936
 Supply Bill (No. 3), *com.*, Schedule: The
 Parliament, 5883-4
 Supply Bill (No. 5), *com.*, Schedule: The
 Parliament, 8983
 Tariff Revision, *address*, 293
 Tobacco Combine: Tariff, *adj.*, 2052; Select
 Committee, *m.*, 3052

Holder, Hon. Sir F. W., K.C.M.G.,

Wakefield :

See SPEAKER, Mr. (SUBJECTS).

Hughes, Hon. W. M., West Sydney :

Adult Military Training, *m.*, 1282
 Agricultural Machinery: Excise Duty, *adj.*, 12161
 Bounties Bill, *com.* (appropriation), 1016; schedule (rice), 1193
 Budget, 2476
 Customs Tariff Bill, *cons. req.* (stearine, paraffine wax, &c.), 10506; (hay and chaff), 10546; (locks), 10781; (oils), 10980. (*See* Tariff Resolutions (Customs))
 Defence:
 Cordite Factory, *supply*, 11286
 Corowa Cadet Corps, *q.*, 5328
 Harbor and Coastal, *supply*, 11285, 11414
 Naval Construction, *q.*, 4308; *supply*, 11285, 11414
 Estimates, Additional, *supply*, 11283, 11414
 Excise Tariff (Agricultural Machinery) Act, *adj.*, 6367
 Grain Bags, Size of, *q.*, 10787
 Immigration, *Budget*, 2485
 Invalid and Old-age Pensions Bill, *2r.*, 11961
 Judiciary Bill, *m.*, 3773
 Labour and Opposition Parties, *Budget*, 2478
 Labour Party's Caucus, *expl.*, 10876
 Land Values Taxation, *Budget*, 2482-6.
 London Offices of Commonwealth, *supply*, 3637; *expl.*, 3677
 Mail Contracts:
 Differentiation against Unionists, *m.*, 2572; *q.*, 4623
 European: Speed of Vessels, *q.*, 5497
 Manufactures Encouragement Bill, *2r.*, 6148; *com.* (schedule), 12179
 Old-age Pensions, *Budget*, 2487 (*see* Invalid and Old-age Pensions Bill)
 Parliament: Reflections on Members, *obs.*, 10980
 Parliamentary Allowances Bill, *int.*, 1008; *com.* (amount of allowance), 1992; *Budget*, 2477
 Parliamentary Witnesses Bill, *com.* (penalty for refusing to answer questions), 12074
 Post and Telegraph Department:
 Officialdom: Need for inquiry, *supply*, 11286
 Sydney General Post Office: Disorganization, *supply*, 11283
 Postal Service:
 Boy Labour, *supply*, 4852-3
 Compensation Claims, *supply*, 4852
 Country Contractors, *supply*, 4852, 5704
 Letter Carriers' Forage Allowance, *supply*, 11284
 Letter Delivery, Sydney, *q.*, 3972; *supply*, 4852
 Temporary Employés, *supply*, 4853
 Undermanning: Sydney, *supply*, 5704, 11283
 Preferential Trade, *Budget*, 2490
 Preferential Trade (Tariff), 4938
 Quarantine Bill, *com.* (scope of quarantine), 1456
 Shipping: Differential Treatment, *q.*, 11916
 States Rights, *Budget*, 2486
 Supply:
 Works and Buildings, (External Affairs), 3637, 3677; (Defence), 11414
 Tariff, *m.*, 2476
 Debates, Conclusion of, *q.*, 11052-3
 Lobbying, *obs.*, 10980
 Order of Consideration of Items, *m.*, 4128, 4327, 4331, 4355, 4359

Hughes, Hon. W. M.—continued.

Tariff Resolutions (Customs):
 Agricultural, &c., Machinery and Implements, 6054, 6578, 6583; ale, porter, &c., 4128
 Animals, 4769, 4771
 Bicycles, 7280
 Candles, 4938-40
 Confectionery, 5216, 5242
 Corn Flour, 5352
 Dates, 5332
 Furniture, 7019
 Glass, &c., 6933
 Hay and Chaff, 5361; *cons. req.*, 10546
 Jewellery, 7148-9
 Kerosene, *cons. req.*, 10980
 Locks, 6114; *cons. req.*, 10781
 Magazines, 7194
 Milk, Condensed, &c., 5506
 Potatoes, 5342
 Road Rollers, Traction Engines, &c., 6690
 Sheep Shearing Machines, 6578, 6583
 Stearine, Paraffine Wax, &c., *cons. req.*, 10506
 Wire Netting, 4453, 4568
 Woollen Piece Goods, 5842, 5845
 (*See* Customs Tariff Bill)
 Tariff Resolutions (Excise):
 Cigarettes, 4325
 Telegraph and Telephone Service:
 Country Telephone Facilities, *supply*, 11285
 Sydney Telephone System, *supply*, 11285

Hutchison, Mr. J., Hindmarsh:

Absentee Tax, *Budget*, 2934
 Address-in-Reply, *m.*, 178
 Australia, Slanders on, *supply*, 9610
 Australian Industries Preservation Bill, *2r.*, 9037; *com.* (burden of proof), 9199; (power of Comptroller-General to question, &c.), 9233; *3r.*, 9591
 Bounties Bill, *com.*, (appropriation), 1006, 1022; schedule (mohair), 1096; (olives), 1109, 1119; (peanuts), 1185; (coffee), 1208; (tobacco), 1222, 1226, 1228, 1229, 1230
 Budget, 2922
 Business, Precedence of Government, *m.*, 2803
 Chinese, Influx of, *q.*, 9844
 Commonwealth Salaries Bill, *com.* (Taxation by States), 3885
 Consumption: Prohibited Immigrants, *adj.*, 1683
 Customs Administration:
 Audit Staff, *q.*, 8938; *adj.*, 9094; *supply*, 9990
 Frauds, alleged, *q.*, 23, 590, 6354, 8815, 9089; *adj.*, 9093-8; *q.*, 10180
 Inspector-General, *q.*, 8817
 Customs Tariff Bill, *cons. req.*, (sago and tapioca), 10497, 10501; (stearine, paraffine wax, &c.), 10508; (confectionery), 10515; (matches), 10553; (hats, caps, &c.), 10610-3; (flannelette), 10629; (waddings, &c.), 10632; (manufactures of metal, *n.e.i.*), 10697; (kitchen utensils, cast-iron), 10708-9; (wire-netting), 10772; (oils), 10823, 11550-1-3-6; (paints and colours), 10895-6-7-8-9; (crucibles, &c.), 10903, 11560; (glass, &c.), 10904-5; (disinfectants, &c.), 11001-3-6-7-8, 11566; (stained glass windows), 11186; (paper), 11453; (electricity and gas meters), 11547 (*see* Tariff Resolutions (Customs))

Hutchison, Mr. J.—*continued*.

Defence :

Australian Navy, *Budget*, 2940
 Cadet Uniforms, *q.*, 23
 Cadets, Medical Examination, *q.*, 3586,
 3936, 7248; *supply*, 10083
 Compulsory Service, *Budget*, 2938
 Crimean and Indian Mutiny Veterans, *q.*,
 12040
 Departmental Administration, *Budget*, 2936
 Hanks, Lance-Sergeant, *q.*, 1976
 Naval Agreement, *Budget*, 2940
 Russell, Lieut., *q.*, 1752, 1976
 Thursday Island, *supply*, 11369
 Disputed Elections and Qualifications Bill.
 2r., 6376; *com.* (pending petitions), 6378,
 6382; (qualifications and vacancies), 6386-7.
 title, 6389
 Electoral Act, *address*, 179, 182; *supply*, 9888,
 9890
 Electoral Office Printing, *supply*, 9886-8
 Electoral Rolls, *q.*, 11259
 Estimates, Additional, *supply*, 11369
 Excise Tariff (Agricultural Machinery)
 Act, *m.*, 1090; *q.*, 1750; *supply*, 1795;
q., 2347, 2688, 2700, 2791; *adj.*, 2843;
Budget, 2925; *q.*, 3268, 5520; *adj.*, 5558; *q.*,
 5691; *supply*, 5693; *q.*, 6130, 6354; *adj.*,
 6370; *q.*, 6811, 7026, 7296; *adj.*, 12167
 Excise Tariff (Spirits) Act, *q.*, 4647, 4749
 Federal Capital, *address*, 187
 Finance, Commonwealth and States, *Budget*,
 2934; *q.*, 11525; payment of Surplus Re-
 venue, *q.*, 11784
 Fire Insurance Bill, 2r., 1612
 Flannel, Australian, *Budget*, 2932
 Government, position of the, *supply*, 10493
 Harvesters, Price of, *q.*, 9584
 High Commissioner, *address*, 186
 Hours of Meeting, *adj.*, 3230
 Immigration, *supply*, 9610; statement by Mr.
 Wade as to Commonwealth Policy, *q.*, 11386
 Immigration Leagues, *adj.*, 929
 Immigration Restriction Act: Contract Labour,
q., 5046
 Imperial Conference, *address*, 178
 Invalid and Old-age Pensions Bill, *com.*
 (necessary conditions), 11974-5-6; (occasional
 short absences), 11977-8
 Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway Survey
 Bill, *cons. amdt.*, 2022
 Labour Party, *Budget*, 2923
 Lighthouses, *supply*, 9888
 Manufactures Encouragement Bill, *com.*
 (Regulations), 12175
 Navigation Conference, *address*, 179
 New Protection, *adj.*, 2843; *Budget*, 2925; *q.*,
 6095
 Northern Territory, *address*, 186; *supply*, 9612;
 Accounts, *supply*, 9970
 Old-age Pensions, *address*, 187; *q.*, 880 (See
 Invalid and Old-age Pensions Bill)
 Parliament House: Entertainment of
 Strangers, *adj.*, 6292
 Parliamentary Allowances Bill, *com.* (amount
 of allowance), 1997, 2008; new clause (return
 of increase to revenue), 2012; *q.*, 2449,
 2964
 Parliamentary Witnesses Bill, *com.* (penalty
 for refusing to answer questions), 12071
 Patent and Proprietary Medicines, *adj.*, 886
 Patent Office, *q.*, 882

Hutchison, Mr. J.—*continued*.

Patriot Newspaper, Western Australia; *ad-
 dress*, 180
 Petition: Signatures, *p.o.*, 3409; *obs.*, 3410;
m., 3411, 3418, 3852
 Postal Rates Bill, *q.*, 882
 Post and Telegraph Department:
 Administration, *supply*, 8860
 Cabinet Committee: Report, *q.*, 11525
 Commonwealth Stamp, *q.*, 8818; *supply*,
 8860
 Goodwood Post Office, *q.*, 11260
 Hamilton Post Office, *q.*, 3423
 Mail Motor Cars, *q.*, 9477, 9842
 Newspaper Postage, *q.*, 7027
 Royal Commission, *supply*, 10453
 Telegraph Messengers, *supply*, 8860
 Preferential Trade (Tariff), 4550, 4573, 4789
 Printing Committee, Reports, *m.*, 769, 771,
 1595, 2229, 3171, 3851
 Printing Office, *supply*, 3593
 Public Service:
 Age Retirements, *q.*, 9475
 Commissioner, *address*, 186; *Budget*, 2935
 Employés' Unions: Officials, *supply*, 8860;
q., 8925, 9953
 Entrance Examinations, Adelaide Telephone
 Exchange, *Budget*, 2936
 Examination Papers, *q.*, 12151
 Gratuities to Officers for Suggestions, *sup-
 ply*, 9890
 Increments, *Budget*, 2934
 Landing Officers' Leave, *q.*, 2235
 Overtime, Customs, Melbourne, *q.*, 3969
 Reinstatement of Dismissed Officers, *ad-
 dress*, 185
 Public Service Bill, 2r., 12058
 Quarantine Bill, *com.*, (scope of quarantine),
 1467; (fumigation of vessels to destroy
 vermin), 1621; (vaccination of quarantined
 persons), 1739; *cons. amdt.*, 8953
 Rabbit Destruction, *q.*, 6674
 Senate Election: South Australia, *supply*,
 8859
 Session, Close of the, *q.*, 11790
 State Export Subsidies, *q.*, 1181
 Supply:
 Defence (Central Administration), 10083
 External Affairs (Miscellaneous), 9610
 Home Affairs (Miscellaneous), 9886-8, 9890;
 (Works and Buildings), 11369
 Trade and Customs, 9990
 Treasury (Audit Office), 9970
 Works and Buildings (Treasury), 3593
 Supply Bill (No. 2), *int.*, 1795
 Supply Bill (No. 5), *int.*, 8859
 Tariff, *m.*, 2922:
 Action of New South Wales Government,
q., 2563
 Order of Consideration of Items, *p.o.*,
 4121; *m.*, 4129, 4336, 4358
 Retailers' increased prices, *q.*, 1865
 Wire Netting, *q.*, 1974
 Tariff Resolutions (Customs):
 Agricultural, &c., Machinery and Imple-
 ments, 6555
 Ale, &c., 4129
 Bags, &c., *recom.*, 5732
 Bananas, 5339
 Blue, 4789
 Bottles, 6946-8
 Confectionery, *cons. req.*, 10515
 Crucibles, &c., *cons. req.*, 10993, 11560

Hutchison, Mr. J.—continued.

Tariff Resolutions (Customs)—continued.

- Disinfectants, Sheep Washes, &c., 6981;
cons. req., 11001-3-6-7-8, 11566
- Electrical and Gas Meters, *cons. req.*, 11547
- Explosives, 7386
- Flannelette, *cons. req.*, 10629
- Galvanized Iron, 6535
- Glass, &c., 6916; *cons. req.*, 10904-5
- Hats, Caps, &c., 5950, 5968; *cons. req.*,
10610-3
- Hay and Chaff, 5421
- Hoist, Hollman Patent, 6712
- Importations for Governor-General and State
Governors, 7420
- Kitchen Utensils, cast-iron, *cons. req.*,
10708-9
- Lamps, 6039, 6040
- Machines and Machinery, 6712-4
- Manufactures of Metal, n.e.i., *cons. req.*,
10697
- Manures, 7362
- Matches, *cons. req.*, 10553
- Mining Machinery, 6797-8
- Motive-power Machinery, &c., 6653
- Newspaper Supplements, 7269
- Oils, *cons. req.*, 10823, 11550-1-3-6
- Paints and Colours, *cons. req.*, 10895-6-7-8-9
- Paper, *cons. req.*, 11453
- Peel, preserved, 5334
- Pianos, 7341
- Printing Inks, 7259
- Road Rollers, Traction Engines, &c.,
6700-1-3
- Sago and Tapioca, *cons. req.*, 10497, 10501
- Salt, 5536
- Scientific Apparatus, 6902
- Spirits, 4136-7
- Stained Glass Windows, 6916; *cons. req.*,
11186
- State Importations, 7436
- Stearine, Paraffine Wax, &c., 5142; *cons.*
req., 10508
- Stone and Marble, 6962
- Stoves, 6044
- Stripper-harvesters, 7447
- Tea, 5464
- Timber, 7073, 7095
- Tobacco, 4228
- Type, Printers', 6755
- Waddings, &c., *cons. req.*, 10632
- Wire Netting, 4550, 4573, 4578; *cons. req.*,
10772

(See Customs Tariff Bill.)

Tariff Resolutions (Excise):

- Cigarettes, 4315, 4325
- Transferred Properties, *Budget*, 2936

Irvine, Mr. Hans Grampians:

- Bounties Bill, 2R., 993; *com.*, schedule (rice),
1192; (coffee), 1208
- Budget*, 2914
- Bureau of Agriculture, *Budget*, 2915
- Coast Defence Appropriation Bill, *int.*, 12090
- Customs Tariff Bill, *cons. req.* (paper), 11458.
(See Tariff Resolutions (Customs))
- Finance, Federal and State, *Budget*, 2916
- High Commissioner, *Budget*, 2916
- Immigration, *Budget*, 2915
- Land Settlement, *Budget*, 2915
- London Offices, *Budget*, 2917; *supply*, 3654
- Parliamentary Allowances Bill, *int.*, 1900;
am., (amount of allowance), 2003

Irvine, Mr. Hans—continued.

- Preferential Trade, *Budget*, 2920
- Preferential Trade (Tariff), 4777
- States Debts, *Budget*, 2916-8
- Supply:**
 - Works and Buildings, (London Offices),
3654
- Surplus Revenue Bill, 2R., 11851
- Tariff, *m.*, 2914
- Tariff Resolutions (Customs):**
 - Bags, &c., *recom.*, 5735
 - Biscuits, 4777
 - Blankets, Flannels, &c., 5726
 - Bottles, 6938
 - Carbon Bisulphide, 7392
 - Carpets, &c., 5739
 - Casks, &c., 7134
 - Corks, 7380
 - Disinfectants, Sheep washes, &c., 6987
 - Flannelette, 5925
 - Furniture, 7019
 - Hats, Caps, &c., 5957, 5968, 5974
 - Hay and Chaff, 5432
 - Hogsheads, 7136
 - Manures, 7365
 - Milk, Condensed, &c., 5516
 - Nails, 6618
 - Packages, outside, 7347
 - Paper, *cons. req.*, 11458
 - Shooks, 7137
 - Socks and Stockings, 5935
 - Stone and Marble, 6960
 - Stoves, 6045
 - Timber, 7097
 - Watches, &c., 7151
 - Wire Netting, 4438
 - Yarns, 7377

(See Customs Tariff Bill.)

Irvine, Hon. W. H., K.C., Flinders:

- Address-in-Reply, *m.*, 225
- Advertising Australia, *supply*, 9516
- Australian Industries Preservation Bill, 2R.,
9121; *com.* (power of Comptroller-General
to question, &c.), 9215, 9230; 3R., 9592
- Bounties Bill, 2R., 798; *com.* (appropriation),
1002, 1018; *expl.*, 1279, 1280; *recom.* (regu-
lations), 1391, 1392; 3R., 1396
- Budget*, 2491; *p.o.*, 2656
- Business, Precedence of Government, *m.*,
2800
- Coast Defence Appropriation Bill, *int.*, 12077
- Customs Tariff Amendment Bill (additional
provisoes, South African Preference), 12054
- Customs Tariff Bill, 3R., 7465; *cons. req.* (sago
and tapioca), 10498; (*p.o.*, 10502); (confection-
ery), 10515; (hay and chaff), 10534-7;
(apparel and attire), 10568; (bags and sacks),
p.o., 10572; (gloves), 10578; (hats, caps, &c.),
10580; (*p.o.*, 10627); (motive power ma-
chinery, &c.), 10679; (rock drills), 10730;
(electrical machines), (*p.o.*, 10735), 10742;
(locks), 10777; (paper), 11084; (oils), 11107;
constitutional rights of the House of Re-
presentatives, *m.*, 11432; *p.o.*, 11437; (log
band saws), *p.o.*, 11542-4; (coal cutting
machines), 11544; (gas meters), *p.o.*, 11545;
(disinfectants, sheep washes, &c.), 11565;
m., 11432; *p.o.*, 11437. (See Tariff Resolu-
tions (Customs))

Defence:

- Military Officers, alien servants, &c., 12156-7
- Naval Agreement, *address*, 227

Irvine, Hon. W. H., K.C.—continued.

Excise Procedure Bill, *q.*, 6812; *2R.*, 7472
 Excise Tariff (Agricultural Machinery) Act, *q.*, 5908-9, 6097, 6130
 Federal Capital, *address*, 226
 Finance, Federal and State, *address*, 230;
Budget, 2495; *q.*, 9846, 11328; payment of
 monthly balances, *adj.*, 11735; *q.*, 11738,
 11740-2
 Freeman and Wallace: Correspondence, *sup-
 ply*, 11337
 Government, position of the, *supply*, 10460
 "Grievance" Day, *p.o.*, 10404
 High Commissioner, *supply*, 9518, 9710
 House, Rights of, *m.*, 11432; *p.o.*, 11437
 Immigration, *supply*, 9516, 9710, 9725
 Imperial Conference, *address*, 227
 Judiciary Bill, *m.*, 3772; *2R.*, 3788
 Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway Survey
 Bill, *int.*, 560, 617; *adj.*, 744
 Labour Party: Land Policy, *Budget*, 2491,
 2501
 Loan Policy, *Budget*, 2501
 London Offices of Commonwealth, *supply*,
 3618, 3668
 Mail Contract, cancelled, *address*, 225
 Manufactures Encouragement Bill, *2R.*, 6153;
com. (regulations), 12176; (schedule), 12177
 New Protection, *supply*, 1784; *q.*, 6231
 New Protection (Tariff), 4131, 10535-7
 Parliament: Reflections on Members, *obs.*,
 11107
 Parliamentary Allowances Bill, *int.*, 1883;
m., 1024; *com.*, (amount of allowance), 2001;
 new clause (return of increase to revenue),
 2013
 Parliamentary Witnesses Bill, *com.* (penalty
 for refusing to answer questions), 12072
 Post and Telegraph Department:
 Finances, *supply*, 10184; *q.*, 12151
 Ministerial Statement, *p.o.*, 11630
 Penny Postage, *q.*, 12151
 Prohibition of Letters, *supply*, 11337
 Royal Commission, *p.o.*, 10404; *supply*,
 10460
 Preferential Trade, *address*, 227
 Protective System, *Budget*, 2492
 Public Service: Automatic Increments, *Bud-
 get*, 2502; *expl.*, 2651
 Quarantine Bill, *2R.*, 536; *com.*, (commence-
 ment), 1417; (proclamation of ports of en-
 try), 1553; new clause (repeal of State
 Laws), 1772
 Revenue Returns, *q.*, 10751
 States Debts, *Budget*, 2498
 Supply:
 External Affairs (Miscellaneous), 9516, 9710,
 9725
 Postmaster-General (Central Staff), 10184
 Works and Buildings, (London Offices),
 3618, 3668
 Supply Bill (No. 2), *int.*, 1783-4
 Surplus Revenue Bill, *2R.*, 9861; *q.*, 11328;
2R., 11814
 Tariff, *m.*, 2401:
 Action of New South Wales Government,
q., 2232
 New Protection: Excise, *supply*, 1784
 Order of Consideration of Items, *m.*, 4628
 Rebates on Machinery, *p.o.*, 6720
 Revenue, *supply*, 1783
 Timber Duties: Rebate on butter boxes and
 fruit cases, *q.*, 6421, 6676, 7025

Irvine, Hon. W. H., K.C.—continued.

Tariff Commission, *obs.*, 7465
 Tariff Resolutions (Customs):
 Agricultural, &c., Machinery and Imple-
 ments, 6567, 6573
 Ale, &c., 4131
 Apparel and Attire, *cons. req.*, 10568
 Bags, Sacks, &c., *cons. req.*, (*p.o.*, 10572)
 Coal Cutting Machines, *cons. req.*, 11544
 Confectionery, *cons. req.*, 10515
 Disinfectants, sheep washes, &c., *cons. req.*,
 11565
 Electrical Machines, *cons. req.*, (*p.o.*), 10735
 10742
 Gas Meters, *cons. req.*, *p.o.*, 11545
 Gloves, *cons. req.*, 10578
 Hats, Caps, &c., *cons. req.*, 10580
 Hay and Chaff, *cons. req.*, 10534-7
 Iron and Steel (VI.A), 6841; (VI.B), 6842
 Jewellery, unfinished, 7144
 Locks, *cons. req.*, 10777
 Log Band Saws, *cons. req.*, *p.o.*, 11542-4
 Machines and Machinery (*p.o.*, 6705), 6720
 Motive Power Machinery, *cons. req.*, 10679
 Oils, *cons. req.*, 11107
 Packages, outside, 7348
 Paper, &c., *cons. req.*, 11084
 Pianos, 7348
 Rails, &c., 6815
 Rock Drills, *cons. req.*, 10730
 Sago and Tapioca, *cons. req.*, 10498
 Saws, 6751
 State Importations, 7428
 Stripper-harvesters, 6573
 Sugar, 4754
 Timber, 7021, 7079, 7084, 7086, (*p.o.*, 7092)
 Watches, &c., 7151
 Weighing Machines, &c., 6627
 Wire Netting, 4524
 (See Customs Tariff Bill.)
 Transferred Properties, *q.*, 11742

Johnson, Mr. W. E., Lang:

Additional Sitting Day, *m.*, 6519
 Address-in-Reply, *m.*, 109
 Adjournment, Christmas, *q.*, 7290, 7416
 Advertising Australia: Purchase of *Lone Hand*
 article, *q.*, 10753, 10786, 10879, 10963
 American Fleet, Visit of, *q.*, 10607
 Asiatics, Influx of, *supply*, 9407
 Australia, Maps of, *q.*, 1056
 Australian Industries Preservation Bill, *2R.*,
 9026; *com.* (burden of proof), 9209;
 (power of Comptroller-General to question,
 &c.), 9220, 9235
 Australians Repatriated from South Africa,
q., 503; *supply*, 11362-4
 Beacons, Buoys, and Ocean Lights, *address*,
 121; *q.*, 405; *adj.*, 1469; *Budget*, 2270;
supply, 9801
 Bounties, *address*, 118
 Bounties Bill, *2R.*, 912; *com.*, (appropriation),
 1021; first schedule, 1066; (cotton), 1069,
 1083; (mohair), 1094, 1098; (copra), 1105;
 (cotton seed), 1107, 1108; (linseed), 1108;
 (olives), 1110; (rice), 1188; (coffee), 1203;
 (tobacco), 1218, 1229, 1230; (preserved fish),
 1293; *recom.*, (specification of bounties), 1383
 Budget, 2173, 2262
 Business, order of, *obs.*, 1077; *q.*, 7416; pri-
 vate members', *adj.*, 2686
 Conference of Premiers' (1899) Memorandum,
m., 774

Johnson, Mr. W. E.—*continued.*

Customs Administration :
 Adelaide Frauds, *q.*, 694
 Border Stations, *supply*, 9984
 Broken Hill Customs House, *supply*, 3436
 Fremantle Customs House, *supply*, 3436
 Laboratory, Melbourne, *supply*, 3436
 Launch, Sydney, *supply*, 3436
 Officers and Salaries, *m.*, 11709
 Customs and Excise Revenue, *m.*, 11709
 Customs Tariff Bill, *q.*, 9390; *cons. req.* (hats, caps, &c.), 10617; (parasols, &c.), 10622; (waddings, &c.), 10634-5-9; (wigs, &c.), 10655; (electrical machines), 10734, 10740; (*p.o.*, 10734-9), 11448; (wire netting), 10757; (locks), 10794; (oils), 10892 (*p.o.*, 10910), 10980; (paints and colours), 10895-8-9; (fibro-cement, &c.), 10900-2; (glass, &c.), 10907; (slate slabs), 10998; (stone and marble), 10999, 11452; (disinfectants, &c.), 11005-7; (timber), 11035, 11121, 11161-5; (wood, wicker, &c.), 11056; (barometers, &c.), 11060-2-3; (kinematographs, &c.), 11064; (paper), 11077, 11090, 11455; (licht-pausrohpapier), 11173; (photographic accessories), 11176; (stained glass windows), 11190; (surgical appliances), 11192; (rebate schedule), 11213; (curtains, &c.), 11439; (electrical apparatus), 11449; (woollen piece goods), 11464; (standards, &c.), 11548; (oils), 11113. (*See* Tariff Resolutions (Customs))
 Defence :
 Australian Naval Cadets, *Budget*, 2270
 Flag, *supply*, 10119
 Fortifications, New South Wales and Western Australia, *supply*, 3446
 Government Policy, *supply*, 8846
 Guns, Lights, and Emplacements, *supply*, 3741, 3747
 Guns, Sydney Heads Forts, *Budget*, 2270; *supply*, 3446
 Harbor and Coastal Defence, *supply*, 3741-2, 3747
 Military Officers : Statements in Parliament, *q.*, 12043
 Morris Tubes, *q.*, 9478
 Naval Agreement, *address*, 112; *q.*, 1378; *supply*, 1806; *Budget*, 2270; *supply*, 3340; *q.*, 7461, 8815, 12040-1.
 Naval Defence Policy, *q.*, 5237
 Officers, shortage of, *supply*, *p.o.*, 3455
 Rifle Ranges, *supply*, 3449
 Small Arms Factory, *supply*, 3736
 Swan Island Boat Harbor, *supply*, 3449
 Torpedo Boats, tenders for, *q.*, 1750
 Electoral Act Administration, *supply*, 1808
 Electoral Rolls, *supply*, 11366
 Empire : Australian Loyalty, *q.*, 11154-5
 Estimates, Additional, *supply*, 11287, 11358, 11362-4-6-7, 11377, 11400
 Estimates : Contingencies, *supply*, 1808
 Excise Tariff (Agricultural Machinery) Act, *q.*, 4927
 Expenditure, Increase of, *supply*, 9994
 Federal Capital, *address*, 110; *q.*, 297; *adj.*, 1469; *supply*, 1878; *Budget*, 2271; *q.*, 2650; *supply*, 1899; *q.*, 3508, 7111; *supply*, 8845; *q.*, 9842; *supply*, 9886, 10477; *q.*, 11181
 Finance, Commonwealth and State, *supply*, 3338, 11287; Payment of Monthly Balances, *adj.*, 11736; *q.*, 11739
 Government, position of the, *address*, 109; *supply*, 10477

Johnson, Mr. W. E.—*continued.*

Governor-General's Residences, *supply*, 9884
 Harvesters : Excise, *Budget*, 2267
 High Commissioner, *address*, 118; *q.*, 9091
 Immigration : Land Question, *supply*, 8077, 9407
 Imperial Conference, *address*, 111; *supply*, 1807; Delegates' Expenses, *supply*, 11362
 Invalid and Old-age Pensions Bill, *com.* (penalty for disobedience of summons), 11063
 Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway Survey Bill, *int.*, 620; *2r.*, 719; *com.* (Power to make survey), 737, 738
 Kanakas, repatriated, *q.*, 502; *supply*, 1806
 London Offices, *q.*, 3732, 3851
 Mail Contracts :
 Cancelled, *address*, 118; *q.*, 352, 1517; *supply*, 2900; *q.*, 9388
 Mail Service to Europe, *q.*, 80, 297; *m.*, 6456, 6499
 Orient Company's Temporary Contract, *supply*, 2901
 Manufactures Encouragement Bill, *q.*, 7416
 Meteorological Branch, *address*, 120; *supply*, 1808
 Navigation Conference, *address*, 114; *q.*, 404
 New Hebrides, *m.*, 470; *q.*, 647, 1413, 1590, 2121, 8818; *supply*, 9410, 9499; *q.*, 10877
 New Protection, *Budget*, 2175; *q.*, 3173
 New Protection (Tariff), 4107
 Northern Territory, *address*, 121; *m.*, 469; *Budget*, 2271; *adj.*, 2346; *q.*, 2566, 4413
 Old-age Pensions, *supply*, 9350, 11288. (*See* Invalid and Old-age Pensions Bill)
 Opium Smuggling, *q.*, 9099
 Pacific Islands : Trade, *q.*, 1378; *supply*, 1806, 9499; Foreign Powers, *supply*, 9412
 Mail Service, *supply*, 9514
 Pairs, *expl.*, 6519, 6793
 Papua, *supply*, 9409, 9498, 9505-6; suspension of Mr. Drummond, *q.*, 10878, 11742; Administrator, *supply*, 9505-6; *q.*, 11235
 Parliament :
 Exhibits : Lobbying, *q.*, 6591, 7115; *obs.*, 10980
 Lighting, *q.*, 7249
 Reflections on Members, *q.*, 8925; *m.*, 9953; *obs.*, 10980, 11113
 Parliamentary Witnesses Bill, *com.* (short title), 11780; (escape from custody), 11781; (disobedience of summons), 11782; (preventing witnesses from giving evidence), 11783, 12066
 Pearl Fisheries : Immigration Restriction Act, *q.*, 9582
 Petition : Signatures, *p.o.*, 3408; *obs.*, 3410; *m.*, 3417
 Pianos : Invoice value, *q.*, 7172
 Post and Telegraph Department : Royal Commission, *obs.*, 8817; *supply*, 10246, 10424; Ministerial Statement, *p.o.*, 11630
 Post and Telegraph Offices :
 Cloncurry Post Office, *supply*, 3532
 Dalby Post Office, *supply*, 3531
 Marrickville Post Office, *supply*, 9880
 Melbourne General Post Office, *supply*, 3528
 Northam Post Office, *supply*, 3537
 Rockdale Post Office, *supply*, 3340
 Roma Post Office, *supply*, 3520
 St. Peter's Post Office, *supply*, 3517
 Sydney General Post Office, *supply*, 3516
 Toowoomba Post Office, *supply*, 3532

Johnson, Mr. W. E.—*continued.*

Postal and Telegraphic Service :
Administration : New South Wales, *adj.*, 6231; *supply*, 6283
Broken Shifts : Mail Branch : Sydney General Post Office, *q.*, 6896
Delays in Answering Correspondence, *supply*, 10247
Delayed Telegrams, *q.*, 4748
Increase of Staff : New South Wales, *q.*, 4842; *supply*, 4855
Officials as Returning Officers, *m.*, 710
Penny Postage, *Budget*, 2270
Penny Postage Radius : New South Wales, *supply*, 10247, 11400
Prohibition of Medical Quacks' Correspondence, *q.*, 1751
Sans Souci and Sandringham : requirements, *supply*, 3519
Stamp, Commonwealth, *supply*, 11400
Sydney General Post Office : Overtime and Sweating, *supply*, 4855; *q.*, 5416; *supply*, 6283; *q.*, 7171; Parcels Branch, *supply*, 8843
Telegraphic Delays, *q.*, 10874
Telegraphists' Pay for Sunday Work, *q.*, 10134; *supply*, 10248; *q.*, 11016
Temporary Hands, *supply*, 8844, 11400
Typewriting Machines for Telegraphists, *q.*, 5520
Vote for, *supply*, 11287-9
Preferential Trade, *q.*, 11627
Preferential Trade (Tariff), 4783, 4870, 5080
Prime Minister, Health of the, *adj.*, 3230
Printing Committee, *p.o.*, 770
Privilege : Select Committee upon Procedure, *m.*, 9953
Public Service :
Allowances, Western Australia, *supply*, 11367
Customs, New South Wales, *q.*, 1281
Increments, Sydney General Post Office, *q.*, 2794
Temporary Employés, *supply*, 11358-64-77, 11400
Quarantine Bill, *com.* (scope of quarantine), 1459; (examination of imported animals), 1755
Questions, *p.o.*, 606; Ministers' answers to, *supply*, 2896
Secret Drugs : Mr. Beale's Report, *adj.*, 3004; *q.*, 9956; *supply*, 9980
Session, Close of the, *q.*, 10180, 11703
Shipping Combine, *adj.*, 3956
Shipping, equipment of, *address*, 114
Standing Orders, *q.*, 6421
Statistics, Printing of, *supply*, 9876-8
Sugar : Bounty and Excise, *Budget*, 2270
Supply :
Attorney-General, 11364
Defence (Central Administration), 10119
External Affairs (Administrative), 8977, 9497, 11358; (Papua), 9409, 9498, 9505; (Pacific Islands Mail Service), 9514; (Miscellaneous), 11362-4
Home Affairs (Census and Statistics), 9876-8; (Meteorological Branch), 9880; (Works and Buildings), 9880; (Governor-General's Establishment), 9884; (Miscellaneous), 9886, 9891; (Electoral Office), 11366; (Public Service Commissioner), 11367
Postmaster-General (Central Staff), 10246, 11400
Trade and Customs, 9984, 9990-4, 11377

Johnson, Mr. W. E.—*continued.*

Supply—*continued.*
Treasury (Government Printer), 9980
Works and Buildings (Home Affairs), 3338; (Post and Telegraph), 3340, 3516; (*p.o.*, 3520), 3528, 3530, 3531, 3537; (Defence), 3340, 3446, 3449, 3455, 3736, 3741, 3747; (Trade and Customs), 3435, 3443; (Telegraphs and Telephones), 3549
Supply Bill (No. 2), *int.*, 1802, 1805; *ad. rep.*, 1877
Supply Bill (No. 3), *int.*, 5800
Supply Bill (No. 4), *int.*, 6283
Supply Bill (No. 5), *int.*, 8842
Surplus Revenue Bill, *2d.*, 11748
Tariff, *m.*, 2173, 2262; *supply*, 2899, 4106; *ad. rep.*, 7453 :
British Goods, Preference, *q.*, 2235, 2311
Debates, conclusion of, *q.*, 11052
Dressed Timber, *q.*, 3300, 3420
Duties, increase of, *p.o.*, 5640
Effect on Employment, *q.*, 10608
Goods in transit : exemptions, *q.*, 1976
Hat and Machinery Duties : Pairs, *expl.*, 6519, 6793
Hat-making Machinery : Rebates, *q.*, 6729; *obj.*, 6745; *q.*, 6813; *cons. req.*, 11213
Lining Boards, *q.*, 4199
Personal explanation, *adj.*, 4243
Petition, 3619
Photographic Plates, *q.*, 3854
Potato Flour, *q.*, 5415
Printing Paper : Exemption from Duty, *q.*, 11179
Recommittal of items, *ad. rep.*, 7453
Refunds of Duty, *q.*, 4199, 7300
Senate's Requests, *q.*, 9390
Stimulus to Industries, *q.*, 9090
Tartaric Acid, &c. : Collection of Duty, *q.*, 11098
Wholesalers' increased prices, *supply*, 1803; *q.*, 1867, 2564
Wire Netting, *q.*, 4199
Tariff Resolutions (Customs) :
Agricultural, &c., Machinery and Implements, 6564-5-8, 6588
Ale, &c., 4106
Ammonia, 6969
Ammonia Condenser Coils, 6113
Apparel and Attire, 5629
Arms, 6038
Asphalt Mastic, 6909
Bananas, 5336, 5340
Barometers, &c., *cons. req.*, 11060-2-3
Biscuits, 4774
Blacking, &c., 6845, 6850, 6855-6-8
Blankets, Flannels, &c., 5712, 5718, 5725, 5730
Blue, 4780, 4783
Buckets, &c., 7138, 7139
Candles, 4870, 4952, 5080, 5132-3-4
Chaffcutters, &c., 6564-5
Churns, &c., 6568
Cigarettes, 4304
Citrus Fruits, 5333
Clay Smoking Pipes, 7397
Cocoa Butter, &c., 5259
Cocoa and Chocolate, 5256-8
Coffee, 5262-3
Combs, &c., 7142
Confectionery, 5220, 5241, 5245, 5255
Cornflour, 5348, 5356
Curtains, &c., *cons. req.*, 11439
Disinfectants, &c., *cons. req.*, 11005-7

Johnson, Mr. W. E.—*continued.*Tariff Resolutions (Customs)—*continued.*

Electrical Apparatus, *cons. req.*, 11449
 Electrical Machinery, 6805; *cons. req.*, 10734,
 10740, 11448
 Ethers, 4139
 Fancy Goods, 7141-2
 Feathers, 5636
 Fibro-cement, &c., *cons. req.*, 10900-2
 Fish, 5265, 5272, 5275
 Flannelette, 5919, 5926
 Furniture, 7003, 7015, 7020, 7021
 Galvanized Iron, 6532
 Glass, &c., 6916, 6920; *cons. req.*, 10907
 Gloves, 5940
 Glue and Gelatine, 6948, 6952-4-5
 Hats, Caps, &c., 5952, 5956, 5962, 5966,
 5968; *cons. req.*, 10617
 Incandescent Filament Lamps, &c., 6809
 Infants and Invalids' Foods, 5521, 5525
 Jewellery, 7146-8
 Kinematographs, &c., *cons. req.*, 11064
 Lasts and Trees, 7126
 Lead, 6049, 6051-2
 Leaf and Foil, 6114
 Leather and Rubber Belting, &c., 7164
 Licht-pausrohpapier, 7269; *cons. req.*, 11173
 Locks, *cons. req.*, 10794
 Machines and Machinery, 6715, 6739, 6745
 Metal and Plated Ware, 6112
 Molasses, 4765
 Nails, 6610, 6618, 6619, 6620
 Oils, *cons. req.*, 10892, 10980, 11113
 Oilmen's Stores, n.e.i., 5522
 Opium, 6996
 Paints and Colours, 6876-9, 6882-3-6; *cons.*
req., 10895-8-9
 Paper, manufactures of, 7185; *cons. req.*,
 11077
 Paper, &c., 7234-5-7-8; *cons. req.*, 11090,
 11455
 Parasols, &c., *cons. req.*, 10622
 Perfumery, 6998
 Photographic Accessories, *cons. req.*, 11176
 Photographs, 7267
 Pianos, 7307
 Pipes, &c., 7396-7
 Potato Flour, 5344
 Printing Roller Composition, 6956
 Rebate : Machinery, 6745; *cons. req.*, 11213
 Rice, 5530, 5533
 Rice Root, 4793
 Roofing Slates, 6957
 Rubber Hose, 7159
 Rubber Manufactures, 7160-2
 Sago and Tapioca, 4774
 Saws, 6752
 Sewing Machines, 6099, 6111
 Sheep Shearing Machines, 6588
 Slate Slabs, *cons. req.*, 10998
 Soap, 5543, 5546
 Socks and Stockings, 5936
 Stained Glass Windows, 6916; *cons. req.*,
 11190
 Standards, &c., *cons. req.*, 11548
 Starch, 5547-8
 Stationery, &c., 7243
 Stearine, Paraffine Wax, &c., 5144
 Steel, band or ribbon, 6116
 Stone and Marble, 6958; *cons. req.*, 10999,
 11452
 Stoves, 6045
 Strawboard, 7231

Johnson, Mr. W. E.—*continued.*Tariff Resolutions (Customs)—*continued.*

Sugar, Invert, 4764
 Surgical Appliances, *cons. req.*, 11192
 Timber, 7045, 7089; *cons. req.*, 11035, 11121,
 11161-5
 Tobacco, 4219, 4243, 4285
 Trimmings, &c., 5938
 Type, Printers', 6763
 Vehicles, 7286, 7292-3
 Waddings, &c., *cons. req.*, 10634-5-9
 Weighing Machines, &c., 6626, 6632
 Wigs, 5939; *cons. req.*, 10655
 Wine, 4140
 Wire-netting, 4529; *cons. req.*, 10757
 Wood Wicker and Cane, *expl.*, 7001; *cons.*
req., 11056
 Woollen Piece Goods, 5810; *cons. req.*, 11464
 (See Customs Tariff Bill)
 Tariff Resolutions (Excise):
 Cigarettes, 4317
 Tariff Revision, *address*, 115
 Telephone Service, *Budget*, 2270; *supply*, 8843;
 Como Bureau, *supply*, 3518
 Disinfection of Receivers, *supply*, 3549
 Melbourne-Sydney, *q.*, 11179
 Miranda facilities, *supply*, 3519
 Public Bureaux, *q.*, 10178
 Rockdale Exchange, *supply*, 3518
 Sylvania, *supply*, 3519
 Transferred Properties, *Budget*, 2271
 Trawler, *supply*, 3443
 Ventilation of Chamber, *adj.*, 3683
 Warning Light, Sydney General Post Office,
supply, 9880
 Wire-netting, seizure of: Cancellation of car-
 riers' licences, *q.*, 2687, 2793; *supply*, 2896
 Women's Work Exhibition Grant, *supply*,
 1804, 1877

Keating, Senator Hon. J. H., *Tasmania* :

Acts and Documents : Distribution, *q.*, 6061
 Additional Appropriation Bill 1907-8, *com.*,
 Schedule : Home Affairs (Electoral Office),
 11617-8
 Additional Appropriation (Works and Build-
 ings) Bill 1907-8, *com.*, Schedule (Home
 Affairs), 11692-6
 Appropriation Bill, *com.*, Schedule : Home
 Affairs (Electoral Office), 10304; (Census
 and Statistics), 10306-7; (Miscellaneous),
 10307-8-9; 3R., 10398
 Appropriation (Works and Buildings) Bill,
com. (Trade and Customs), 3931; (De-
 fence), 4044; (Telegraphs and Telephones),
 4050
 Bills of Exchange Bill, *int.*, 132; 2R., 651; *com.*
 (application of State laws), 668; *p.o.*, 671, 674,
 747, 1585, 1592, 1705, 1966, 1972; (signature
 essential to liability), 747; (accommodation
 bill or party), 748; (non-acceptance), 748;
 (notice of dishonour), 748; (presentment of
 cheque), 750, 2056, 2060; (protection of
 banker: cheques), 755, 2063, 2194, 2205,
 2208, 2209; (good faith), 758; (signature),
 759; (protest: notary), 760, 762; (computa-
 tion of time), 2210; Second Schedule, 2284;
recom., new clauses (State stamp duty),
 2293; (post-dated cheque), 2297, 2298; (pro-
 tection of banker: promissory notes), 2299;
recom., 2407; (presentment of stale cheque),
 2408, 2411, 2413; (protest: notary), 2415;
 Second Schedule, 2419

Keating, Senator Hon. J. H.—*continued.*

Bounties Bill, 1R., 1471; 2R., 1707, 2762; *com.* (specification of bounties), 2769, 2770; (offences against Act), 2771-2-5; new clause (prevention of monopoly), 2776; new clause, (supply of information by applicant), 2778, 2782, 2784, 2786; (regulations), 2787, 2848, 2854, 2859; First Schedule (cotton), 2867, 2872; (New Zealand flax), 3072; (jute), 3160; (sisal hemp), 3267; (mohair), 3380; (copra), 3395; (rice), 3465, 3474; (rubber), 3491, 3559; (coffee), 3720, 3723-4; (tobacco), 4247, 4261; (fish), 4262-3-5, 4270; (dates), 4382; (wool tops), 4391; Second Schedule, 4391-2, 4482; *recom.*, 4386; First Schedule (coffee), 4896; (tobacco), 4897; *cons. mes.*, 6410-1-2-3-4; Regulations, *q.*, 9138

Cable to Tasmania, *q.*, 1566, 1815, 2179, 2407; *supply*, 4050; *q.*, 4470, 5560, 7623; King Island, *q.*, 11467, 11863-4, 11987; Eastern Extension Telegraph Company, *supply*, 12138

Collins, Captain, *q.*, 1814

Commerce Act, *q.*, 7701

Compulsory Voting, *q.*, 650

Customs Tariff Bill, *com.*, Schedule :

Acetic Acid, &c., 9237-9
Ammonia, &c., 9240 (*p.o.*, 9242-6), 9275-7-9, 9280

Art, Works of, 9937

Bananas, 7838, 7872

Basketware, *n.e.i.*, 9572

Bicycles, &c., 9815, 9821

Blacking, &c., 8366

Blacks, 8473-4-6

Bottles, 8496-7-9, 8500-1

Bronzing, &c., Powders, 8375

Buckets and Tubs, 9640

Carbide of Calcium, 9257

Carbonic Acid Gas, 9253

Casks, &c., 9644-5

Chemical Compounds, &c., 9293

Children's Tricycles, 9822

Coffee, 7762, 7780-1-2

Cresylic Acid, &c., 9273

Cycle Parts, 9824-5

Doors of Wood, 9640

Drugs and Chemicals, 9270-1-2

Fire Bricks, &c., 8479

Fish, 7783-4, 7797

Frames, Photograph and Picture, 9641

Fruits, citrus, 7829

Furniture, 9353-4-6

Ginger, green, 7832

Glass, 8483-9, 8490-1-2-3-4-6

Globes, 9813

Glue, &c., 8502-3-9, 8513

Glycerine, &c., 9297

Grain and Pulse, 7889, 7894, 7907, 7919

Graphite, &c., 8368-9

Hay and Chaff, 7933

Hogsheads, second-hand, 9647

Honey, Jams, &c., 7945

Insecticides, Sheep Washes, &c., 9280

Isinglass, 8064

Licht-pausrohpapier, 9814-5

Lounges and Settees, 9385-6

Malt Extract, 7956-9

Matches, 8009, 8010

Meats, &c., 8012-4

Medicines, 9293

Motor Cycles, &c., 9822

Naphthalene, 9275

Keating, Senator Hon. J. H.—*continued.*

Customs Tariff Bill (Schedule)—*continued.*

Nuts, 8033-6-7

Oatmeal, &c., 7919

Oilmen's Stores, 8047, 8059

Oils, 8387, 8391, 8414-5-6-7, 8424, 8444-6-7

Onions, 7883-7

Paint Removers, &c., 8472

Paints, 8450-1, 8471

Paper, &c., 9679, 9680, 9744-5, 9755-7-8-9, 9762, 9797-8-9, 9800-1

Patterns, Paper, 9808

Pencils, Pens, &c., 9801, 9810-1-2-3

Perambulators, &c., 9822-3-4

Poles, Bent, 9643

Printing Ink, 9805

Printing Roller Composition, 8520-6

Rennet, &c., 8065

Rice, 8067, 8083-6-7

Roasting Dishes, &c., 8482

Roofing Tiles, &c. 8478-9

Saccharine, 9272

Salt, 8090

Sausage Casings, 8018

Shafts, 9642

Slate Slabs, 8528, 8532

Soap, 8096

Spices, 8099

Sparklets, 8100

Stained Glass Windows, 8483, 9937

Starch Flour, 8101

Stone and Marble, 8535, 8549, 8550-1-2

Strawboard, 9755

Tallow, &c., 8377, 8380-1

Tartaric Acid, &c., 0293

Tea, 8108

Timber, 9387, 9425, 9449, 9455-6, 9462-5-6-9, 9538-9, 9547-8 (*p.o.*, 9550-1), 9554-6-7, 9562-3

Tobacco, 7634, 7647-8-9-50-2

Tool Handles, &c., 9634-5

Vegetables, 7872

Vegetables, Herbs, dried, 7874-5

Vehicles, 9826-9, 9830-2-3

Voltoids of Sal-ammoniac, 9275-7-9, 9280

Wicker, &c., 9564, 9570

Wine, sparkling, 7625-9

Wood, Articles of, *n.e.i.*, 9573-7-9

Defence :

Ammunition, Defective, *q.*, 3463; *adj.*, 4618

Ammunition Factory, *q.*, 6409

Ammunition Waggon, *q.*, 4245, 4364

Australian Appointments : Defence Forces, *q.*, 4471

Berringa Rifle Club, *q.*, 2616, 5978, 7841

Boots, Service, *q.*, 9137

Cadet Forces, *q.*, 8672, 8866

Cadet Uniforms, *q.*, 249, 11580

Cadets : New South Wales : Equipment, *q.*, 11219; Western Australia, *q.*, 3464, 3706

Cartridge Blanks, *q.*, 9237, 9796, 10255

Cartridges, *q.*, 9796

Coastal Vessels, *q.*, 2179

Corps of Guides, *supply*, 8090

Dove, Major, *q.*, 10253-4-5

Fremantle Barrack Accommodation, *supply*, 11666

Fremantle Graving Dock, *q.*, 7977, 8700, 10369

Hobart Barrack Reserve, *q.*, 2615

Hobart Rifle Range, *supply*, 4044 *q.*, 4142

Horses, *supply*, 8995; *q.*, 9137

Kerang Rifle Range, *q.*, 8424

Keating, Senator Hon. J. H.—*continued.*Defence—*continued.*

Lithgow: Land for Small-arms Factory, *supply*, 11692
 Maribyrnong: Land for Cordite Factory, *supply*, 11692
 Military Leather Equipments, *q.*, 9042
 Military Saddles, *q.*, 10920; *supply*, 12140
 Military Schools, Melbourne and Sydney, *q.*, 4143
 Military Uniforms, *q.*, 353, 354, 5859, 6295, 9797, 11303
 Nairne Easter Encampment, *q.*, 9137
 Naval Officers' Report, *q.*, 9633, 11301, 11580; *supply*, 12140
 Officers sent Abroad, *supply*, 12147
 One-Tree Point Battery, *q.*, 4142
 Percussive Caps, *q.*, 11986
 Protector, *supply*, 12147
 Rifle Clubs: Western Australia, *q.*, 6061, 6294; Relations with Commandant, *q.*, 7572
 Rifle Matches, Sydney: Charge for Tents, *q.*, 5083-4, 5283, 6189
 State Forces, Quotas, *q.*, 4471; *adj.*, 4618
 Submarines, *q.*, 7754
 Tenth Australian Infantry Regiment, *q.*, 8424
 Thursday Island Fortifications: Explosion, *q.*, 11678; *supply*, 11696, 12147
 Torpedo Boats, *q.*, 1814, 1928, 2179, 4471, 11301, 11580; *supply*, 12140
 Transport Waggons, *q.*, 7704, 7752; *m.*, 7844
 Wireless Telegraph Stations, *q.*, 9537
 Eastern Extension Telegraph Company, *supply*, 12138
 Election Expenses: Recoup, *supply*, 10304
 Election Expenses Reimbursement Bill, 2R., 12148
 Electoral Act:
 Amending Bill, *q.*, 9796; *supply*, 11618-9, 12145
 Electoral officers: Western Australia, *supply*, 10304-5
 Interference with voters; Corio, *adj.*, 2449; *q.*, 3364, 4362
 Nomination paper, Bowen, *q.*, 9735; *supply*, 10398
 Rolls, Publication of, *q.*, 9633; Removal of Names, *supply*, 11617-8; *q.*, 11983-4
 Excise Procedure Bill, *q.*, 4363; *int.*, 4472; 2R., 5114; *com.* (power to appoint assessors), 5118; new clauses (exclusion of lawyers), 5120, 5124; (protection of witnesses), 5129
 Excise Tariff Bill, *com.*, Schedule (Tobacco), 10015; (amylac alcohol, &c.), 10025; (glucose), 10027-31
 Exports: Statistical Tables, *q.*, 1816
 Federal Capital Sites, *q.*, 828, 829, 10004; maps, *m.*, 10369
 Fire Insurance: Commonwealth, *supply*, 12145
Hansard, *q.*, 5177
 Immigration Restriction Act: Bonds for Sick Sailors, *q.*, 10829
 Industrial Awards, *q.*, 8103, 8154
 Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway Survey Bill, 3R., 1694; *q.*, 3558, 7541, 7927, 8221, 8505, 11217
 Kanakas, Repatriation of, *supply*, 8087
 Labour Bureau: Wages and Cost of Living, *q.*, 11303

Keating, Senator Hon. J. H.—*continued.*

Land, Alienated and Unalienated, *q.*, 4364
 Land Claim: Mr. Spencer, *q.*, 5283
 Lighthouses, *supply*, 10308-9, 12146
 Mail Contracts:
 Cooktown Service, *q.*, 11987
 North-West Coast, Western Australia, *supply*, 10398
 Tasmania, *q.*, 745; *obs.*, 829; *q.*, 2845, 2941
 Map of Australasia, *supply*, 10307, 12145
 Marine Signal Stations, South Australia, *supply*, 4051
 Meteorologists: International Conference, *q.*, 8422
 Meteorology, *supply*, 140, 8088; Tasmanian Forecasts, *q.*, 7568, 7843; *adj.*, 7652
 Northern Territory: Mining, *q.*, 931
 Officers' Compensation Act, *q.*, 10828, 10919
 Papers, printing of, *m.*, 248
 Papua: Steam Service, *q.*, 1927
 Parliament: Accommodation, *supply*, 8085; Personal Attendance, *supply*, 8086
 Parliamentary Papers Bill, 2R., 12127; *com.* (no action for publishing Parliamentary Papers), 12131-3; (no action for publishing copies, &c.), 12136
 Parliamentary Witnesses Bill, *int.*, 354; 2R., 763; *com.* (escape from custody), 765; (preventing witnesses from giving evidence), 766
 Penny Postage, *q.*, 1233
 Post and Telegraph Department:
 Alleged Disorganization, *supply*, 9002
 Eucla Allotments, *q.*, 6297
 Queensland, *q.*, 4705
 Stores and Material, *supply*, 9003
 Tenders: British Preference, *q.*, 8868
 Post and Telegraph Offices:
 Post and Telegraph Office, Moora, *q.*, 5178
 Post Office, Port Pirie, *q.*, 745, 8700
 Postal Rates Bill, *q.*, 4037
 Postal Service:
 "Allowance" Postmasters, *q.*, 8617, 8698
 Assistant Sorters, Brisbane, *q.*, 11471
 Boy Labour, *q.*, 1470
 Carting of Mails, Brisbane, *q.*, 1688
 Contracts for Uniforms: Wages Conditions, *q.*, 7542, 7571
 Cue: Postmaster, *q.*, 6296
 Delay in delivery of letters, *adj.*, 1055
 Delay of Nomination Paper, Bowen, *q.*, 9735; *supply*, 10398
 Early Closing of Offices, *q.*, 5980
 East Brighton: Postmaster, *q.*, 8617, 8698
 Eucla: Purchase of Allotments, *q.*, 6297
 Launceston Post Office Staff, *q.*, 7848, 8029, 9735, 10003
 Letter Carriers, Brisbane, *q.*, 10370, 11384; Queensland, *q.*, 1232
 Letter Clearers, Brisbane, *q.*, 3233
 Mitchell, Hundred of, South Australia, *q.*, 9633
 Moonta Mines, *q.*, 8154, 8286
 Motor Cars, *q.*, 4471, 8423
 Newspapers: Delivery of, *q.*, 7926
 Port Adelaide Outer Harbor facilities, *q.*, 7976
 Port Pirie, *q.*, 29, 132
 Postage on News-sheets, *q.*, 1688
 Postal Facilities: Western Australia, *adj.*, 4926; *q.*, 5178
 Queensland Mails, *q.*, 2031

Keating, Senator Hon. J. H.—*continued.*

Postal Service—*continued.*

Queensland Postal Staff, *q.*, 1233, 11384, 11471
 Springfield Post Office: Mrs. Murray, *q.*, 6407
 Stamps, Design for, *q.*, 3083, 5648
 Stamps, Sale of: Gawler Post Office, *q.*, 5082, 7569
 Stockwell Post Office Staff, *q.*, 10252
 Sydney General Post Office: Underman-
 ning, *q.*, 6296
 Sydney-Melbourne Mail, *q.*, 10252
 Sydney Mail Branch, *q.*, 3798
 Tasmanian Mails for England, *q.*, 131; *adj.*,
 157; *q.*, 2845, 2941
 Tasmanian Mails: Carriage from Victoria,
q., 1815, 1029, 2031
 Tattersall's Sweeps Correspondence: Tas-
 manian Bank's Action, *q.*, 8364
 Printing Committee, *m.*, 7844
 Printing Office, Commonwealth, *q.*, 4707
 Printing Office, Melbourne, *supply*, 8089,
 8991-2
 Public Offices, Melbourne, *q.*, 5284
 Public Service:
 Actions by Dismissed Officers, *q.*, 6296,
 7569
 Allowances, Queensland, *q.*, 7977, 8483
 Blakney, Mr. E. A.: Classification and pro-
 motion, *q.*, 7702, 7752, 7796; *obs.*, 7848;
q., 8364, 8555, 8699, 8867, 9743
 Boards of Inquiry: Divisional Representa-
 tive, Queensland, *q.*, 8672
 Civic Positions, *q.*, 7754, 7926, 7977, 8221;
adj., 8421; *q.*, 8554, 9139
 Classification: Tasmanian Postal Depart-
 ment, *q.*, 8699
 Commissioner's Report, *q.*, 8076
 Examinations, *q.*, 4144
 Gratuities for Suggestions, *supply*, 10307
 List of Officers, *q.*, 8076
 Long Service Leave, *q.*, 7572, 11384
 Medical Officers, *supply*, 10307
 Office Cleaners, *supply*, 10307
 Overtime Payments, Western Australia, *q.*,
 7754, 7791-2
 Plebiscite of Post and Telegraph Officers:
 Grievances, *q.*, 7704
 Regulations, *m.*, 690; *q.*, 1684
 Superannuation Fund, *q.*, 7704
 Suspended Officer: Brisbane, *q.*, 6296
 Transfers to Clerical Division, *q.*, 5176
 Quarantine, *q.*, 2405, 5367, 8508
 Quarantine Bill, 2R., 2941; *com.* (scope of
 quarantine), 5304; (arrangements with State
 Governments: stations, &c.), 5305, 5317;
 (powers of Commonwealth), 5322, 5325,
 5483-4, 5670, 5987; new paragraph (ex-
 clusion of consumptives), *p.o.*, 5992; (ex-
 emption of vessels), 5993; (disinfecting ap-
 paratus on vessels), 5993-4; (vessels to enter
 first ports of entry), 5995; (hoisting of quaran-
 tine signal), 5997; (signal), 5998, 6225-6;
 (master to deliver health report), 5999;
 (master and medical officer to answer ques-
 tions), 5999, 6000; (no person to quit vessel
 subject to quarantine), 6000; (quarantine
 officer allowed to quit vessel), 6002; (quar-
 antine surveillance), 6003; (performance of
 quarantine by persons), 6005; (release from
 quarantine), 6005; (performance of quar-
 antine by goods), 6006, 6062; (examination

Keating, Senator Hon. J. H.—*continued.*

of imported animals), 6065, 6067; (liability
 of owners, &c., for provisions for qua-
 antined persons), 6073, 6077, 6082; (persons
 able to support themselves), 6217-9, 6220;
 (owners liable for services of medical officer),
 6220; (quarantine signals), 6226; (general
 definitions), 6227; (persons may be vaccin-
 ated), 6222-4; (general definitions), 6225-7
 Questions, responsibility for answers to, *q.*,
 7792
 Senate Election: South Australia, *q.*, 3364,
 8423
 Statistics, printing of, *q.*, 1130-1, 1816; *sup-
 ply*, 10306
 Stores, Tenders for, *q.*, 9041
 Supply Bill (No. 1), *com.*, Schedule: Home
 Affairs: (Meteorology), 140
 Supply Bill (No. 5), *com.*, Schedule: The
 Parliament, 8985; External Affairs (Repatri-
 ation of Kanakas), 8987; Home Affairs
 (Electoral Office), 8988; (Meteorology),
 8988; Treasury (Government Printing
 Office), 8989, 8991-2; Defence, 8995-6-8-9,
 9001; Post and Telegraph, 9002
 Supply Bill (No. 1), 1908-9, 1R., 12138; *com.*,
 Schedule. Home Affairs (Miscellaneous),
 12145-6; Defence: (Central Administration),
 12146; (South Australia), 12147
 Sydney-Melbourne Express, *q.*, 11217, 11301
 Tasmania: Cable Service, *q.*, 1566, 1815,
 2179, 2407; *supply*, 4050; *q.*, 4470, 5560,
 7623, 11467, 11863-4, 11987; *supply*, 12138
 Telegraph and Telephone Service:
 Applications for Telephones, *q.*, 650, 1470,
 1566
 Automatic Transmitters, *q.*, 9537, 9892
 Black Range, Western Australia, Telegraph
 Extension, *q.*, 2743, 11987
 Copper Wire: Departmental Requirements,
q., 11986
 Cypher Telegrams, *q.*, 1330; *adj.*, 1686;
q., 1927, 2029, 2031
 Interrupted Telegraphic Communication:
 Victoria and South Australia, *q.*, 8506,
 8555
 Isolated Stations: Medicine Chests, *q.*,
 9536
 Millicent: Telephone Exchange, *q.*, 6296
 Nanango: Telephone Exchange, *q.*, 11864
 Party Telephones: South Australia, *q.*, 29,
 131, 247
 Pinnaroo Railway Telegraph Line, *q.*, 1929
 Pole Dressers, *q.*, 8482, 8507, 8868; *supply*,
 10308
 Poles, *q.*, 3363; Wages for Painting, *q.*,
 7703-4, 7795, 7842-3
 Port Adelaide Outer Harbor Facilities, *q.*,
 7976
 Queensland: Telegraph Service, *supply*,
 9002; *q.*, 9041, 9136; Telegraphists, *q.*,
 9536, 9891; *adj.*, 10400
 Riverina Telephone Facilities, *q.*, 9742, 9892
 Sydney-Melbourne Telephone Line, *q.*,
 10829-30, 11220
 Tasmania: State Guarantee, *q.*, 11087
 Telegram Delivery: Brisbane, *q.*, 9796,
 10370
 Telegrams, Postage of Delayed, *q.*, 7623,
 7702, 7751-2, 7796
 Telegraph Charges, *q.*, 2615, 2845

Keating, Senator Hon. J. H.—*continued.*

- Telegraph and Telephone Service—*continued.*
 Telegraph Construction Branch: Painters' Wages, *q.*, 5647, 5857, 7703-4, 7795, 7842
 Telegraph Message Forms, *q.*, 11471
 Telegraph Messenger, Cairns, *q.*, 4364
 Telegraph Service: Melbourne to Brisbane, *q.*, 4895
 Telegraphic Delay: Kingscote, *q.*, 11218, 11985-7
 Telegraphic Money Orders, *q.*, 5979
 Telegraphists, Assistant, *q.*, 8979
 Telegraphists, Numbers of, *q.*, 8422, 8864
 Telegraphists' Overtime, Western Australia, *q.*, 7754, 7791-2, 8865
 Telegraphists: Sunday Work, *q.*, 8864-5
 Telephone Rates, *q.*, 472
 Telephone Subscribers: Advertising Supplementary Lists, *q.*, 11865
 Telephone Wires, Western Australia, *q.*, 3900
 Telephonic Communication: Delays, *q.*, 8506; *supply*, 9003
 Undergrounding Contracts: Wages, *q.*, 7927
 Wireless Telegraphy, *q.*, 1815, 2031; *supply*, 4050; *q.*, 8701, 9537, 9796, 11383, 11468, 11863, 11987; *supply*, 12139
 Tasmanian Coast: Survey, *q.*, 11985
 Timber, Australian, *q.*, 11382
 Tobacco Combine, *q.*, 3149
 Trawler: Tenders for Construction, *q.*, 1928, 2029, 2071; *supply*, 3931
 Unemployed: Western Australia, *adj.*, 8697
 Voting Machines, *q.*, 131; *m.*, 1271; *q.*, 3798, 7543, 8698, 11383, 11472-3
 Weather Reports, Queensland, *q.*, 247; Tasmania, *q.*, 7568, 7652, 7843
 Year-Book, Printing of, *q.*, 4707; *adj.*, 9190; *supply*, 10306; *q.*, 11218

Kelly, Mr. W. H., Wentworth:

- Adjournment, Special, *m.*, 2027, 12201
 Advertising Australia, *q.*, 10523, 10576, 10652, 10753-4-5, 10879, 11261, 11389; *m.*, 10880; *expl.*, 11051
 American Fleet, Visit of, *supply*, 11366
 Australia, Slanders on, *supply*, 9612
 Australian Industries Preservation Bill, 2R., 9034; *com.*, (Definition), 9131; (Burden of Proof), 9136, 9194, 9212; (Power of Comptroller-General to question, &c.), 9219, 9225, 9232-3-5
 Banking Bill, *q.*, 501
 Bounties Bill, *adj.*, 741; *com.*, (appropriation), 1000, 1002, 1017; (specification of bounties), 1022, 1057; First Schedule, 1063, 1067; (cotton), 1073; (mohair), 1093; (palm fruit), 1183; (coffee), 1209; (tobacco), 1221, 1226; *p.o.*, 1229; (tobacco), 1229, 1230; (preserved fish), 1204, 1300, 1307; *recom.*, (specification of bounties), 1382, 1387; (conditions of bounty), 1389
 Budget Debate, *adj.*, 1743
 Business, order of, *adj.*, 744
 Coast Defence Appropriation Bill, *int.*, 12076, 12087; 2R., 12094; *com.* (appropriation), 12094
 Commonwealth Representative in London, 406

Kelly, Mr. W. H.—*continued.*

- Customs Administration:
 Comptroller-General, *supply*, 9983
 Drawback on Re-exported Material, *q.*, 11329; *supply*, 11379
 Law Costs, *supply*, 9991-2
 Oversea Ships: Collection of Duty, *supply*, 9992-3
 Temporary Employés, *supply*, 11379
 Customs Tariff Bill, *cons. req.* (Stearine, Paraffine Wax, &c.), 10513; (Liquorice), 10517; (Hay and Chaff), 10544; (Mustard), 10556; (Apparel and Attire), 10566; (Curtains), 10577; (Hats, Caps, &c.), 10584-9, 10595, 10601; *expl.*, 10605; (Parasols, &c.), 10622; (Waddings, &c.), 10631-3-6, 10642; (Socks, &c.), 10642-9; (Cutlery), 10673; (Motive Power Machinery, &c.), 10677; (Log Band Saws), 10686; (Manufactures of Metal n.e.i.), 10689, 10703; (Electrical Machines), 10740; (Electrical Articles), 10748-9; (Standards, &c.), 10802; (Oils), 10825, 10884-6, 10892, 10910, 10906, 11554-6; (Paints and Colours), 10899; (Fibro-cement, &c.), 10900; (Printing Roller Composition), 10997; (Stone and Marble), 10998; (Ammonia), 11001; (Disinfectants, &c.), 11003; (Poles, Bent), 11057; (Pens, Pencils, &c.), 11059, 11168-9; (Barometers, &c.), 11063-4; (Spectacles, &c.), 11067; (Slipper Forms), 11068; (Paper), 11078-9, 11087; (Printing Ink), 11093; (Timber), 11147; (Fishing Lines), 11175; (Rebate Schedule), 11209, 11212; (Coal-cutting Machines), 11545; (Stained Glass Windows), 11576-7. (*See* Tariff Resolutions (Customs).)
 Defence:
 Australian Navy, *supply*, 11415; *q.*, 12041
 Coastal Defence: Submarines, *supply*, 1781
 Collins, Captain, *supply*, 1811, 9487, 10114
 Colquhoun, Commander, *q.*, 1749-50; *supply*, 1780
 Cordite Factory, *q.*, 9389
 Crouch, Captain, *q.*, 11703
 Easter Encampment: Transport Delays, *q.*, 10484
 Field Artillery: Ranges, *q.*, 1595; Guns, *q.*, 9479, 10077
 Government Policy, *q.*, 8812-3, 8926, 9009, 9389; *supply*, 9997, 10115, 10119, 11408, 11415; Reports by Officers, *q.*, 11743; Imperial Defence Committee's views, *q.*, 12040
 Horses, *supply*, 9995, 10117
 Imperial Defence Committee's Report, *q.*, 588, 1087; *supply*, 10116, 11370; *q.*, 12040
 Military College, *supply*, 10118
 Military Officers: Alien Servants, *q.*, 12156
 Naval Agreement, *q.*, 1377-8; *supply*, 10117; *q.*, 12041
 Pensions, *q.*, 11385
 Pethebridge, Commander, *supply*, 10114
 Secrecy, Maintenance of, *supply*, 11370; *q.*, 12156
 Small Arms Factory, *q.*, 9389; Speeches of Minister, *q.*, 12041
 Thursday Island, *supply*, 11370
 Torpedo Boats, tenders for, *q.*, 1749-50; *supply*, 1780
 Defence Bill, *q.*, 9389
 Estimates, Additional, *supply*, 11363-5-6, 11370-5-9, 11403-8, 11415
 Expenditure, Increase of, *supply*, 9993-4

Kelly, Mr. W. H.—*continued.*

Federal Capital, *supply*, 8862; *q.*, 9842, 10401
(See Seat of Government Bill.)
Financial Relations: Commonwealth and
States: Monthly Balances, *adj.*, 11734
Geraldton Trade, *supply*, 9997
Government, Position of the, *m.*, 10461; *expl.*,
10480; *supply*, 12187
Governor-General's Residences, *supply*, 9885
High Commissioner, *supply*, 8967
Horses, Export of, *supply*, 9995
Immigration: Land for Settlement, *supply*,
8967; *q.*, 9090; *supply*, 9612; *q.*, 9765,
10130, 10877; Scottish Fishermen, *q.*, 10965
Imperial Conference: Delegates' expenses,
supply, 11363
Imperial Institute, *supply*, 9404
Invalid and Old-age Pensions Bill, 2R., 11939
Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway Survey
Bill, *int.*, 561, 611; 2R., 734; *com.* (power to
make survey), 738; *cons. amdts.*, 2025
London Standard Supplement, *q.*, 11389
Lone Hand Article, purchase of, *q.*, 10652,
10753-4-5, 10879; *m.*, 10880; *expl.*, 11051
Mail Contract, Cancelled, *supply*, 1810
Manufactures Encouragement Bill, *com.*,
(schedule), 12178
Marble, Australian, *q.*, 11624
Meteorological Department, *q.*, 976, 1056
New Protection, *obs.*, 10601
Old-age Pensions, *adj.*, 1744; *supply*, 1779-80,
9335, 11416. (See Invalid and Old-age
Pensions Bill.)
Old-age Pensions Appropriation Bill, 3R.,
12097
Pairs in Committee, *obs.*, 10544, 10584, 10595;
expl., 10605; *adj.*, 10699; *expl.*, 10703,
11578
Papua: Suspension of Surveyor-General, *q.*,
9763; Administrator, *supply*, 9501-2-8; *q.*,
10178, 11324, 11522; Government Service, *q.*,
10607, 11324; Mr. Staniforth Smith, *q.*,
11524
Parliament House: Lobbying, *q.*, 11051
Parliament:
Lobbying, *q.*, 11051
Reflections on, *obs.*, 10996
Prorogation of, *adj.*, 12201
Parliamentary Allowances Bill, *int.*, 1891,
1905; *com.*, (amount of allowance), 1993,
2000; (commencement), 2010; new clause
(Return of increase to Revenue), 2016
Parliamentary Witnesses Bill, *com.* (preventing
witnesses from giving evidence), 12066;
(penalty for refusing to answer questions),
12067-9, 12072
Post and Telegraph Department: Royal Com-
mission, *m.*, 10461; Ministerial Statement,
p.o., 11630
Postal Service:
Stamp Booklets, *supply*, 11403
Postmaster-General, *q.*, 1516; Statements to
Deputations, *q.*, E2152
Privilege: Select Committee upon Procedure,
q., 10075-6; *m.*, 10128; *q.*, 10400-1
Public Service:
Inspector-General of Public Works, *supply*,
9788, 9793
Temporary Assistance, *supply*, 11379

Kelly, Mr. W. H.—*continued.*

Quarantine Bill, 2R., 556; *com.*, (scope of
quarantine), 1523; (general definitions), 1545;
(appointment of officers), 1547; (proclama-
tion of ports of entry), 1563; (master to
notify outbreak of disease), 1624-5; (quaran-
tine surveillance), 1718, 1719; (animals or
plants to be landed at declared ports), 1721;
(examination of imported animals), 1723,
1742, 1754, 1758, 1761, 1763; (vaccination of
quarantined persons), 1737, 1741; (penalty
for desertion), 1742; (maliciously ordering
vessels into quarantine), 1742; (Regulations),
1742; *cons. amdts.*, 8952
Seat of Government Bill, *q.*, 10074; *expl.*,
10480. (See Federal Capital.)
Secret Drugs, Cures, and Foods: Mr. Beale's
Report, *q.*, 9580, 9845; *supply*, 9968; (*p.o.*,
9969), 9975, 9980-2
Senate Election: South Australia, Candidate's
Expenses, *supply*, 11365
Starch Industry, *adj.*, 928
State Officers: Compensation for Common-
wealth Work, *supply*, 9728, 9730-2
Supply:
Attorney-General (Secretary's Office), 9725-6;
(Crown Solicitor's Offices), 9727; (High
Court), 9728, 9730-2
Defence (Central Administration), 9997, 10113
External Affairs (Administrative), 8967,
8977, 9404; (London Offices), 9487;
(Papua), 9501-8; (miscellaneous), 9612,
11363
Home Affairs (Public Works Staff), 9788,
9793; (Governor-General's Establishment),
9885; (miscellaneous), 11365-6; (works
and buildings), 11370
Postmaster-General, 11403
Trade and Customs (Central Staff), 9083,
11379; (Queensland), 9990; (South Aus-
tralia), 9991-2-3-4-5-6; (Western Aus-
tralia), 9997
Treasury, 9968-9; (Government Printer),
9975, 9980; (Treasurer's Advance), 9982;
(miscellaneous), 11375
Works and Buildings (Home Affairs), 11403;
(Defence), 11408, 11415
Supply Bill (No. 2), *int.*, 1779, 1795, 1796,
1800, 1802, 1805; *m.s.o.*, 1809; *com.*, Exter-
nal Affairs (London offices), 1810-1
Supply Bill (No. 5), *int.*, 8862
Supply Bill (No. 1), 1908-9, 2R., 12187
Surplus Revenue Bill, *adj.*, 11757; 2R., 11859
Tariff:
Collection of New Duties, *supply*, 9983
Commission's Reports, *q.*, 1716
Postponement of items, *q.*, 11053
Printing Paper, exemption from duty, *q.*,
10878, 11019, 11055, 11095; *expl.*, 11177;
q., 11179; *supply*, 11375-9
Refunds of duty, *supply*, 1800
Re-opening of, *q.*, 11789
Stimulus to Industries: Immigration, *q.*,
9090
Transmission of Information to England,
q., 9476-7
Tariff Resolutions (Customs):
Ammonia, *cons. req.*, 11001
Apparel and Attire, *cons. req.*, 10566
Barometers, &c., *cons. req.*, 11063-4
Coal Cutting Machines, *cons. req.*, 11545
Curtains, *cons. req.*, 10577
Cutlery, *cons. req.*, 10673

Kelly, Mr. W. H.—continued.

Tariff Resolutions (Customs)—*continued.*
 Disinfectants, &c., *cons. req.*, 11003
 Electrical Articles, *cons. req.*, 10748-9
 Electrical Machines, *cons. req.*, 10740
 Fibro-cement, &c., *cons. req.*, 10900
 Fishing Lines, *cons. req.*, 11175
 Hats, Caps, &c., *cons. req.*, 10584-9, 10505,
 10601; *expt.*, 10605
 Hay and Chaff, *cons. req.*, 10544
 Liquorice, *cons. req.*, 10517
 Log Band Saws, *cons. req.*, 10686
 Manufactures of Metal, n.e.i., *cons. req.*,
 10689, 10703
 Motive Power Machinery, &c., *cons. req.*,
 10677
 Mustard, *cons. req.*, 10556
 Oils, *cons. req.*, 10825, 10884-6, 10892,
 10910, 10996, 11554-6
 Paints and Colours, *cons. req.*, 10899
 Paper, &c., *cons. req.*, 11078-9, 11087
 Parasols, &c., *cons. req.*, 10622
 Pens, Pencils, &c., *cons. req.*, 11059, 11168-9
 Poles, Bent, *cons. req.*, 11057
 Printing Ink, *cons. req.*, 11093
 Printing Roller Composition, *cons. req.*,
 10997
 Rebate: Machinery, *cons. req.*, 11209, 11212
 Slipper Forms, &c., *cons. req.*, 11068
 Socks, &c., *cons. req.*, 10642-9
 Spectacles, &c., *cons. req.*, 11067
 Stained Glass Windows, *cons. req.*, 11576-7
 Standards, &c., *cons. req.*, 10802
 Stearine, Paraffin Wax, &c., *cons. req.*, 10513
 Stone and Marble, *cons. req.*, 10998
 Timber, *cons. req.*, 11147
 Waddings, &c., *cons. req.*, 10631-3-6, 10642
 (See Customs Tariff Bill.)
 Telephone Anomalies, *adj.*, 986
 Telephone: Melbourne-Sydney, *q.*, 11179; *sup-
 ply*, 11375-80
 Telephone Subscribers, Supplementary Lists,
q., 11743
 Treasurer, The, *q.*, 11707
 Victorian Board of Trade Representative, 406
 Waverley Postal District, *m.*, 10757
 Women's Work Exhibition Grant, *supply*, 1795,
 1796

Knox, Hon. W., Kooyong :

Additional Sitting Day, *m.*, 6513
 Address-in-Reply, *m.*, 343
 Advertising Australia, *supply*, 9605
 Antarctic Expedition, *m.*, 7492
 Australian Industries Preservation Bill, 2R,
 9113; 3R., 9587
 Bounties Bill, 2R., 811; *q.*, 881; *com.*, (appro-
 priation), 998, 1000; schedule (cotton), 1074;
 (mohair), 1102; (rice), 1196, 1197; (tobacco),
 1224; (preserved fish), 1303; 3R., 1410
 Budget, 2691
 Coast Defence Appropriation Bill, *int.*, 12087
 Coinage, *q.*, 112424
 Customs Tariff Bill, *cons. req.* (liquorice),
 10518; (hay and chaff), 10542; (woollen piece
 goods), 10626; (waddings, &c.), 10631-6,
 10640; (motive power machinery, &c.),
 10675-8, 10680-4, 11536; (mining machinery),
 10706; (rock drills), 10721-8; (*p.o.*, 10734);
 (electrical machines), 10742-3; (wire netting),
 10770; (locks), 10791-8; (oils), 10822,
 10885-6, 10893, 10910, 10978, 11100; (fibro-
 cement, &c.), 10900; (disinfectants, &c.),

Knox, Hon. W.—continued.

11001; (timber), 11035, 11150; (paper),
 11082-8; (screws), 11088; (kitchen utensils,
 cast-iron), 11167. (See Tariff Resolutions
 (Customs).)
 Defence:
 Ministerial Policy, *supply*, 3599
 Naval Agreement, *Budget*, 2695; *supply*,
 3601
 Eastern Extension Telegraph Company, *q.*,
 12153
 Empire: Australian loyalty, *q.*, 11155
 Excise Procedure Bill, 2R., 7486; *com.*, (ex-
 clusion of lawyers), 7490
 Finance, Commonwealth and States, *Budget*,
 2692; *q.*, 10875
 High Commissioner, *supply*, 9605
 Immigration, *supply*, 9605
 Invalid and Old-age Pension. Bill, 2R., 11936
 Loan Policy, *Budget*, 2696
 London Offices, *supply*, 3618, 3674; *q.*, 3732
 Mail Contract, Cancelled, *address*, 346; *q.*,
 4086
 Mail Service to Europe, *adj.*, 192; *address*,
 346; *q.*, 590, 4086; *m.*, 6127; *q.*, 6354; *m.*,
 6451; interim service, *q.*, 6728
 Manufactures Encouragement Bill, 2R., 6250;
com. (authority to pay bounties), 12173
 Miners: Broken Hill, *adj.*, 3298
 Navigation Bill, *address*, 345; *q.*, 9089
 Northern Territory, *address*, 345
 Officers' Compensation Bill, *int.*, 7502
 Old-age Pensions, *supply*, 9331. (See Invalid
 and Old-age Pensions Bill.)
 Papua: Treatment of natives, *q.*, 11158; Mr.
 Drummond, *q.*, 12199
 Parliament, Cost of, *q.*, 502; Reflections on
 members, *q.*, 10076; *obs.*, 10978
 Parliamentary Allowances Bill, *int.*, 1903;
com., (amount of allowance), 2004
 Parties, position of, *address*, 344, 346
 Penny Postage, *Budget*, 2695
 Petition: Signatures, *m.*, 3413; *p.o.*, 3414
 Post and Telegraph Department:
 Accounts, *Budget*, 2694; *supply*, 3542-3
 Cable Codes: Lisbon Conference, *q.*, 12154
 Deputy Postmaster-General, Victoria, *supply*,
 4853
 Expenditure on Works and Buildings, *m.*,
 7505
 Ministerial Statement, *m.s.o.*, 11637
 Wireless Telegraph Stations. Pacific, *q.*,
 12154
 Post and Telegraph Offices:
 Post Office, Glenferrie, *q.*, 7296
 Preferential Trade, *address*, 345
 Preferential Trade (Tariff), 4792, 4969
 Privilege: Select Committee upon Procedure,
q., 10076
 Public Service:
 Amendment of Act, *supply*, 9776
 Commissioner, *supply*, 9776
 Quarantine Bill, 2R., 556; *com.*, (scope of
 quarantine), 1520; (general definitions),
 1539; (proclamation of ports of entry), 1563;
 (fumigation of vessels to destroy vermin),
 1620, 1622; (vessel to enter first port of
 entry), 1622; (hoisting of quarantine signal),
 1623; (vaccination of quarantined persons),
 1736; (vessel having disease on board enter-
 ing other than first port of entry), 1741
 Secret Drugs, Cures, and Foods: Mr. Beale's
 Report, *adj.*, 3099

Knox, Hon. W.—continued.

States Debts, *Budget*, 2692, 2697
 Suez Canal Dues, *q.*, 10181
 Sugar Industry, *Budget*, 2696
 Supply :
 External Affairs (Miscellaneous), 9605
 Home Affairs (Public Service Commissioner), 9776
 Works and Buildings (Telegraphs and Telephones), 3542; (Defence), 3599; (London Offices), 3618, 3674
 Supply Bill (No. 2), *int.*, 1782; *ad. rep.*, 1874
 Tariff, *q.*, 1180; *m.*, 2691; *ad. rep.* 7451 :
 Iron and Steel, *q.*, 3734
 Order of consideration of items, *m.*, 4348
 Piano Duties : Petition, *obs.*, 6725
 Refunds, *adj.*, 1743; *supply*, 1782; *q.*, 4621, 4649
 Senate's Requests, *q.*, 10079
Tariff Resolutions (Customs) :
 Air Compressors, 6717
 Apparel and Attire, 5623, 5624
 Barley, 5347
 Blacking, &c., 6850
 Blue, 4792
 Candles, 4943, 4969
 China, &c., ware, 6897
 Confectionery, 5217
 Directories, &c., 7191
 Disinfectants, &c., *cons. reg.*, 11001
 Electrical Machines, 6039, 6041, 6800-1-7-8; *cons. reg.*, 10742-3
 Fibro-cement, &c., *cons. reg.*, 10900
 Firebricks, 6910
 Fish, 5271
 Galvanized Iron, 6541
 Glass, &c., 6914
 Hay and Chaff, *cons. reg.*, 10542
 Importations for Governor-General and State Governors, 7420
 Infants and Invalids' Foods, 5525
 Iron and Steel (V.I.A.), 6836-9, 6842; (V.I.R.), 6845
 Kitchen Utensils, Cast-iron, *cons. reg.*, 11167
 Lead, 6049, 6050
 Liquorice, *cons. reg.*, 10518
 Locks, *cons. reg.*, 10791-8
 Machines and Machinery, 6712-7
 Manures, 7366
 Marine Engines, 6660
 Mining Machinery, 6782, 6796, 6799; *cons. reg.*, 10706
 Motive-power Machinery, &c., 6642, 6660; *cons. reg.*, 10675-8, 10680-4, 11536
 Oils, 6875; *cons. reg.*, 10822, 10885-6, 10893, 10910, 10978, 11100
 Paper, manufactures of, 7175, 7191; *cons. reg.*, 11082-8
 Paper, Printing, 7209, 7213
 Photo. Frames, 7125
 Pianos, 7334
 Potato Flour, 5344
 Rails, &c., 6825
 Rock Drills, 6782, 6796; *cons. reg.*, 10721-8
 Scientific Apparatus, 6902
 Screws, *ad. rep.*, 7451; *cons. reg.*, 11088
 Stearine, Paraffine Wax, &c., 5136
 Sugar, 4681
 Tiles, 6907
 Timber, 7047, 7085, 7095-9, 7100; *cons. reg.*, 11035, 11100
 Waddings, &c., *cons. reg.*, 10631-6, 10640

Knox, Hon. W.—continued.

Tariff Resolutions (Customs)—continued.
 Wire Netting, 4442, 4573, 4574, 4578; *cons. reg.*, 10770
 Woollen Piece Goods, *cons. reg.*, 10626
 (See Customs Tariff Bill.)
Tariff Resolutions (Excise) :
 Glucose, 4638
 Starch, 5553
Telegraph and Telephone Service :
 Flat and Toll Rates, *supply*, 2, 43
 Sydney-Melbourne Trunk Telephone, *supply*, 3542
 Telephone Administration, *q.*, 5130
 Telephone Anomalies, *adj.*, 985
 Telephone Charges, *supply*, 3542
 Telephone Operators, *supply*, 3543
 Women's Work Exhibition : Grant, *supply*, 1874; Opening Ceremony, *q.*, 4646

Liddell, Mr. F., Hunter :

Additional Sitting Day, *m.*, 6513
 Address-in-Reply, *m.*, 170
 Adjournment : Christmas, *q.*, 6834
 Advertising Australia, *q.*, 10607
 Australians, Repatriation of, *address*, 174
 Bankruptcy Bill, *q.*, 1088
 Bounties Bill, *com.*, schedule (N.Z. flax), 1091; (olives), 1128; (rice), 1196; (coffee), 1200, 1206; *recom.* (specification of bounties), 1382
 British Party Politics : Australian interference, *address*, 170
 Budget, 3282; *adj.*, 3298
 Business, Precedence of Government, *m.*, 2804
 Consumption : Prohibited Immigrants, *q.*, 1516; *adj.*, 1678; *q.*, 2314
 Cotton, Absorbent, duty on, *q.*, 10751
 Customs Department : Undermanning, *q.*, 11258
 Customs Tariff Bill, *cons. reg.*, (parasols, &c.), 10621; (waddings, &c.), 10630-1; (agricultural, &c. machinery and implements), 10661; (sheep-shearing machines), 10669; (kitchen utensils, cast iron), 10709; (electrical and gas appliances), 10746-8; (wire netting), 10759; (pens, pencils, &c.), 11058; (barometers, &c.), 11059, 11062-3; (oils), 11109; (stained-glass windows), 11189; (surgical appliances, &c.), 11193. (See Tariff Resolutions (Customs).)
Defence :
 Accountments, *supply*, 3603
 Coastal, *address*, 173; *Budget*, 3290
 Field Artillery, *supply*, 3602
 Land Forces, *address*, 173
 Medical Equipment, *supply*, 3603
 Mitchell, case of Mr., *supply*, 5797
 Mounted Rifles, *supply*, 3603
 Naval Agreement, *address*, 173; *Budget*, 3289
 Officers, shortage of, *supply*, 3454
 Rifle Ranges, *supply*, 3454
 Denton Hat Mills, *q.*, 1747
 Estimates, Additional, *supply*, 11372
 Federal Capital, *q.*, 773; *supply*, 10477
 Fittings and Furniture, Public Departments, *supply*, 11372
 Freeman and Wallace : Correspondence, *supply*, 11333
 Fruit Growing at Cooma, *q.*, 10401
 Government, Position of the, *supply*, 10477
 Hain, Mr. Richard, *Budget*, 3288

Liddell, Mr. F.—*continued*.

Hats, Duty on, *q.*, 880, 1747
 High Commissioner, *address*, 174
 Immigration, *address*, 173
 Imperial Conference, *address*, 170, 172;
Budget, 3289
 Insane, Exclusion of, *q.*, 502, 648
 Library: Binding of Plans, *supply*, 3595
 London Offices, *supply*, 3659, 3671; *q.*, 4622
 Maitland Coal Miners: Postmaster-General,
q., 8812
 Minister of Defence: Speech at Lithgow, *q.*,
 772
 Morphia, Price of, *q.*, 10750
 Opium, Smuggling of, *q.*, 2565
 Papua: Administration, *address*, 174
 Parliament:
 Alleged Corruption of Members, *q.*, 8028;
 obs., 11109
 Piano Playing, *obs.*, 7213
 Ventilation of, *q.*, 4412; *supply*, 4857, 6289
 Patent and Proprietary Medicines, *adj.*, 890
 Petition: Signatures, *m.*, 3410, 3413
 Post and Telegraph Department:
 Administration, *Budget*, 3291-2-3; *supply*,
 10245
 Correspondence, Delays in answering, *q.*,
 2793; *Budget*, 3202
 Deputy Postmaster-General, Victoria, *supply*,
 4856
 Royal Commission, *supply*, 10244
 Secretary, *q.*, 10609
 Post and Telegraph Offices:
 Brunswick Post Office, *q.*, 2996; *adj.*, 3231
 Kurri Kurri Post Office, *supply*, 3520
 Sydney General Post Office, *supply*, 3519
 Postal Service:
 Inspectors, *supply*, 3520, 10245
 Officers' Salaries: Deductions for rent,
 supply, 3521
 Postmasters: Provincial Towns, *supply*,
 10244
 Prohibition of Correspondence, *adj.*, 2612;
 q., 10785; *supply*, 11333
 Sydney General Post Office: Sweating,
 supply, 4856; additional employes, *q.*,
 5803; *expl.*, 5910
 Undermanning of Country Post Offices,
 Budget, 3292
 West Maitland, Postmaster, *supply*, 10244
 Preferential Trade, *address*, 171; *Budget*, 3290
 Preferential Trade (Tariff), 5077
 Printing Office, *supply*, 3595
 Quarantine Bill, *address*, 174; 2R., 549; *q.*,
 1412; *com.* (commencement), 1418; (scope
 of quarantine), 1461; (general definitions),
 1538, 1543, 1545; (performance of quarantine
 by vessel), 1720, 1721; (release from quaran-
 tine), 1721; (animals or plants to be landed
 at declared ports), 1722; (liability for pro-
 visions for quarantined persons), 1731;
 (penalty for importing contrary to proclama-
 tion), 1732; (inquiries by quarantine officer),
 1733; (vaccination of quarantined persons),
 1733, 1740; (examination of imported
 animals), 1758; *cons. amds.*, 8949
 Rabbit Destruction, *q.*, 6505
 Secret Drugs, Cures, and Foods: Mr. Beale's
 Report, *adj.*, 2612; *q.*, 2995; *adj.*, 3091,
 3105; *q.*, 11159, 11261, 11521
 Sitting, Days of, *adj.*, 6504; *m.*, 6513
 Statistics, *q.*, 4309

Liddell, Mr. F.—*continued*.

Supply:
 Home Affairs (Works and Buildings), 11372
 Postmaster-General (Central Staff), 10244
 Works and Buildings (Defence), 3454, 3602;
 (Post and Telegraph), 3519; (Telegraphs
 and Telephones), 3520, 3551; (Treasury),
 3595; (London Offices), 3659, 3671
 Supply Bill (No. 1), 1908-9, 2R., 12187
 Supply Bill (No. 3), *int.*, 5797
 Supply Bill (No. 4), *com.*, The Parliament,
 6289
 Tariff, *m.*, 3282:
 Cotton, Absorbent, *q.*, 10751
 Hats, *q.*, 880, 1747
 Magazines, *q.*, 2312
 Morphia, *q.*, 10750
 Order of consideration of items, *m.*, 4340
 Tariff Resolutions (Customs):
 Acetic Acid, etc., 6968
 Agricultural, &c., Machinery and Imple-
 ments, 6055, 6566; *cons. req.*, 1066:
 Animals, 4770, 4773
 Barley, ground, 5348
 Barometers, &c., *cons. req.*, 11059, 11062-3
 Boots, &c., 7154-7
 Candles, 4953
 Cigarettes, 4304
 Cocoa and Chocolate, 5256
 Confectionery, 5232, 5252, 5256
 Cotton, Linen, &c., Piece Goods, 5855
 Cupels, 6911
 Cutlery, 6056
 Disinfectants, Sheep Washes, &c., 6982
 Drugs and Chemicals, 6971
 Electrical and Gas Appliances, *cons. req.*,
 10746-8
 Fish, 5274
 Flannelette, 5925
 Furniture, 7004
 Galvanized Iron, 6543
 Glass, &c., 6913
 Gloves, 5940
 Kitchen Utensils, Cast Iron, *cons. req.*,
 10709
 Leatherette, 7269
 Matches, 5451
 Meats, 5455
 Medicines, 6993
 Milk, Condensed, &c., 5497, 5517
 Molasses, 4765, 4766
 Nails, 6607
 Naphthalene, 6977
 Oils, *cons. req.*, 11109
 Opium, 6996
 Parasols, &c., *cons. req.*, 10621
 Peel, preserved, 5335
 Pens, Pencils, &c., *cons. req.*, 11058
 Pickles, 5463
 Potato Flour, 5344
 Printing Paper, 7213
 Rubber manufactures, 7160
 Saccharine, 6974
 Sausage Casings, 5460
 Sheep-Shearing Machines, *cons. req.*, 10669
 Stained-glass windows, 6913; *cons. req.*,
 11189
 Stone and Marble, 6967
 Surgical Appliances, &c., *cons. req.*, 11193
 Tea, 5464
 Timber, 7075
 Waddings and Cotton Wool, 5927-9; *cons.*
 req., 10630-1

Liddell, Mr. F.—continued.

Tariff Resolutions (Customs)—continued.

Weighing Machines, &c., 6628, 6631
Wire Netting, 4520; *cons. req.*, 10759
Wood, Articles of, 7110
(*See Customs Tariff Bill.*)

Tariff Resolutions (Excise):

Cigarettes, 4310

Telegraph and Telephone Service:

Country Telephones, *supply*, 10244
Hotel Telephone Facilities, *supply*, 3520
Lostock Telephone Requirements, *supply*, 12187

Maitland West and Sydney Telephone, *g.*, 298, 2690, 2707; *m.*, 2064; *supply*, 3551; *g.*, 4749; *supply*, 5798; *g.*, 5802; *supply*, 10245

Silence Bureaux: Country Offices, *supply*, 3521

Sydney-Melbourne Telephone, *g.*, 5802; *expl.*, 5910; *supply*, 10245

Telegraph Operators' Hours, *Budget*, 3292

Telephone Directories, *g.*, 3586

Underbank, *supply*, 3520, 12187

Wilks, Mr., *expl.*, 2683

Livingston, Mr. J., Barker:

Additional Sitting Day, *m.*, 6511

Australia, Advertising by Mr. Price, *g.*, 10878

Bounties Bill, *com.*, schedule (olives), 1124

Commonwealth Salaries Bill, *com.* (Taxation by States), 3888

Customs Tariff Bill, *cons. req.* (hay and chaff), 10532; (sheep shearing machines), 10671; (wire netting), 10763; (oils), 11553; (crucibles), 11558. (*See Tariff Resolutions (Customs).*)

Disputed Elections and Qualifications Bill, *g.*, 6131

Electoral Rolls, *g.*, 11250

Grain Bags, Size of, *g.*, 10700

Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway Survey, *g.*, 9191

Papua: Crown Lands, *g.*, 11523

Parliament House: Exhibits, *g.*, 7300

Post and Telegraph Offices:

Classification: Mt. Gambier and Port Pirie, *g.*, 11791, 11917, 12042

Post Office, Penola, *g.*, 3175, 6505

Post Office, Port Elliot, *g.*, 1089

Postal Service:

Early Closing of Post Offices: Mails, *supply*, 5704

Supplies: South Australia, *g.*, 6728

Quarantine Bill, *com.*, (examination of imported animals), 1757

Rabbits for the Navy, *g.*, 10875

Tariff:

Refunds, *g.*, 2997

Tariff Resolutions (Customs):

Ale, &c., 4124

China, &c., ware, 6899

Crucibles, *cons. req.*, 11558

Droppers, 6831

Disinfectants, Sheepwashes, &c., 6970, 6985, 6991

Flypapers, 6993

Hay and Chaff, *cons. req.*, 10532

Manures, 7364, 7373

Oils, *cons. req.*, 11553

F. 6950. —c.

Livingston, Mr. J.—continued.

Tariff Resolutions (Customs)—continued.

Sheep-Shearing Machines, *cons. req.*, 10671

Tobacco, 4288

Wire Netting, 4124; *cons. req.*, 10763

(*See Customs Tariff Bill.*)

Telephone Service:

Administration, *g.*, 7296

Hog Bay, Kingston, Lucindale, Mount Gambier, Narracoorte, *g.*, 1976, 3174, 6421

Supply of Telephones, *g.*, 7464

Wire Netting: Seizure by New South Wales Government, *g.*, 2233

Lynch, Senator P. J., Western Australia:

Address-in-Reply, *m.*, 147

Appropriation (Works and Buildings) Bill, 22., 3016; *com.* (External Affairs), 4073

Australian Industries Preservation Bill, 22., 4594; *com.* (power of Comptroller-General to question, &c.), 5030

Australians, Repatriation of, *address*, 155

Bills of Exchange Bill, *com.* (protest), 761; (application of State laws), 1591, 1970; (protection of banker), 2199; *recom.*, new clause (State stamp duty), 2292

Bounties Bill, 22., 2531; *com.* (appropriation), 2767; (offences against Act), 2771; new clause (supply of information by applicant), 2782; (regulations), 2857, 2861, 2864; First Schedule (jute), 3170; (mohair), 3193; (rice), 3470; (rubber), 3572; (coffee), 3720; (tobacco), 4253; *recom.*, First Schedule (tobacco), 4903

Coal Combine, *adj.*, 3701

Commercial Congress, Sydney, *g.*, 9353

Commonwealth Mail Steamers, *m.*, 5410

Customs Tariff Amendment Bill, *com.* (additional provisos: South African Preference), 12104

Customs Tariff Bill, com., Schedule:

Agricultural, &c., Machinery and Implements, 8577

Atomisers, 9924-5-6; *cons. req.*, 11316

Bananas, 7867

Basketware, n.e.i., 9571

Blankets, &c., 8233, 8249, 8253

Blue, 7692

Carbide of Calcium, 9268

Casks, &c., 9644

Coffee, 7770

Confectionery, 7732

Electrical and Gas Appliances, 6051-5

Electrical Machines, &c., 8797, 8805-9, 8811, 8860, 8870-1-4; *cons. req.*, 10945-7, 11590

Fire Bricks, &c., 8479, 8481

Fire Extinguishers, 8773

Fruits, dried, 7821

Furniture, 9371

Galvanized Iron, &c., 8565

Grain and Pulse, 7910

Ginger, green, 7831

Hats, &c., 8320-4

Hay and Chaff, 7924; *cons. req.*, 10864

Honey, Jams, &c., 7946

Insecticides, Sheepwashes, &c., 9285

Iron Pipes, 9085-7

Lounges and Settees, 9383-7

Macaroni, &c., 7955

Manufactures of Metal, n.e.i., 8733-4

Manures, 9910

Matches, 7994, 8008

Lynch, Senator P. J.—*continued.*Customs Tariff Bill (Schedule)—*continued.*

Mine Ventilating Fans, 8688
 Motive Power Machinery, 8627, 8631,
 8642-4 (*p.o.*, 8650)
 Oilmen's Stores, 8049
 Oils, 8417, 8432
 Paints, 8449, 8452-5-7, 8471
 Patterns, Paper, 9806
 Perambulators, &c., 9823
 Piece Goods, 8144, 8153
 Pulley Blocks, &c., 8670
 Rubber Manufactures, *n.e.i.*, 9673
 Sago and Tapioca, 7658, 7666
 Salt, 8090-4
 Spices, 8098
 Stained Glass Windows, *cons. req.*, 11319
 Stearine, Paraffine Wax, &c., 7717
 Tallow, &c., 8378, 8382-4
 Tea, 8110-5
 Timber, 9538, 9544
 Tobacco, 7646
 Vehicles, 9829
 Wheels, Steel, &c., *cons. req.*, 10961
 Wicker, &c., 9564-9

Defence:

Cadet System, *supply*, 3916
 Military Uniforms, *q.*, 354
 Naval Agreement, *address*, 150
 Nomenclature of Forces, *supply*, 1950
 Disputed Elections and Qualifications Bill,
com., (Qualifications and Vacancies), 5648,
 5654, 5657, 5659; (powers of Court), 5661,
 5663, 5665; *recom.* (Qualifications and
 Vacancies), 5983
 Dissent from Ruling: Admissibility of Re-
 quest (Customs Tariff Bill), *m.*, 8650
 Electoral Act, *address*, 151
 Excise Tariff (Agricultural Machinery) Act,
adj., 5769
 Financial relations: Commonwealth and State,
address, 149
 German New Guinea: British Subjects, *q.*,
 11678
 High Commissioner, *address*, 153; *q.*, 4706,
 7571
 Immigrants: Sugar Industry, *q.*, 1689, 1816
 Immigration, *address*, 153
 Immigration Leagues: Grants, *q.*, 8232
 Imperial Conference, *address*, 148
 Invalid and Old-age Pensions Bill, *2r.*, 12021;
com. (Investigation by Registrar), 12037
 Judiciary Bill, *2r.*, 860
 Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway Survey
 Bill, *address*, 154; *2r.*, 1252; *p.o.*, 1364,
 1369, 1370; *com.* (power to make survey),
 1401; (appropriation), 1512; *q.*, 3463, 3558
 London Offices of Commonwealth, *supply*,
 3917, 4073
 Mail Contract, Cancelled, *address*, 155
 Map of Australasia, *supply*, 12145
 Navigation Bill, *address*, 155
 Pair, Broken, *adj.*, 7790; *expl.*, 8240
 Parliamentary Allowances Bill, *2r.*, 2110;
3r., 2188
 Parliamentary Papers Bill, *com.* (no action
 for publishing Parliamentary Papers),
 12135
 Post and Telegraph Act, Evasions of, *address*,
 152
 Post and Telegraph Offices:
 Boulder City Post Office, *supply*, 3917
 Preferential Trade, *address*, 148

Lynch, Senator P. J.—*continued.*

Progressive Land Values Tax, *address*, 156
 Pulsford, Senator, statements in London, *q.*,
 4706
 Quarantine, *q.*, 8482, 8508
 Quarantine Bill, *2r.*, 5198; *com.* (arrange-
 ments with State Governments: stations,
 &c.), 5307; (powers of Commonwealth),
 5475; new paragraph (exclusion of con-
 sumptives), 5986, 5989; *p.o.*, 5991; (examina-
 tion of imported animals), 6063, 6067; (lia-
 bility of owners, &c., for provisions for
 quarantined persons), 6076, 6086
 Questions: Quotations, *q.*, 5980
 Supply Bill (No. 2), *com.* (application), 1945;
 Defence: (Commonwealth Forces), 1950
 Supply Bill (No. 1) 1908-9, *com.*, Schedule:
 Home Affairs (miscellaneous), 12145
 Tariff Revision, *address*, 150
 Telegraph and Telephone Service:
 Black Range Telegraph Extension, *q.*, 2743;
 supply, 3916
 Isolated Stations: Medicine Chests, *q.*,
 9536
 Tobacco Combine: Tariff, *adj.*, 2052

Lyne, Hon. Sir W. J., K.C.M.G., Hume:

Acting Prime Minister, *q.*, 297
 Address-in-Reply, *adj.*, 243; *m.*, 100; *obs.*,
 352
 Adjournment, Special, *m.*, 743, 2025, 2028,
 3360, 3622, 5745, 6292, 6503, 6591, 6810,
 6834, 6896, 6967, 7024, 7110, 7169, 7294,
 12201-3
 Adjustments, Inter-State, *Budget*, 1629-30
 Advertising Australia, *Budget*, 2151; *q.*, 11051
 Agricultural Machinery: Excise Duty, *q.*,
 1748, 1750; *supply*, 1797; *Budget*, 2151;
adj., 2843; *q.*, 3421; *obs.*, 3984; *adj.*, 5800;
q., 7417; *adj.*, 12160
 Agriculture, Federal Bureau of, *q.*, 12158
 All-night sittings: Attendance of Members,
q., 6024
 Appropriation (Works and Buildings) Bill, *m.*,
 3749
 Australian Industries Preservation Act: Coal
 and Shipping Combine, *q.*, 3585, 3621
 Australians Repatriated from South Africa, *q.*,
 503, 928; *adj.*, 1329
 Banking Legislation, *Budget*, 1642
 Beacons Buoys, and Ocean Lights, *q.*, 405;
adj., 1470; *Budget*, 2271
 Beale, Mr., *q.*, 1975; *adj.*, 2612; *q.*, 2995;
adj., 3102; *supply*, 9982
 Blotting Paper: Tenders, *q.*, 11922
 Bookkeeping System, *Budget*, 1639
 Bounties Bill, *int.*, 562; *q.*, 881; *com.* (ap-
 propriation), 1003; *expl.*, 1280; *3r.*, 1405,
Budget, 1632, 1641
 Braddon Section, *Budget*, 1627, 1638-9, 1640,
 1643, 1644, 2144; *expl.*, 2741; *supply*, 3316
 (see Finance: Relations of Commonwealth
 and States; also Surplus Revenue Bill)
 British Party Politics: Australian interfer-
 ence, *address*, 104
 Budget, 1625, 2143; *q.*, 1716; *adj.*, 1744,
 2612; *p.o.*, 3297; *adj.*, 3299; *supply*, 3303,
 3359
 Budget Papers, *m.*, 1678

Lyne, Hon. Sir W. J., K.C.M.G.—*continued*.

Business, Order of, *m.*, 469; *adj.*, 472, 563, 648, 744, 1084; *obs.*, 1977; *supply*, 2124; *adj.*, 2282, 2340, 3048; *q.*, 3588; *adj.*, 3619; *q.*, 3622; *adj.*, 3899, 6188; *supply*, 6279; *adj.*, 6521-2, 7413, 7456-7, 11982; *obs.*, 12054; *adj.*, 12100; Precedence of Government, *adj.*, 2612; *m.*, 2690, 2795, 2805; conduct of, *adj.*, 3682, 4461, 4704, 5236-7; Conduct of, *supply*, 6287; *m.*, 6513; *obs.*, 6673, 6724, 7378

Butter Freights, *q.*, 1089, 3935; *adj.*, 3952

Canada: preferential trade, *Budget*, 1647

Canberra Capital Site, *q.*, 193

Carruthers, Statue to Mr., *q.*, 2311

Chairman of Committees, *m.*, 315; *obs.*, 317

Cheap Weekly Trains: Melbourne and Sydney, *q.*, 1751

Children, provision for, at Waitara Home, *adj.*, 12203

Coal Combine, *q.*, 3585, 3621, 3935

Coast Defence Appropriation Bill, *int.*, 12077; *2r.*, 12094

Coinage, Silver and Bronze: Commonwealth, *Budget*, 1643; *q.*, 2235

Cold Storage, *Budget*, 1634

Collins, Captain, *supply*, 1812

Commerce Act: States Expenses, *Budget*, 1633; *supply*, 6290

Commonwealth Salaries Bill, *q.*, 1279; *supply*, 2124; *adj.*, 2282, 2346

Conciliation and Arbitration Act: Discharged Victorian coal miners, *q.*, 2233

Consumption: Prohibited Immigrants, *q.*, 1517

Contracts, Government: Standard Wages, *q.*, 1751

Customs Administration:

- Audit Staff, *q.*, 8938
- Broken Hill Customs House, *supply*, 3436
- Fremantle Customs House, *supply*, 3436
- Laboratory, Melbourne, *supply*, 3436, 3442
- Launch, Sydney, *supply*, 3436
- Leakage of Information: Melbourne, *supply*, 7307, 7327
- Patent and Proprietary Medicines, *q.*, 80, 648, 772, 879, 880; *adj.*, 892, 897; *q.*, 1516; Mr. Beale's Report, *q.*, 1975; *adj.*, 2613; *q.*, 2995; *adj.*, 3102
- Prosecutions, *q.*, 23, 590
- Trawler, *q.*, 1751; *supply*, 3437, 3442, 3445

Customs Tariff Amendment Bill, *int.*, 11795; *2r.*, 12053; *com.*, (additional provisos: South African Preference) 12054; *m.s.o.*, 12054

Customs Tariff Bill, *com.* (short title), 7456; schedule, 7456; *3r.*, 7469; *q.*, 9100, 9390; *cons. req.*, 10487; (sago and tapioca), 10496-7; (blue), 10501; (*p.o.*, 10502-3); (rice root), 10502-4; (stearine, paraffine wax, &c.), 10505-6; (confectionery), 10514; (liquorice), 10517-8; (fish), 10519; (herbs, dried), 10520; (hay and chaff), 10526; (matches), 10546-7-50-1-2-4; (mustard), 10555; (nuts, edible), 10557-8; (invalids' foods), 10558; (rice), 10559; (salt), 10559; (tea), 10559-62; (apparel and attire), 10562-4-5; (bags, &c.), 10571; (blankets), 10576, 11534; (carpets), 10576, 11459; (curtains), 10577, 11438, 11441-2-3; (gloves), 10577-8-9, 11460; (hats, caps, &c.), 10580, 10593-7; (wigs, &c.), 10655; (arms), 10656; (lead), 10660, 11443; (agricultural, &c., machinery, and implements), 10660-2; (cutlery), 10672-3,

Lyne, Sir W. J., K.C.M.G.—*continued*.

11444; (motive power machinery, &c.), 10674-5-8, 11534-5; (Hoist, Holman patent), 10685; (log band saws), 10686, 11539, *p.o.*, 11541-4; (manufactures of metal, *n.e.i.*), 10686-8; (mining machinery), 10706, 10731; (aluminium ware), 10707, 11544; (kitchen utensils, cast-iron), 10707-8, 11167; (type, printers'), 10709; (screws), 10709, 11086, 11444; (rock drills), 10710, 10730; (rock boring machines), 10731; (*p.o.*, 10733); (electrical machines), 10734-8, 10741-2-3, 11444-5-9, 11452-9; (electrical and gas meters), 10743-7, 11545; (electrical articles), 10748, 11448-9; (rails, &c.), 10749; (iron pipes), 10750; (wire netting), 10770; (locks), 10776, 10780-9, 10790-1-8; (standards, &c.), 10798-9, 10800-1-4, 11548; (steel and steel-rimmed wheels), 10804-6; (wire cloth, gauze, &c.), 10806, 10815; *ad. progress rep.*, 10815; (oils), 10817, 10828, 10881-4, 10890, 10909, 10910-1, 10971-4-5-6, 10981, 11098-9, 11100, 11550-1; (paints and colours), 10895-8; (fibro-cement, &c.), 10900-1-2; (crucibles, &c.), 10903, 11556; (glassware), 10906; (printing roller composition), 10906; (slate slabs), 10998; (stone and marble), 10908, 11452; (ammonia), 11001; (disinfectants, sheep washes, &c.), 11001-9, 11010, 11562; (drugs and chemicals), 11010-1; (furniture), 11011-4-5; (timber), 11019-56, 11447-9, 11550-3-9, 11162-6, 11452, 11567, 11570-1; (wicker, bamboo, &c.), 11056; (photo frames), 11057; (poles, bent), 11057; (fancy goods), 11057; (pens, pencils, &c.), 11058-9, 11168-9; (barometers, &c.), 11059-60-3; (kinematographs, &c.), 11064-5; (gramaphones, &c.), 11066; (spectacles, &c.), 11067; (slipper forms, &c.), 11068; (rubber manufactures), 11068-9; (leather), 11069, 11574; (paper), 11071-5-6, 11080-1-2-4-6-9, 11090-1-2, 11452; (printing inks), 11092-3-5; (licht-pausrohpapier), 11170-1-2-3; (bicycles, &c.), 11174; (fishing lines), 11175; (corks), 11175; (photographic accessories), 11176-7; (stained glass windows), 11183, 11191, 11575-6; (surgical appliances, &c.), 11192-3; (rebate schedule), 11194-7, 11200, 11211-3; (pianos), 11213-4; (flannel-ette), 11443; (woollen piece goods), 11461-6, 11526, 11533; *adj.*, 11466; (coal cutting machines), 10731, 11544-5; *m.*, 11578; *ad. rep.*, 11579. (See Tariff Resolutions (Customs))

Darling Island Store, *supply*, 3423

Debts, States, *Budget*, 1643-4; *supply*, 3316; *q.*, 8816, 10462, 10524, 11159

Decimal Coinage, *q.*, 11325-6

Defence:

- Ammunition, Defective, *q.*, 3301
- British Rifle Team, *Budget*, 1633
- Cadet Ranges, *supply*, 3448
- Cadets, *Budget*, 1633
- Cordite Factory, *Budget*, 1637
- Fixed Defences: Guns and Lights, *Budget*, 1637
- Harbor and Coastal, *Budget*, 1637; *supply*, 3677, 11267
- Naval Agreement, *address*, 101, 104; *q.*, 1282, 1377-8; *Budget*, 1633-6, 2143; *q.*, 2680, 2998; *adj.*, 3230; *q.*, 3300, 3422, 12200
- Naval Policy, Government, *Budget*, 1632-3-6; *q.*, 4411
- New Works, *Budget*, 1636-7-8

Lyne, Hon. Sir W. J., K.C.M.G.—*continued.*Defence—*continued.*

Port Darwin Defence, *supply*, 3450
Protector, *supply*, 3450
 Rifle Clubs, *Budget*, 1633; *supply*, 3448
 Rifle Ranges, *supply*, 3448, 3450
 Royal Naval Reserve, *Budget*, 1633
 Small Arms Factory, *Budget*, 1637
 Swan Island Boat Harbor, *supply*, 3449
 Telephones: Rifle Ranges, *supply*, 3449
 Denton Hat Mills, *q.*, 881, 1747
 Dissent from Ruling: Close of Budget Debate, *obs.*, 3298
 Divisions: Calls for, *obs.*, 6909
 Eastern Extension Australasia and China Telegraph Company, *Budget*, 1635
 Eight Hours Principle, *q.*, 11019
 Election Expenses, *q.*, 977, 978; *supply*, 8965, 9773; *q.*, 10180; *supply*, 11216; *q.*, 11421
 Election Expenses Reimbursement Bill, 2R., 12196; *com.*, (Appropriation), 12197
 Estimates, additional, *q.*, 10078; (*p.o.*, 10185-6); *supply*, 10189, 11216, 11262, 11371-3-5-7, 11418
 Estimates: New Works and Buildings, *q.*, 1866, 2312
 Estimates, Reduction of, *expl.*, 11706; *q.*, 11707, 12154
 Excise Duties on Manufactures, *q.*, 5240
 Excise Tariff (Agricultural Machinery) Act, *q.*, 1748, 1750; *supply*, 1797; *Budget*, 2151; *adj.*, 2843; *q.*, 3421; *obs.*, 3984; *q.*, 7417; Award of Court, *adj.*, 5800, 12160
 Excise Tariff Bill, *cons. req.*, (amylie alcohol), 11215. (*See* Excise Tariff Resolutions)
 Excise Tariff (Spirits) Act, *adj.*, 4142
 Excise Tariff (Starch) Bill, *int.*, 11795; 2R., 11215
 Expenditure of the Commonwealth, *Budget*, 1631-2-3-4-7-8; *supply*, 3303; *q.*, 9099; *supply*, 9961, 11262, 12098
 Exports, Imports, and Production, *Budget*, 1626
 Federal Capital, *q.*, 193, 297, 773, 1270; *adj.*, 1460; *supply*, 1882; *q.*, 2651, 3508, 3588, 3733 (*see* Seat of Government Bill)
 Finance: Relations of Commonwealth and States; *Budget*, 1627-38-9-40-1-4, 2144; *expl.*, 2741; *supply*, 3303-11-16; *q.*, 6420, 8816, 9099, 10462, 10524; *adj.*, 10784; *m.*, 10808; *q.*, 10875-6, 11016-7, 11159; *supply*, 11264; *q.*, 11525; Payment of Surplus Revenue, *adj.*, 11735; *q.*, 11737-8-9, 11740-1-2, 11784-5-6-7, 11921, 12151
 Fires in New South Wales, *adj.*, 3163
 Forrest, Sir John, resignation as Treasurer, *obs.*, 1085, 2655
 Friday Sitting *q.*, 977
 Gloves, Manufacture of, *q.*, 2566, 2689
 Government, Position of the, *address*, 101; *obs.*, 604; *Budget*, 2145; changes in the, *obs.*, 1084
 Government Printing Office, *q.*, 2230; *supply*, 3590, 3594, 3598, 9971
 Harvesters, price of, *obs.*, 12055; *q.*, 12155
 Hats, Duty on, *q.*, 881, 1747
 High Commissioner, *address*, 101; *Budget*, 1642
 Hirsch, Mr. Max, *q.*, 405
 Honors, Australian Recommendations for, *q.*, 1751
 Hughes, Diver, Decoration of, *q.*, 2566, 2794; *adj.*, 2995

Lyne, Hon. Sir W. J., K.C.M.G.—*continued.*

Immigration:

Assisted: New South Wales, *adj.*, 1329
 Contract, *q.*, 503, 1087, 1281; *adj.*, 1231, 1744, 2347; *q.*, 3423
 Government Policy, *Budget*, 1641, 2151
 Misleading Advertisements, *q.*, 772, 928; *adj.*, 930, 1231; *q.*, 1281, 1413
 Prohibited Immigrants, *q.*, 1517
 Salvation Army Settlements, *q.*, 1596
 Immigration League of Australia, *q.*, 772, 881, 928; *adj.*, 930, 1231
 Immigration Restriction Act, *adj.*, 247; *q.*, 1517
 Imperial Conference, *address*, 101, 104; report of, *q.*, 298; *adj.*, 470; *m.*, 701
 Imports, *Budget*, 1626, 1646; *obs.*, 3977-8, 4964
 Income Tax: Federal Salaries and Allowances, *q.*, 1279; Baxter Case, *adj.*, 3556
 Information, supply of to Members, *expl.*, 2652-3
 Insane, Exclusion of, *q.*, 502, 648
 Invalid and Old-age Pensions Bill, *adj.*, 11982
 Insurance Companies, *q.*, 12158
 Iron Bounties, *Budget*, 1645; *q.*, 5690-1 (*see also* Manufactures Encouragement Bill)
 Judiciary Bill, *adj.*, 2346; *q.*, 3588; *m.*, 3760; 3R., 3856
 Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway Survey Bill, *obs.*, 562; *Budget*, 1632; *q.*, 2121, 2996
 Kanakas, Repatriated, *q.*, 502
 Labour Party, *address*, 104
 Lascars: Commonwealth legislation, *q.*, 1975
 Leave of Absence, *m.*, 2121
 Loan Expenditure, *Budget*, 1636
 Log Timber, duty on, *q.*, 1715
 London Offices, *Budget*, 1641-2; *supply*, 1810, 1811, 1876, 1882, 3616, 3619, 3626, 3661; *q.*, 3732, 3851, 4622, 4648, 12155-6
 Lunatic, alleged, landing of at Fremantle, *q.*, 502
 Mail Contracts:
 Cancelled, *address*, 102; *q.*, 193; *Budget*, 1634; *supply*, 1798, 1869; *q.*, 2651, 4623, 10701
 Cold Storage, *Budget*, 1634
 Mail Service to Europe, *Budget*, 1634; *adj.*, 6504
 Pacific Islands, *supply*, 1812
 Papua, Solomon Islands, New Hebrides, *q.*, 3508
 Mail Fleet, Federal, *q.*, 773, 1089; State Importations, *q.*, 988, 1181
 Mail Steamers: Passenger Rates, *q.*, 1075; charges for liquor, *q.*, 2564
 Manufactures Encouragement Bill, *supply*, 5804; *q.*, 5910; *int.*, 5912-3-4; 2R., 6026, 6186; *q.*, 6229; *adj.*, 6522; *q.*, 11789; *com.* (commencement), 12168; (authority to pay bounties), 12169; (proof of good quality), 12174; (regulations), 12175; (schedules), 12177-8, 12180
 Marble, Australian, *q.*, 11624
 Melbourne Offices: Commonwealth, *q.*, 2801
 Meteorological Branch, *Budget*, 1632
 Ministerialists, Loyalty of, *q.*, 976
 Ministers, Relations of, *q.*, 1026
 Ministry, Changes in the, *obs.*, 1084
 Murray Waters Agreement, *q.*, 2501
 National Physique: Medical Inspection of School children, *q.*, 3302, 3585
 Naval Agreement, *q.*, 1026 (*See* Defence)

Lyne, Hon. Sir W. J., K.C.M.G.—*continued.*

Navigation Commission: Report, *q.*, 3173
 Navigation Conference, *address*, 103; *q.*, 404;
obs., 465
 Netherlands Indies: Influx of Orientals:
 Trade, *q.*, 2998
 New Hebrides, *q.*, 647, 1413, 1596; *Budget*,
 1646; *q.*, 3268, 3301; *obs.*, 3419; *q.*, 3508
 New Protection, *q.*, 1715; *adj.*, 1745; *q.*,
 1748; *supply*, 1784, 1797; *q.*, 1975; *Budget*,
 2148, 2151; *adj.*, 2843; *q.*, 2890, 3174, 3268
 3302; *supply*, 3319, 3320; *q.*, 3421, 3622.
 4200, 5802; *adj.*, 6188; *q.*, 11053; *adj.*,
 12160
 New Protection (Tariff), 3986, 4009, 4644, 4674
 New South Wales Government: Seizure of
 wire-netting, *obs.*, 2120; *Budget*, 2152; *q.*,
 2230-1-2-3; *adj.*, 2346; *q.*, 2563, 3422; Can-
 cellation of Carriers' Licences, *q.*, 2793,
supply, 2904; Savings Bank Claim, *supply*,
 5783
 Northern Territory, *q.*, 158, 194, 1280; *Bud-*
get, 1642; *adj.*, 2346; *q.*, 2566; *adj.*, 3363;
q., 4413, 9100
 Officers' Compensation Bill, *int.*, 7494, 7499,
 7502; *3R.*, 7502
 Old-age Pensions, *q.*, 352; *Budget*, 1643; *obs.*,
 10808; *q.*, 11790, 11918. (*See Invalid and*
Old-age Pensions Bill)
 Old-age Pensions Appropriation Bill, *com.*
 (Appropriation), 12006-7
 Olive, Coconut, and Mineral Oils, *q.*, 1717
 Opium, *q.*, 2234
 Opposition Corner, *q.*, 11054
 Orion, s.s., *adj.*, 11177; *q.*, 11917
 Pacific Cable, *q.*, 12153
 Pacific Islands Mail Service, *supply*, 1812; *q.*,
 3508
 Paper, Tenders for, *q.*, 10081
 Papua, *Budget*, 1642, 1646; *q.*, 3508; *Supply*,
 6290; deportation of aborigines, *q.*, 4412;
 Public Service, *q.*, 12054; Royal Commis-
 sion, *supply*, 11375; Land Administration:
 Mr. Drummond and Mr. Ardlie, *q.*, 12199
 Parliament:
 Candidates' Expenses, *q.*, 977, 978; *supply*,
 8965, 9773; *q.*, 10180; *supply*, 11216; *q.*,
 11421
 Entertainment of Strangers, *adj.*, 6292
 Exhibit of Pianos, *q.*, 7114
 Lobbying, *obs.*, 10977; *q.*, 11051
 Prorogation of, *q.*, 11053-4; *adj.*, 12201
 Reassembling of, *supply*, 12097; *q.*, 12201;
adj., 12201
 Reflections on Members, *Tariff*, 10974-5-6,
 10981; *q.*, 11017
 Parliamentary Allowances Bill, *Budget*, 1644,
 1678; *supply*, 1775; *adj.*, 1812; *q.*, 1866;
int., 1883, 1886; *m.*, 1924; *2R.*, 1077, 1082;
com., (amount of allowance), 1996-7, 2001;
 new clause (appropriation), 2016; preamble,
 2017; *q.*, 2450, 2064
 Patent and Proprietary Medicines, *q.*, 80, 648,
 772, 879, 880; *adj.*, 892, 897; *q.*, 1516; Mr.
 Beale's report, *q.*, 1975; *adj.*, 2613; *q.*,
 2995; *adj.*, 3102
 Patent Office: Administration, *q.*, 501, 882
 Penny Postage, *Budget*, 1629-33; *adj.*, 2905;
q., 12151
 Petherick, Mr., *q.*, 2567
 Petition: Signatures, *obs.*, 3408; *m.*, 3409,
 3415
 Population, *Budget*, 1641

Lyne, Hon. W. J., K.C.M.G.—*continued.*

Post and Telegraph Department:
 Annual Report, *supply*, 10194
 Cabinet Committee of Inquiry, *supply*,
 10194, 10445
 Eastern and Pacific Cables, *q.*, 12153
 Expenditure, *adj.*, 7457; *m.*, 7502; *supply*,
 8821, 9962, 10190; *expl.*, 11706-7; *q.*,
 12151-4
 Increase of Employés, *Budget*, 1634, 2275;
supply, 3309; *adj.*, 3363; *supply*, 4869;
m., 7504; *supply*, 8821, 9962, 10192, 10443
 Increments, *q.*, 7464
 New Works and Buildings, *Budget*, 1636;
supply, 3521, 3528, 3533, 3540; *m.*,
 7502; *supply*, 10190; *q.*, 11054; *supply*,
 11268
 Prohibition of Correspondence, *adj.*, 2614
 Royal Commission, *supply*, 10441; *q.*, 12042,
 12152
 Stamps: Printing of, *supply*, 3590, 3594;
q., 6099; *supply*, 9971
 Wireless Telegraphy, *supply*, 3554
 Post and Telegraph Offices:
 Alstonville Post Office, *supply*, 3522
 Bangalow Post Office, *supply*, 3522
 Bellingen Post Office, *supply*, 3522
 Bondi Post Office, *supply*, 3522
 Canbelego Post Office, *supply*, 3522
 Cessnock Post Office, *supply*, 3522
 Coffs Harbor Post Office, *supply*, 3522
 Culcairn Post Office, *supply*, 3522
 Gunning Post Office, *supply*, 3523
 Katoomba Post Office, *supply*, 3522
 Launceston Post Office, *supply*, 3540
 Lithgow Post Office, *supply*, 3523
 Melbourne General Post Office, *supply*,
 3528
 Northam Post Office, *supply*, 3533
 Sydney General Post Office, *supply*, 3521
 Poynton, Mr., naming of, *obs.*, 7369
 Preferential Trade:
 Canada, *Budget*, 1647
 South Africa, *Budget*, 1647
 United Kingdom, *address*, 101, 104; *q.*,
 590, 591, 694, 1413; *Budget*, 1645-6-7; *adj.*,
 1745; *q.*, 1747, 2122; *Budget*, 2146, 2150;
q., 2312, 2791
 Preferential Trade (Tariff), 457-6, 4788, 4959,
 4968, 4970
 Premiers' Conferences, States, *adj.*, 470;
Budget, 1643, 2144
 Prime Minister, Absence of the, *obs.*, 193;
q., 297; *obs.*, 694; *adj.*, 1084; *q.*, 2563;
adj., 3232; *q.*, 3621
 Printing Committee, *m.*, 770, 2230
 Printing Office, *q.*, 2230; *supply*, 3590, 3594,
 3598; Sweating at Sydney, *q.*, 6132, 6595,
 6813, 6968; Casual employés, Melbourne,
q., 7415; New South Wales Electoral Rolls,
supply, 9971; Labourers' pay, Melbourne,
q., 11421
 Production, *Budget*, 1626
 Public Service:
 Allowances, Western Australia, *supply*,
 11371-3; *q.*, 11919
 Boards of Inquiry, *obs.*, 8935
 Classification, *q.*, 1076
 Commissioner, *supply*, 9773, 10443
 Examinations, Public Service Act, *q.*, 12152
 Gratuities; Case of late Mr. Clarke, *q.*,
 7463-4. (*See Officers' Compensation Bill*).

Lyne, Hon. Sir W. J., K.C.M.G.—*continued*.
 Public Service—*continued*.
 Increments; Treasurer's advance, *supply*, 1798; *q.*, 2689; *supply*, 3314; *q.*, 6812;
 Postal officials, *q.*, 7464
 Owen, Colonel, appointment of, *supply*, 9792
 Public Works: New South Wales, *q.*, 2997;
 Expenditure, Post and Telegraph Department, *m.*, 7502; *supply*, 8821
 Pulmonary Phthisis, *q.*, 1517
 Quarantine Bill, 22., 504, 557; *q.*, 1412;
com., (commencement) 1417, (scope of quarantine) 1418, 1468, (general definitions) 1536, 1541, (arrangements with States Governments) 1547, (proclamation of Ports of entry) 1549, 1560, 1562, 1565; *Budget*, 1632-3
 Quarantine:
 Transferred Properties, *q.*, 11918
 Queensland:
 Notice of New Duties, *q.*, 1864, 2122
 Questions without notice, *obs.*, 2233; *q.*, 12041
 Rabbit Virus, *q.*, 407, 503, 3969, 5520, 6356, 6505, 6674, 7300; *supply*, 11377
 Recess, Duration of, *supply*, 12097; *q.*, 12201; *adj.*, 12201
 Revenue of the Commonwealth, *Budget*, 1627-8-9-90-1; *supply*, 3303; *q.*, 9099, 10751; *supply*, 11262, 12098
 Revotes, *Budget*, 1633
 Royal Agricultural Show, *q.*, 2688
 Rural Industries, *q.*, 12158
 Salvation Army Settlements, *q.*, 1596
 Savings Bank Claim: New South Wales, *supply*, 5783
 Seat of Government Bill, *q.*, 3588, 3733 (*see* Federal Capital)
 Secret Drugs, Cures, and Foods: Mr. Beale's Report, *q.*, 1975; *adj.*, 2613; *q.*, 2995; *adj.*, 3102; *supply*, 9982
 Senate, powers of requesting alteration in Tariff, *q.*, 7450
 Shipping Combine, *adj.*, 3952
 Shipping, Differential Treatment by States, *q.*, 11790
 Sitings, Suspension of, *obs.*, 113; *adj.*, 3232; *q.*, 3854; extension of, *adj.*, 4704; *q.*, 5131; *adj.*, 5236; days and hours of, *adj.*, 6188; *obs.*, 6417; *m.*, 6503, 6515; *adj.*, 6591, 6810
 South Africa; Preferential Trade, *Budget*, 1647
 Special Tariff, Western Australia, *Budget*, 1627
 Standard Oil Company and Members, *obs.*, 10974-5-6, 10981; *q.*, 11017; operations of trust, *q.*, 12044
 State Bank, *Budget*, 1642; *q.*, 11019
 State Importations, *obs.*, 2120; *Budget*, 2152; *q.*, 2230-1-2-3; *adj.*, 2346; *q.*, 2563, 3422; *obs.*, 7401
 State Referendum at Federal Elections, *q.*, 2689; *adj.*, 3970, 3971
 States Debts, *Budget*, 1643-4; *supply*, 3316; *q.*, 8816, 10462, 10524, 11159
 States Expenditure, *Budget*, 1634; *supply*, 3304-9, 3359; *expl.*, 3411
 States Premiers' Conference, Report, *q.*, 12040

Lyne, Hon. Sir W. J., K.C.M.G.—*continued*.
 States, Revenue Returned to the, *Budget*, 1627-38-9-40-3, 2144; *expl.*, 2741; *supply*, 3303-11; *q.*, 6420, 9099, 10462; *supply*, 11264; *adj.*, 11735; *q.*, 11737-8-9, 11740-1-2, 11784-5-6-7, 11921, 12151
 States, Services rendered to by Commonwealth Officers, *q.*, 7297
 Sugar:
 Bounty, *Budget*, 1628-32; *supply*, 3310; *q.*, 10464, 10526, 10575, 10702
 Consumption, *Budget*, 1627
 Excise, *Budget*, 1628-32; *q.*, 3173, 10464, 10526, 10575, 10702
 Imports, *Budget*, 1629
 Production, *Budget*, 1628-9
 Rebate, *q.*, 10464, 10526, 10575, 10702, 10789
 Supply:
 External Affairs (Administrative), 8976
 Home Affairs (Electoral Office), 9773;
 (Public Service Commissioner), 9773, 11371-3
 Parliament (Election Expenses), 8965, 11216
 Postmaster-General (Central Staff), (*p.o.*, 10185-6), 10189
 Trade and Customs (Central Staff), 11377
 Treasury, 9961; (Government Printer), 9971 (*p.o.*, 9975); (Treasurer's Advance), 9982; (miscellaneous), 11375
 Works and Buildings, 3303, (*p.o.*, 3319-20); (Home Affairs), 3359, 3423; (Trade and Customs), 3436-7, 3442, 3445; (Defence), 3448-9, 3450, 3677; (Post and Telegraph), 3521, 3528, 3533, 3540; (Telegraphs and Telephones), 3554; (Treasury), 3590, 3504, 3598; (London Offices), 3616, 3619, 3626, 3661
 Supply Bill (No. 2), *int.*, 1775, 1784, 1700; *com.*, External Affairs: (London Offices), 1810-1, 1812; (Pacific Islands Mail Service), 1812; *ad. rep.*, 1869, 1881
 Supply Bill (No. 3), *int.*, 5783
 Supply Bill (No. 4), *int.*, 6279; 22., 6286; *com.*, Contingencies, 6288; Trade and Customs: (Commerce Act), 6290; External Affairs: (Papua), 6290
 Supply Bill (No. 5), *int.*, 8820; *m.s.o.*, 8863
 Supply Bill (No. 1), 1908-9; *int.*, 12097; 22., 12098, 12182; 32., 12190
 Surplus Revenue Bill, *int.*, 9010; *q.*, 9470; 22., 9847, 9875; *expl.*, 11919
 Surplus Revenue, Distribution of, *q.*, 10462
 Tahiti, *q.*, 3105
 Tariff, *q.*, 406, 975, 976; *adj.*, 1180, 1460; *m.*, 1645-6-7-8; *q.*, 1715-6; *adj.*, 1744; *q.*, 1747; *supply*, 1775; *adj.*, 2025, 2028; *m.*, 2143; *q.*, 2791; *adj.*, 3048; *q.*, 3173; *supply*, 3303; *q.*, 3420, 3586, 3587, 3733; *ad. rep.*, 7440; *q.*, 7450; *ad. rep.*, 7455; *q.*, 11780; *adj.*, 12203
 Action of New South Wales Government, *obs.*, 2120; *Budget*, 2152; *q.*, 2230-1-2-3; *adj.*, 2346; *q.*, 2563, 2793; *supply*, 2004; *q.*, 3422
 Agricultural Machinery, *q.*, 1748, 1700; *supply*, 1797; *Budget*, 2148, 2151; *obs.*, 3984
 Alterations, *q.*, 6834
 Amendments, date of, *m.*, 10502-3; *obs.*, 10557-8
 Amendments, formal, *obs.*, 7440
 Anomalies, *q.*, 1715, 2096; *ad. rep.*, 7455
 Antimony, *q.*, 11157-8

Lyne, Hon. Sir W. J., K.C.M.G.—*continued.*

Tariff—*continued.*

Bicycles and parts, *q.*, 3588
 Bottles and Cases, *q.*, 5496
 Collection at Reduced Rates, *q.*, 3734
 Comparative Tariff Tables, *obs.*, 3981; *adj.*, 4307
 Congratulatory messages, *q.*, 2996
 Debates, conclusion of, *q.*, 11052-3
 Discontent in Western Australia, *q.*, 2691
 Dressed Timber, *q.*, 3300, 3421
 Electric Equipment, *q.*, 2232
 Gloves, *q.*, 2566, 2689
 Goods in transit, *q.*, 1745-6; *supply*, 1797, 1882; *q.*, 3586
 Hats, *q.*, 881, 1747
 Index, *q.*, 1715
 Instructions to Collectors, *q.*, 1864, 2122
 Introduction, *q.*, 975, 976, 1180; *adj.*, 1469
 Iron, *Budget*, 1645; *q.*, 3734
 Kerosene, *Budget*, 2152; *obs.*, 3975
 Lobbying, *obs.*, 10977; *q.*, 11051
 Log Timber, *q.*, 1715
 Magazines, *q.*, 3421
 Minister in charge, *q.*, 3587
 New Protection, *q.*, 1715; *adj.*, 1745; *q.*, 1748; *supply*, 1784, 1797; *q.*, 1975; *Budget*, 2148, 2151; *adj.*, 2843; *q.*, 2890, 3174, 3268, 3302; *supply*, 3319, 3320; *q.*, 3421, 3622; *obs.*, 3986, 4009; *q.*, 4200; *obs.*, 4644, 4674; *q.*, 11053.
 Non-debatable items, *q.*, 5210, 5240; *obs.*, 6515
 Order of consideration of items, *q.*, 3421, 3587-8; *obs.*, 3976, 4007, 4010; *p.o.*, 4120; *m.*, 4124; *q.*, 4280; *m.*, 4325-7, 4354, 4360, 4625, 4636; *q.*, 6523
 Paper, duties on, *q.*, 6675
 Photographic Plates, *q.*, 3854
 Piano, Exhibit in Parliament House, *q.*, 7114
 Potato Flour, *q.*, 5415
 Preferential Rates, *Budget*, 1645-6-7; *adj.*, 1745; *q.*, 1747, 2122; *Budget*, 2146, 2150; *q.*, 2312, 2797; *obs.*, 4576, 4788, 4959, 4968, 4970
 Printing Paper: Exemption from duty, *q.*, 11179
 Queensland: Notice of New Duties, *q.*, 1864, 2122
 Rebates on Hat Making and other Machinery, *obs.*, 4450; *adj.*, 4461; *obs.*, 4569; *supply*, 4867; *q.*, 4926; *obs.*, 6704, 6710, 6720-1-3-4, 6738; *m.*, 6744, 6753; *cons. req.*, 11194-7, 11200, 11211-3; piece goods, *obs.*, 7412
 Recommittal of items, *adj.*, 7413; *ad. rep.*, 7455
 Reduction of Duties: Interview with Sydney Daily Telegraph, *obs.*, 5218
 Refunds, *adj.*, 1744; *q.*, 1746; *supply*, 1797; *q.*, 2792, 4199, 4622, 4650
 Retailers' increased prices, *q.*, 1865, 1974; *Budget*, 2147, 2152; *obs.*, 3982-5
 Revenue, *supply*, 1784; *Budget*, 2147; *supply*, 3311-4; *obs.*, 3989; *q.*, 10751; *supply*, 11265
 Senate's Requests, *q.*, 7450, 9100, 9390, 10079; *obs.*, 10674; *m.*, 10815 (*see* Customs Tariff Bill)
 Stearine and Paraffine Wax, *q.*, 5131

Lyne, Hon. Sir W. J., K.C.M.G.—*continued.*

Tariff—*continued.*

Tasmania: Notice of New Duties, *q.*, 1747, 2122
 Tea, *Budget*, 2152; *obs.*, 3976
 Transmission of Resolutions to Senate, *obs.*, 4010
 Wire Netting, *q.*, 1974; *obs.*, 2120; *Budget*, 2148, 2152; *q.*, 2230-1-2-3, 2314, 2792, 2997, 3174, 3422, 3586; *m.*, 4124; *q.*, 4199, 4622, 4650
 Woollen Piece Goods, *adj.*, 11466
 Tariff Commission's Reports, *expl.*, 897; *Budget*, 1646; *q.*, 1716; *adj.*, 1744; *q.*, 1747, 1748, 1866, 1868; *adj.*, 2029; *Budget*, 2149; *expl.*, 2562; *obs.*, 3976, 7470
 Tariff Resolutions (Customs):
 Accoutrements, &c., 5939
 Acetic Acid, &c., 6069
 Adze, Axe, and Scythe Handles, 7125
 Agricultural &c. Machinery and Implements, 6053-4, 6549, 6550, 6556, 6564-5-6-9, 6570-5, 6583-5, 6590; *cons. req.*, 10660-2
 Air Compressors, 6717
 Ale, &c., 3974, 4007, 4009, 4124
 Aluminium Ware, 6748; *cons. req.*, 10707, 11544
 Ammonia, 6069, 6970; *cons. req.*, 11001
 Ammonia Condenser Coils, &c., 6113
 Amylic Alcohol, 4118
 Animals, 4768, 4770, 4771
 Antimony, &c., 6830
 Apparel and Attire, 5625, 5627, 5628; *cons. req.*, 10562-4-5
 Arms, 6034-6; *cons. req.*, 10656
 Arrowroot, 5445
 Articles, n.e.i., 5632, 5633
 Articles, Advertising, 7359
 Articles of Celluloid, 7399
 Art, Works of, 7398; *cons. req.*, 11183, 11191, 11575-6
 Asbestos Pipe and Boiler Covering, 7399
 Asphalt Mastic, 6909
 Bags, &c., 5642, 5644, 5645; *recom.*, 5730-6; *cons. req.*, 10571
 Bags, Baskets, &c., 7359
 Bananas, 5337
 Barbed Wire, 6830
 Barley, 5346
 Barometers, &c., *cons. req.*, 11059-60-3
 Basketware, 7109
 Bicycles, &c., 7270-7, 7280-1-2; *cons. req.*, 11174
 Biscuits, 4775, 4778, 4780
 Blacking, &c., 6847, 6855
 Blacks, 6806
 Blankets, Flannels, &c., 5719, 5727; *cons. req.*, 10576, 11534
 Blue, 4788; *cons. req.*, 10501
 Boats, &c., 7360
 Bolts, Carriage, 6831
 Bolts, Nuts, &c., 6829
 Books, n.e.i., 7269
 Boot Linings, 5927
 Bottle Stoppers, 6935-6
 Bottles, 5463, 6938, 6947-8
 Brass Work, &c., 6112
 Brushmakers' Woodware, 7118
 Buckets, &c., 7138
 Buggy Shafts, 7130-1
 Cameras, Photographs, Postcards, &c., 7393-5
 Candles, 4928, 5132-3

Lyne, Hon. Sir W. J., K.C.M.G.—*continued.*Tariff Resolutions (Customs)—*continued.*

Canvas and Duck, 5930
 Carbide of Calcium, 6971
 Carbon Bisulphide, 7392
 Carpets, &c., 5738; *cons. req.*, 10576, 11459
 Casks, &c., 7131-5
 Cement, &c., 6896
 Chaffcutters, &c., 6564-5
 Chairs, &c. 7021
 China, &c., Ware, 6897, 6900
 Cigarettes, 4304
 Cigars, 4304
 Clay Smoking Pipes, 7397
 Coal-cutting Machines, *cons. req.*, 10731, 11544-5
 Cocoa Butter, &c., 5259
 Coffee, 5263
 Coir Mats, &c., 5739
 Combined Corn Sheller, Husker, &c., 6566
 Combs, &c., 7142
 Confectionery, 5159, 5160, 5219, 5242; *cons. req.*, 10514
 Copying Apparatus, 7379
 Cork Mats, 7379; *cons. req.*, 11175
 Cornflour, 5349, 5350
 Cosies, Cushions, Quilts, &c., 5740-1-2-4
 Cotton, Linen, &c., Piece Goods, 5853-4-6, 5915-7
 Cream Separators, 6583
 Cresylic Acid, 6976
 Crucibles, &c., *cons. req.*, 10903, 11556
 Currants, 5278
 Curtains, &c., *cons. req.*, 10577, 11438, 11441-2-3
 Cutlery, *cons. req.*, 10672-3, 11444
 Cycle Tubing, 7282
 Cycle Parts, 7283-4
 Cylinders, 6113-4
 Dairy Refrigerators, 6569; *cons. req.*, 10662
 Dates, 5331
 Denims, 5850
 Disinfectants, Sheep Washes, &c., 6985-7; *cons. req.*, 11001-9, 11010, 11562
 Droppers, 6831-2
 Drugs and Chemicals, 6976-7; *cons. req.*, 11010-1
 Dry Gums, 6957
 Earthenware, 6903-6
 Eggs, 5265
 Electrical and Gas Meters, *cons. req.*, 10743-7, 11545
 Electrical Articles, 6810; *cons. req.*, 10748, 11448-9
 Electrical Machines, 6800-1-4; *cons. req.*, 10734-8, 10741-2-3, 11444-5-9, 11452-9
 Electroliers, &c., 6808-9
 Engines, 6712
 Essential Oils, 6999
 Ethers, 4139, 6999
 Explosives, 7381-5-8, 7391
 Eyelets, 6114
 Fancy Goods, 7141-2; *cons. req.*, 11057
 Feathers, 5634, 5636
 Fibro-cement, &c., *cons. req.*, 10900-1-2
 Filters, 7359
 Fish, 5260, 5270, 5278; *cons. req.*, 10519
 Fishing Lines, *cons. req.*, 11175
 Flannelette, 5918, 5923; *cons. req.*, 11443
 Furniture, 7002, 7019, 7020, 7021; *cons. req.*, 11011-4-5
 Galvanised Iron, 6524-7, 6530, 6547

Lyne, Hon. Sir W. J., K.C.M.G.—*continued.*Tariff Resolutions (Customs)—*continued.*

Glass, &c., 6915-7-9, 6921-2-3-9, 6934; *cons. req.*, 10906
 Gloves, 5939, 5940; *cons. req.*, 10577-8-9, 11460
 Glucose, 4628
 Glue, 6949, 6954-6
 Glycerine and Lanoline, 6998
 Grain and Pulse, n.e.i., 5358
 Gramophones, &c., *cons. req.*, 11066
 Graphite, 6858
 Hats, Caps, &c., 5947, 5950, 5956, 5960, 5966, 5975, 5976; *cons. req.*, 10580, 10593-7
 Hay and Chaff, 5359, 5361, 5417, 5429; *q.*, 6132; *cons. req.*, 10526
 Herbs, dried, 5341; *cons. req.*, 10520
 Hessians, Jute, Bookbinders' Cloth, &c., 5931
 Hogsheads, 7135-6
 Hoist, Hollman Patent, 6710-2; *cons. req.*, 10685, 10686
 Honey, Jams, Jellies, 5444
 Importations for Governor-General and State Governors, 7403-4-5
 Incandescent Filament Lamps, &c., 6810
 Incandescent Mantles, 5977
 Infants and Invalids' Foods, 5521, 5523-4; *cons. req.*, 10558
 Inkstands, &c., 7266
 Iron and Steel (VIA.), 6833-5-7; (VIA.), 6842-3
 Iron and Steel Tubes, 6829
 Iron Pipes, 6829; *cons. req.*, 10750
 Isinglass, 5462
 Jewellery, 7146-7-8, 7150
 Kerosene, *cons. req.*, 10890, 10900, 10910-1, 10971-4-5-6, 10981, 11098-9, 11100
 Kindergarten Materials, 7266
 Kinematographs, &c., 7152; *cons. req.*, 11064-5
 Kitchen Utensils, Cast Iron, *cons. req.*, 10707-8, 11167
 Lamps, 6038, 6042
 Lasts and Trees, 7126
 Lead, 6051-2; *cons. req.*, 10660, 11443
 Leather, Rubber Belting, &c., 7104-7; *cons. req.*, 11069, 11574
 Licht-pausrohpapier, *cons. req.*, 11170-1-2-3
 Liquorice, 5260; *cons. req.*, 10517-8
 Locks, 6114; *cons. req.*, 10776, 10780-9, 10790-1-8
 Log Band Saws, *cons. req.*, 10686, 11539; (*p.o.*, 11541-4)
 Machine Tools, 6112
 Machinery and Parts, 6103, 6111
 Machines, Machinery, Machine Tools, &c., 6704-7-9, 6710-5-7, 6720-1, 6723-4, 6738, 6743-5-6, 6753
 Magazines, 7192; *cons. req.*, 11081-2-4
 Mangles, &c., 6549
 Manufactures of Metal, n.e.i., 6748; *cons. req.*, 10686-8, 10707-8, 11167
 Matches, 5454; *cons. req.*, 10546-7-50-1-2-4
 Medicines, 6993
 Metal Cordage, 7378
 Milk, Condensed, &c., 5500, 5515, 5518-9
 Milling Silk, 5029
 Miners' Safety Lamps, 6049
 Mining Engines and Machinery, 6772, 6784, 6797; *cons. req.*, 10706, 10731
 Molasses, 4766

Lyne, Hon. Sir W. J., K.C.M.G.—*continued.*Tariff Resolutions (Customs)—*continued.*

Motive Power Machinery, &c., 6633, 6643, 6707; *cons. req.*, 10674-5-8, 11534-5
 Motor Cycles, 7282
 Musical Instruments, 7358-9
 Mustard, *cons. req.*, 10555
 Nails, 6596-7, 6617
 Naphthalene, 6977
 Nuts, edible, *cons. req.*, 10557-8
 Oils, 6867, 6868-9, 6876; *cons. req.*, 10817, 10828, 10881-4, 10890, 10909, 10910-1, 10971-4-5-6, 10981, 11098-9, 11100, 11550-1
 Opium, 6994-5
 Packages, outside, 7347, 7411
 Paint Removers, 6893-5
 Paints and Colours, 6888; *cons. req.*, 10895-8
 Paper, &c., 7198, 7206, 7210-1-4-6-7, 7220-2-3, 7234-7-8, 7240-2; *cons. req.*, 11090-1-2
 Paper, Manufactures of, 7171-2-3-4-6-8, 7180-3-4-7; *cons. req.*, 11071-5-6, 11080-1-2-4-6, 11452
 Peel, preserved, 5336
 Pens, Pencils, &c., 7143, 7266; *cons. req.*, 11058-9, 11168-9
 Perambulators, &c., 7282-3
 Photographic Accessories, 7395-6; *cons. req.*, 11176-7
 Photograph Frames, *cons. req.*, 11057
 Photographs, 7267
 Pianos, 7301-7, 7327, 7345-6-7, 7356; *cons. req.*, 11213-4
 Pictorial Illustrations, 7406
 Pictures, 7398-9
 Pipes, &c., 7396-7
 Plates, 6830
 Poles, Bent, *cons. req.*, 11057
 Potato Flour, 5344, 5346
 Printers' Material, 6115, 6755
 Printing Inks, 7260-3; *cons. req.*, 11092-3-5
 Printing Roller Composition, *cons. req.*, 10996
 Pump Butts, 7168
 Rails, &c., 6814-6, 6821, 6829; *cons. req.*, 10749
 Rebate: Machinery, 6753; *cons. req.*, 11194-7, 11200, 11211-3; Piece Goods, 7412
 Regalia, 5640
 Rennet, 5462
 Rice, 5526, 5531; *cons. req.*, 10559
 Rice Root, 4793; *cons. req.*, 10502-4
 Rivets, bifurcated, 6832
 Road Rollers, Traction Engines, &c., 6678-9, 6689, 6700
 Roasting Dishes, 6911
 Rock-boring Machines, 6797-9; *cons. req.*, 10731
 Rock Drills, 6784, 6797; *cons. req.*, 10710, 10730
 Roll Shells, 6103, 6111
 Roofing Slates, 6957
 Roofing Tiles, 6906
 Rubber Manufactures, 7160-2-3; *cons. req.*, 11068-9
 Rubberised Waterproof Cloth, 5804
 Saccharin, 6973-6
 Saddlers' Material, 6116
 Sago and Tapioca, 4774; *cons. req.*, 10496-7
 Salt, 5535-6; *cons. req.*, 10559
 Sausage Casings, 5459, 5460-1
 School Slates, &c., 7267
 Scientific Instruments, 7406, 7410-1; *cons. req.*, 10906

Lyne, Hon. Sir W. J., K.C.M.G.—*continued.*Tariff Resolutions (Customs)—*continued.*

Scrap Iron and Steel, 6832
 Screws, 6768-9, 6772; *cons. req.*, 10709, 11086, 11444
 Sewing Machines, 6103
 Sewing Silks, &c., 7378
 Sheep Shearing Machines, 6575, 6583-5; *cons. req.*, 10662-7
 Shooks, 7136-8
 Silk Piece Goods, 5851
 Slate Slabs, 6957; *cons. req.*, 10998
 Slipper Forms, &c., *cons. req.*, 11068
 Soap, 5545
 Socks and Stockings, 5931, 5936, 5937
 Spectacles, Spectacle Frames, &c., 7153; *cons. req.*, 11067
 Stained Glass Windows, 6915-9, 6921; *cons. req.*, 11183, 11191, 11575-6
 Standards, &c., 6116; *cons. req.*, 10798-9, 10800-1-4, 11548
 Starch, 5547, 5548
 State Importations, 7401
 Stationery, &c., 7243
 Stay Paper, &c., 7267-8
 Stearine, Paraffine Wax, &c., 5136, 5155; *cons. req.*, 10505-6
 Steel and Steel-rimmed Wheels, 6832; *cons. req.*, 10804-6
 Stone and Marble, 6957-8, 6966-7; *cons. req.*, 10998, 11452
 Stoves, 6043-4-5
 Stripper Harvesters, 6570, 7449
 Strippers, 7449
 Sugar, 4672, 4762
 Sugar, Invert, 4764
 Surgical and Dental and Veterinary Appliances, &c., 7406-7; *cons. req.*, 11192-3
 Table Waters, 4142
 Tanks, 6621
 Tartaric Acid, 6993
 Tea, *cons. req.*, 10559-62
 Tents, Tarpaulins, &c., 5937
 Tiles, 6906
 Thio Sulphates, 6993
 Timber, 7021-2, 7077, 7095-6-7, 7101, 7104-6-7; *cons. req.*, 11019, 11056, 11144-7-9, 11150-3-9, 11162-6, 11452, 11567, 11570-1
 Tin Plate, 6116
 Tinned Plates, 6833
 Tobacco, 4202, 4302, 4303, 4304
 Tool Handles, 7119, 7122-4-5
 Traps, Rabbit, &c., 6115
 Trimings, &c., 5938
 Type, Printers', 6755; *cons. req.*, 10709
 Varnishes, &c., 6893
 Vehicles, 7284-9, 7290-2-3-4
 Waddings and Cotton Wool, 5927-8
 Watches, &c., 7151-2
 Weighing Machines, &c., 6626-8, 6630-1-2
 Wigs, &c., *cons. req.*, 10655
 Wine, 4140, 4142, 4200
 Wire, 6118
 Wire Cloth, Gauze, &c., 6833; *cons. req.*, 10806, 10815
 Wire Netting, 4413, 4448, 4569, 4571, 4572, (p.o., 4575), 4579; *cons. req.*, 10770
 Wood Naphtha, 4738
 Wood, Wicker, Bamboo, and Cane, 6999, 7000-1, 7100; *cons. req.*, 11056
 Wool Scouring Machines, 6721-3-4, 6738

Lyne, Hon. Sir W. J., K.C.M.G.—continued.

Tariff Resolutions (Customs)—*continued*.
 Woollen Piece Goods, 5804, 5812, 5837, 5838,
 5841, 5843, (*p.o.*, 5847, 5850), 5850; *cons.*
reg., 11461-6, 11526, 11533
 Yarns, 7375-6

(*See* Customs Tariff Bill.)

Tariff Resolutions (Excise):

Amylic Alcohol, *cons. reg.*, 11215
 Cigarettes, 4306, 4312, 4323, 4324, 4325
 Cigars, 4306
 Glucose, 4636, 4642, 4643, 4644
 Golden Syrup, 4767
 Saccharin, 5558, 7412
 Starch, 5549, 5551, 5555, 5556
 Sugar, Invert, 4766
 Tobacco, 4304, 4305, 4306

(*See* Excise Tariff Bill.)

Tariff Revision, *address*, 100; *q.*, 406, 11789;
adj., 12203

Tasmania:

Cable Communication, *Budget*, 1635; *q.*,
 12154; *supply*, 12182
 Inter-State Certificates, *Budget*, 1629
 Notice of New Duties, *q.*, 1747, 2122
 Shipping Services, *q.*, 11917
 Telephone: Melbourne-Sydney, *q.*, 11179
 Tenders: British Preference, *q.*, 12198
 Transferred Properties, *Budget*, 1641; *q.*,
 11741-2, 11785-6, 11918
 Trawler: Tenders for construction, *q.*, 1751;
supply, 3437, 3442, 3445
 Treasurer, Resignation of the, *obs.*, 1084
 Treasurer's Advance, *supply*, 1795, 1798, 8820,
 12098, 12182, 12190
 Tropical Diseases, Study of, *supply*, 6288
 Wages, Standard rate of: Contracts, *q.*, 1751
 Western Australia:
 Survey of North-west Coast, *q.*, 2450
 Tariff: Discontent with, *q.*, 2691
 Wireless Telegraphy, *supply*, 3554
 Wire Netting:
 Action of New South Wales Government,
obs., 2120; *Budget*, 2152; *q.*, 2230-1-2-3;
adj., 2346; *q.*, 2563, 3422; cancellation of
 carriers' licences, *q.*, 2793; *supply*, 2904
 Commonwealth Imports, *q.*, 2314, 3174
 Manufacture of, *q.*, 2997
 Women's Work Exhibition Grant, *q.*, 1751;
supply, 1798; *expl.*, 1867; *supply*, 1883;
q., 2236; *adj.*, 2346
 Woollen Trade Wages Board, *q.*, 3622
 Works and Buildings, *Budget*, 1632-5-6-8;
supply, 1775; *q.*, 1866, 2312, 2997; *supply*,
 12190 (*see under* Supply)
 Year-Book, Commonwealth, *q.*, 11920

Macfarlane, Senator Hon. J., Tasmania:

Adjournment, Special, *m.*, 10400
 Agriculture, Federal Bureau of, *q.*, 8505-6
 Appropriation (Works and Buildings) Bill, 2R.,
 3825; *com.* (Trade and Customs), 3933; (*De*
fence), 4044; (*External Affairs*), 4060
 Australian Industries Preservation Bill, 2R.,
 4099; *com.* (burden of proof), 4915, 4923;
 (power of Comptroller-General to question,
 &c.), 5012, 5084, 5094; *ad. rep.*, 5182
 Bills of Exchange Bill, 2R., 664; *com.* (ac-
 commodation bill or party), 747; (non-
 acceptance), 748; (protection of banker),
 758; (signature), 759; (application of State
 Laws), 1502; (presentment of cheque), 2059;
recom., (presentment of stale cheque), 2414

Macfarlane, Senator Hon. J.—continued.

Bounties Bill, 2R., 2753; *com.*, (regulations),
 2849, 2858; First Schedule (fish), 4262, 4274;
 (wool tops), 4389
 Business, Conduct of, *adj.*, 487
 Coast Defence Appropriation Bill, 2R., 12112
 Commerce Act, *q.*, 132, 7701, 7754, 7849
 Customs Certificates: British Goods, *m.*, 1955,
 1965; *q.*, 7927
 Customs Tariff Bill, 2R., 7594; *com.*,
 Schedule:
 Acetic Acid, &c., 9238
 Ale, &c., 7624
 Ammonia Condenser Coils, 9169
 Apparel and Attire, 8215
 Arrowroot, 7952-4
 Biscuits, 7679
 Blankets, &c., 8233
 Bottles, 8408-9, 8501
 Carbide of Calcium, 9262-7
 Coffee, 7782
 Confectionery, 7739, 7747
 Cornflour, 7909
 Curtains, &c., 8287
 Disinfectants, &c., *cons. reg.*, 11242
 Electrical Machines, &c., 8884
 Fire Bricks, &c., 8480
 Fish, 7805
 Fruits, Citrus, 7830
 Furniture, 9354-7
 Furs, &c., 8292
 Glassware, 8493
 Gloves, 8295
 Glue, &c., 8512-3
 Graphite, &c., 8370
 Hay and Chaff, 7942
 Honey, Jams, &c., 7946
 Iron and Steel (VI.A), 9188
 Lamps, &c., 8568, 8570-1
 Locks, 9178
 Manures, 9913
 Matches, 8002
 Mine Ventilating Fans, 8680
 Mining Machinery, 8786
 Motive Power Machinery, 8627-9, 8636;
 (*p.o.*, 8645)
 Oilmen's Stores, 8045
 Oils, 8309, 8439, 8448; *cons. reg.*, 11226
 Paints, 8450-1, 8468, 8470
 Paper, &c., 9684
 Piece Goods, 8125, 8143, 8178, 8190-4
 Printing Roller Composition, 8519, 8521
 Rice, 8086
 Roofing Tiles, &c., 8479
 Salt, 8090-3
 Sensitised Films, 9031
 Standards, &c., 9180
 Stearine, Paraffine Wax, &c., 7715; *cons.*
reg., 10851
 Stone and Marble, 8549
 Tallow, &c., 8380-1-3-6
 Tea, 8115
 Timber, 9425, 9458, 9547
 Tool Handles, &c., 9637
 Type, &c., 8769, 8770
 Wood, articles of, *n.e.i.*, 9580
 Vegetables, Herbs, dried, 7882
 Cypher Telegrams, *adj.*, 1687
 Days and Hours of Meeting, *m.*, 8079
 Defence:
 Hobart Rifle Range, *supply*, 4044

Macfarlane, Senator Hon. J.—*continued.*

English Mails: Tasmania, *q.*, 131; *adj.*, 157; *q.*, 745; *adj.*, 766
Excise Tariff (Spirits) Act, *q.*, 8364
Fruit Export Regulations, *q.*, 7849
Hobart Postal Service, *q.*, 11301-2
Immigration Restriction Act: Bond for Sick Sailor, *q.*, 5858
Invalid and Old-age Pensions Bill, 2R., 12015; *com.* (persons disqualified), 12031
Judiciary Bill, *com.*, new clause (appeals from State Courts), 954
London Offices, *q.*, 3683; *supply*, 3825, 4069
Mail Contract, Cancelled, *q.*, 931, 2513, 2743, 7926
Mail Service to Europe, *m.*, 6207
Mails: Tasmania, *supply*, 1954; *q.*, 2031, 11301-2, 11473
Meteorological Department, *adj.*, 7652; *q.*, 7568, 7843; *supply*, 8988
Navigation Bill, *q.*, 2406, 3145, 9422, 10253, 12918
Navigation Conference, *q.*, 563
Parliament Gardens, *supply*, 5884
Parliamentary Papers Bill, *com.* (no action for publishing copies, &c., of Parliamentary Papers), 12135
Port Davey: Marine Telegraph Station, *q.*, 5178
Printing Committee, *m.*, 38, 8225
Quarantine Bill, 2R., 4402; *com.* (arrangements with State Governments: stations, &c.), 5304, 5319, 5321; (powers of Commonwealth), 5322, 5325, 5396, 5473, 5480, 5482; (disinfecting apparatus on vessels), 5994; (cleansing and disinfecting vessel), 6004; (goods not to be removed), 6004; (liability of owners, &c., for provisions for quarantined persons), 6073, 6077
Queensland Sugar Cane Fields: Labour, *q.*, 5176
Reid, Mr. J. K., *m.*, 354
Shipping Companies: Rebates, *q.*, 11985
Supply Bill (No. 2), 3R., 1954
Supply Bill (No. 3), 2R., 4880; *com.*, Schedule: The Parliament, 5884
Supply Bill (No. 4), 1R., 6347
Supply Bill (No. 5), *com.*, Schedule: Home Affairs (Meteorology), 8988
Supply Bill (No. 1) 1908-9, 1R., 12140; *com.*, Schedule, Home Affairs, (Miscellaneous), 12146
Surplus Revenue Bill, 2R., 11888
Tariff:
Tasmania, *q.*, 1814
Tasmania: Survey of West Coast, *supply*, 5880, 6347; Weather Reports and Forecasts, *q.*, 7568, 7652, 7843; Cable Service *via* King Island, *q.*, 11467, 11863; *supply*, 12140; State Guarantee, *q.*, 11987
Trawler, *supply*, 3933
Wireless Telegraphy, *supply*, 6347; *q.*, 11863; *supply*, 12140

Mahon, Hon. H Coolgardie:

Aborigines, Western Australia: Allegations of cruelty, *q.*, 7115
Additional Sitting Day, *m.*, 6508
Advertising Australia, *Budget*, 3215
Australians repatriated from South Africa, *Budget*, 3215
Budget, 3210

Mahon, Hon. H.—*continued.*

Business, Precedence of Government, *adj.*, 2684; *m.*, 2800; Conduct of, *m.*, 6508
Commonwealth and States: Relations, *supply*, 9713
Commonwealth Buildings: Rental System, *supply*, 9880
Customs Department:
Leakage of information: Melbourne, *supply*, 7332
Customs Tariff Bill, *cons. req.* (*p.o.*, 10571); (hats, caps, &c.), 10590; (electrical machinery), (*p.o.*, 10736-8), 10740-1; (wire gauze), 10814; (*p.o.*, 10815); (printing roller composition), 10997; (timber), 11149 (*See* Tariff Resolutions (Customs))
Defence:
Government Policy, *q.*, 8813
Naval Agreement, *q.*, 2908; *Budget*, 3224
Estimates, Additional, *supply*, 11360-1, 11371-4-8
Federal Capital, *Budget*, 3211; *supply*, 8836
Forrest, Sir John: Tariff and Naval Agreement, *Budget*, 3220; *adj.*, 3231; *supply*, 3349
Government House, Sydney, *supply*, 9882
High Court, *supply*, 8841, 9727-9
Hughes, Decoration of Diver, *q.*, 2566, 2793; *adj.*, 2994
Immigration, *supply*, 9711
Indigent Authors' Fund, *q.*, 4647
Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway: Brennan Mono-rail, *q.*, 8927; Survey, *q.*, 10785
Kanakas, Repatriation of, *Budget*, 3214; *supply*, 8841; *q.*, 9684; *supply*, 9686, 9707, 11378
Land Values Taxation, *Budget*, 3215-6
London Offices, *supply*, 9488
Mails:
Casino to Grafton Service, *q.*, 407
Imperial Government Contract, *q.*, 3973
Mail Service to Europe, *q.*, 6129, 6229; *supply*, 10162
North-West Coast, *q.*, 2690; *supply*, 9996; *q.*, 10784
Pilbarra Gold-field Service, *q.*, 2123
Port Hedland to Marble Bar: Employment of Asiatics, *q.*, 9844
Ministerial Expenses, *supply*, 9484
Navigation Bill, *Budget*, 3217
New Protection, *Budget*, 3216
Northam Post Office, *supply*, 3534
Old-age Pensions, *q.*, 352; *Budget*, 3215
Pacific Cable, *q.*, 4086
Pacific Islands Mail Service, *supply*, 9511-13
Papua: Removal of Aborigines, *q.*, 4309, 4412; administrator, *q.*, 9476; *supply*, 9494, 9503; *adj.*, 9794; *q.*, 11325; administration, *supply*, 9493; officials, *supply*, 9495-6, 9501-3; mail service, *q.*, 9953; *supply*, 11360-1; Treasurer, *q.*, 10178
Parliamentary Debates: Official Précis, *Budget*, 3212
Pearling Fleets, Raids on, *q.*, 81
Petitions: Prayers, *obs.*, 3619
Post and Telegraph Department:
Administration, *supply*, 8838
Allowance Postmasters: Sweating, *supply*, 10163
Complaints: Newspaper Influence, *supply*, 10161
Country Districts, Facilities, *m.*, 7507; *supply*, 8840, 10162

Mahon, Hon. H.—*continued.*

Post and Telegraph Department—*continued.*

- Cue: Postmaster, *q.*, 6406
- Deputy Postmaster-General, Victoria, *supply*, 4847
- Employés Organizations, *supply*, 3553
- Expenditure on Works and Buildings, *m.*, 7507
- Salaries, *supply*, 8838
- Temporary Hands, *supply*, 8838
- Postal Rates Bill, *q.*, 297; *supply*, 10162
- Preferential Trade, *Budget*, 3224
- Printing Committee, *m.*, 2229
- Public Service:
 - Allowances, Western Australia, *q.*, 405, 504; *adj.*, 2684; *supply*, 9781, 11371-4
 - Boards of Inquiry, *supply*, 9779
 - Commissioner's Policy, *supply*, 8838, 9779, 9780
 - Insolvencies, *supply*, 9781
 - Overtime, Customs, Melbourne, *q.*, 3969
 - Promotions, *supply*, 9782
 - Secretary to Commissioner, *supply*, 9782
- Quarantine Bill, *com.* (disinfecting apparatus on vessels), 1620; (vaccination of quarantined persons), 1736
- Questions, *p.o.*, 315
- Rabbit Destruction: Dr. Danysz's Experiments, *m.*, 6520
- States:
 - Compensation to Officers doing Commonwealth Work, *supply*, 9729
 - Expenditure, *Budget*, 3217-8; *expl.*, 3419
 - Premiers' Conferences, *Budget*, 3217; *supply*, 9713
- Statistics, Printing of, *supply*, 9876-7
- Stock Quarantine, *q.*, 3732
- Sugar Industry: Bounty, Excise, and Drawback, *Budget*, 3213, 3229; *Tariff*, 4650, 4758; *q.*, 5240; *supply*, 8841, 9986; *q.*, 10463, 10525, 10575, 10701, 10789; wages, *q.*, 11325
- Supply:
 - Attorney-General (High Court), 9727-9
 - External Affairs (Executive Council), 9484; (London Offices), 9488; (Papua), 9493, 9501-3, 11360-1; (Pacific Islands Mail Service), 9511-3, 11360-1; (Miscellaneous), 9686, 9707, 9711
 - Home Affairs (Public Service Commissioner), 9778, 11371-4; (Census and Statistics), 9876-7; (Works and Buildings), 9880; (Governor-General's Establishment), 9882
 - Postmaster-General (Central Staff), 10161
 - Trade and Customs (Queensland), 9986, 11378; (Western Australia), 9996-7
 - Works and Buildings (Home Affairs), 3349; (Post and Telegraph), 3534; (Telegraphs and Telephones), 3540, 3552, 3554, 3555
- Supply Bill (No. 2), *int.*, 1787; *ad. rep.*, 1872
- Supply Bill (No. 5), *int.*, 8836
- Tariff, *m.*, 3210:
 - Cases, *q.*, 2233
 - Condensed Milk, *q.*, 2564; *recom.*, 7453
 - Discontent in Western Australia, *q.*, 2601
 - Hat Duties: Pairs, *m.*, 6510
 - Paper, Duties on, *q.*, 6675
 - Pianos: Importation, *q.*, 7113
- Tariff Resolutions (Customs):
 - Agricultural, &c., Machinery and Implements, 6549, 6560, 6563
 - Tasks, 7135
 - Umbs, &c., 7142
 - Condensed Milk, *ad. rep.*, 7453

Mahon, Hon. H.—*continued.*

Tariff Resolutions (Customs)—*continued.*

- Directories, Books, &c., 7190-1-5; *p.o.*, 10736-8
 - Electrical Machinery, *cons. req.*, 10740-1
 - Furniture, 7002, 7020
 - Hats, Caps, &c., *cons. req.*, 10590
 - Importations for Governor-General and State Governors, 7405
 - Machines and Machinery, 6723-4
 - Manufactures of Metal, *n.e.i.*, 6747
 - Motive Power Machinery, &c., 6670
 - Nails, 6609
 - Newspaper Supplements, 7195, 7398-9
 - Packages, outside, 7347, 7351-4-5
 - Paper, Manufactures of, 7177, 7183-5
 - Paper, &c., 7196-8, 7202-5, 7212-4-5
 - Phonographs, &c., 7152-3
 - Pianos, 7332, 7347, 7351-4-5
 - Plates, prepared, 7396
 - Printers' Material, 6115
 - Printing Inks, 7254-7, 7264-6
 - Printing Roller Composition, *cons. req.*, 10997
 - State Importations, 7431
 - Sugar, 4650, 4758
 - Timber, *cons. req.*, 11149
 - Type, Printers', 6753-5, 6768
 - Wire Gauze, *cons. req.*, 10814
 - Wool Scouring Machines, 6723-4
(See Customs Tariff Bill)
 - Telegraph and Telephone Service:
 - Black Range Telegraph Extension, *supply*, 10163
 - Country Districts: Telephones, *supply*, 10163
 - Flat and Toll Rates, *supply*, 3542, 3553, 10162
 - Sydney-Melbourne Trunk Telephone, *supply*, 3540, 3552, 8841, 10162
 - Telegraph Communication: Western Australia, *q.*, 2121
 - Telegraph Line: North-West Australia, *q.*, 4412; *m.*, 7507
 - Wireless Telegraphy, *supply*, 3554-5
 - Western Australia:
 - Coastal Trade, *supply*, 9996-7; *q.*, 10784
 - Industries, *Budget*, 3217
 - Survey of North-West Coast, *q.*, 2450
 - Women's Work Exhibition Grant, *q.*, 1750; *supply*, 1787, 1872; *m.*, 1977; *q.*, 2236; *adj.*, 2345
- Maloney, Mr. W., Melbourne:**
- Adjournment, Special, *m.*, 742, 12202
 - All-night Sitzings: Attendance of Members, *q.*, 6024
 - Australian Industries Preservation Bill, *com.* (power of Comptroller-General to question, &c.), 9231-4
 - British Patents Act, *q.*, 11157
 - Butter Export: Philippines, *q.*, 6726
 - Chairman of Committees, *m.*, 315
 - Cheap Weekly Trains: Melbourne and Sydney, *q.*, 1751
 - Children, provision for, at Waitara Home, *adj.*, 12202
 - Chinese, Influx of, *supply*, 9413
 - Citizens' Life Assurance Company, *q.*, 12200
 - Commonwealth Salaries Bill, 28, 3878
 - Consumption: Prohibited Immigrants, *adj.*, 1682

Maloney, Mr. W.—*continued.*

Coon, Mr., *expl.*, 12198
 Customs Tariff Bill, *cons. req.* (hay and chaff), 10539; (matches), 10550; (apparel and attire), 10562-4; (woollen piece goods), 10624-7; (*p.o.*, 10627), 10628, 11527, 11530-2-3; (socks, &c.), 10643-4; (manufactures of metal, *n.e.i.*), 10694; (rock drills), 10725-8; (oils), 10822, 10918, 10970, 10992, 11553; (disinfectants, &c.), 11003, (*p.o.*, 11011), 11566; (furniture), 11014; (paper), 11087; (timber), 11142; (bicycles, motors, &c.), 11174; (curtains, &c.), 11442; (stained-glass windows), 11578. (*See* Tariff Resolutions (Customs))
 Defence :
 Cadets Clothing and Equipment, *q.*, 11793
 Crimea Veterans, *q.*, 6593
 King's Regulations, *q.*, 883
 Major's Examination : Victorian Scottish Regiment, *q.*, 6232
 Non-Commissioned Officers : Royal Australian Artillery, *q.*, 11921
 Oath of Fidelity, *q.*, 9299
 Shergold, Compensation to Bombardier, *q.*, 9955
 Disputed Elections and Qualifications Bill, *com.* (pending petitions), 6381
 Electoral Act :
 Postal Votes, *supply*, 9772
 Federal Capital, *adj.*, 308
 Government, position of the, *supply*, 10475
 Grain Bags, size of, *adj.*, 9734
 Immigration : Land Question, *q.*, 10179
 Impure Foods, Sale of, *q.*, 9764
 Invalid and Old-age Pensions Bill, 2R., 11950
 Kingston, Mr., death of, *m.*, 11048
 London Offices, *supply*, 1879
 Mail Service to Europe, *m.*, 6126
 Mail Steamers : Charges for Liquor, *q.*, 2564
 Manufactures Encouragement Bill, 2R., 6177
 Medical Degrees, Registration of, *q.*, 10574
 New Hebrides, *supply*, 9413
 Norfolk Island, *q.*, 9957
 Officers, Services of, *adj.*, 12202
 Old-age Pensions, *m.*, 694; *supply*, 9323; *adj.*, 10482. (*See* Invalid and Old-age Pensions Bill.)
 Old-age Pensions Appropriation Bill, 3R., 12097
 Olympian Games, *q.*, 9388
 Opium Smuggling : Deportation of Chinese, *q.*, 11525
 Paper, Duties on, *expl.*, 7185
 Papua : Appointments, *q.*, 4958; Administration, *supply*, 9414
 Parliament House : Lobbying, *q.*, 6592; *expl.*, 7185
 Parliament : Reflections on Members, *Tariff*, 10992; *expl.*, 10998
 Parliamentary Allowances Bill, *com.* (amount of allowance), 2000, 2002; new clause (return of increase to revenue), 2012
 Patent and Proprietary Medicines, *adj.*, 885
 Post and Telegraph Department :
 Administration, *supply*, 4857
 Carpenters, *adj.*, 3230
 Contract Post Offices, *q.*, 9192
 Deputy Postmaster-General, Victoria, *supply*, 4858
 Melbourne General Post Office, *supply*, 3529

Maloney, Mr. W.—*continued.*

Post and Telegraph Department—*continued.*
 Registration of applicants for work, Melbourne, *q.*, 10081
 Royal Commission, *supply*, 10447, 10475; *expl.*, 10481
 Saturday Half-holiday, *q.*, 8925
 Printing Office, Melbourne, casual employes, *q.*, 7415; *adj.*, 7538; pay of labourers, *q.*, 11421
 Public Service :
 Arrears of Pay, *q.*, 988
 Office Cleaners, *supply*, 9876
 Quarantine Bill, *com.* (general definitions), 1542; (fumigation of vessels to destroy vermin), 1622; *cons. amds.*, 8944
 Questions without notice, *q.*, 10079
 Rabbit Virus, *q.*, 407
 Rat Virus, *q.*, 6675
 Repatriation of Australians, *q.*, 928
 Shipping Combine, *adj.*, 3957
 State Officers : Compensation for Commonwealth Work, *supply*, 9733
 Statistics, Printing of, *supply*, 9878
 Supply :
 Attorney-General (Secretary's Office), 9726; (High Court), 9733
 External Affairs (Administrative), 9415
 Home Affairs (Electoral Office), 9772; (Census and Statistics), 9876-8
 Works and Buildings (Post and Telegraph), 3529
 Supply Bill (No. 2), *ad. rep.*, 1879
 Tariff, *ad. rep.*, 7455 :
 Order of Consideration of Items, *m.*, 4355, 4359
 Prohibitions, *obs.*, 7412
 Tariff Resolutions (Customs) :
 Apparel and Attire, 5629, 5630, 5631; *ad. rep.*, 7455; *cons. req.*, 10562-4
 Bags, &c., 5646
 Belt Butts, 7168
 Bicycles, Motors, &c., 7279; *cons. req.*, 11174
 Confectionery, 5233, 5237, 5241, 5255
 Corks, 7380
 Curtains, &c., *cons. req.*, 11442
 Disinfectants, &c., *cons. req.*, 11003 (*p.o.*, 11011), 11566
 Feathers, 5635, 5638
 Furniture, *cons. req.*, 11014
 Glucose, 4632
 Glue, 6952
 Hay and Chaff, *cons. req.*, 10539
 Importations for Governor-General and State Governors, 7405
 Italian Cloths, 5853
 Leather and Rubber Belting, &c., 7164-8
 Machines, Machine Tools, &c., 6745
 Manufactures of Metal, *n.e.i.*, *cons. req.*, 10694
 Matches, *cons. req.*, 10550
 Oils, *cons. req.*, 10822, 10918, 10970, 10992, 11553
 Paper, &c., 7185, 7202-5, 7237, 7240-1; *cons. req.*, 11087
 Road Rollers, Trac tion Engines, &c., 6687
 Rock Drills, *cons. req.*, 10725-8
 Rubber Manufactures, 7160
 Scientific Instruments, 7408
 Silk Piece Goods, 4851
 Socks, &c., *cons. req.*, 10643-4
 Stained-glass Windows, *cons. req.*, 11578

Maloney, Mr. W.—continued.Tariff Resolutions (Customs)—*continued.*

- Stone and Marble, 6961
- Sugar, 4758
- Timber, 7107; *cons. reg.*, 11142
- Tin Plate, 6117
- Tobacco, 4223, 4299
- Type, Printers', 6766
- Velvets, Plushes, &c., 5851-2
- Wine, 4202
- Wire Netting, 4579
- Woollen Piece Goods, 5838, 5850; *cons. reg.*, 10624-7-8, 11527, 11530-2-3
(*See* Customs Tariff Bill.)
- Tariff Resolutions (Excise):
 - Cigarettes, 4307, 4311, 4313
- Telegraph and Telephone Service:
 - Long Distance Telephones: privacy, *supply*, 4858
 - Shipping information, *q.*, 773, 928
 - Telegraphists' Overtime, *q.*, 2688
 - Telephone Anomalies, *adj.*, 985
 - Telephone Directories, *q.*, 1516, 3586, 5911
- Women's Work Exhibition Grant, *supply*, 1879

Mathews, Mr. J., Melbourne Ports:

- Address-in-Reply, *m.*, 233
- American Fleet, Visit of, *q.*, 11525
- Australian Industries Preservation Bill, 2R., 9033
- Blotting Paper: Tenders, *q.*, 11922
- Bounties Bill, *com.*, schedule (rice), 1190;
(preserved fish), 1299
- British Patents Act, *q.*, 9297
- Budget, 3269
- Customs Administration:
 - Border Stations, *supply*, 9984
 - Officers' Promotions, *supply*, 9985
- Customs Tariff Bill, *cons. reg.* (mustard), 10557; (apparel and attire), 10563; (bags and sacks), 10571-3; (waddings, &c.), 10630; (socks, &c.), 10650; (electrical and gas meters), 10745-7; (iron pipes), 10750; (oils), 10914, 11552; (timber), 11125; (woollen piece goods), 11533. (*See* Tariff Resolutions (Customs))
- Defence:
 - Australian Navy, *address*, 235; *Budget*, 3271
 - Bridles and Bits, Tenders for, *q.*, 9389
 - Cadet System, *Budget*, 3270
 - Commissions, *supply*, 10103
 - Cordite, Small Arms, and Ammunition Factories, *Budget*, 3271
 - Inspector of Ordnance Machinery, *supply*, 10104
 - Land Forces, *address*, 235
 - Naval Agreement, *supply*, 3602
 - Naval Brigade, *Budget*, 3271
 - Naval Forces: Retiring Age, *q.*, 7116
 - Rifle Clubs, *Budget*, 3271
 - Williamstown Naval Depot, *supply*, 10104
 - Williamstown Rifle Butts, *q.*, 9581
- Electoral Rolls, *q.*, 11258-9
- Estimates, Additional, *supply*, 11398
- Excise Tariff (Agricultural Machinery) Act, *q.*, 5909
- Federal Capital, *address*, 236; *q.*, 10074
- Grain Bags, size of, *q.*, 9767
- Immigrants, assisted: New South Wales, *adj.*, 1326
- Ion Restriction Act, *q.*, 10483

Mathews, Mr. J.—continued.

- Invalid and Old-age Pensions Bill, *com.* (persons disqualified), 11972
- Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway, *Budget*, 3272
- Mail Service to Europe, *m.*, 6484
- Manufacturers Encouragement Bill, 2R., 6272; *com.* (Schedule), 12178
- New Protection, *supply*, 5695
- Northern Territory, *Budget*, 3272
- Old-age Pensions, *address*, 234; *supply*, 9341
(*See* Invalid and Old-age Pensions Bill.)
- Pair, *expl.*, 10732
- Parliamentary Allowances Bill, 2R., 1989
- Post and Telegraph Department:
 - Administration: Victoria and Queensland, *supply*, 5696
 - Country Services, *supply*, 10233, 11399
 - Deputy Postmaster-General, Victoria, *supply*, 4849, 5696
 - Finance: Works and Buildings, *supply*, 10231
 - Mail Bags: Victoria, *q.*, 3509
 - Officials as Returning Officers, *m.*, 717
 - Pole Dressers, *supply*, 11398
 - Stony Point and San Remo Mail Contract, *supply*, 11399
- Preferential Trade, *address*, 234
- Preferential Trade (Tariff), 4890
- Public Service:
 - Amendment of Act, *q.*, 10310
 - Boy Labour, *Budget*, 3270
 - Commissioner, *supply*, 10232
 - Increments, *Budget*, 3270; *q.*, 6812
 - Leave of Rifle Match Competitors, *supply*, 5697
 - Promotions, *supply*, 10232
- Public Service Bill, 2R., 12061
- Quarantine Bill, *com.* (inquiries by quarantine officer), 1733; (vaccination of quarantined persons), 1738
- State Imports, *Budget*, 3279
- Supply:
 - Defence (Central Administration), 10103
 - Postmaster-General (Central Staff), 10231; (Victoria), 11398
 - Trade and Customs, 9984-5
 - Works and Buildings (Defence), 3602
- Surplus Revenue Bill, 2R., 11773
- Tariff, *m.*, 3269; *ad. rep.*, 7455:
 - Bicycles and Parts, *q.*, 3588
 - Goods in Transit, *q.*, 1746
 - Old and New Duties, *q.*, 1747
 - Prices, increase of, *q.*, 2792
- Tariff Resolutions (Customs):
 - Agricultural, &c., Machinery and Implements, 6562
 - Air Compressors, 6718
 - Apparel and Attire, 5608; *cons. reg.*, 10563
 - Bags, &c., *cons. reg.*, 10571-3
 - Boats, &c., 7360
 - Bottles, 6941
 - Candles, 4890, 4951
 - Canvas and Duck, 6930
 - Directories, &c., 7189
 - Disinfectants, Sheep Washes, &c., 6978
 - Electrical and Gas Meters, *cons. reg.*, 10745-7
 - Fire Extinguishers, 6112
 - Firebricks, 6910
 - Fishing Nets, 7375
 - Furniture, 7020
 - Glass, &c., 6913

Mathews, Mr. J.—continued.

Tariff Resolutions (Customs)—continued.

- Hats, Caps, &c., 5072
- Incandescent Filament Lamps, &c., 6809-10
- Iron pipes, *cons. req.*, 10750
- Italian Cloths, 5851-2
- Liquorice, 5260
- Locks, 6114
- Machinery and Parts, 6108, 6111
- Machines and Machinery, 6718
- Manures, 7362, 7372; *ad. rep.*, 7455
- Milk, condensed, &c., 5517
- Mining Engines, 6795, 6798
- Motive Power Machinery, &c., 6661
- Mustard, *cons. req.*, 10557
- Oils, 6864, 6872; *cons. req.*, 10914, 11552
- Paints and Colours, 6882
- Paper, &c., 7179, 7201, 7216-8, 7238
- Quilts, &c., 5741
- Road Rollers, Traction Engines, &c., 6681
- Rock Drills, 6798
- Rubber Manufactures, 7162-3
- Soap, 5544
- Socks, &c., *cons. req.*, 10650
- Stearine, Paraffine Wax, &c., 5152
- Stone and Marble, 6964
- Stoves, 6044
- Tea, 5464
- Timber, 7107-8; *cons. req.*, 11125
- Tobacco, 4236, 4288
- Varnishes, &c., 6893
- Waddings, &c., *cons. req.*, 10630
- Wire Netting, 4570
- Woollen Piece Goods, *cons. req.*, 11533
(See Customs Tariff Bill)
- Tariff Revision, *address*, 233
- Trawler: Tenders for construction, *q.*, 1751
- Western Australia: Proposed New State, *q.*, 11743

Mauger, Hon. S., Maribyrnong:

- Australia, map of, *adj.*, 648; *q.*, 1056
- Australian Press Association: Visit of British Delegates, *q.*, 7117
- Budget Debate, Close of, *p.o.*, 1206
- Child Mortality, New South Wales, *q.*, 2008
- Customs Tariff Bill, *cons. req.* (hats, caps, &c.), 10582 (See Tariff Resolutions (Customs))
- Deputations, statements to, *q.*, 12152
- East Sydney Electors, Speech Regarding, *q.*, 8818
- Eastern Extension Telegraph Company, *q.*, 10788, 10967, 11707, 11921, 12153; *supply*, 12185
- Electoral Administration:
 - Amalgamation of Commonwealth and State Departments, *q.*, 3301
 - Postal Votes, *q.*, 1181, 1866; *supply*, 2903
 - Printing of Electoral Rolls, *q.*, 1596
 - Public Officials as Returning Officers, *m.*, 714, 718
 - Queensland Elections, *q.*, 1866; *supply*, 2903
- Electricon, The, *q.*, 10787
- Estimates, Additional, *supply*, 11408
- Estimates: Military and Lighthouse Engineers, *q.*, 2793
- Freeman and Wallace: Correspondence, *supply*, 10221, 11335; *q.*, 11627, 11704
- Freight Charges: London to Fremantle, *q.*, 3422

Mauger, Hon. S.—continued.

- Insurance: Government Property, *q.*, 6834
- Mails:
 - Country Services, *supply*, 10198
 - Delivery of English Mails, *q.*, 9843
 - Differentiation against Unionists on Mail Steamers, *q.*, 4623
 - Imperial Government Contract, *q.*, 3973
 - Japanese Steamers: Payments, *q.*, 9585
 - Magnet Service, *q.*, 10463
 - Mail Contract, Cancelled, *q.*, 1517, 2313, 2890; *supply*, 2903; *q.*, 2964, 4086, 5783, 7027, 8817, 9389, 9766, 9842, 10786, 12154
 - Mail Service to Europe, *q.*, 6129, 6229; *m.*, 6389, 6497; *q.*, 8817; freight subsidy, *supply*, 10198
 - New Zealand and Tasmania Contract, *q.*, 6131
 - North-West Coast, *q.*, 2690
 - Protection from Fire, *q.*, 11158
 - Queensland: s.s. *Bingera*, *q.*, 10463
 - Railway carriage, *q.*, 1595
 - Tasmanian, *q.*, 1974, 2998, 6673, 7250, 11791
 - Victoria and Tasmania Contract, *q.*, 6131; *adj.*, 6054; *q.*, 6524, 10134, 10875, 11419, 11917
 - Western Australia: Employment of Asiatics, *q.*, 9844
- Maitland Coal Miners, *q.*, 8812
- Meteorological Department, *q.*, 976, 1056
- Murwillumbah Fire: Post Office Officials, *q.*, 3420
- Parliament, Criticisms on, *q.*, 11522
- Post and Telegraph Department:
 - Accounts, *supply*, 10139, 10196
 - Administration: Age criticism, 1516; Secretary's Opinion, *q.*, 9092
 - Cabinet Committee of Inquiry: Secretary, *q.*, 9764; scope of inquiry, *supply*, 10140; *q.*, 10177; *supply*, 10199, 10416; *q.*, 10464, 10879, 11096; Report, *q.*, 11525
 - Complaints, Remedying of, *q.*, 8936; *supply*, 10139, 10419
 - Confusion, Alleged, *q.*, 12155
 - Decentralization: Powers of Deputy Postmasters-General, *supply*, 10143, 10420
 - Delays in answering correspondence, *q.*, 2793; *adj.*, 3362; *q.*, 7300
 - Electoral and Savings Bank Work, *supply*, 10418
 - Employés, *q.*, 4649, 4843, 5130, 5692; *supply*, 4864, 5702; *q.*, 5803, 6814, 8036-7, 9474
 - Expenditure on Public Works, *m.*, 7508; *supply*, 10140, 10195, 10422; *q.*, 11525, 11625-6, 12042
 - Fidelity Guarantees, *supply*, 10418
 - Furlough: Postmistress, Portarlington, *q.*, 9479
 - Lisbon Conference, *q.*, 12154
 - Officers' Leave of Absence for Military Training, *q.*, 9481, 10079, 10131
 - Oxenham, Mr., promotion of, *supply*, 10234
 - Reclassification of Officials, *q.*, 10875, 11260, 11708
 - Registration of applicants for work, Melbourne, *q.*, 10081
 - Reports, Delay of, *q.*, 8936
 - Revenue and Expenditure, *q.*, 4649; *supply*, 10141, 10195
 - Royal Commission, *supply*, 10416
 - Saturday Half-holiday, *q.*, 8925
 - Secretary, *supply*, 10176

Mauger, Hon. S.—continued.

Post and Telegraph Department—continued.

South Australia: Supplies, *q.*, 6728
 Statutory Day's Work, *q.*, 8937
 St. Patrick's day, leave, *q.*, 9093
 Sunday Work, *q.*, 10134; *supply*, 10248; *q.*, 11016, 11708, 12155
 Sweating, alleged, *q.*, 8936
 Temporary and Permanent Hands, *q.*, 8936-7, 9474; *supply*, 10143, 10197, 10417; *q.*, 11181

Post and Telegraph Offices:

Berrigan Post Office, *q.*, 12153
 Brunswick Post Office, *q.*, 2096; *adj.*, 3231
 Cobar Post Office, *adj.*, 4646
 Glenferrie Post Office, *q.*, 7297
 Goodwood Post Office, *q.*, 11260
 Jerilderie Post Office, *q.*, 12153
 Katoomba Post Office, *q.*, 12153
 Linda Post, Telegraph, and Money Order Office, *q.*, 6416
 Lithgow Post Office, *q.*, 6099, 12153
 Lockhart Post Office, *q.*, 12153
 Melbourne General Post Office, *supply*, 3530
 Northam Post Office, *supply*, 3536
 Penola Post Office, *q.*, 3175, 6505
 Port Elliot Post Office, *q.*, 1089
 Port Pirie Post Office, *q.*, 8938, 9299, 10575
 Unley Post Office, *q.*, 5407
 Urana Post Office, *q.*, 12153

Postal Service:

Allowance Post Offices, *supply*, 4866, 10175
 Allowance to Railway Station-masters, Queensland, *q.*, 9955, 10136
 Bacchus Marsh Post Office Staff, *q.*, 5601, 5911
 Boy Labour: Shepparton, *q.*, 1413
 Broken Shifts: Mail Branch: Sydney General Post Office, *q.*, 6896
 Cairns Post Office: Sweating, *supply*, 5704
 Charwoman, Melbourne General Post Office, *q.*, 2235
 Clarke, Mrs., compensation to, *q.*, 3423, 8938
 Classification of Post Offices, *q.*, 10178, 11791, 11917, 12042
 Classification of Postal Officials, *q.*, 2566, 2890, 10875, 11260, 11708
 Contract Post Offices, *q.*, 9192
 Contract System: Boy Letter-Carriers, *q.*, 3854, 3973
 Conveniences, Western Australia, *q.*, 1595
 Country Districts: Facilities, *m.*, 7508; *q.*, 9100
 Country Post Offices: Sweating, *q.*, 5329
 Cue: Postmaster, *q.*, 6406
 Deniliquin Post Office, overtime, *q.*, 2795, 3733
 Deputy Postmaster-General, Victoria, *supply*, 4865
 District Inspector, New South Wales, *q.*, 9193
 Early Closing of Post Offices, *supply*, 5703
 Extensions, *q.*, 8938
 Hamilton Office Staff, *q.*, 3423, 3974
 Hart, Mr. Bruce, *q.*, 2793
 Helmets, Chinese, for Postal Officials, *q.*, 6593, 6675-6
 Inquiry Fee, *q.*, 9476, 9766
 Inspectors, *adj.*, 3362; *q.*, 3854, 3973, 9193; *supply*, 10249
 International Reply Coupons, *q.*, 5908

Mauger, Hon. S.—continued.

Postal Service—continued.

Junee and Narandera Offices: Underman-ning, *q.*, 5692, 6406
 Launceston Postal Officials, *q.*, 5328
 Letter Carriers: Promotion as Sorters, *q.*, 11526, 11708
 Letter delivery by telegraph messengers, *q.*, 1181, 3972
 McDonnell, Mrs., Compensation to, *q.*, 3622
 Mailbags: Victoria, *q.*, 3500
 Mail Motor Cars, *q.*, 4086, 9477, 9842, 11526, 11791
 Mail vans, lighting of, *q.*, 1158
 Melbourne General Post Office Conditions, *supply*, 4865; *q.*, 8925
 Morce Post Office Staff, *q.*, 8936
 Newspaper Postage, *q.*, 7027
 New South Wales: Additional Employés, *q.*, 4649, 4843; *supply*, 4864; *q.*, 5803
 Newspaper Advertisements, *q.*, 3269
 Non-delivery of Letters: Eaglehawk, *q.*, 9476, 9766
 North-west Coast Service, *q.*, 2690
 Overtime, *q.*, 2313, 2651, 2795, 3733, 3854, 3973, 4049, 5416, 5692, 7171, 7417, 8937; *supply*, 10145
 Packets: Postage on, *supply*, 5704
 Parcels: Delivery by Contractors, *q.*, 11424, 11628, 11794
 Parcels Post Offices, *q.*, 7027
 Payment of Mail Contractors, *q.*, 2313, 5520
 Penny Postage Radius: New South Wales, *supply*, 10249
 Permanent Hands, New South Wales, *q.*, 8937, 9474
 Pilbarra Gold Field, *q.*, 2124
 Postal Orders and Notes: Charges, *q.*, 11917
 Prohibition of Correspondence, *q.*, 12043:
 Bookmakers', *q.*, 4958, 5691
 Lottery Promoters', *q.*, 10785
 Medical, *q.*, 1751, 6025, 6422; *supply*, 10221; *q.*, 10787; *supply*, 11335; *q.*, 11627
 New Zealand Government's action, *q.*, 5783, 6025, 6422
 Protection of Mails from Fire, *q.*, 11158
 Queensland Elections: Non-delivery of registered letter, *q.*, 9193
 Railway Mail Charges, *q.*, 4200
 Semi-Official Post Offices, *supply*, 4867; *q.*, 9193; *supply*, 10175
 Stamps, Designs for Commonwealth, *q.*, 4958, 5908, 6677, 8818; *supply*, 10249
 Stanley, Tasmania, *q.*, 10134
 Sydney General Post Office: Increments, *q.*, 2794; "Sweating," *q.*, 3422-3, 8936, 10310; Overtime, *q.*, 4649; *supply*, 4864; *q.*, 5416, 5692, 7171, 7417
 Tasmania, *adj.*, 2346
 Tasmanian Mails, *q.*, 1974, 2998, 6131; *adj.*, 6504; *q.*, 6524, 6673, 11419, 11791, 11917
 Temporary Employés, New South Wales, *q.*, 6814, 8936-7, 9474, 11181
 Temporary Letter Carriers: Western Australia, *q.*, 6676
 Trundle Mail Service, *q.*, 4411
 Woolongong Letter Box, *q.*, 12042
 Zeehan Post Office: Alleged Sweating, *q.*, 7025
 Postmaster-General, *q.*, 1516

Mauger, Hon. S.—continued.

Printing, Tenders for Government, *q.*, 4310, 4412-3
Public Service :
 Age Retirements, *q.*, 9475; *supply*, 10176, 10248
 Allowances, Western Australia, *q.*, 405, 504; North Queensland, *q.*, 9010
 Amendment of Act, *q.*, 3854; *supply*, 4865, 10248, 10420
 Applications for Promotions: Reports, *supply*, 10175
 Blakney, case of Mr. E. A., *q.*, 8818, 9476
 Casual Employés' Wages, *supply*, 4866
 Civil Rights, *supply*, 10174
 Clerical Division: Promotions, *q.*, 4648, 4842
 Commissioner, *supply*, 10248, 10420; *q.*, 12152
 Customs, New South Wales, *q.*, 1281
 Employés' Organizations, Sydney, *supply*, 4864
 Employés' Unions: Officials, *q.*, 8925, 9953
 Examination Papers, *q.*, 12151
 Hart, Mr. Bruce, *q.*, 2793
 Inspectors, *supply*, 4866
 Instrument Fitters, *q.*, 11158-82
 Isolated Districts: Railway Concessions, *supply*, 10175
 Leave, Sick and Recreation, *q.*, 10130
 Line Repairers, Dismissed, *q.*, 12152
 Long Service Furloughs, *q.*, 9479
 Military Leave of Absence, *q.*, 9481, 10079, 10131
 Pole Dressers, *adj.*, 3231; *supply*, 10250
 Promotions, Postal Department: Queensland, *q.*, 5240; Tasmania, *q.*, 7028
 Retirement of Officer, *q.*, 8814
 Retiring Allowances, *q.*, 12043
 South Australian Association, *q.*, 11919
 Temporary Employés: Holidays, *q.*, 7169, 7250
 Transferred Officers' Rights, *supply*, 4864
 Questions, Minister's answers to, *supply*, 2904
 Statistics, *q.*, 4309
Supply :
 Postmaster-General (Central Staff), 10139, 10174-6, 10195, 10221, 10234, 10248, 10250
 Works and Buildings (Post and Telegraph), 3461, 3530, 3536; (Telegraphs and Telephones), 3461, 3555; (Home Affairs), 11408
 Supply Bill (No. 1) 1908-9, 2R., 12185
 Tariff: Hat-making Industry, *expl.*, 6812
 Tariff Resolutions (Customs):
 Hats, caps, &c., *cons. req.*, 10582
 Lamps, 6039
 Medicinal Preparations, 6997
 State Importations, 7430
 (See Customs Tariff Bill.)
Telegraph and Telephone Service :
 Balmain Telephone Exchange, *supply*, 3530
 Barwon Heads Telephone Bureau, *q.*, 11626
 Bathurst Exchange, telephone charges, *q.*, 1090
 Brimpaen-Horsham Telephone Line, *q.*, 10526
 Cable to Tasmania, *q.*, 6811, 8929, 10963, 11526, 11707; *supply*, 12185
 Cable Codes: Lisbon Conference, *q.*, 12154
 Conveniences, Western Australia and Queensland, *q.*, 1595

Mauger, Hon. S.—continued.

Telegraph and Telephone Service—continued.
 Copper Wire and Telephones: Manufacture by Government, *q.*, 3586
 Country Telephone Facilities, *q.*, 9300, 10464
 Cypher Telegrams: Queensland, *q.*, 1868
 Delayed Telegrams, *q.*, 4748, 8814, 8925
 Essendon to Keilor Telephone Service, *q.*, 9954, 10135
 Extensions, *q.*, 8938
 Galvanized Iron Wire, *q.*, 6025
 Goroke-Minimay Telephone, *q.*, 11794
 Guarantees: Country Telephones, *q.*, 3589; *supply*, 10140; *q.*, 12042
 Hog Bay, Kingston, Lucindale, Mount Gambier, and Narracoorte: Telephone connections, *q.*, 1976, 3174, 6421
 Hotel Telephone Facilities, *supply*, 3520
 Instrument Fitters, *q.*, 11158-82
 Insulators, *q.*, 2890, 3853, 5911, 11181
 Inter-State Telegraph Communication, *q.*, 5209
 Kerang Telephone Service, *q.*, 10963
 Lineman's hours, *q.*, 9299, 9480
 Maitland West and Sydney Telephone, *q.*, 2690, 2793, 4749, 5802
 Metallic Circuits and Tunnels: Telephone Wires, *q.*, 6726
 Newcastle Telephone Service, *q.*, 6726, 7169; Switchboard, *q.*, 11521
 Norwood and Unley Exchanges, *q.*, 1090, 5520
 Poles: Painting, *q.*, 9479, 11628
 Port Davey: Telephone Communication, *q.*, 6129, 6505
 Queensland: Telegraphic Communication, *q.*, 8813, 8925, 9089
 Queensland Telegraphists, *q.*, 9300, 9474
 South Yarra Exchange, *supply*, 3509
 Sydney-Brisbane Telegraph, *q.*, 6677, 9089
 Sydney-Melbourne Telephone, *q.*, 5802, 6675, 6726, 6896, 7417, 11179, 11794
 Sydney Telephone Switchboard, *q.*, 5209
 Sydney-Wollongong Trunk Telephone, *q.*, 7249, 8929
 Telegrams, Errors in, *q.*, 10874
 Telegraph Communication: Western Australia, *q.*, 2121
 Telegraph Construction: Payment of Contractors, *q.*, 6025
 Telegraph Forms, *q.*, 11704
 Telegraph Line, North-West Australia, *q.*, 4412
 Telegraph Messages for Transmission abroad, *q.*, 9389
 Telegraphic Delays: Brisbane, *q.*, 4647; New South Wales, *q.*, 5328, 6025, 7117, 7250, 10874, 11626; Melbourne, *q.*, 10874
 Telegraphic Money Orders: Mangana, *q.*, 3173
 Telegraphists' Military Leave, *q.*, 9481, 10079, 10131
 Telegraphists' Overtime, *q.*, 2688, 6422, 7117
 Telegraphists' Pay for Sunday Work, *q.*, 10134; *supply*, 10248; *q.*, 11016, 11708, 12155
 Telegraphists: Sydney General Post Office, *q.*, 6814, 7117, 10080, 10135
 Telegraphists' Promotion, *q.*, 5804
 Telephone Administration, *q.*, 5130, 7296
 Telephone Attendants: New South Wales Elections, *q.*, 1866
 Telephone Attendants' Ornaments, *q.*, 10177

Mauger, Hon. S.—*continued.*

Telegraph and Telephone Service—*continued.*
 Telephone Bureaux, *q.*, 7460, 10178, 11708, 11917
 Telephone Cabinets, *q.*, 4309
 Telephone Charges: *q.*, Bathurst, Norwood, Unley, 1090; Richmond, Abbotsford, Hawthorn, 2348
 Telephone Directories, *q.*, 1516, 3586, 4412, 9299; Advertisements, *q.*, 5911; Supplementary Lists, *q.*, 11743-4
 Telephone Exchanges, *supply*, 3461
 Telephone Guarantees, *q.*, 4749
 Telephone Line Repairers, *q.*, 12152
 Telephone Numbers, *q.*, 2234
 Telephone Rates: Differential Charges, *q.*, 6726; mileage, *q.*, 6726
 Telephone Service: Melbourne Fire, *q.*, 6835, 7464
 Telephones: Notice of Discontinuance, *q.*, 9954
 Telephones, Supply of, *q.*, 7464
 Toll System, *supply*, 10249
 Typewriting Machines for Telegraphists, *q.*, 5521, 5911
 Undergrounding of Wires, *q.*, 10131; *supply*, 10196
 Victorian Telegraphs Staff, *q.*, 4519, 4843
 Wireless Telegraphy, *q.*, 3301; *supply*, 3555; *q.*, 4311, 6505, 11918, 12154
 Zeehan Telegraph Route, *q.*, 5209
 Trawler, Tenders for Construction, *q.*, 3301
 Voting Machines, *q.*, 2890
 Wangaratta Train Service, *q.*, 11154
 Warning Light, Sydney General Post Office, *q.*, 2890; *supply*, 2903, 9880
Year-Book, Commonwealth, q., 4412

McCull, Senator Hon. J. H., *Victoria:*

Adjournments, Special: Women's Work Exhibition, *m.*, 4894; Tuesday Sitzings, *m.*, 7788
 Appropriation (Works and Buildings) Bill, 2R., 3843; *com.* (Treasury), 4058; 3R., 4145
 Australian Industries Preservation Bill, 2R., 4514; *ad. rep.*, 5182
 Bounties Bill, 2R., 2301, 2765; *com.* (regulations), 2852, 2861; First Schedule (Rice), 3473-4, 3487; (fish), 4263
 Commonwealth Salaries Bill, *com.* (taxation by States), 956, 1045
 Constitution Alteration (Senate Elections) Act, *q.*, 9237
 Customs Tariff Bill, 2R., 7587; *com.*, Schedule: Agricultural, &c., Machinery and Implements, 8576
 Ammonia, &c., 9241-3
 Apparel and Attire, 8210
 Artificial Plants, &c., 8352
 Biscuits, 7673
 Blankets, &c., 8256
 Coffee, 7775
 Cosies, &c., 8281
 Curtains, &c., 8287
 Electrical and Gas Appliances, 9060
 Explosives, 9927-9
 Fire Brigade Appliances, 9940
 Fish, 7785, 7797, 7806
 Fruits, Dried, 7816
 Furniture, 9361
 Galvanized Iron, &c., 8567
 Gloves, 8293-4

McCull, Senator Hon. J. H.—*continued.*

Customs Tariff Bill (Schedule)—*continued.*
 Graphite, &c., 8371
 Hats, &c., 8323
 Hay and Chaff, 7941
 Hops, 7949
 Infants' Food, 8063
 Insecticides, Sheep Washes, &c., 9292
 Liquorice, 7755
 Locomotives, Traction Engines, &c., 8661-4
 Machines, n.e.i., and Machine Tools, 801-4-9, 8710, (*f.o.*, 8714), 8718
 Manures, 9911
 Matches, 7982, 7990; *cons. reg.*, 1086-7
 Milk, 8021
 Mine Ventilating Fans, 8682
 Motive Power Machinery, 8626-7
 Nuts, 8036
 Oilmen's Stores, 8044-9, 8054-8
 Oils, 8389, 8425, 8444-7
 Paints, 8455, 8468
 Paper, &c., 9762, 9797
 Parasols, &c., 8325
 Patterns, Paper, 9810
 Perfumery, 9296
 Piece Goods, 8162-9, 8176, 8188
 Plough Mould Boards, 8580
 Poles, Bent, 9643
 Rails, &c., 9063, 9071
 Roasting Dishes, &c., 8482
 Rock Drills, 8791
 Rubber Manufactures, n.e.i., 9671-2
 Socks, &c., 8334-5-8-9, 8346
 Tallow, &c., 8382
 Tanks, 8613
 Tents, &c., 8347
 Tool Handles, &c., 9636
 Trimmings, &c., 8348
 Waddings, &c., 8331
 Wicker, &c., 9565
 Wine, Sparkling, 7628
 Wire Netting, 9164
 Wood, Articles of, n.e.i., 9578
 Defence:
 Kerang Rifle Range, *q.*, 8424
 Dissent from Ruling: Stage for moving request on item (Customs Tariff Bill), *m.*, 8714
 Excise Procedure Bill, *com.*, new clauses (exclusion of lawyers) 5127, 5128; (protection of witnesses), 5129, 5193
 Financial relations, Commonwealth and States, *supply*, 3843
 Fraser, Senator, Leave of Absence, *m.*, 5370
 Income Tax: Victoria, *m.*, 1275, 1279
 Invalid and Old-age Pensions Bill, 2R., 12025
 Judiciary Bill, 2R., 861
 Kalgoolie to Port Augusta Railway Survey Bill, 2R., 1361; *com.* (power to make survey), 1497, 1506
 Labour Party, *supply*, 3845
 London Offices, *supply*, 3845, 4145
 Old-age Pensions, *supply*, 3844. (*See* Invalid and Old-age Pensions Bill.)
 Parliament House: Entertainment of Strangers, *q.*, 6058
 Parliamentary Allowances Bill, 2R., 2105; *com.* (amount of allowance), 2118; 3R., 2187; *expl.*, 2193
 Prayers in Parliament, *expl.*, 5746; *adj.*, 5781
 Printing Office, *supply*, 4058

McColl, Senator Hon. J. H.—continued.

Privilege: Select Committee upon Procedure, *m.*, 10009-13
 Quarantine Bill, *2R.*, 5290; *com.* (arrangements with State Governments: stations, &c.), 5305-6; (powers of Commonwealth), 5475, 5667, 5986; (examination of imported animals), 6063, 6066; (General Definitions), 6226
 Tariff, *q.*, 1684
 Tobacco Combine: Tariff, *adj.*, 2046

McDonald, Hon. C.—continued.

Tariff, *q.*, 1715-6, *ad. rep.*, 7455
 Commission's Reports, *q.*, 1715
 Debates, conclusion of, *q.*, 11052
 Exemption of Machinery, *supply*, 4870
 Magazines, *q.*, 2312
 Telephone Facilities: Queensland, *q.*, 1595
 Telephone Subscribers: Printing of Supplementary Lists, *q.*, 11744
 Year-Book, Commonwealth, *q.*, 4412
 See CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES (SUBJECTS).

McDonald, Hon. C., Kennedy:

Adjournment, Special, *m.*, 2027
 Australia, map of, *q.*, 1056
 Australian Industries Preservation Bill, *3R.*, 9593
 Bounties Bill, *p.o.*, 1314
 Business, Precedence of Government, *m.*, 2802; Conduct of, *q.*, 5520; *supply*, 6286
 Chairman of Committees, *obs.*, 317
 Christmas Adjournment, *q.*, 6729
 Cloncurry Post Office, *supply*, 3424
 Commonwealth Salaries Bill, *2R.*, 3879
 Copper Wire and Telephones: Manufacture by Government, *q.*, 3586
 Disputed Elections and Qualifications Bill, *q.*, 6098
 Dissent from Ruling: Constitutionality of amendment (Bounties Bill), *p.o.*, 1314
 Electoral Rolls, *q.*, 11258
 Excise Tariff Acts, *supply*, 5712; *q.*, 6096
 Federal Capital, *supply*, 1869
 Government, Position of the, *supply*, 10454
 High Court Cases: Commonwealth Costs, *q.*, 11742
 House, Rights of, *m.*, 11425, 11437
 Immigration: Contract, *q.*, 3423; *supply*, 3425
 Industrial Legislation: Transfer to Commonwealth, *q.*, 6096
 Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway Survey, *q.*, 9093
 Mail Service to Europe, *adj.*, 246; *m.*, 6128
 Manufactures Encouragement Bill, *2R.*, 6171
 New Protection, *supply*, 5712
 Old-age Pensions, *supply*, 9343, 9351
 Post and Telegraph Department:
 Annual Report, *supply*, 4860
 Employés at Remote Stations, *supply*, 4870
 Increase of Staff, *supply*, 4869
 Ministerial Statement, *p.o.*, 11630
 Royal Commission, *supply*, 10454
 Officials as Returning Officers, *m.*, 708
 Printing Committee, *m.*, 771, 2229
 Privilege: Select Committee upon Procedure, *m.*, 10129
 Queensland Elections: Postal votes, *q.*, 1866; *supply*, 2891
 Questions without notice, *q.*, 11744, 12041
 Session. Close of the, *q.*, 11525-6
 Shipping Combine, *adj.*, 3030
 States Debts: New South Wales Loan, *q.*, 9764
 Sugar Industry:
 Contract Immigrants, *q.*, 3423; *supply*, 3425
 Shortage of Labour, alleged, *supply*, 3425
 Supply:
 Works and Buildings (Post and Telegraph), 3424
 Supply Bill (No. 2), *ad. rep.*, 1869
 Supply Bill (No. 1), *2R.*, 6286
 Surplus Revenue Bill, *2R.*, 11857

McDougall, Mr. J. K., Wannon:

Australian Industries Preservation Bill, *com.*, (Power of Comptroller-General to question, &c.), 9232-5
 Bounties Bill, *com.*, Schedule (preserved fish), 1308, 1309
 Dates: Importation, *q.*, 11390
 Defence:
 Country Rifle Clubs, *q.*, 11158
 Militia Garrison Artillery, Western District, Victoria, *q.*, 10464
 German Navy: South Seas, *q.*, 11628
 Harvesters, price of, *q.*, 9767, 12155
 Immigration: Land in Victoria, *q.*, 10179
 Iron Industry: Japanese, *q.*, 6593
 Iron Ore: Exportation, *q.*, 6407
 Jam Manufacturers' Combine, *q.*, 9956, 10576, 10970, 11329
 Manures: Alleged Combine, *q.*, 7417, 11055
 Post and Telegraph Department:
 Brimpaen-Horsham Telephone Line, *q.*, 10526
 Employés, *q.*, 5130
 Galvanized Iron Wire, *q.*, 6025
 Goroke-Minimay Telephone, *q.*, 11794
 Hamilton Post Office Staff, *q.*, 3423
 Insulators, *q.*, 2890
 Poles, Painting of, *q.*, 9479, 11628
 Revenue, *q.*, 4649
 Sydney-Melbourne Telephone, *q.*, 6896, 7417, 11794
 Preferential Tariff: Foreign Goods, *q.*, 11056
 Standard Oil Trust, *q.*, 12044
 Sunshine Harvester Works: Dismissal of Employé, *q.*, 7463
 Transferred Officers: Pensions, *q.*, 9480
 Wheat: Reimportation of, *q.*, 5600, 6099

McGregor, Senator Hon. G., South Australia:

Additional Appropriation Bill 1907-8, *com.*, Schedule: Home Affairs, (Electoral Office), 11619
 Adjournment, Special, *m.*, 6416, 7787, 10962, 11322
 Advertising Australia: Cable Messages, *q.*, 6407
 American Fleet, visit of, *q.*, 11468
 Appropriation Bill, *com.*, The Parliament, 10289; External Affairs: (Administrative), 10291
 Appropriation (Works and Buildings) Bill, *com.*, (Defence), 4017; (Telegraphs and Telephones), 4051; (External Affairs), 4082
 Australian Industries Preservation Bill, *2R.*, 4608: *com.* (power of Comptroller-General to question, &c.), 5018, 5086; *ad. rep.*, 5113
 Bills of Exchange Bill, *com.* (application of State laws), 679, 747; (protection of banker), 2206

McGregor, Senator Hon. G.—*continued.*

Bounties Bill, *com.*, First Schedule (cotton), 3068; (jute), 3159; (mohair), 3385; (coffee), 3718; (tobacco), 3727 (*p.o.*, 4164), 4250; (wool tops), 4389; *recom.*, First Schedule (tobacco), 4899
 Business, order of, *m.*, 34; conduct of, *adj.*, 486, 586, 7564; *supply*, 5879; state of, *adj.*, 1712
 Coal Combine, *adj.*, 3702
 Commonwealth Mail Steamers, *m.*, 5406
 Commonwealth Salaries Bill, *com.* (taxation by States), 957, 1044, 1052
 Customs Tariff Bill, 2*r.*, 7583; *com.*, despatch of business, *obs.*, 9190; *m.s.o.*, 10835; *recom.*, 11687; Schedule, (*p.o.*, 7624):
 Agricultural, &c., Machinery and Implements, 8574-5
 Ammonia, &c., 9241 (*p.o.*, 9247, 9251), 9277
 Artificial Plants, &c., 8352
 Biscuits, 7683
 Blacks, &c., 8475
 Blankets, &c., 8246-8
 Blue, 7690-6
 Bottles, 8498
 Carbide of Calcium, 9261
 Carpets, &c., 8267
 Chaffcutters, &c., 8581
 Confectionery, 7733, 7750
 Curtains, &c., 8288
 Electrical and Gas Appliances, 9054
 Electrical Machinery, 8811
 Electrical Machines, &c., 8869, 8875
 Fruits, dried, 7811
 Furniture, 9357
 Galvanized Iron, &c., 8563-6
 Ginger, green, 7832
 Glassware, 8490
 Glue, &c., 8515-7
 Hats, &c., 8318
 Iron Pipes, 9075
 Lead, Sheet, &c., 8571-2; *cons. req.*, 10935
 Liquorice, 7760
 Locks, 9174
 Machines *n.e.i.*, and Machine Tools, *p.o.*, 8711
 Matches, 7967, 7986, 7998
 Metal and Plated ware, 8723
 Mine Ventilating Fans, 8679
 Motive Power Machinery, 8628
 Nails, 8611
 Oilmen's Stores, 8053-8-9
 Oils, 8308, 8401, 8448; *cons. req.*, 11225
 Paints, 8456-8
 Peel, preserved, 7834
 Piece Goods, 8163-7, 8184
 Printing Roller Composition, 8524
 Rubber, &c., Hose, 0666
 Sago and Tapioca, 7601
 Salt, 8094
 Slate Slabs, 8531
 Socks, &c., 8344
 Spectacle Cases, 9658
 Stained Glass Windows, *cons. req.*, 11319
 Stearine, Paraffine Wax, &c., 7714
 Stone and Marble, 8549
 Stripper-Harvesters, 8582
 Tallow, &c., 8377, 8380-1-3-6
 Tea, 8109
 Timber, 9423, 9430, 9452, 9461-2-8, 9542, 9554-9; *cons. req.*, 11256, 11600
 Tobacco, 7638, 7645-7-9; *cons. req.*, 10842
 Tool Handles, &c., 9635.

McGregor, Senator Hon. G.—*continued.*

Customs Tariff Bill (Schedule)—*continued.*
 Vegetables, Herbs, dried, 7873-4-5-8, -880
 Volts of Sal ammoniac, 9277
 Wheels, Steel, &c., 9184; *cons. req.*, 10961
 Wine, Sparkling, 7626
 Wire Netting, 9149
 Wood, articles of, *n.e.i.*, 9576-9
 Cypher Telegrams, *q.*, 1927
 Days of Meeting, *m.*, 7573; *adj.*, 7787
 Defence:
 Brisbane Rifle Range, *supply*, 4037
 Cadet Uniforms, *q.*, 249
 Disputed Elections and Qualifications Bill, 2*r.*, 5561; *com.* (pending petitions), 5599, 5600; (qualifications and vacancies), 5653, 5657, 5659; (powers of Court), 5665; *recom.* (pending petitions), 5775, 578-9; (qualifications and vacancies), 5984
 Dissent from Ruling: admissibility of request (Customs Tariff Bill), *m.*, 9251
 Dooley, Mr. Election of, *q.*, 3233; *adj.*, 4277
 Electoral Rolls, *supply*, 11619
 Excise Procedure Bill, *com.*, new clauses (exclusion of lawyers), 5125; (protection of witnesses), 5129, 5104; 3*r.*, 5392
 Excise Tariff (Agricultural Machinery) Act, *adj.*, 4277, 5773; *supply*, 6314; *q.*, 7568
 First President of the Senate, *m.*, 3366
 Friday Sitting, *adj.*, 693
 Grain Bags, size of, *q.*, 7565
 Immigration: New South Wales, *adj.*, 4277
 Immigration Restriction Act: Evasions, *supply*, 10291
 Income Tax: Victoria, *m.*, 1277
 Invalid and Old-age Pensions Bill, 2*r.*, 12004; *com.*, (persons disqualified), 12033; (investigation by Registrar), 12036
 Judiciary Bill, 2*r.*, 861
 Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway Survey Bill, *p.o.*, 1026; *com.* (power to make survey), 1476
 Legislation, Commonwealth and States, *q.*, 564
 Linlithgow, Death of Marquis of, *m.*, 8505
 London Offices, *supply*, 4082
 Matches: Contracts for, *q.*, 8309
 Northern Territory, *q.*, 8554; *adj.*, 9741
 Opposition, Leader of the, *obs.*, 6293
 Parliament House: Maps, *q.*, 5466; electric bells, *supply*, 5881; gardens, *supply*, 5883; entertainment of strangers, *q.*, 6059; Usher of the Black Rod, *supply*, 10280
 Parliamentary Allowances Bill, 2*r.*, 2077
 Patents Act Amendment, *q.*, 9139
 Post and Telegraph Service:
 Disorganization: Committee of Inquiry, *adj.*, 9527
 Freeman and Wallace's Correspondence, *q.*, 7567, 8076, 8221, 8286
 Moonta Mines, *q.*, 8154
 Port Adelaide Outer Harbor Facilities, *q.*, 7976
 Post Office, Port Pirie, *q.*, 8500
 Prayers in Parliament, *q.*, 5745
 President, Rights of the, *p.o.*, 4616
 Printing Committee, *m.*, 4467, 7845-6
 Privilege: Select Committee upon Procedure, *m.*, 10005
 Public Offices, Melbourne, *q.*, 5284; *supply*, 5907
 Public Service:
 Regulations, *m.*, 692

McGregor, Senator Hon. G.—continued.

Quarantine Bill, *com.* (arrangements with State Governments: stations, &c.), 5320; (powers of Commonwealth), 5474, 5481, 5668, 5988; (examination of imported animals), 6065; (liability of owners, &c., for provisions for quarantined persons), 6087
 Queensland Sugar Cane Fields: Labour, *q.*, 5368, 5467
 Questions: Quotations, *q.*, 5370; notice of, *p.o.*, 8229
 Seat of Government, *m.*, 2180
 Senate:
 Election, South Australia, *q.*, 9421, 12101
 Position and Rights of, *obs.*, 11687
 Shipping Ring, *q.*, 10828
 Standing Orders Committee, *m.*, 36
 Steamship Service: Victoria and Singapore, *q.*, 5647
 Stores, Tenders for, *q.*, 9041
 Supply Bill (No. 3), 2R., 5879; *com.*, The Parliament, 5881, 5881; 3R., 5907
 Supply Bill (No. 4), 1R., 6314
 Surplus Revenue Bill, 2R., 11880
 Telegraph Construction Branch: Painters' Wages, *q.*, 5857
 Tobacco Combine: Tariff, *adj.*, 2047; Select Committee, *m.*, 3050, 3058
 Wireless Telegraphy, *supply*, 4051

McWilliams, Mr. W. J., Franklin:

Adjournment, Special, *m.*, 741
 Agricultural Machinery: Excise, *Budget*, 2984-5
 Bounties Bill, 2R., 813; *com.*, (specification of bounties), 1058; schedule (mohair), 1097; (olives), 1117; (rice), 1189; (coffee), 1212; (preserved fish), 1301; (dried fruits), 1317
 Budget, 2978
 Business, Precedence of Government, *m.*, 2802
 Coast Defence Appropriation Bill, *int.*, 12094
 Commonwealth Salaries Bill, *com.*, (Taxation by States), 3887
 Customs Tariff Bill, *cons. req.*, (Stearine, paraffine wax, &c.), 10510; (hay and chaff), 10544; (gloves), 10578; (hats, caps, &c.), 10603; (timber), 11044. (*See* Tariff Resolutions (Customs).)
 Defence:
 Cadet Head Covering, *q.*, 10130
 Derwent Infantry Regiment, *q.*, 2122
 Military Officers, *q.*, 9090
 Excise Tariff (Agricultural Machinery) Act, *q.*, 7296
 Finance, Commonwealth and States, *Budget*, 2978; payment of monthly balances, *q.*, 11741
 Friction between Commonwealth and States, *Budget*, 2981
 High Commissioner, *supply*, 8975
 Immigration: Land Question, *supply*, 8974
 Invalid and Old-age Pensions Bill, *com.* (who may receive pensions), 11065; (payment to minister of religion, &c., for pensions), 11981
 Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway Survey Bill, 2R., 720; *com.* (power to make survey), 740
 Mail Contracts:
 Cold Storage, *adj.*, 600
 Mail Service to Europe, *m.*, 6485, 6502
 Tasmanian, *q.*, 6523, 11419

McWilliams, Mr. W. J.—continued

Manufactures Encouragement Bill, 2R., 6273; *com.* (authority to pay bounties), 12171
 Mining Industry, *Budget*, 2984
 New Protection, *Budget*, 2985; *q.*, 10132
 Old-age Pensions, *Budget*, 2978. (*See* Invalid and Old-age Pensions Bill.)
 Papua: Mortality of Natives, *supply*, 6289; *q.*, 6725, 9766; *supply*, 8975; Native Indented Labourers: Regulations, *supply*, 8975; *m.*, 9300, 11744; Appointment of Administrator, *q.*, 9763; Land Settlement, *q.*, 10606, 10652; German Boundary, *q.*, 11385; Officials and Land Transactions, *q.*, 11524
 Parliamentary Allowances Bill, *int.*, 1917
 Port Davey: Telephone Communication, *q.*, 6505
 Post and Telegraph Department:
 Cabinet Committee of Inquiry, *supply*, 10155
 Centralization, *supply*, 9791, 10154-5
 Correspondence, Delays in Answering, *supply*, 10155
 Preferential Trade (Tariff), 4788
 Printing Committee, *m.*, 770, 2220
 Printing Office, *supply*, 3591
 Public Service:
 Appeal Courts, *supply*, 9774
 Blakney, Mr. E. A., Case of, *q.*, 8818; *supply*, 10154
 Commissioner, *supply*, 9773
 Vacancies, Notification of, *q.*, 9684; *supply*, 9773
 Public Works, *supply*, 9791
 Quarantine Bill, 2R., 518; *com.*, (scope of quarantine), 1527; (proclamation of ports of entry), 1558; (fumigation of vessels to destroy vermin), 1620; (power to destroy diseased plants), 1730; (examination of imported animals), 1766; new clause (repeal of State Laws), 1770
 Sitting, days and hours of, *adj.*, 6187; *q.*, 11703
 States Debts, *Budget*, 2981
 Sugar Industry, *Budget*, 2982
 Supply:
 External Affairs (Administrative), 8974-5; (Papua), 8975
 Home Affairs (Public Service Commissioner), 9773; (Public Works Staff), 9791; (Miscellaneous), 9800
 Postmaster-General (Central Staff), 10153
 Works and Buildings (Treasury), 3591
 Supply Bill (No. 4), *com.*, External Affairs: (Papua), 6289
 Surplus Revenue Bill, 2R., 11855
 Tariff, *m.*, 2978:
 British Goods, *q.*, 1747, 1868
 Tasmania: Notice of new duties, *q.*, 1747
 Timber Duties: Rebate on fruit cases, *q.*, 6421
 Tariff Resolutions (Customs):
 Acetylene Gas Appliances, &c., 6809
 Bags, &c., 5736
 Barley, 5348
 Blankets, Flannels, &c., 5718
 Blue, 4788
 Buckets, &c., 7139
 Electrical Machinery, 6807
 Gloves, *cons. req.*, 10578
 Hats, Caps, &c., *cons. req.*, 10603
 Hay and Chaff, 5365; *cons. req.*, 10544

McWilliams, Mr. W. J.—*continued.*Tariff Resolutions (Customs)—*continued.*

- Lamps, 6042
- Mining Engines, 6784, 6796
- Motive Power Machinery, &c., 6663
- Paper, Manufactures of, 7174, 7181
- Printing Inks, 7245
- State Importations, 7437
- Stearine, Paraffine wax, &c., 5151; *cons. req.*, 10510
- Sugar, 4693
- Timber, 7053, 7087; *cons. req.*, 11044
- Type, Printers', 6765
- Vehicles, 7290
- (*See* Customs Tariff Bill.)
- Tasmanian Finances, *Budget*, 2980
- Tasmanian Mails: Carriage from Melbourne, *q.*, 1973, 6523
- Transferred Properties, *supply*, 9890; *q.*, 11703, 11741
- Woolen Industry, *Budget*, 2983

Millen, Senator Hon. E. D., *New South Wales:*

- Additional Appropriation Bill 1905-6 and 1906-7, 1R., 11623; 2R., 11697
- Additional Appropriation Bill 1907-8, *com.*, Schedule: Postmaster-General, 11620-1
- Additional Appropriation (Works and Buildings) Bill 1907-8, *m.s.o.*, 11621; 2R., 11688; *com.*, Schedule (Home Affairs), 11691-6
- Address-in-Reply, *obs.*, 39; *m.*, 40
- Adjournment: Leave of Absence, *m.*, 6297
- Adjournments, Special: Women's Work Exhibition, *m.*, 4894; Christmas vacation, *m.*, 6415; Tuesday Sittings, *m.*, 7789, 10072, 11321
- Appropriation Bill, 1R., 10260; 2R., 10269; *com.*, Home Affairs (Electoral Office), 10304
- Appropriation (Works and Buildings) Bill, 2R., 3804, 3811; *com.*, (application), 3930; (Defence), 4038; (Post and Telegraph), 4045; (External Affairs), 4063; 3R., 4146
- Australian Industries Preservation Bill, *q.*, 4035; 2R., 4483; *com.*, (Burden of Proof), 4919, 4923; *q.*, 7566, 7653, 8507, 8555
- Bills of Exchange Bill, *recom.*, (stale cheque), 2410
- Bounties Bill, 2R., 2525; *com.*, First Schedule: (mohair), 3377; (copra), 3394, 3396; (rice), (*p.o.*, 3479), 3483; (rubber), 3569; (coffee), 3723-4; (tobacco), 3727; (fish), 4263; (wool tops), 4390; Second Schedule, 4392; *cons. mes.*, 6410-1-3
- Business: Order of, *m.*, 33; *adj.*, 157, 6154, 8284; *q.*, 11579
- Chairman of Committees: Votes, *p.o.*, 8757
- Coal Combine, *adj.*, 3684, 3705; *q.*, 3809
- Coast Defence Appropriation Bill, 2R., 12107
- Commerce Act: State Officers, *supply*, 6352
- Commonwealth Salaries Bill, 3R., 1825
- Customs and Excise Revenue, *q.*, 7701, 7926
- Customs Certificates: British Goods, *m.*, 1959
- Customs Tariff Bill, *m.s.o.*, 7553; 2R., 7574; *com.* (short title), 7622; Despatch of Business, *obs.*, 7895; *p.o.*, 7897, 7901; *obs.*, 9189; *m.s.o.*, 10041; *ad. rep.*, 10044; *m.s.o.*, 10831; *m.*, 11583; *recom.*, 11682; Schedule: Acetic Acid, &c., 9238-9
- Adding Machines, &c., 8625-6; *cons. req.*, 10937
- Agricultural, &c., Machinery and Implements, 8587-8-9, 8591

Millen, Senator Hon. E. D.—*continued.*Customs Tariff Bill (Schedule)—*continued.*

- Ale, &c., 7624
- Ammonia (*p.o.*, 9246-7), 9276-9
- Antimony, &c., 9172
- Animals, 7654-7
- Apparel and Attire, 8198, 8203-9, 8212
- Arms, 8557-8-9, 8560; *cons. req.*, 10934
- Arrowroot, 7952
- Art, Works of, 9937
- Artificial Plants, &c., 8350-1
- Atomisers, 9925
- Bags, Sacks, &c., 8218, 8220
- Bayonets, &c., 8349
- Bicycles, &c., 9816-9
- Blacking, &c., 8365-7-8
- Blankets, &c., 8233, 8254-9
- Blue, *cons. req.*, 10844
- Boats, &c., 9901
- Boots, &c., 9661-3
- Bottles, 8496-7-8, 8500
- Bronzing, &c., Powders, 8374-6
- Buckets and Tubs, 9648
- Butter and Cheese, 7699
- Carbide of Calcium, 9259, 9268
- Carbonic Acid Gas, 9254
- Carpets, &c., 8261-6; *cons. req.*, 10925
- Chaff-cutters, &c., 8579
- Coffee, 7777, 7781
- Coir Mats, &c., 8275
- Confectionery, 7734, 7742-4; *ad. rep.*, 10044
- Cornflour, 7906, 7914-5
- Cosies, &c., 8282
- Cresylic Acid, &c., 9273-4
- Curtains, &c., 8288; *cons. req.*, 10926
- Cutlery, *cons. req.*, 10936
- Drugs and Chemicals, 9272
- Electrical and Gas Appliances, 8889, 8891, 9042-4-8, 9053-7, 9061; *cons. req.*, 10948-50
- Electrical Machines, &c., 8805, 8869, 8873-7; *cons. req.*, 10943-7, 11592
- Fire Extinguishers, 8773
- Fish, 7783-4-6, 7799
- Fishing Lines, 9917
- Fruits, dried, 7808, 7810, 7828, 9949
- Furniture, 9354-5-8, 9380
- Furs, &c., 8289
- Galvanized Iron, &c., 8560-7-8
- Ginger, 7833
- Glass, 8483-8, 8491-3-6
- Gloves, 8294-6; *cons. req.*, 10928-32
- Glue, &c., 8502, 8514-5-8; *cons. req.*, 11235
- Goods exported for repairs, 9945
- Grain and Pulse, 7892
- Graphite, &c., 8368-9, 8370-2
- Hats, 8302, 8318-9, 8321
- Hay and Chaff, 7928; *cons. req.*, 10857
- Insecticides; Sheepwashes, &c., 9281, 9292
- Iron and Steel (VIA.), 9187
- Iron Pipes, 9079
- Lamps, &c., 8568, 8571
- Leather, &c., 9677
- Lead, Sheet, &c., 8572; *cons. req.*, 10935
- Licht-pausrohpapier, 9814
- Liquorice, 7758, 7760-1; *cons. req.*, 10856
- Locks, 9177; *cons. req.*, 10958
- Log Band Saws, 8671; *cons. req.*, 10940
- Machines and Machinery, *n.e.i.*, 8694-5-6-7
- Machines, *n.e.i.*, and Machine Tools, 8704; (*p.o.*, 8710-1-5)

Millen, Senator Hon. E. D.—*continued.*

Customs Tariff Bill (Schedule)—*continued.*

Manufactures of Metal, *n.e.i.*, 8724-6,
8734-6-7-9, 8741; (*p.o.*, 8749, 8753);
8755-6-7, 8760
Matches, 7990, 8002, 8010
Meats, &c., 8016
Medicines, 9294
Mine Ventilating Fans, 8684
Mining Machinery, 8796
Motive Power Machinery, 8626-8, 8631-9;
(*p.o.*, 8644-5-6-7); 8656, 8660-1
Mustard, *cons. reg.*, 10868
Nails, 8604-7, 8612
Nuts, 8037
Oilmen's Stores, 8042-3-4-5-6, 8053, 8061
Oils, 8387-8, 8403, 8414-6-7, 8434; (*p.o.*,
8441, 8446; *cons. reg.*, 11224
Paint Removers, &c., 8472
Paints, 8451-6, 8462; (*p.o.*, 8464); 8466-9,
8471
Paper, &c., 9680-3, 9746, 9756, 9760, 9799;
cons. reg., 11311
Parasols, &c., 8325-6
Perambulators, &c., 9824
Piece Goods, 8122-5, 8134, 8146, 8151-2,
8169, 8170-9
Printing Ink, 9803-4
Printing Roller Composition, 8522-4-6
Pulley Blocks, &c., 8669
Rails &c., 9067, 9072
Rice, 8068, 8073, 8087; *cons. reg.*, 10871
Rock-boring Machines, *cons. reg.*, 10942
Roofing Tiles, &c., 8478
Rubber, &c., Hose, 9667, 9670
Rubber Manufactures, *n.e.i.*, 9671
Saccharin, 9272
Salt, 8088, 8090
Sago and Tapioca, 7664
Shafts, 9642
Sheep Shearing Machines, 8589, 8591
Slate Slabs, 8528, 8530-2
Soap, 8095-7
Socks, &c., 8334-7-8-9, 8340-3-5
Stained Glass Windows, 9937
Standards, &c., 9179, 9181-2-3; *cons. reg.*,
10960
Starch Flours, 8100-1-2
Stearine, Paraffine Wax, &c., 7712; *cons.*
reg., 10851-3
Stereoscopic Views, 9934
Stone and Marble, 8532, 8546-7-8, 8551-2
Straw, 7944
Strawboard, 9746, 9756
Stripper Harvesters, 8583-5
Surgical, &c., Appliances, 9943
Tallow, &c., 8376-7, 8380-1-6
Tanks, 8618
Tea, 8107, 8114; *cons. reg.*, 10922
Tents, &c., 8346-7
Timber, 9449, 9456, 9543 (*p.o.*, 9552),
9558; *cons. reg.*, 11253-6
Tobacco, 7637, 7644-7; *cons. reg.*, 10842
Type, &c., 8767
Vegetables, Herbs, dried, 7874-5-9
Voltoids of Sal-ammoniac, 9276-9
Waddings, &c., 8326-7-9, 8331-2
Wheels, Steel, &c., 9183-5-6
Wicker, &c., 9571
Wine, Sparkling, 7627
Wire Netting, 9142

Days and Hours of Meeting, *m.*, 30, 7573;
adj., 7789; *m.*, 8077

Millen, Senator Hon. E. D.—*continued.*

Defence:

Brisbane Rifle Range, *supply*, 4038
Colah Land Purchase, *supply*, 11691
Corps of Guides, *supply*, 8999
Horses, *supply*, 8995-6
Lithgow: Land for Small-arms Factory,
supply, 11696
Naval Agreement, *address*, 47
Submarines, *q.*, 7754
Defence Bill, *2r.*, 5084
Disputed Elections and Qualifications Bill,
2r., 5581; *com.* (pending petitions), 5599;
(qualifications and vacancies), 5651; *recom.*
(pending petitions), 5775-6-8
Dissent from Ruling: Admissibility of re-
quest (Customs Tariff Bill), *m.*, 8646-7
Dissent from Ruling: Right of reply to Min-
isterial Statement (Customs Tariff Bill), *m.*,
7897, 7901
Dissent from Ruling: Stage for moving re-
quest on item (Customs Tariff Bill), *m.*,
8715
Dobson, Senator, Leave of Absence for, *m.*,
10921
Electoral Act, *supply*, 8988
Excise Procedure Bill, *int.*, 4480
Excise Tariff (Agricultural Machinery) Act,
adj., 5755, 5781; *q.*, 5857, 6189; *supply*,
8902
Excise Tariff (Starch) Bill, *2r.*, 12105
Federal Capital, *address*, 51; *supply*, 8980
Financial relations, Commonwealth and States,
address, 51; *supply*, 3806, 3811, 10271; *q.*,
11381
Government, position of the, *address*, 40
Governor-General, new, *q.*, 9352
High Commissioner, *address*, 51
High Court, *address*, 51
Immigration, *address*, 51; *q.*, 4244
Income Tax: Federal Salaries and Allow-
ances, *address*, 51
Invalid and Old-age Pensions Bill, *adj.*,
11909; *2r.*, 12000; *com.* (who may receive
pensions), 12026; (persons disqualified),
12030; (invalid pensions: commencement),
12031; (investigation by Registrar), 12035-7;
(Benevolent Asylum inmates), 12037
Judiciary Bill, *2r.*, 581
Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway Survey
Bill, *address*, 50; *adj.*, 879; *2r.*, 1233
Land, New South Wales, applications for, *q.*,
4705
Lapsed Votes, *supply*, 138
Linlithgow, Death of Marquis of, *m.*, 8504
London Offices, *q.*, 3796; *supply*, 3804, 4063,
4146; *q.*, 4362, 7700
Mail Contracts:
Cancelled, *address*, 41; *q.*, 249; *supply*,
1951
Mail Service to Europe, *q.*, 5560, 5746,
6060; *m.*, 6092, 6194
Vancouver: Refund of Fine to Union-
Steam-ship Company, *supply*, 11621
Maitland Coal Miners: Postmaster-General,
adj., 8360
Meteorologists: International Conference, *q.*,
8422
Meteorology, *supply*, 139
Navigation Bill, *q.*, 10919
New Hebrides, *q.*, 8867
Northern Territory, *address*, 50; *q.*, 1232; *sup-*
ply, 3809

Millen, Senator Hon. E. D.—*continued.*

Officers' Compensation Bill, 2R., 10052; *com.*, (payments), 10064-6; (Title), 10070
 Old-age Pensions, *address*, 51; compulsory life assurance, *m.*, 6019 (*see* Invalid and Old-age Pensions Bill)
 Old-age Pensions Appropriation Bill, 2R., 12126
 Opium Smuggling, *q.*, 8699
 Opposition, Leader of the, *obs.*, 6293
 Papers, printing of, *m.*, 248, 12102
 Papua, *supply*, 5885; German claims, *q.*, 11300
 Parliament: Accommodation, *supply*, 8980
 Parliamentary Allowances Bill, 2R., 2083; *com.* (amount of allowance), 2118
 Parliamentary Papers Bill, 2R., 12128; *com.* (no action for publishing Parliamentary Papers), 12131
 Post and Telegraph Department:
 Accounts, *supply*, 8902, 10270
 Additional Permanent Hands: Mr. Mauger's Speech, *q.*, 7795
 Disorganization: Committee of Inquiry, *supply*, 8900, 9003; *q.*, 9137; *adj.*, 9125; *q.*, 9632, 9735; *supply*, 10271
 Money Order Branch: Advance from New South Wales Savings Bank, *supply*, 11620-1
 Tenders for Material, *supply*, 9006
 Post and Telegraph Offices:
 Sydney Railway Station Post Office, *supply*, 4045; *expl.*, 4143
 Preferential Trade, *address*, 52
 Printing Committee, *obs.*, 4463; *m.*, 4466, 8228
 Printing Office, Melbourne, *supply*, 8992
 Privilege: Select Committee upon Procedure, *m.*, 10004, 10256; *ad. rep.*, 11992
 Produce, transport of, *address*, 46
 Public Service:
 Plebscite of Officers, Post and Telegraph Department: Grievances, *q.*, 7704
 Pulsford, Senator, leave of absence for, *m.*, 1330, 4896, 9139
 Quarantine Bill, 2R., 4399; *com.* (hoisting of quarantine signal), 5997; (signal), 5998; (no person to quit vessel subject to quarantine), 6001; (performance of quarantine by goods), 6062; (examination of imported animals), 6066; (liability of owners, &c., for provisions for quarantined persons), 6075, 6083; (persons able to support themselves), 6220; (owners liable for services of medical officer), 6221; (persons may be vaccinated), 6223-4
 Questions, supervision of, *q.*, 9893
 Remounts for India, *q.*, 8867; *supply*, 8902; *adj.*, 10073; *q.*, 10253
 Senate:
 Rights of, *m.*, 11583; *obs.*, 11682
 Vacancy: South Australia, *q.*, 3558; *m.*, 4396
 Shipping: Differential Treatment, *q.*, 11983, 12100
 Starch: Increase of Price, *q.*, 2513, 3556, 3683
 Sugar, Surtax on Australian, *q.*, 9138
 Supply Bill (No. 1), *m.s.o.*, 39; 1R., 138; *com.*, Schedule, Home Affairs: (meteorology), 139
 Supply Bill (No. 2) *com.* (application), 1938; Schedule (contingencies), 1948-9; External Affairs: (Laing and Company's Bond), 1951; Postmaster-General: (Refunds of Revenue), 1951-2; 3R., 1953

Millen, Senator Hon. E. D.—*continued.*

Supply Bill (No. 3), *com.*, Schedule: External Affairs: (Papua), 5885
 Supply Bill (No. 4), *m.s.o.*, 6300; *com.* (application), 6347; Schedule, 6348; Trade and Customs: (Commerce Act), 6352
 Supply Bill (No. 5), 1R., 8900; *com.*, Schedule: The Parliament, 8980; Home Affairs (Electoral Act), 8988; Treasury (Government Printing Office), 8992; Defence, 8995-6-9; Post and Telegraphs, 9003-6
 Surplus Revenue Bill, *q.*, 11381; 2R., 11874; *com.* (commencement), 11903-6-8
 Tariff, *q.*, 11863
 Action of New South Wales Government, *q.*, 2178
 Revenue, *q.*, 7791, 7926
 Statement by Treasurer, *q.*, 11863
 Tariff Revision, *address*, 49
 Telegraph and Telephone Service:
 Delayed Telegrams, *q.*, 7752
 Poles, *q.*, 3363
 Tobacco Combine: Tariff, *adj.*, 2048
 Transferred Properties, *supply*, 3809
 Treasurer's Advance Account, *supply*, 11689
 Trusts (*see* Australian Industries Preservation Bill)
 Voting Machines, *m.*, 1269; *q.*, 8698
 Walker, Senator, leave of absence for, *m.*, 9139, 10921
 Wire Netting, *q.*, 1926, 2405. (*See* Customs Tariff Bill)

Mulcahy, Senator Hon. E., Tasmania:

Additional Appropriation Bill, 1907-8, 1R., 11501
 Additional Appropriation (Works and Buildings) Bill 1907-8, 1R., 11622
 Address-in-Reply, *m.*, 397
 Adjournment, Special, *m.*, 12150
 American Fleet, Visit of, *q.*, 11468, 11581, 11983
 Advertising Australia: Press Cable Rates, *adj.*, 767
 Appropriation Bill, *com.*; The Parliament, 10285-90; Home Affairs: (Miscellaneous), 10307
 Appropriation (Works and Buildings) Bill, 2R., 3919; *com.*, (Defence), 4045; (Post and Telegraph), 4047; (Telegraphs and Telephones), 4050
 Australian Industries Preservation Bill, *com.*, (power of Comptroller-General to question, &c.), 5086, 5102
 Bills of Exchange Bill, *com.*, (application of State Laws), 1971-2; (protection of banker), 2200
 Bounties Bill, *com.*, First Schedule (copra), 3405; (rice), 3485; (coffee), 3719; *recomm.*, 4840
 Business, Order of, *m.*, 34
 Cable Communication: Tasmania, *supply*, 4050; King Island, *q.*, 11864
 Coast Defence Appropriation Bill, 2R., 12125
 Commonwealth Salaries Bill, *com.*, (Taxation by States), 1049, 1579
 Customs Certificates: British goods, *m.*, 1960

Mulcahy, Senator Hon. E.—continued.

Customs Tariff Bill, 2R., 7609; *ad. rep.*, 10046;
recom., 11686; Schedule:
 Agricultural, &c., Machinery and Imple-
 ments, 8587-8
 Ammonia, *p.o.*, 9250
 Apparel and Attire, 8117-8, 8205, 8215; *ad.*
rep., 10047
 Blankets, &c., 8232-3, 8251; *ad. rep.*, 10047
 Blue, 7688, 7697
 Butter and Cheese, 7700
 Carbide of Calcium, 9258, 9266-8
 Carpets, &c., 8271-3-5
 Confectionery, 7727
 Cosies, &c., 8277-9, 8280-4-6
 Curtains, &c., 8287
 Drugs and Chemicals, 9271-2
 Electrical and Gas Appliances, 9057-9
 Electrical Machinery, 8803-6
 Electrical Machines, &c., 8873
 Fire Bricks, &c., 8481
 Fire Extinguishers, 8773-5
 Fruits, Dried, 7819
 Furniture, 9381
 Galvanized Iron, &c., 8564
 Gloves, 8293-4; *cons. req.*, 11594
 Hats, &c., 8298
 Hay and Chaff, 7936
 Locks, 9176
 Locomotives, Traction Engines, &c., 8663
 Lounges and Settees, 9386
 Malt Extract, 7927
 Manures, 9908
 Motive Power Machinery, 8627; (*p.o.*
 8651)
 Nails, 8604-6
 Oilmen's Stores, 8062
 Oils, 8394, 8427
 Onions, 7885
 Paints, 8460
 Paper, &c., *cons. req.*, 11313
 Photographic Requisites, 9931-2-5-6
 Pianos, 9894
 Piece Goods, 8124-5-6-8, 8143, 8150-3,
 8159, 8166-8, 8173-8, 8184-5-6-7-8, 8190-3;
ad. rep., 10047; *cons. req.*, 11504
 Printing Roller Composition, 821
 Pulley Blocks, Blowers, &c., 8669
 Stained Glass Windows, *cons. req.*, 11317
 Stone and Marble, 8548
 Tea, 8115
 Timber, 9432, 9458, 9464-5; *cons. req.*,
 11308, 11607
 Type, &c., 8768, 8772
 Yarns, 9919, 9921-2-3
 Days and Hours of Meeting, *m.*, 8078
 Defence:
 Barrack Reserve, Hobart, *q.*, 2615
 Hobart Rifle Range, *supply*, 4045; *q.*, 4142
 One Tree Point Battery, *q.*, 4142
 Dissent from Ruling: Admissibility of re-
 quest (Customs Tariff Bill), *m.*, 8651, 9250
 Excise Procedure Bill, *com.*, new clause (ex-
 clusion of lawyers), 5128
 Excise Tariff (Agricultural Machinery) Act, *q.*,
 5560; *adj.*, 5747
 Federal Capital, *address*, 402
 Finance, Commonwealth and State, *supply*,
 11501
 Invalid and Old-age Pensions Bill, 2R., 12010
 Interstate Communication: Commonwealth
 Responsibility, *q.*, 11865

Mulcahy, Senator Hon. E.—continued.

Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway Survey
 Bill, *address*, 403; 2R., 1337; *com.*, (power
 to make survey), 1477; *q.*, 8229
 London Offices, *q.*, 3683; *adj.*, 3731; *supply*,
 3920
 Mail Contracts:
 Cancelled, *address*, 400; *q.*, 8672, 8868;
supply, 8923
 Mail Service to Europe, *m.*, 6212
 Tasmania, *adj.*, 768; *supply*, 4047
 Northern Territory, *address*, 401
 Officers' Compensation Bill, *com.*, (payments),
 10059-63
 Officers, Services of, *adj.*, 12150
 Old-age Pensions, *supply*, 11502. (*See Invalid*
and Old-age Pensions Bill)
 Pair Book, Entries in, *m.*, 3503
 Parliamentary Allowances Bill, 2R., 2090
 Parliamentary Papers Bill, 2R., 12130; *com.*
 (no action for publishing Parliamentary
 Papers), 12134
 Parties, Position of, *address*, 403
 Post and Telegraph Offices:
 Melbourne General Post Office, *supply*, 4047
 Post and Telegraph Department:
 Disorganization, Committee of Inquiry,
adj., 9530
 Tattersall's Sweeps Correspondence: Tas-
 manian Bank's action, *q.*, 8364
 Tenders: British Preference, *q.*, 8868; *sup-*
ply, 8923
 Preferential Voting, *address*, 403
 Printing Committee, *m.*, 1566, 3647
 Privilege: Select Committee upon Procedure,
m., 10008
 Public Service:
 Blakney, Mr. E. A.: Classification and pro-
 motion, *q.*, 7702, 7796, 8364-5, 8554, 8867
 Gratuities for Suggestions, *supply*, 10307
 Quarantine Bill, 2R., 5202; *com.*, (powers of
 Commonwealth), 5490
 Secret Drugs: Mr. Beale's Report, *q.*, 8286
 Senate:
 Clerk: Usher, *supply*, 10285-00
 Rights of, *obs.*, 11686
 Vacancy: South Australia, *m.*, 4736
 Standing Orders Committee, *m.*, 37
 State Premiers' Conferences, *address*, 400
 Supply Bill (No. 2), *com.*, (application), 1934
 Supply Bill (No. 5), 1R., 8923
 Surplus Revenue Bill, 2R., 11897
 Tariff Revision, *address*, 397, 401
 Tasmanian Finances, *address*, 397
 Telephone Subscribers: Supplementary Lists,
q., 11865
 Tobacco Combine: Select Committee, *m.*,
 3053
 Voting Machines, *q.*, 11472
 Wireless Telegraphy, *supply*, 4050

Needham, Senator E., Western Australia:

Address-in-Reply, *m.*, 77
 Additional Appropriation Bill, 1907-8, 1R.,
 11512
 Additional Appropriation (Works and Build-
 ings) Bill, *com.*, schedule, 11606
 Adjournments of Senate, *supply*, 1856; special
 adjournment, *m.*, 7788
 Advertising Australia, *supply*, 5893-4, 10278-9
 Agricultural Implement Makers, *m.*, 650
 American Fleet, visit, *q.*, 11469

Needham, Senator E.—*continued.*

Appropriation Bill, 2*r.*, 10278; *com.*, (External Affairs), 10295, 10302; (Attorney-General), 10303; (Home Affairs), 10307, 10308; (Treasury), 10371; (Defence), 10379
 Appropriation (Works and Buildings) Bill, 2*r.*, 3924; *com.* schedule (Commonwealth Offices, London), 4075
 Australian Industries Preservation Bill, 2*r.*, 4589; *com.* (Burden of proof), 5013, 5032, 5112, 5113
 Bills, initiation of, in Senate, *supply*, 1856
 Bills of Exchange Bill, *com.* (application of State laws), 1706
 Bounties Bill, 2*r.*, 2759; *com.* (minimum rate of wages), 2770; First Schedule (rice), (*p.o.*), 3476, 3477; (coffee), 3583; (coffee), 3713; (tobacco), 4245
 Business of Session, *adj.*, 1712, 9191
 Coast Defence Appropriation Bill, 2*r.*, 12124
 Conciliation and Arbitration Bill, *int.*, 5467
 Customs Act, breaches, *q.*, 3463
 Customs Tariff Bill, *rec.*, 11683. Schedule :
 Bananas (*p.o.*), 7856
 Biscuits, 7679
 Blacks, &c., 8473
 Blankets, 8238, 8239 (*p.o.*, 8260)
 Blue, 7690
 Bronzing Powders, &c., 8376
 Candles, 7710
 Carpets, 8265
 Coffee, 7765
 Confectionery, 7746
 Engines, &c., 8671
 Electrical and gas appliances, 9049, 9051; *cons. req.*, 10948
 Fruits and Vegetables, 7812
 Ginger, 7831
 Grain and Pulse, prepared, 7894
 Hats, &c., 8307, 8322
 Iron pipes, &c., 9076
 Iron and steel tubes, &c., 9086
 Macaroni, &c., 7955
 Machinery, &c., 8706
 Manufactures of metals *n.e.i.* (*p.o.*, 8757)
 Matches, 8000, 8003, 8008
 Milk, 8026
 Motive power machinery, 8654
 Oils, 8390; *cons. req.*, 11231, 11233
 Paints, &c., 8453
 Parasols, &c., 8325
 Piece Goods, 8188
 Rice, *cons. req.*, 10873
 Strawboard, 9752
 Tanks, 8612
 Tea, 8113
 Timber (*p.o.*, 9550), 9555
 Trimmings, &c., *n.e.i.*, 8348
 Vegetables, dried, &c., 7876
 Vehicles, 9823
 Wine, Sparkling, 7625, 7629
 Wood, Articles of, 9572-3, 9576-9
 Works of Art, 9936, 9938
 Defence :
 Barracks, Fremantle, *supply*, 11606
 Breach of Discipline, Fremantle, *supply*, 10380
 Camps, Annual, *supply*, 10379
 Naval Agreement, *address*, 77; *q.*, 1131; *supply*, 3924, 11512-3
 Naval Officer's Report, *q.*, 9633
 Naval Subsidy, *q.*, 2514
 Policy, Statement of, *supply*, 5873-4, 6311

Needham, Senator E.—*continued.*

Defence—*continued.*
 Rifle Clubs, *supply*, 10380
 Saddles, Military, *q.*, 10920; *supply*, 12138
 Torpedoes, *q.*, 1813-4, 4471, 11301, 11580; *supply*, 1856-7, 1927, 10380, 12138
 Uniforms, *q.*, 9796, 11303; *supply*, 10380; Cadets, *q.*, 11580
 Decimal Coinage, *q.*, 10369
 Disputed Elections and Qualifications Bill, *rec.* (sending petitions), 5780
 Electoral Act, *q.*, 9633, 9796; *supply*, 12145
 Elections, General, *address*, 78
 Electoral Department, *address*, 78; *supply*, 1856, 6351, 10279
 Financial Relations, Commonwealth and States, *supply*, 11512
 Fremantle Dock, *q.*, 6191, 7977, 8700, 10369; *supply*, 6312-2
 Government Printing Office, *supply*, 10371, 11514-5; *m.*, 11865
 High Commissioner, *q.*, 3797; *supply*, 10295-6. (See London Offices of Commonwealth.)
 Home Affairs, administration, *supply*, 1856
 Immigration, *address*, 78-9; *supply*, 5893-4, 10278-9; *q.*, 8156, 8230, 8231
 Imperial Conference, *address*, 77
 Invalid and Old-age Pensions Bill, 2*r.*, 12008; *com.* (persons disqualified), 12033; (payment procedure), 12037
 Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway, *address*, 78
 Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway Survey Bill, 2*r.*, *p.o.*, 1137, 1145
 Labour Party, attitude of, *address*, 79
 Land Policy, *address*, 79; *supply*, 10278-9
 Lighthouses, *supply*, 10308
 Linotype Operators, *m.*, 3829, 5402; *supply*, 6353
 London Offices of Commonwealth, *supply*, 3924, 4075, 5885, 10295-6, 12144. (See High Commissioner.)
 Mail Service to Europe, *m.*, 6207, 6353; *q.*, 7652
 Mail Steamers, Commonwealth, *m.*, 3838
 Medical Officers, *supply*, 10307
 Navigation Conference, *address*, 79
 Northern Territory, *address*, 77-8
 Officers Compensation Bill, *com.* (J. Wilson), 10663
 Old-age Pensions, *address*, 78
 Order of Business, *obs.*, 651
 Pair Book, Entries, *m.*, 3504
 Paper, tenders for preference to Britain, *supply*, 10371
 Papua, *supply*, 10302
 Parliamentary Allowances Bill, 3*r.*, 2192
 Parliament House : Entertainment of Strangers, *adj.*, 6093
 Parliamentary Papers Bill, *com.* (no action for publishing copies), 12136
 Parliamentary Witnesses Bill, *com.* (escape from custody), 764
 Post Offices :
 Moora, *q.*, 5178
 Postal Service :
 Delay in delivery of letters, *adj.*, 1055
 Motor cars, *q.*, 4471, 8423
 Stores, *q.*, 8423
 Uniform Stamp, Board, Report of, *supply*, 5874-5, 5906, 6353

Needham, Senator E.—continued.

Preferential Freight Charges, Western Australia, *q.*, 649, 3798, 8029
 Preferential Voting, *address*, 78
 Prime Minister, actions of, in England, *address*, 77
 Public Servants; civic positions, *supply*, 10279-80
 Public Service:
 Allowances, Western Australia, *supply*, 10280, 12146
 Commissioner, *supply*, 10280
 Regulations, *m.*, 692
 Quarantine Bill, *2r.*, 4397; *com.* (arrangement with States), 5308; (proclamation of ports), 5488; (liability of owners for expenses), 6087; (persons able to support themselves), 6218, 6220; (vaccination), 6221
 Royal Agricultural Show, adjournment, *m.*, 2063
 Senate:
 Election, South Australia, *m.*, 4830
 Rights of, *obs.*, 11683
 Supply Bill (No. 1), 1908-9, *1r.*, 12138; *com.*, (Schedule), (External Affairs), 12144; (Home Affairs), 12145, 12146
 Supply Bill (No. 2), *1r.*, 1856
 Supply Bill (No. 3), *1r.*, 5873; *com.* (Schedule), (External Affairs), 5885, 5893; (post and telegraphs), 5906
 Supply Bill (No. 4), *1r.*, 6311; *com.*, 6351
 Tariff:
 New Protection, Agricultural Implements, *m.*, 650
 Protest, Western Australian Parliament, *q.*, 4143
 Wire Netting, *q.*, 3463
 Tobacco Combine, *adj.*, 2051
 Trawler, tender, *q.*, 1928, 2029, 2070
 Uniform Postage Stamp, Commonwealth, *q.*, 5648; *supply*, 5874-5, 5906
 Wages in Australian States, *address*, 79
 Wireless Telegraphy, *q.*, 6189, 8701, 9537, 9796; *supply*, 6312-3
 Year-Book, *q.*, 11218

Neild, Senator Col. Hon. J. C., New South Wales:

Additional Appropriation Bill 1907-8, *1r.*, 11517
 Address-in-Reply, *m.*, 12
 Adjournment of Senate, *address*, 12-3; special adjournment, *m.*, 7786, 10400, 10962; Easter adjournment, *q.*, 10252, 10369
 Adjournment, Formal: Repetition of Debate, *p.o.*, 2070
 Agricultural Implement Makers' Union, *expl.*, 5466; *adj.*, 5495
 American Fleet, Visit, *q.*, 8554, 9138, 9236
 Appropriation Bill, *2r.*, 10285; *com.* (External Affairs), 10294, 10296; (Defence), 10372, 10381, 10385, 10386
 Appropriation (Works and Buildings) Bill, *2r.*, 3904, 3930; *com.*, schedule (Defence), 3933, 3934; (Post and Telegraph), 4046; (Special Defence), 4059, 4060, 4061, 4062; (Commonwealth Offices, London), 4069-71; *3r.*, 4150
 Australian Industries Preservation Bill, *2r.*, 4585; *com.* (Burden of proof, &c.), 4915; *3r.* (*p.o.*, 5285)
 Bankruptcy and Company Legislation, *address*, 19-21

Neild, Senator Col. Hon. J. C.—continued.

Bounties Bill, *2r.* (*p.o.*), 2446; *m.* (to postpone Bill until settlement of Tariff), 3149 (*p.o.*, 3149-52); *com.*, schedule (New Zealand flax), 3077, 3153, 3158; (mohair), 3372; (rice), 3486; (fish), 4275; (dates), 4384; (wool tops), 4391; *ad. rep.*, 4580; *recom.* (*p.o.*, 4836), 4836; (tobacco), 4907
 Cabinet Changes, *q.*, 7544, 7569
 Cameron, Senator Lt.-Colonel: political attitude, *address*, 13
 Chairman of Committees, *address*, 14
 Coal Combine, alleged, *adj.*, 3697; *q.*, 3899
 Coastal Survey, Western Australia, *supply*, 6324-5
 Commonwealth Salaries Act, *q.*, 7567
 Commonwealth Salaries Bill, *com.* (taxation by States), 955, 958, 1045-7, 1568, 1577; *cons. amds.*, 4084
 Compulsory Life Assurance, *m.*, 4196, 6006
 Criminal Appeals, *q.*, 1567
 Criminal Appeals Bill, order of leave, 30; *2r.*, 959; *obs.*, 1594; *2r.*, 2543; *m.*, 2561
 Customs:
 Undermanning, Sydney, *supply*, 6324
 Customs Tariff Bill, *1r.*, 7545; *2r.*, 7580; *com.*, (rebate for home consumption), 9950; *m.s.o.*, 10042; *recom.*, 10045; *cons. req.*, *m.s.o.*, 10837; Schedule:
 Acetic Acid, &c., 9237, 9238
 Adding and Computing Machines, *cons. req.*, 10937
 Agricultural machinery, 8588, 8595
 Agricultural machinery, *n.e.i.*, 8575, 8576
 Ammonia, 9239, 9240, 9241, 9242 (*p.o.*, 9246, 9247, 9248, 9249), 9247; *cons. req.*, 11237
 Animal foods, 7920
 Apparel, &c., 8118
 Apparel, &c., *n.e.i.*, 8212, 8213, 8216
 Arms, 8556, 8557, 8558
 Arrowroot, 7950, 7952, 7954
 Articles, *n.e.i.*, 8217
 Bags, &c., of calico, &c., 8217
 Bananas, 7835, 7854, 7872
 Biscuits, 7680
 Blankets, &c., 8253, 8257
 Blue, 7692, 7696; *cons. req.*, 10844
 Boots, &c., 9662
 Bottles, 8409
 Butter and cheese, 7699, 7700
 Candles, 7704, 7711
 Carbide of calcium, 9260, 9264, 9269
 Carbonic acid gas, 9256
 Carpets, &c., 8273
 Cair mats, &c., 8275, 8277
 Coffee, 7769, 7780
 Confectionery, 7726, 7740, 7746, 7747, 7751
 Cosies, &c., 8281, 8283, 8284
 Curtains, &c., 8289
 Cutlery, 8509
 Electrical and Gas Appliances, *cons. req.*, 10950
 Electrical machinery, &c., 8810, 8870, 8871, 8874, 8876
 Feathers, 8217
 Fire Brigade Appliances, 9940
 Fire Extinguishers, 8773, 8774, 8775, 8776
 Fish, 7785
 Fruits, citrus, 7830
 Fruits and vegetables, 7818, 7824, 7827
 Furniture, 9173

Neild, Senator Col. Hon. J. C.—*continued.*Customs Tariff Bill (Schedule)—*continued.*

Furs, &c., 8289, 8290, 8292
 Fuse, 9927
 Glass-lenses, &c., 8494
 Gloves, 8296
 Glue, 8502, 8508, 8510, 8513, 8515, 8516, 8517, 8519
 Glycerine, 9297
 Goods brought back to Australia, 9946
 Grain and pulse, prepared (*f.o.* 7900, 7903, 7905), 7908, 7913, 7914, 7916, 7920
 Graphite, &c., 8373, 8374
 Hats, &c., 8297 (*p.o.* 8319)
 Hay and chaff, 7931
 Honey, &c., 7945, 7946
 Hops, 7947, 7949
 Insecticides, &c., 9282, 9292; *cons. req.*, 11239
 Iron, plate and sheet, 8562
 Isinglass, 8065
 Jewellery, 9055
 Kindergarten materials, 9806
 Lamps, 8570
 Lard, &c., 7720
 Leather, 9677, 9678
 Linseed, 7949
 Linseed meal, 7949
 Locks, &c., 9173, 9175, 9178
 Macaroni, 7957
 Machinery, &c., 8701, 8719
 Machinery, proclaimed, 8722
 Manufactures of metal, *n.e.i.*, 8724, 8730, 8739, 8740, 8744 (*p.o.*, 8748), 8751
 Malt, 7956
 Malt extract, 7958, 7959
 Mangles, &c., 8574
 Matches, 7970, 8004, 8008
 Meats, &c., 8011, 8012, 8013
 Medicines, 9293, 9295
 Milk, 8025
 Mining Engines, &c., 8787, 8707
 Mixed Metalware, 8723
 Nails, 8600, 8603, 8604, 8612
 Naphthalene, 9275
 Oils, 8410, 8414; *cons. req.*, 11223
 Oilmen's stores, 8045, 8057
 Onions, 7884
 Paints, &c., 8460, 8463, 8464
 Paper, copying, &c., 9800
 Paper, gummed, 9798
 Paper, manufactures of, 9682, 9683
 Paper patterns, 9809
 Peel, 7834
 Pens, &c., 9810, 9812, 9813
 Perfumery, 9295 (*p.o.*, 9296)
 Pianos, 9841, 9894
 Pickles, &c., 8066; *cons. req.*, 10871
 Piece goods, 8119, 8120, 8126, 8134, 8149, 8168
 Printing ink, 9805
 Printing roller composition, 8521, 8527
 Rails, fish plates, &c., 9064, 9067, 9071; *cons. req.*, 10953
 Rice, 8074, 8086
 Rice root, 7608
 Rock Boring Machines, *cons. req.*, 10042
 Rubber manufactures *n.e.i.*, 9670
 Saccharin, 9273
 Salicylic acid, &c., 9270, 9271
 Salt, 8088, 8089, 8090
 Sago and tapioca, 7662
 Scientific Instruments, &c., 9942

Neild, Senator Col. Hon. J. C.—*continued.*Customs Tariff Bill (Schedule)—*continued.*

Screws, 8777, 8779, 8780
 Seed (Cotton), 8095
 Sheet lead, &c., 8573
 Slate slabs, &c., 8528
 Soap, 8097, 8098
 Sparklets, 8100
 Spectacle cases, 9657, 9658
 Spectacle frames, 9661
 Spirit heaters, 7712
 Standards, &c., 9180, 9181, 9182
 Stationery, manufactured, 9801
 Stearine, *cons. req.*, 10847
 Stone and marble, 8543, 8550
 Strawboard, 9751
 Stripper Harvesters, 8586
 Surgical Appliances, &c., 9943
 Tallow, &c., 8383, 8384, 8386
 Textile articles, *n.e.i.*, 8217
 Tricycles, children's, 9821
 Type, &c., 8771
 Vegetables, dried, &c., 7876, 7879, 7880
 Vehicles, 9831, 9832, 9833
 Voltsoids of sal-ammoniac, 9278, 9279
 Watches, &c., 9656
 Waxes, 7720
 Weighing machines, 8624
 Wire Netting, 9139, 9168

Days of Meeting, *m.* 7573

Defence :

Administration, *supply*, 10372-3
 Ammunition waggons, *supply*, 3906, 4059, 4060-1, 4151-2
 Badges, *supply*, 5862
 Barracks, *supply*, 3933
 Boots, *supply*, 5860-1; *q.*, 9734
 Cadets, *supply*, 7545, 8914-5, 10387; *q.*, 8672, 8866, 11219
 Camps, Pay and Expenses, *supply*, 10382
 Ceremonial Parades, *supply*, 10381
 Collins, Capt., *supply*, 10294
 Corps of Guides, *supply*, 9000
 Dove, Major, *supply*, 8914, 10387-8; *q.*, 10253-5
 Drill Halls, *supply*, 3904
 Establishment, strength, *supply*, 3933, 3934
 Fixed Defences, *supply*, 3904
 Great-Coats, *supply*, 5862
 Guns, Fremantle, *address*, 15
 Inspection of Infantry, Perth, *address*, 15
 Instructional School Allowances, *supply*, 10382-3
 Lyons, Capt., *supply*, 10385-6
 Military Board, *supply*, 3906, 5867
 Military Clothing, *m.*, 249
 Military Forces, Perth, *address*, 15-6
 Officers, *supply*, 3905-6, 8914-5, 8917, 8996, 8997, 10383; *q.*, 10828, 10919
 Pay, *supply*, 8913; Sergeants, *supply*, 10285
 Policy, *supply*, 7545-6
 Promotion, Disrating, &c., *supply*, 5863-6
 Ranges, *supply*, 3905, 3933-4
 Regulations, Military, *supply*, 10381
 Revolvers, *supply*, 3905
 Rifle Clubs, *supply*, 7545, 10382-3
 Rifles, *supply*, 3905
 Scheme, Government, *supply*, 10372-3
 Small Arms and Ammunition Factory, *supply*, 3904-5; *q.*, 6409
 Torpedoes, *supply*, 4062

Neild, Senator Col. Hon. J. C.—*continued.*

Defence—*continued.*

Training, *supply*, 8915-7
 Transport waggons, *q.*, 7704, 7752; *obs.*, 7844;
 Uniforms, *supply*, 10381-2
 Disputed Returns and Qualifications, *expl.*, 3796
 Dissent from Ruling: (Bounties Bill), *m.*, 3049-53; Admissibility of Request (Customs Tariff Bill), *m.*, 9248, 9249
 Dooley, New South Wales Election, *q.*, 3233
 Dominion of New Zealand, congratulations, *m.*, 3811
 Elections, General, *address*, 17
 Electoral Office, *supply*, 8988
 Excise Procedure Bill, *int.*, 4472; *3R.*, 5370
 Excise Tariff (Agricultural Machinery) Act, *q.*, 4362; *adj.*, 4617; *supply*, 8993, 8995. (See New Protection.)
 Excise Tariff Bill, *ad. rep.*, *p.o.*, 10040
 Federal Capital, *address*, 18; *q.*, 5979, 6407, 10003, 10369; *supply*, 6325-6, 7547; *m.*, 7571
 Financial Relations: Commonwealth and States, *address*, 14; *q.* (*p.o.*, 7974); *supply*, 11517-20
 Fires in New South Wales, *q.*, 3164
 First President of the Senate, *m.*, 3165, 3369
 German Convict Settlement, Pacific, *q.*, 7791, 7841
 Gold-fields Water Supply, *expl.*, 2068
 Hansard Report, *expl.*, 7703; what may be recorded, *p.o.*, 7974
 High Commissioner, *supply*, 10294. (See London Offices of Commonwealth.)
 High Court as Final Court of Appeal, *address*, 16-7
 Historical Records, *supply*, 10295-6
 Hours of Meeting, *m.*, 8078
 Immigration, *q.*, 4244; *adj.*, 4276
 Immigration Restriction Act, *q.*, 5980, 10829, 10920, 11221
 Income Tax: Federal Salaries and Allowances, *address*, 16-17; Victoria, *m.* (*p.o.*), 1276; *q.*, 3901
 Industrial Dispute, Mildura, *q.*, 7843
 Judiciary Bill, *2R.*, 850; *com.* (appeals from State Courts), 945
 Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway, *supply*, 3907; *q.*, 8221, 11217
 Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway Survey Bill, *2R.*, 1261, 1330; (*p.o.*), 1026-7-31; *com.* (power to make survey), 1483, 1499, 1507; (appropriation of moneys), 1510; *3R.*, 1700
 Land Settlement, *q.*, 4244
 Leave of Absence to every Senator, *m.*, 6298
 Legal Adviser, Commonwealth, New South Wales, *address*, 18-9
 London Offices, Commonwealth, *supply*, 3907-8-9-10, 4069, 4150; *q.*, 7543. (See High Commissioner)
 Mails:
 Mail Contract Cancelled, *address*, 14; *q.*, 240, 1131, 3558, 4363, 4462, 4706, 4895, 5858, 8230, 8672; *m.*, 3171
 Service to Europe, *q.*, 4462, 5858; *m.*, 6200, 7542
 Sydney, *q.*, 10252
 Maitland Coal Miners: Postmaster-General, *q.*, 8103, 8229, 8309, 8672; *adj.*, 8354, 8363
 Marquis of Linlithgow, Death of, *m.*, 8505
 Mauger, Mr., Speech by, *q.*, 8507
 Ministers, rumoured disagreement of, *q.*, 7925

Neild, Senator Col. Hon. J. C.—*continued.*

Navigation Bill, *q.*, *p.o.*, 8155
 Navigation Conference, *address*, 16
 New Protection *q.*, 4362; *adj.*, 4617. (See Excise Tariff, &c.)
 Nimrod Polar Expedition, *q.*, 7701, 7754, 7849
 Northern Territory, *address*, 15; *q.*, 1232; *adj.*, 9738
 Officers Compensation Bill, *q.*, 7753; *2R.*, 10054; *com.* (Lt.-Col. Bayly), 10058; (J. Wilson), 10062; *q.*, 10828, 10919
 Old-age Pensions, *address*, 14-5; *m.*, 4196, 6006
 Opposition, selection of leader, *supply*, 6322
 Order of Business, *m.*, 35
 Pair Book, Entries, *expl.*, 3145, 3147; *m.*, 3501, 3506
 Papers: Library Table, *q.* (*p.o.*), 933
 Parliamentary Allowances Bill, *2R.*, 2094
 Parliament House, accommodation for Senators, *supply*, 8981; insanitary condition of, *q.*, 9631
 Petition, printing of, *m.*, 10251
 Postal Service:
 Hours in Mail Branch, *q.*, 3798
 Letter-boxes, *supply*, 4046, 8912-3
 Letter delivery, *supply*, 7546, 8911-12
 Newspapers, *supply*, 8913
 Stamps, *q.*, 7565
 Undermanning, Sydney General Post Office, *supply*, 6324
 Post and Telegraph Department:
 Committee of Inquiry, *m.*, 9521, 9535
 Post Offices:
 Contract, *supply*, 8912
 Early Closing, *q.*, 5979, 6409; *supply*, 6326-7
 Preferential Trade (Tariff), 7581
 Preferential Voting, *address*, 17, 18
 President, the, *address*, 14
 Press statements, *expl.*, 8026
 Printing Committee, *m.*, 912, 2180, 3148; (*p.o.*, 4463), 4464, 4470, 7344, 8223
 Printing Office, *q.*, 7793
 Privilege, procedure, Select Committee, *m.*, 10007, 10256, 11303-4; report, *m.*, 11676-8
 Public Servants: Civic positions, *adj.*, 8421
 Public Works, *m.*, *dis.*, 5467
 Quarantine Bill, *q.*, 829, 934; *2R.*, 5292; *com.* (arrangements with States), 5310, 5319
 Questions, Supervision of, *q.*, 9802, 0893
 Select Committees on Bills, *m.*, 30; *q.*, 2512
 Senate:
 Photograph of, *q.*, 11383
 Status of, *supply*, 11517-20
 Vacancy, South Australia, *p.o.*, 8; *obs.*, 9, 974; *q.*, 28, 2512, 8423, 9353; *m.*, 4740; *expl.*, 4795, 4801
 Snake-bite, Antidote, *q.*, 3901
 Standing Orders, amendment of, *adj.*, 2616, 2625; suspension, *obs.*, 6408
 State Election, New South Wales, *q.*, 3233
 Stationery: Government Printer, *q.*, 2514, 2615
 Supply Bill (No. 3), *1R.*, 5860
 Supply Bill (No. 4), *1R.*, 6122
 Supply Bill (No. 5), *1R.*, 8911; *com.*, Schedule (Parliament), 8981; (Home Affairs), 8988; (Trade and Customs), 8993, 8995; (Defence), 8996, 8997, 9000.
 Sydney-Melbourne Express, *q.*, 11217, 11301
 Tariff:
 Dried Fruits, *q.*, 7843
 State Imports, *q.*, 2406
 Tobacco, *adj.*, 2448, 2513, 2615

Neild, Senator Col. Hon. J. C.—*continued.*

- Telegraphs :
 - Delayed Telegrams, *supply*, 8912
- Telephones :
 - Wires, Western Australia, *q.*, 3900
 - Delay in communication, Melbourne, *q.*, 8506
- Tobacco Combine, *adj.* (*p.o.*), 2070, 2448; *q.*, 2513, 2615, 3049, 4706; *m.*, *s.o.*, 3049, 3054; *m.*, 3055, 3056, 3059
- Vardon v. O'Loughlin, *q.*, 9353
- Voting Machines, *m.*, 1268
- Western Australia : Gold-fields Water Supply, *expl.*, 2068
- Wines for New Zealand, *q.*, 11472
- Wire Netting, seizure, N.S.W., *supply*, 5860

O'Loughlin, Senator J. Y., South Australia :

- Australian Industries Preservation Bill, *com.* (Burden of proof), 5022
- Appropriation (Works and Buildings) Bill, *com.*, schedule (Defence), 4043; (Post and Telegraphs), 4048
- Bills of Exchange Bill, *com.* (protection of banker), 752, 2061, 2195, 2203; (protest when notary not accessible), 761
- Bounties Bill, *com.*, First Schedule (copra), 3404; (rubber), 3575; (tobacco), (*p.o.*, 4165)
- Commonwealth Salaries Bill, *com.* (taxation by States), 1579
- Defence :
 - Protector, *supply*, 4043
- Disputed Elections and Qualifications Bill, *2R.*, 5585; *com.* (pending petitions), 5597; (reference question), 5651; *recom.* (pending petitions), 5775, 5777
- Excise Tariff Acts, *supply*, 6316-7
- Federal Capital, *q.*, 829
- Immigration, *q.*, 4241
- Inter-State Commission, *supply*, 6319
- Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway Bill, *2R.*, 1357; *com.* (appropriation of moneys), 1512
- Land Settlement, *q.*, 4243
- Millicent, South Australia, *q.*, 6296
- Parliamentary Allowances Bill, *2R.*, 2092; *com.* (commenced), 2119
- Post and Telegraph Offices :
 - Port Pirie, *q.*, 744; *supply*, 4048
- Senate, Adjournment of, *m.*, 6298
- Senate Election, South Australia, *q.*, 4801
- Steamship Service, Victoria and Singapore, *q.*, 5746
- Sumatra and Java, Subsidized Shipping Service, *supply*, 6317-9
- Supply Bill (No. 4), *1R.*, 6316
- Telephone Service :
 - Millicent, South Australia, *q.*, 6296
- Tobacco Combine. *m.s.o.*, 3052

O'Malley, Hon. King, Darwin :

- Address-in-Reply (*p.o.*), 467; *m.*, 468
- Advertising Australia, *Lone Hand*, article, *q.*, 10755
- American Fleet, Visit of, *q.*, 9089
- Australian Industries Preservation Act, *q.*, 3585, 3621, 3935, 3971, 9192
- Australian Industries Preservation Bill, *com.* (Burden of Proof), 9207
- Bank Clerks' Salaries, *q.*, 11155
- Bounties Bill, *2R.*, 996; *com.*, First Schedule (cotton), 1082
- Budget, *m.*, 1678

O'Malley, Hon. King—*continued.*

- Butter Freights, *q.*, 1089
- Carruthers, Mr., statue, *q.*, 2311
- Chinese Sailors on British Ships, *q.*, 11179
- Coal Combine, *q.*, 3585, 3621, 3935, 3971
- Coal Mining Dispute, *q.*, 6004
- Coast Defence Appropriation Bill, *int.*, 12078
- Commonwealth Salaries Bill, *2R.*, 3874
- Conciliation and Arbitration Court, *q.*, 4927, 5046
- Cup Day, adjournment, *q.*, 5416
- Customs Tariff Bill, *cons. req.* (oils), 11108; (paper), 11088; (locks), 10796; (timber), 11148
- (See Tariff Resolutions (Customs).)
- Defence :
 - Admission to Fort, *q.*, 12157
 - Disclosure of information, *q.*, 12157
 - Expenditure, *supply*, 10123-5
 - Government Policy, *adj.*, 7540
 - Rifle Range, Ulverstone, *q.*, 2449
 - Scheme, Government, *q.*, 11419
 - Taxation for purposes of, *q.*, 11628
 - Thursday Island, *supply*, 11368
- Departmental Administration, *supply*, 11298-9
- Disputed Elections and Qualifications Bill, *2R.*, 6375; *com.* (petitions removed to Court), 6379, 6383
- Electoral Rolls, *q.*, 11259
- Estimates, Additional, *supply*, 11298
- Excise Tariff (Agricultural Machinery) Act, *adj.*, 5800; *q.*, 6354, 7171, 7417
- Federal Capital, *q.*, 10074
- Financial Relations, Commonwealth and States, *q.*, 12151
- High Commissioner, *supply*, 9707
- High Court, Authority of, *q.*, 9388
- Immigration, *supply*, 8972, 9706; *q.*, 10130, 10877
- Invalid and Old-age Pensions Bill, *2R.*, 11938 (see Old-age Pensions)
- Land Values Taxation, *supply*, 9349
- London Offices, Commonwealth, *supply*, 3043
- Mails :
 - Burnie-Melbourne, *q.*, 7249
 - Cancelled Contract, *q.*, 404
 - Cool Storage, *m.*, 599
 - European, *m.*, 6475
 - Stanley, *q.*, 10134
 - Magnet, *q.*, 10463; *supply*, 11299
 - Tasmanian, *q.*, 2008, 6131
- Manufactures Encouragement Bill, *int.*, 5013; *2R.*, 6264
- Ministers, relations of, *q.*, 1056
- Monopolies and Trusts, *q.*, 7414
- Old-age Pensions, *supply*, 9320, 9340. See Invalid and Old-age Pensions Bill)
- Orion, missing steamer, *q.*, 11177, 11260
- Papua, *q.*, 10575
- Parliament, Reflections on, *obs.*, 11108
- Parliamentary Allowances, *Budget*, 1678; *adj.*, 1813
- Patent Medicines and Secret Drugs, *m.*, 806
- Photographic Materials Trust, *q.*, 11050
- Port Davey Light, *q.*, 4955
- Postal Service :
 - Administration of, *supply*, 11299
 - Money Order Office, Linda, *q.*, 6416
 - Promotions, *q.*, 7028
 - Sweating, alleged, Zeehan, *q.*, 7025
- Privilege, Procedure, Select Committee. *q.*, 10075; *m.*, 10, 20
- Public Service Methods, *supply*, 11298

O'Malley, Hon. King—continued.

Rifle Range, Ulverstone, *q.*, 2449
 Roosevelt, President, *q.*, 10756
 Settlers in Western Australia, *q.*, 9765
 Steamers, Subsidizing of, *q.*, 10785
 Shipping Combine, alleged, *q.*, 3585, 3621, 3935, 3971
 Shipping Service, Tasmania, *q.*, 11916
 Supply Bill (No. 1) 1908-9, 2R., 12190
 Supply:
 Defence (Central Administration), 10123
 External Affairs (Administration), 8972;
 (Miscellaneous), 9706
 Home Affairs (Miscellaneous), 11368
 Works and Buildings (External Affairs), 3643
 Tariff:
 Antimony, *q.*, 11157
 Committee, appointment of, *q.*, 5131, 5210, 5240
 Kerosene Duties, *q.*, 7414
 Tariff Resolutions (Customs):
 Bags, &c., *m.* to report, 5735
 Commonwealth and State Government Imports, 7427
 Gas Analysis Apparatus, &c., 6933
 Locks, 6115; *cons. reg.*, 10796
 Mining Engines, &c., 6789
 Motive Power Machinery, 6649
 Oils, *cons. reg.*, 11108
 Paper, *cons. reg.*, 11088
 Piece Goods, 5818
 Scientific Apparatus, 6902
 Steam Road Rollers, 6700
 Timber, &c., 7041, 7073, 11148
 Tin Plates, 6116, 6117
 (See Customs Tariff Bill.)
 Tea Duty, *q.*, 1517
 Telegraphy and Telephones:
 Errors in Messages, *q.*, 10874
 Tasmanian Cable, *q.*, 6811, 10963; *supply*, 12190
 Telephone Attendants' Ornaments, *q.*, 10177
 Wireless Telegraphy, *q.*, 6505, 12154
 Waratah-Zeehan telegraph route, *q.*, 5200
 Port Davey, telephone, *q.*, 6129
 Walpole, Mr. R. S., *q.*, 11018

Page, Hon. J.—continued.

Customs Tariff Bill, *cons. reg.*, (Piece Goods), 10625, 11463, 11531; (Waddings, &c.), 10638; (Socks, &c.), 10644, 10647; (Arms), 10656, 10657; (Agricultural Implements, &c.), 10669; (Kitchen Utensils), 10707; (Wire Netting), 10763; (Locks), 10795; (Standards, &c.), 10799; (Oils), 10893, 10911, 10987, 10991, 11107, 11116-21; Scientific Apparatus, &c.), 10908; (Furniture), 11013; (Fancy Goods), 11057; (Photograph Frames), 11057; (Timber), 11132, 11152; (Machinery, Rebate for Home consumption), 11195; (Electrical Machines), 11449; (Gloves), 11460; (Fulley Blocks), 11543; (Pens and Pencils), 11168-9
 Defence:
 Adult Military Training, *m.*, 2243, 2247
 Area for Manœuvring and Artillery Practice, *supply*, 3454
 Artillery Training and Equipment, *supply*, 10111
 Assistant Military Engineer, *supply*, 9792
 Cadets, *q.*, 1089
 Camp, Heidelberg, *q.*, 7248, 7297
 Collins, Capt., *supply*, 10109, 10112
 Cox, Col., *supply*, 10108
 Drayton Grange, *supply*, 10111
 Easter Training, *q.*, 10080
 Encampments and Public Servants, *q.*, 10079
 Guns, lights, &c., 3742
 Gunnery Instruction, *supply*, 10109-10
 Lyster, Col., *supply*, 10111-2
 Military College, *supply*, 10110
 Military Promotions, *q.*, 974
 Officers and Clerical Work, *supply*, 10109
 Officers, Training of, *address*, 348; *supply*, 3615
 Ordnance, *supply*, 3614
 Policy, *supply*, 3610
 Scheme, Government, *supply*, 8846, 10112; *q.*, 11702
 Small Arms and Ammunition Factory, *q.*, 158, 6355, 6419; *address*, 348; *supply*, 3682, 3735
 Special Material, *supply*, 3610
 Farm Machinery and Implement Industry, Nationalization, *address*, 349-50; *expl.*, 500
 Federal Expenditure, *address*, 350
 Immigration, *supply*, 9602
 Information to Members of Parliament, *supply* of, *obs.*, 2653
 Income Tax, Federal Servants, *q.*, 11326
 Labour Party, *address*, 346-7
 London Offices, Commonwealth, *supply*, 3675, 9488; *q.*, 3732
 Loyalty of Ministerialists, *q.*, 976
 Mails:
 Mail Contract Cancelled, *address*, 348
 Service to Europe, *adj.*, 245; *address*, 348-9; *q.*, 590
 Northern Territory, *address*, 347; *supply*, 3454
 Old-age Pensions, *address*, 347
 Opposition Corner, *q.*, 11054
 Papua, *q.*, 4646, 10077
 Parliament, Slanders on, *obs.*, 10987, 10991, 11107; *expl.*, 11017
 Postal Service:
 Officials as Returning Officers, *m.*, 715
 Overtime, Deniliquin, *q.*, 2794
 Post and Telegraph Department:
 Commission, Permanent, *q.*, 11385
 Preferential Trade (Tariff), 4561, 4891

Page, Hon. J., Maranoa:

Address-in-Reply, *m.*, 346
 Adjournment, Special, *m.*, 6591
 Advertising Australia, *supply*, 9602; *q.*, 11097, 11156
 American Canned Meats, *q.*, 9952
 Australian Industries Preservation Bill, 2R., 9030
 Australian Men of Letters Fund, *supply*, 9520, 9521
 Bankruptcy Bill, *q.*, 1089
 Bounties Bill, *com.*, First Schedule (mohair), 1103
 Business, conduct of, *q.*, 5519; order of, *adj.*, 6834
 Captain Collins, *supply*, 9488
 Carruthers Government, *adj.*, 3361
 Carruthers, Mr., *q.*, 2233
 Christmas Recess, *q.*, 5519
 Corn Sacks, *q.*, 6356, 7461

Page, Hon. J.—*continued.*

Public Service :

- Boards of Inquiry, *supply*, 8847-50; *q.*, 8936; *supply*, 9774
- Commissioner, *supply*, 9773, 9774
- Information to Members of Parliament, *q.*, 2653
- States Officers, Services by, *supply*, 9729, 9731
- Temporary Employés, holidays, *q.*, 7169, 7250
- Quarantine Bill, 2R., 535
- Repatriated Australians, *adj.*, 1326
- Shipping Combine, alleged, *adj.* (*p.o.*, 3965)
- Socialism, *address*, 349-50
- Special Adjournment, *m.*, 742
- Starch Industry, *adj.*, 929
- Supply :

- Attorney-General : (Secretary's Office), 9725, 9726; (High Court), 9729, 9731
- Defence : (Central Administration), 10108
- External Affairs : (London Offices), 9488; (miscellaneous), 9520, 9521, 9602
- Home Affairs : (Public Service Commissioner), 9773, 9774; (Public Works Staff), 9792
- Works and Buildings (Trade and Customs), 3442; (Defence), 3454, 3610, 3614, 3682, 3735, 3742; (External Affairs), 3675
- Supply Bill (No. 4), *m.*, 6285-6
- Supply Bill (No. 5), *m.*, 8846
- Tariff :

- Address*, 346-7, 349-50
- Amendments, Notice of, 3173
- Commission's Reports, *q.*, 6419
- Differential Duties, machinery, *supply*, 4845; *q.*, 4026
- Extra Sitings, *q.*, 5131
- Items, Precedence to, *q.*, 3587
- Kerosene Duties, *q.*, 7298, 9685
- Minutes of Evidence, *q.*, 6419
- Order of consideration, *m.*, 4353
- Submission of, *q.*, 466-7
- Wire Netting, *q.*, 2233, 3586, 4309; precedence to item, *m.*, 4353
- Tariff Resolutions (Customs) :
- Agricultural, &c., Machinery, 6553, 6556; *cons. req.*, 10669
- Arms, *cons. req.*, 10656, 10657
- Bicycles, &c., 7278
- Boots, &c., 7155
- Candles, 4801
- Celluloid, &c., Articles, 7399
- China, &c., 6897
- Confectionery, &c. (*p.o.*, 5253)
- Cycle Parts, &c., 7283
- Electrical Machines, *cons. req.*, 11440
- Fancy Goods, 7140; *cons. req.*, 11057
- Furniture, *cons. req.*, 11013
- Gas Analysis Apparatus, &c., 6930, 6932
- Gloves, *cons. req.*, 11460
- Hay and Chaff, 5431
- Insecticides, &c., 6992
- Iron, Plate and Sheet, 6546
- Jewellery, 7144, 7147, 7148
- Kitchen Utensils, *cons. req.*, 10707
- Licht-pausrohpapier, 7268, 7269
- Locks, *cons. req.*, 10795
- Machinery and Machines and Machine Tools, 6733, 6737, 6740, 6741
- Machinery, Rebate for Home consumption, *cons. req.*, 11195
- Maps, 7266

Page, Hon. J.—*continued.*Tariff Resolutions (Customs)—*continued.*

- Matches, 5447
- Milk, 5518
- Motor Cycles, &c., 7281
- Oils, 6865; *cons. req.*, 10893, 10911, 10986, 10991, 11107, 11116, 11121
- Pens and Pencils, &c., 7143; *cons. req.*, 11168, 11169
- Photographs, 7267
- Photograph Frames, &c., *cons. req.*, 11057
- Pianos, 7304
- Piece Goods, *cons. req.*, 10625, 11463, 11531
- Potatoes, 5341
- Pulley Blocks, *cons. req.*, 11543
- Salt, &c., 5535
- Scientific Apparatus, &c., 6935, 7409; *cons. req.*, 10908
- Socks, &c., *cons. req.*, 10644, 10647
- Standards, &c., *cons. req.*, 10799
- Sugar, 4607
- Timber, &c., 7104; *cons. req.*, 11132, 11521
- Waddings, &c., *cons. req.*, 10638
- Watches, &c., 7151
- Wire Netting, 4558; *cons. req.*, 10763
- Wood Articles, 7141
- Tariff (Excise) :
- Starch, 5551, 5553, 5554, 5556
- Telegraphs and Telephones :
- Queensland Telegraph Operators, *q.*, 9300

Palmer, Mr. A. C., *Echuca* :

- Bounties Bill, 2R., 823; *com.* (appropriation), 1056; First Schedule (period of bounty), 1064; (cotton), 1082; (mohair), 1102; (cotton seed), 1108; (olives), 1124; (rice), 1195; (fish), 1300; (fruits, dried), 1318
- Budget, *m.*, 2086
- Customs Tariff Amendment Bill, *com.* (additional provisos South Africa), 12054
- Customs Tariff Bill, *cons. req.* (Hay and Chaff), 10541; (Apparel), 10564; (Wire Netting), 10759; (Timber), 11040, 11147 (*See* Tariff Resolutions (Customs))
- Disputed Elections and Qualifications Bill, 2R., 6378; *com.* (petitions removed to Court), 6381
- Defence :
- Coastal, *supply*, 3432
- Light Horse, *supply*, 10084; *q.*, 12157
- Rifle Ranges, *supply*, 3525
- Scheme, Government, *supply*, 10084
- Electoral Law, *supply*, 9771
- Estimates, Additional, *supply*, 11307
- Excise Tariff (Agricultural Machinery) Act, *q.*, 7206 (*see* New Protection)
- Government Printing, tenders, *q.*, 4310; hand-setting, *q.*, 4417
- Grain bags, *q.*, 6355, 10787, 10970
- Immigration, *supply*, 9616; *q.*, 10130
- Invalid and Old-age Pensions Bill, *com.* (who may receive pensions), 11967. (*See* Old-age Pensions)
- Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway Survey Bill, *mes.*, 642
- Mail Service to Europe, *m.*, 604
- Manufactures Encouragement Bill, *q.*, 6594, 7027
- New Protection : Socialism, *q.*, 7415. (*See* Excise Tariff, &c.)
- Oath of Allegiance, *q.*, 9093

Palmer, Mr. A. C.—continued.

Old-age Pensions, *supply*, 9323. (See Invalid and Old-age Pensions Bill)

Parliamentary Allowances Bill, *m.*, 1919; *2R.*, 1986; *com.* (commencement of application), 2010

Post Offices :

Sites, *supply*, 3525

Postal Service :

Classification, *q.*, 10178, 11708

Country Facilities, *q.*, 9100; *supply*, 11397-8

"Sweating," *supply*, 11397

Prayers in Parliament, *q.*, 5782

Preferential Trade (Tariff), 4555, 4947

Quarantine Bill, *com.* (scope of quarantine), 1526; (surveillance), 1720; (power to destroy animals), 1725

Repatriated Australians, *adj.*, 1325

Supply :

Defence : (Central Administration), 10083

External Affairs (Miscellaneous), 9616

Home Affairs (Electoral Office), 9771

Postmaster-General (Victoria), 11307

Trade and Customs : (South Australia), 9993

Works and Buildings (Home Affairs), 3432; Post and Telegraph (New South Wales), 3525

Tariff :

Bonds, pressure on, *q.*, 5131

Budget, 2966-9

Kerosene, *adj.*, 3048

Order of consideration, *m.*, 4336

Timber, Butter Box, *q.*, 2567

Wire Netting, precedence to item, *m.*, 4336

Tariff Resolutions (Customs) :

Apparel, *cons. req.*, 10564

Blacking, &c., 6857

Blue, 4786, 4787

Candles, 4947

Carpets, 5739

Confectionery, &c., 5251

Commonwealth and State Government Imports, 7427

Engines, &c., 6711, 6714

Fish, 5266

Hay and Chaff, 5432; *cons. req.*, 10541

Insecticides, &c., 6984

Machinery and parts, 6108

Manures, 7367

Motive Power Machinery, 6660

Motor Cars, &c., 7293, 7294

Newspaper, 7202

Oils, 6871

Paints and Colours, 6881

Perambulators, &c., 7282

Printing, &c., Inks, 7253

State Imports, 7427

Timber, &c., 7074; *cons. req.*, 11040, 11147

Wire Netting, 4555; *cons. req.*, 10759

(See Customs Tariff Bill)

Tariff Resolutions (Excise) :

Glucose, 4641

Wireless Telegraphy, *supply*, 3432

Pearce, Senator Hon. G. F., Western Australia :

Acts and Documents, *q.*, 6061

Address-in-Reply, *m.*, 473

Additional Appropriation Bill, *1R.*, 11481

Adjournment, Special, *m.*, 11321

Advertising Australia, *adj.*, 766

F.6950.—D

Pearce, Senator Hon. G. F.—continued.

Appropriation Bill, *com.*, (Defence), 10373

Appropriation (Works and Buildings) Bill, *2R.*, 3812; *com.*, Schedule : (Telegraphs and Telephones), 4049; (Special Defence Material), 4059, 4062; *3R.*, 4147

Australian Industries Preservation Act, *address*, 483-4

Australian Industries Preservation Bill, *2R.*, 4491, 4502; *ad. rep.*, 5186

Bills of Exchange Bill, *com.* (protection of banker), 757, 2204

Boot Machinery Trust, *address*, 484

Bounties, *address*, 477-8

Bounties, Western Australia, *q.*, 5175, 5284

Bounties Bill, *2R.*, 2627; *com.*, First Schedule (cotton), 2870; (jute), 3166; (tobacco), 3725, 4155; (*p.o.*), 4162, 4164, 4166, 4257; *recom.*, 4837

Budget Papers, *q.*, 1684

Chairman of Committees, *obs.*, 12150

Chinese in Australia, *q.*, 9236, 9422, 10370

Cigar Boxes, stamp, *q.*, 5083

Coal Combine, alleged, *adj.*, 3692

Coast Defence Appropriation Bill, *1R.*, 12110

Coastal Trade : Treaties, *address*, 474-5; *q.*, 564

Commonwealth Mail Steamers, *m.*, 2223

Copper Wire, Supply of, *q.*, 11986

Customs and Excise Revenue, *q.*, 11986

Customs Tariff Bill, *q.*, 10919; *recom.*, 11685; Schedule :

Blankets, &c., 8246, 8248

Engines, &c., 8671, 8696

Manufactures of Metals, *n.e.i.* (*p.o.*), 8757)

Matches, 7996

Oilmen's Stores, 8051

Oils, 8393

Onions, 7883, 7884

Rice, 8080

Timber, 9440, 9467, 9470, 9471; *cons. req.*, 11254

Tobacco, unmanufactured, 7631, 7642, 7649

Vegetables, dried, &c., 7874, 7879

Wicker, Bamboo, &c., *n.e.i.*, 9567

Defence :

Ammunition, defective, *q.*, 3463, 4616

Ammunition Waggon, *supply*, 4059; *q.*, 4245, 4304

Ammunition Factory, *supply*, 3814

Australian Navy, *address*, 479

Cadets, *address*, 479; *q.*, 3464, 3706

Cartridges, *q.*, 9796

Cartridge Blanks, *q.*, 9237, 9796, 10255

Commandants, State, *supply*, 10374

Entrenching Tools, *supply*, 10378

Field Artillery, *supply*, 10376-8

Garrison Artillery, *supply*, 10378

Instructional Cadres, *supply*, 10376

Military Board, *supply*, 10373-4

Military School, *q.*, 4143

Military Uniforms, *q.*, 353, 354

Naval Agreement, *address*, 479

Naval Policy, *q.*, 5177, 5367, 5465

Officers, Scarcity of, *supply*, 10375-6

Percussive Caps, *q.*, 11986

Policy, newspaper article, *q.*, 5560

Protector, *address*, 479

Rifle Clubs, *q.*, 6061, 6294, 7572; *supply*, 10378-9

Rifle Matches, Sydney, *q.*, 5083

Strength of Forces, *supply*, 10375-6

Torpedoes, *supply*, 4062

Pearce, Senator Hon. G. F.—*continued.*

Defence—*continued.*

Uniforms, *supply*, 10374-5
Units to each State, *q.*, 4471; *adj.*, 4616
Defence Bill, 2*r.*, 5682
Disputed Elections and Qualifications Bill, *com.* (reference of question), 5654
Division Bells, *obs.*, 7074
Excise Procedure Bill, 2*r.*, 5389
Excise Tariff Acts, *adj.*, 5772; *q.*, 6295; *supply*, 6319-20
Expenditure, States and Commonwealth, *m.*, 3233
Federal Capital, *q.*, 8029, 9537
Financial Relations, Commonwealth and State, *address*, 478; *supply*, 3815-6, 11481-2; *q.*, 11986
Goldfields Water Supply, *expl.*, 2069
High Commissioner, *address*, 484-5 (See London Offices)
Immigration, encouragement, *address*, 479-80; *supply*, 3814; *q.*, 8211, 8285
Immigration Restriction, Canada, *q.*, 8507
Imperial Conference, *address*, 473
Industries Preservation Bill, *address*, 483-4
Japanese Treaty, *q.*, 5561, 5858; *supply*, 5867-73
Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway, *address*, 482-3
Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway Bill, 2*r.* (*p.o.*), 1023-8, 1338; *expl.*, 1704
Labour Party and Women's National League, *expl.*, 2227
Land Taxation, *address*, 476
Legal Adviser to States, *address*, 478
London Offices, Commonwealth, *address*, 484; *supply*, 3814, 4147. (See High Commissioner)

Mails.

Service to Europe, *adj.*, 6093; *m.*, 6206
Mail Contract, Cancelled, *address*, 480-2
Minister of Trade and Customs, actions in England, *address*, 473
Navigation Bill, *q.*, *p.o.*, 8154
Navigation Conference, *address*, 473
Officers Compensation Bill, 2*r.*, 10055
Oil Trust, *address*, 484
Old-age Pensions, *address*, 478; *q.*, 12100
Order of Business, *m.*, 33; *adj.*, 693
Papers: Library Table, *q.*, 932-3
Papua, *q.*, 353, 7701, 9237, 9353; *m.*, 8869, 12102; *supply*, 11483-5
Parliamentary Allowances Bill, 2*r.*, 2103
Parliamentary Papers Bill, 2*r.*, 12129
Pearl Shelling, bounty for white labour, *address*, 478
Post and Telegraph Department:
Committee of Inquiry, *m.*, 9524
Post Office, Eucla, *q.*, 6296
Postal Service:
Country Postmasters, *q.*, 11219
Uniforms and Wages, *q.*, 7542, 7571
Preferential Trade, *address*, 473-4, 475-6
Press Statements, *expl.* (*p.o.*, 8026), 8028
Prime Minister, Actions of, in England, *address*, 473
Printing Committee, *m.*, appointment of, 39; to print paper, *p.o.*, 135; *m.*, to adopt report, 4465, 7845, 7847, 8222
Privilege, Procedure, Select Committee, *m.*, 10004, 10258; *ad. rep.*, 11990
Public Servants: Civic positions, *q.*, 7754, 7926, 7977, 8221, 8554, 9139; *adj.*, 8418

Pearce, Senator Hon. G. F.—*continued.*

Public Service:

Exemptions, *q.*, 250
Quarantine Bill, 2*r.*, 5197
Revenue Leakage, Tasmania, *q.*, 7752, 7850
Revotes, *supply*, 3813-4
Royal Commissions: Witnesses, *q.*, 8
Senate:
Election, South Australia, *expl.*, 4705-6; *m.*, 4814
Housekeeper, *supply*, 6319
Rights of, *obs.*, 11685
Silver Coinage, *q.*, 8229, 8309
Standing Orders, Amendment of, *adj.* (*p.o.*, 2617), 2619
Stationery: Government Printer, *q.*, 2615
Sugar Bounty, *address*, 483
Sugar Industry, Queensland, *q.*, 6100
Sugar Trust, *address*, 484
Supply Bill (No. 1) 1908-9, 1*r.*, 12137
Supply Bill (No. 2), 1*r.*, 1839
Supply Bill (No. 3), 1*r.*, 2867
Supply Bill (No. 4), 1*r.*, 6319
Supply Bill (No. 5), 1*r.*, 8908
Tariff:

Address, 476-7, 483
Textile Machinery, *q.*, 10920
Tobacco, *m.*, 2227
Western Australian Protest, *adj.*, 4024
Telegraphs and Telephones:
Assistant Telegraphists, *supply*, 8909-10; *q.*, 8979
New Subscribers, advertisements, *supply*, 11482; *q.*, 11865
Overtime, Western Australia, *q.*, 7754, 7791, 7792
Promotion, *supply*, 8908-11
State Guarantees, *q.*, 11986
Sunday Work, *q.*, 8864-5
Tasmanian Cable Service, *q.*, 1555, 1815; *supply*, 1840-1, 4049
Telegraphic communication, Tasmania, *q.*, 11986; *supply*, 12137-8
Telegraphists, *m.*, 7572; *q.*, 8422; *supply*, 8908-11
Undermanning, 8908-11
Tobacco Combine, *address*, 483-4; *adj.*, 2032, 2053; *m.s.o.*, 3051; *m.*, 3056
Tobacco Industry, Tariff, *m.*, 2227
Tobacco Waste, *q.*, 649, 830
Unemployed, Western Australia, *adj.*, 8607
Voting Machines, *q.*, 131, 3798, 7543, 8698, 11383, 11472-3; *m.*, 1262
Wages and Conditions, United States and England, *address*, 482
Wireless Telegraphy, *supply*, 1840, 4049, 6320-2
Women's National League, Geelong, *expl.*, 2227
Women's Work Exhibition, *q.*, 4245
Workers, condition of, *address*, 482

Poynton, Hon. A., Grey:

Borrowing, Commonwealth, *Budget*, 2700
Bounties Bill, *com.*, First Schedule (mohair), 1097; (cotton seed), 1107; (palm fruit), 1183; (peanuts), 1186
Budget, *m.*, 2699
Candidates' Expenses, *q.*, 978
Coast Defence Appropriation Bill, *int.*, 12088

Poynton, Hon. A.—*continued*.

Customs Tariff Bill. *cons. reg.*, (sago, &c.), 10496; (confectionery), 10516; (matches), 10552; (agricultural implements, &c.), 10666-72; (manufactures of metals), 10689; (wire netting), 10758; (standards, &c.), 10798, 10802, 11549; (directories, &c.), 11077, 11456; (pens), 11168; (curtains and blinds), 11430; *m.*, 11429. (*See* Tariff Resolutions (Customs))

Defence :

Cordite Factory, *supply*, 3737, 3741
Rifle Clubs, *q.*, 9585
Electoral Administration, *supply*, 8853-4
Excise Tariff (Agricultural Machinery) Act, *supply*, 5699; *q.*, 8817
Federal Capital, *supply*, 1876-7
Financial Relations : Commonwealth and States, *Budget*, 2701-2; *supply*, 3330-2; *q.*, 11785, 11786, 11921
Franklin Harbor, *supply*, 8854-5
Grain Bags, size of, *q.*, 9845
Harvesters, Price of, *q.*, 9582-3
House, Rights of, *m.*, 11429
Immigration, *supply*, 9615
Invalid and Old-age Pensions Bill, *com.*, (persons disqualified), 11969
Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway, *supply*, 3330; *q.*, 9093
Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway Bill, *cons. amends.* (power to make survey), 2017
Mails :

Franklin Harbor, *supply*, 10229-30
Service to Europe, *q.*, 6132; *m.*, 6490, (*p.o.* 6500); *adj.*, 6504

New Protection, *supply*, 1795, 5600

Northern Territory, *supply*, 3330; *q.*, 10786

Opium, sale of, *q.*, 2234

Parliamentary Allowances Bill, *m.*, 1903; *com.* (amount of allowance), 2006; (excess may be paid to Consolidated Revenue), 2016

Postal Service :

Allowance Offices, *supply*, 10230
Country Services, *supply*, 8852, 10228-9
Employés, number of, *supply*, 10227-8
Officials as Returning Officers, *m.*, 702
Penny Postage, *Budget*, 2701-2
Retiring Age, *supply*, 10227-8
Stamps, Printing of, *q.*, 503; *supply*, 3596-7
Transfer of officers, *q.*, 10653

Post Office :

Port Pirie, *q.*, 8938, 9299
Preferential Trade (Tariff), 4880, 4950, 4970, 5079

Printing Office, Government, *supply*, 3590-7

Privilege, signatures to petitions, *m.*, 3418

Public Service Bill, 22., 12060

Public Service :

Association, South Australia, *q.*, 11919
Classification, South Australia, *supply*, 5700
Commissioner, *supply*, 5700-1
Increments, *q.*, 7026, 7171, 9581
Transferred Officers : Reports by Deputy Postmasters-General, *q.*, 10653
Transferred Rights, *supply*, 5700-2

Supply :

External Affairs (Miscellaneous), 9615
Postmaster-General : (Central Staff), 10227
Works and Buildings, (Home Affairs, New South Wales), 3330; (Treasury), 3596; (*p.o.*), 3597; (Defence), 3737, 3741
Supply Bill (No. 2), *m.*, 1795; *ad. rep.*, 1876
Supply Bill (No. 5), *m.*, 8852

Poynton, Hon. A.—*continued*.

Tariff :

Budget, 2700-8

Kerosene, *q.*, 1865, 2687

Magazines, *q.*, 1716

New Protection, *supply*, 1795

Order of consideration, *m.*, 4343

Pianos, exhibit, *q.*, 7114

Preference, *Budget*, 2703

Stearine and Paraffine Wax, *q.*, 5131

Further consideration of, *q.*, 3420

Webb v. Oultrim, 773

Wire-netting, precedence to item, *m.*, 4129, 4343; *adj.*, 4646

Tariff Resolutions (Customs) :

Agricultural, &c., Machinery, 6053, 6557,

6577, 6582, 6589; *cons. reg.*, 10666, 10672

Ale, Porter, and other Beer, 4129

Apparel, 5602

Arrowroot, &c., 5445

Bags, &c., 5641, 5733

Biscuits, 4774, 4776

Blankets, 5718

Bottles, empty, 6938, 6943

Cameras, &c., 7393

Candles, 4889, 4950, 5079

Carpets, 5737, 5738, 5739

Catalogues, &c., 7174, 7176, 7184, 7187

Coir Mats, 5739

Confectionery, &c., 5160, 5234, 5243; *cons. reg.*, 10516

Corks, 7380

Corn Shellers, &c., 6566, 6567

Cosies and Cushions, 5740, 5741, 5742, 5743

Curtains and blinds, *cons. reg.*, 11439

Cutlery, 6056

Directories, &c., 7188; *cons. reg.*, 11077, 11456

Feathers, 5636

Fire Bricks, &c., 6909

Fish, 5273

Fruits and Vegetables, 5280, 5333

Glassware, 6923, 6926

Grain and Pulse, 5347

Hats, &c., 5951, 5965

Iron, Plate and Sheet, 6528, 6545, 6547, 6548, 6549

Kindergarten materials, 7266

Lamps, &c., 6047

Lead, 6051

Machinery and Parts, 6103

Manufactures of Metals, *cons. reg.*, 10689

Manures, 7363 (*p.o.*, 7368)

Matches, 5454; *cons. reg.*, 10552

Milk, 5501

Milling Silk, 5029

Motor Lorries, &c., 7293

Motive Power Machinery, 6651

Musical Instruments, parts, 7358

Paper and Stationery, 7220, 7236

Pens, *cons. reg.*, 11168

Pianos, 7339

Piece Goods, 5807, 5811, 5837, 5846, 5852, 5853, 5920

Regalia, 5640

Rice Root, 4793

Saccharin, 6972, 6975

Sago, *cons. reg.*, 10496

Salicylic Acid, &c., 6972, 6975

Salt, 5538

Smelling Bottles, &c., 6923, 6926

Socks and Stockings, 5937, 5935

Poynton, Hon. A.—*continued.*

Tariff Resolutions (Customs)—*continued.*

Standards, &c., *cons. req.*, 10798, 10802, 11549
 Steam Road Rollers, 6691
 Strawboard, 7226
 Sugar, 4749
 Tanks, 6625
 Tea, 5464
 Tents, &c., 5937
 Timber, &c., 7069, 7104
 Tobacco, unmanufactured, 4209
 Trimmings, 5938
 Yarns, 7376
 Wine, 4141, 4201
 Wire-netting, 4427, 4573 (*p.o.*, 4573); *cons. req.*, 10758
 Writing Ink, &c., 7266
 (*See Customs Tariff Bill*)
 Tariff Resolutions (Excise):
 Saccharin, 4636
 Telegraphs and Telephones:
 Guarantees for telephones, *q.*, 3588-9; *supply*, 8853, 10230-1
 Line Repairers, *supply*, 10228-9

Pulsford, Senator E., New South Wales:

Additional Appropriation (Works and Buildings) Bill, 2R., 11689; *com.*, schedule, 11692-6
 Additional Appropriation (Works and Buildings) Bill, 1905-6 and 1906-7, *com.*, schedule, 11697
 Additional Appropriation Bill, 1R., 11485
 Adjournment, Special, *m.*, 10072, 11322
 Advertising Australia, *q.*, 11302
 American Fleet, Visit, *q.*, 11301, 12102, 12141
 Appropriation Bill, 2R., 10276, 10278; *com.*, (Attorney-General), 10303; (Postmaster-General), 10389; 3R., 10393
 Asiatics, relations of, with Commonwealth, *supply*, 11486-7
 Coast Defence Appropriation Bill, 2R., 12115
 Customs and Excise Revenue, *q.*, 10370, 12101
 Customs Tariff Bill, *com.*, (Application), 9950; *m.s.o.*, 10041; *recom.*, 10042; *cons. req.*, *m.s.o.*, 10839; *recom.*, 11684; Schedule:
 Bicycles, &c., 9818
 Boats, &c., 9901, 9902
 Confectionery, *cons. req.*, 10856
 Directories, &c., *cons. req.*, 11313
 Doors, 9640
 Electrical Machines, &c., *cons. req.*, 10945
 Fruits, Dried, 9948, 9949
 Furniture, *cons. req.*, 11242
 Globes, geographical, &c., 9813
 Gloves, *cons. req.*, 10931
 Hay and Chaff, *cons. req.*, 10856, 10865
 Lantern Slides, &c., 9934
 Paper Patterns, 9807
 Playing Cards, 9798
 Pulley Blocks, &c., *cons. req.*, 10939
 Rails, Fish plates, &c., *cons. req.*, 10952
 Shaft bars, 9643
 Sheet Lead, &c., *cons. req.*, 10936
 Stearine, *cons. req.*, 10849
 Timber, 9428, 9466, 9471, 9472, 9542, 9540, 9562; *cons. req.*, 11252, 11601
 Vehicles, 9827, 9831
 Wicker, Bamboo, &c., *n.e.i.*, 9665
 Wood articles, 9576, 9577, 9578
 Works of Art, *cons. req.*, 11607

Pulsford, Senator E.—*continued.*

Defence:

Expenditure, *supply*, 11689, 12141
 Naval Agreement, *q.*, 10251
 Sandy Bay Range, *supply*, 11697
 Small Arms and Cordite Factories, *supply*, 1689, 1692, 1693, 1694, 1695, 11689, 11692-6
 Eastern Extension Telegraph Co., *supply*, 10389
 Estimates, late presentation of, *supply*, 10393
 Excise Tariff (Agricultural Machinery) Act, *q.*, 11221
 Excise Tariff Bill, *com.*, Schedule: (Tobacco), 10018; (Glucose), 10026
 Excise Tariff (Starch) Bill, *com.*, (starch from imported rice), 12106
 Financial Policy of Government, *supply*, 10276; relations, Commonwealth and States, *supply*, 11485, 11490-7
 Foreign Trade, *supply*, 11487-8
 Immigration Restriction, *q.*, 9633; *supply*, 11486
 Invalid and Old-age Pensions Bill, 2R., 12006; *com.* (who may receive pensions), 12027; (persons disqualified), 12027, 12030
 Land Purchases by Government, *supply*, 11689, 11692-7
 Norfolk Island, *supply*, 11486
 Officers Compensation Bill, 2R., 10055; *com.*, (short title), 10058
 Parliament House: Sanitation, *q.*, 9632
 Patent and Trademarks, *q.*, 11301, 11985
 Post and Telegraph Department:
 Administration, *supply*, 11489
 Sites for Offices, *supply*, 11690
 Privilege, procedure, Select Committee, *m.*, 10259
 Senate, Rights of, *obs.*, 11684
 Ships' Stores, *q.*, 10251
 Statistical Branch, *supply*, 10306
 Sugar Bounties, *supply*, 11489
 Supply Bill (No. 1) 1908-9, 2R., 12141
 Surplus Revenue Bill, 2R., 11889; *com.* (commencement), 11905, 11907; (provisions in lieu of expired provisions), 11909
 Suspension of Standing Orders, *q.*, 12100
 Tariff:
 New Bills Relating to, *q.*, 11863
 Preference Policy, *supply*, 11487
 Thanks to officials, *adj.*, 11700
 Tokio Exhibition, *q.*, 11383
 Trust Funds, *q.*, 10252

Quick, Hon. Sir John, Kt., Bendigo:

Australian Industries Preservation Bill, *com.* (burden of proof), 9132; (answers to questions), 9214, 9215
 Bounties Bill, 2R., 804; *com.*, First Schedule (olives) 1114; (coffee), 1211
 Budget, *m.*, 2153
 Business, order of, *adj.*, 6521
 Coast Defence Appropriation Bill, *int.*, 12079
 Customs Tariff Bill, 3R., 7469; *cons. req.*, (Slipper Forms), 11068; (Catalogues, &c.), 11071; (Advertisements, &c.), 11087; (Paper and Stationery), 11091; (Oils), 11118; (Timber), 11161, 11165; (Works of Art), 11185, 11190; (Curtains and Blinds), 11438, 11440, 11442; (Electrical Machinery), 11444; (Gloves), 11460; (Piece Goods), 11463, 11465, 11528, 11533; (Roasting Dishes), 11557. (*See Tariff Resolutions (Customs).*)

Quick, Hon. Sir John, Kt.—*continued.*

Defence :

Bendigo Infantry, *q.*, 1867
 Cadets, *q.*, 11097
 Easter Encampment, *q.*, 9193
 Light Horse, Victorian, *q.*, 11385, 12156
 Militia, *supply*, 8850
 Rifle Clubs, *supply*, 8850-1
 Scheme, Government, *supply*, 8850, 11417
 West Shelbourne Rifle Club, *q.*, 8926
 Electoral Registrars, Allowance to, *supply*, 9768
 Estimates, Additional, *supply*, 11401, 11417
 Excise Procedure Bill, 2*r.*, 7481
 Federal Capital, *q.*, 10135
 Historical Records, Australian, *supply*, 9489
 Manufactures Encouragement Bill, 2*r.*, 6241
 Mail Service to Europe, *adj.*, 243-4, 592; *q.*, 297, 408, 588
 Old-age Pensions Appropriation Bill, *com.* (Appropriation), 12096
 Parliamentary Allowance Bill, *m.* (to fix second reading), 1925; 2*r.*, 1980
 Parliamentary Witnesses Bill, *com.* (disobedience), 12066; (refusing to be sworn), 12068, 12071
 Petition, forged signatures, *q.*, Committee's report, 6094
 Post and Telegraph Department :
 Committee of Inquiry, *q.*, 9477
 Postal Service :
 Letter Carriers, *supply*, 8851
 Non-delivery of Letters, *q.*, 9475, 9766
 Printing Committee, Report, *m.*, 404, 974
 Privilege, Procedure, Select Committee, *m.*, 11328; *obs.*, 11701; *ad. rep.*, 12044
 Preferential Trade, *Budget*, 2164-9
 Public Service Bill, 2*r.*, 12064
 Public Service :
 Injured Officers, Compensation, *supply*, 11444
 Quarantine Bill, 2*r.*, 514; *com.* (scope of quarantine), 1436; (proclamation of ports), 1548, 1559; (Governor-General may direct State laws to cease to apply), 1771

Supply :

External Affairs (London Offices), 9489
 Home Affairs (Electoral Office), 9768
 Postmaster-General (Gratuities), 11401
 Works and Buildings (Defence), 11417

Supply Bill (No. 5), *m.*, 8850

Surplus Revenue Bill, 2*r.*, 11732

Tariff :

Budget, 2153
 Commission's recommendations, *q.*, 1868
 Commission's Reports, *expl.*, 2562
 Definition of British manufacture, *obs.*, 7440
 Government proposals, *q.*, 1748
 Minutes of Evidence, *q.*, 6418
 New Protection, *Budget*, 2172-3
 Newspaper information, *q.*, 976
 Paints, duty, *q.*, 2232
 Preference, British Imports, *Budget*, 2164-6
 Timber duties, *q.*, 6420
 Tariff Resolutions (Customs) :
 Advertisements, &c., *cons. req.*, 11087
 Agricultural, &c., Machinery, 6553, 6562, 6564
 Arms, 6033, 6036, 6037
 Bicycles, &c., 7275
 Blacking, &c., 6851
 Books, *n.e.i.*, 7269
 Boots, &c., 7158
 Bottles, empty, 6940, 6945, 6947

Quick, Hon. Sir John, Kt.—*continued.*

Tariff Resolutions (Customs)—*continued.*

Casks, &c., 7132
 Catalogues, &c., 7173, 7176, 7183, 7187; *cons. req.*, 11071
 China, &c., 6898
 Commonwealth and State Government Imports, 7422, 7440
 Curtains and Blinds, *cons. req.*, 11438, 11440-2
 Discs for agricultural implements, 7452
 Electrical machinery, 6800, 6801, 6807; *cons. req.*, 11444
 Engines, &c., 6709, 6715
 Essential oils, 6999
 Firebricks, &c., 6910
 Furniture, &c., 7002, 7018
 Fuse, 7383
 Glassware, *n.e.i.*, 6923
 Glass, polished, &c., 6922
 Gloves, *cons. req.*, 11460
 Glue, &c., 6951, 6952
 Hogsheds, 7135
 Insecticides, &c., 6980
 Iron, plate and sheet, 6531, 6546, 6547
 Jewellery, 7143, 7147, 7148, 7150
 Lamps, &c., 6039, 6040, 6044, 6045, 6047, 6048
 Lasts, 7126
 Leather manufactures, 7164, 7165
 Leather, 7452
 Liquid removers, &c., 6895
 Machinery and Machines and Machine Tools, 6733, 6739, 6741
 Machinery and parts, 6109
 Mining engines, &c., 6773, 6784, 6793, 6797, 6798
 Motive power machinery, 6656, 6661, 6664
 Nails, 6607, 6616
 Naphthalene, 6977
 Newspaper, 7106, 7205, 7213
 Oils, 6861, 6863, 6874; *cons. req.*, 11118
 Paper and stationery, 7214, 7222, 7235, 7238; *cons. req.*, 11091
 Paints and colours, 6877, 6881, 6884, 6886, 6889
 Photograph frames, &c., 7125
 Pianos, 7347, 7350
 Piece Goods, *cons. req.*, 11463, 11465, 11528, 11533
 Printing, &c., inks, 7262
 Reaper and binder twine, 7378
 Roasting Dishes, &c., *cons. req.*, 11557
 Saccharin, 6975
 Saws, &c., 6749, 6752
 Shooks, 7136, 7138
 Slipper Forms, *cons. req.*, 11068
 Stained Glass Windows, 6912, 6921
 Steam road rollers, &c., 6679, 6700, 6703
 Stone and marble, 6964, 6966
 Tanks, 6621
 Tiles, 6907
 Timber, &c., 7021, 7059, 7086, 7101, 7103, 7105, 7106; *cons. req.*, 11161, 11165
 Varnishes, 6892
 Vehicles, 7289
 Weighing machines, 6629
 Works of Art, *cons. req.*, 11185, 11190
 (See Customs Tariff Bill)

Telegraphs :

Insulators, Kaolin clay, *q.*, 3853, 5911

Telephones :

Extension in Rural Districts, *supply*, 8852
 Melbourne to Sydney, *supply*, 8852

- Reid, Rt. Hon. G. H., P.C., K.C., East Sydney:**
 Address-in-Reply, *m.*, 206
 Advertising Australia, *q.*, 10754, 11051
 Agriculture, area under cultivation, *Budget*, 2126
 American Fleet, *q.*, 10607
 Australian Industries Preservation Bill, *2R.*, 8063, 9011
 Bounties Bill, *com.*, first schedule (New Zealand flax), 1090; (jute), 1092; (mohair), 1095, 1103; (copra), 1106; (olives), 1122; (sunflower seed), 1186; (rice), 1188; (fruits—dates), 1310; (fruits—dried), *p.o.*, 1312-3-4; second schedule, 1320-1-2; *recom.*, (specification of bounties), 1385, 1388; (regulations), 1390, 1392; *3R.*, 1393
 British Party Politics, Australian Interference, *address*, 210-11
 British Trade, *address*, 216
Budget, 2124
 Business of the Session, *supply*, 8821; *obs.*, 8930-1
 Capital and Labour, Relations of, *address*, 207-8
 Commonwealth Salaries Bill, *2R.*, 3872; *com.* (taxation by States), 3889
 Customs Tariff Bill, *cons. req.* (hats, &c.), 10611, 10615; (parasols), 10620; (piece goods), 10626 (*p.o.*, 10627), 10628, 11461, 11465; (waddings, &c.), 10635, 10640; (socks, &c.), 10643, 10647; (arms, &c.), 10656; (agricultural implements, &c.), 10660, 10662, 10664, 10671; (motive power machinery), 10675, 10681, 10685; (manufactures of metals), 10689; (aluminium goods), 10707; (rock drills), 10723; (electrical machines), *p.o.*, 10737-8, 10741; (locks), 10776, 10781, 10790; (standards, &c.), 10800, 10801, 10802, 11549; (wheels), 10805; (wire), 10812; (oils), 10818, 10828, 10881, 10882, 10894, 10895 (*p.o.*, 10974, 10975), 10979, 11099, 11104, 11552; (roofing tiles, &c.), 10902; (scientific apparatus), 10906; (insecticides), 11002; (furniture), 11011; (slipper forms), 11068; (catalogues, &c.), 11071; (directories, &c.), 11076; (advertisements, &c.), 11083; (sheet lead, &c.), 11443; (gloves), 11460; (pulley lead, &c.), 10685, *p.o.*, 11541, 11544; (rails, fishplates), 10749; (roasting dishes), 10904; *m.*, 10805, 11425. (*See* Tariff Resolutions (Customs).)
 Defence:
 Australian Navy, *address*, 215
 Military Organization, *address*, 215
 Minister's Letters on, *q.*, 12041
 Naval Agreement, *address*, 215; *Budget*, 2127-9
 Officers, active service of, *q.*, 2122
 Officers, training of, *address*, 215
 Scheme, Government, *q.*, 8813; *supply*, 8826-7
 Departmental Administration, Centralization, *supply*, 8825-6
 Disputed Elections and Qualifications Bill, *q.*, 6095
 Dominion of New Zealand, congratulations, *m.*, 3853
 Excise Exemption, *q.*, 4200
 Excise Tariff Acts, standard of wages, *q.*, 6097 (*see* New Protection)
 Excise Tariff (Agricultural Machinery) Act, *7.*, 6229
- Reid, Right Hon. G. H., P.C., K.C.—continued.**
 Federal Capital, *address*, 213-4; *adj.*, 306; *q.*, 1279, 8814; *supply*, 8823-5, 8932 (*see* Seat of Government Bill)
 Financial Relations, Commonwealth and States, *Budget*, 2126-7, 2129-30; *m.*, 10808; *q.*, 11187-9
 Forrest, Sir John, personal explanation, 11706
 Government, position of, *Budget*, 2124-5; *supply*, 10434, 10461, 10467
 Grievance Day, *p.o.*, 10404
 High Court as Final Court of Appeal, *address*, 214-5
 House, Rights of, *m.*, 11425
 Imperial Conference, *address*, 209-11, 216-7; *q.*, 208
 Income Tax, Federal Salaries and Allowances, *address*, 214-5
 Invalid and Old-age Pensions Bill, *2R.*, 11926 (*see* Old-age Pensions)
 Judiciary Bill, *3R.*, 3855
 Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway, *address*, 215
 Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway Survey Bill, *mes.*, 637
 Kingston, Right Hon. C. C., death of, *m.*, 11047
 Labour Party, *address*, 207; *Budget*, 2125
 Lintlithgow, Marquis of, death of, *m.*, 8819
 Mails:
 Mail Contract, cancelled, *address*, 211-3; *supply*, 1869; *q.*, 4279, 5908, 6098
 Service to Europe, *adj.*, 605; *q.*, 4309, 4519, 4957, 5908; *m.*, to print contract, 6124
 Maitland Coal Miners: Postmaster-General, *q.*, 8818
 Manufactures Encouragement Bill, *mes.*, 5913; *2R.*, 6032, 6139
 Mauger, Mr., speech by, *q.*, 8818
 Minister of Trade and Customs, actions in Europe, *address*, 209-11
 Ministers, disclosure of their relations, *q.*, 11706
 Newspaper Misrepresentations, *expl.*, 693
 New Protection (Tariff):
 Ale, Porter, and other Beer, 3989, 4132
 General Application, *q.*, 6230
 (*Vide* Excise Tariff, &c.)
 Norfolk Island Bill, *int.*, 11795
 Northern Territory, *Budget*, 2132-3
 Old-age pensions, *Budget*, 2131-2 (*see* Invalid and Old-age Pensions Bill)
 Opium, Importation of, *q.*, 2234
 Opposition, position of, *address*, 207
 Parliament:
 Slanders on, *p.o.*, 10974; *expl.*, 10975; *obs.*, 10979, 11104; *q.*, 11017
 Parliamentary Papers Bill, *com.* (publication), 11674; (no action for libel), 11674; (authorization to print), 11675
 Parliamentary Allowances Bill, *m.*, 1804; *2R.*, 1082; *com.*, (amount of allowance), 1902, 1997
 Parliamentary Witnesses Bill, *2R.*, 3808
 Parties, Political, State of, *address*, 206-7
 Population of Australia, *Budget*, 2125-6
 Post and Telegraph Department:
 Cabinet Committee, *q.*, 10177; *supply*, 10181-4, 10203-4, 10434-41; Ministerial statement (*m.s.o.*), 11629-30; *obs.*, 11636, 11655
 Centralization, *supply*, 10438
 Commission, permanent, *adj.*, 11466

Reid, Right Hon. G. H., P.C., K.C.—*continued.*

Post and Telegraph Department—*continued.*

Receipts and Expenditure, *supply*, 10199, 10202

Royal Commission, *supply* (*p.o.*, 10404), 10434-41, 10461; Ministerial statement, *supply*, 10467 (*m.s.o.*, 11629-30, 11636), 11655

Postal Service :

Boy Labour, *supply*, 10438

Employés, Number of, *supply*, 10200-1

Prohibition of Correspondence, *supply*, 10235

Salaries, *supply*, 8822

Preferential Trade, *address*, 209-11, 216-7; *Budget*, 2138, 2141

Preferential Trade (Tariff), 4576, 4790, 4940, 4970, 4990

Premiers' Conference, official report, *q.*, 12040

Prime Minister, absence of, *obs.*, 193; *address*, 206; *Budget*, 2124; actions of, in England, *address*, 209-11; *expl.*, 693-4; Acting Prime Minister, *q.*, 207

Printing Committee, *m.*, 2230

Privilege, Select Committee on Procedure, report, *m.*, 11702

Prosperity of Australia, *Budget*, 2125, 2129

Public Service :

Commissioner, *supply*, 10437-8

Officers' Celebration, party complexion, *supply*, 8822

Quarantine Bill, *cons. amds.*, 8939, 8949

Revenue Returns, *q.*, 10751

Seat of Government Bill, *22.*, 10311 (*see* Federal Capital)

Senate Vacancy, South Australia, *address*, 214; *supply*, 8855-9

Shipping Combine, Alleged, *adj.*, 3950; *expl.*, 3955-6

Standing Orders, suspension, *supply*, 8863

Sugar Bounty, *Budget*, 2130-1

Supply :

Postmaster-General (Central Staff), 10181, 10199 (*p.o.*, 10212-3), 10235

Supply Bill (No. 2), *ad. rep.*, 1869

Supply Bill (No. 3), *int.*, 5784

Supply Bill (No. 5), *m.*, 8821, 8855, 8859

Surplus Revenue Bill, *int.*, 9010; *cons. mes.*, 11670; *22.*, 11833; *com.*, (commencement), 11861; (Payments to Trust Accounts), 11862

Tariff :

Address, 207-11, 217

Budget, 2124, 2133-43

Commission's Recommendations, *q.*, 1865

Duties, Collection of, *q.*, 11052

Free-trade Cause, alleged betrayal of, *supply*, 4112

Free-traders, attitude of, *supply*, 3992-3

Industries, Preferential Treatment of, *supply*, 4846

Machinery Exemptions, *adj.*, 4461

New Protection, *Budget*, 2141-3; *supply*, 3990-7, 4113-7, 4132; *q.*, 4200

Order of Consideration, *q.*, 4280; *m.*, 4327 (*p.o.*, 4330), 4354

Progress Report on Requests, *m.*, 10805

Taxation, Increase of, *supply*, 3089-90

Wire-netting, *supply*, 4123, 4125; *precedence* to item, 4123, 4125, 4327, 4354

Reid, Right Hon. G. H., P.C., K.C.—*continued.*

Tariff Resolutions (Customs) :

Advertisements, &c., *cons. reg.*, 11083

Agricultural Machinery, &c., 6055; *cons. reg.*, 10660, 10662, 10664, 10671

Ale, Porter, and other Beer, 3989, 4112, 4123, 4125, 4132

Aluminium Goods, *cons. reg.*, 10707

Amylic Alcohol and Fusel Oil, 4137

Animals, 4769 (*p.o.*, 4772)

Apparel, 5616

Arms, &c., 6035; *cons. reg.*, 10656

Bags, &c., *m.*, to report, 5732

Biscuits, 4779-80

Blankets, &c., 5725

Blue, 4782, 4790

Brasswork, &c., 6112

Candles, 4940, 4969, 4970

Catalogues, &c., *cons. reg.*, 11071

Cosies and Cushions, 5741

Directories, &c., *cons. reg.*, 11076

Dutiable Machinery proclaimed, 6112

Electrical Machines, *cons. reg.* (*p.o.*) 10731-41

Furniture, *cons. reg.*, 11011

Gloves, *cons. reg.*, 11460

Hats, &c., *cons. reg.*, 10611, 10615

Hay and Chaff, 5434

Insecticides, *cons. reg.*, 11002

Lamps, &c., 6040, 6048

Locks, *cons. reg.*, 10776, 10781, 10790

Machine Tools, 6112

Machinery and Parts, 6103

Manufactures of Metals, *cons. reg.*, 10689

Milk, 5507, 5518

Motive Power Machinery, *cons. reg.*, 10675, 10681

Oils, *cons. reg.*, 10818, 10828, 10881, 10882, 10894, 10895, (*p.o.*, 10974, 10975), 10979, 11999, 11104, 11552

Parasols, *cons. reg.*, 10620

Piece Goods, 5805, 5824, 5837, 5840, 5842, 5844 (*p.o.*, 5846-50), 5851, 5914; *cons. reg.*, 10626, 10628, (*p.o.*, 10627), 11461, 11465

Pulley Blocks, &c., *cons. reg.*, 10685; *p.o.*, 11541, 11544

Rails, Fish Plates, *cons. reg.*, 10749

Roasting Dishes, &c., *cons. reg.*, 10904

Rock Drills, *cons. reg.*, 10723

Roofing Tiles, &c., *cons. reg.*, 10902

Scientific apparatus, *cons. reg.*, 10906

Sheet Lead, &c., *cons. reg.*, 11443

Slipper Forms, *cons. reg.*, 11068

Soap, 5545, 5546

Socks, &c., *cons. reg.*, 10643, 10647

Standards, &c., *cons. reg.*, 10800, 10801, 10802, 11549

Starch, &c., 5547

Stearine, &c., 5154

Textiles, &c., *n.e.i.*, 5632, 5633

Tobacco, 4230, 4302, 4304

Wadding, &c., *cons. reg.*, 10635, 10640

Wheels, *cons. reg.*, 10805

Wine, 4140, 4141, 4201

Wire-netting, 4443 (*p.o.*, 4455), 4563, 4576

Wire, *cons. reg.*, 10812

(*See* Customs Tariff Bill.)

Tariff Resolutions (Excise) :

Cigarettes, 4322

Starch, 5548, 5550

Vacancy in Senate, South Australia, *address*, 2144; *supply*, 8855-8, 8861

Russell, Senator E. J., Victoria :

Address-in-Reply, *m.*, 392
 Agricultural Implement Makers Union, *adj.*,
 5493 (*p.o.*, 5495), 5496
 Appropriation Bill, *3r.*, 10393
 Appropriation (Works and Buildings) Bill,
2r., 3848
 Australasian Industries Preservation Bill, *2r.*,
 4606; *com.* (Burden of proof), 5027
 Bills of Exchange Bill, *com.* (States duty
 stamps), 2291
 Bounties Bill, *com.*, First Schedule (rice),
 3486
 Child Labour, *adj.*, 7790
 Coal Combine, alleged, *adj.*, 3693
 Customs Tariff Bill, *com.*, Schedule :
 Apparel, &c., 8197
 Bicycles, &c., 9819
 Biscuits, 7666, 7675
 Blankets, &c., 8259
 Cresylic Acid, &c., 9273, 9274
 Electrical and Gas Appliances, 9050; *cons.*
 req., 11598
 Engines, &c., 8689
 Fishing Nets, &c., 9917
 Glue, 8522
 Insecticides, &c., 9280, 9291; *cons. req.*,
 11239
 Iron Pipes, &c., 9077
 Oils, *cons. req.*, 11234
 Rubber, Manufactures, *n.e.i.*, 9572
 Steel Wheels, &c., 9184
 Stripper Harvesters, 8586
 Talking Machines, 9657
 Tanks, 8614
 Timber, 9545; *cons. req.*, 11247
 Defence : Compulsory Training, *address*, 393
 Defence Bill, *2r.*, 5686
 Disputed Elections and Qualifications Bill,
com. (reference of question), 5656; *recom.*
 (pending petitions), 5777, 5780
 Excise Tariff Bill, *com.* Schedule : (Glucose),
 10038
 Excise Tariff (Agricultural Machinery) Act,
q., 3049, 3149, 7543, 7567; *adj.*, 5764
 Excise Procedure Bill, *com.* (legal representa-
 tion), 5119, 5122, 5127, 5128; *3r.*, 5382
 Financial Relations, Commonwealth and
 States, *supply*, 3849
 Immigration : Encouragement, *address*, 394,
 396
 Imperial Conference, *address*, 393
 Income Taxation, Victoria, *m.*, 1278
 Invalid and Old-age Pensions Bill, *2r.*,
 12017; *com.* (investigation by Registrar),
 12037
 Jumbunna and Outtrim Mines :
 Dismissals, *q.*, 7926, 8104
 Labour Conditions, *address*, 395
 Labour Party, charges of extravagance, *sup-*
ply, 3848, 3850
 Land Tax, *address*, 394
 London Offices of Commonwealth, *supply*,
 3848-9
 Mail Contract Cancelled, *address*, 394-5
 Navigation Conference, *address*, 393
 Northern Territory, *address*, 393
 Officers Compensation Bill, *com.* (J. Wilson),
 10067
 Parliamentary Allowances Bill, *2r.*, 2107; *com.*
 (amount of allowance), 2118
 Preferential Trade, *address*, 393

Russell, Senator E. J.—continued.

Prime Minister, actions of in England, *ad-*
dress, 393
 Tariff :
 Address, 393
 Tobacco Combine, *adj.*, 2044
 Wages in Australian States, *address*, 395
 Telegraphs and Telephones :
 Pole Dressers, *q.*, 8482, 8506, 8868; *supply*,
 10393-4
 Underground Workmen, *q.*, 7927*

Russell, Senator W., South Australia :

Address-in-Reply, *m.*, 140
 Adjournments of Senate, *supply*, 1934
 Advertising the Commonwealth, *supply*, 5894,
 6350
 Appropriation (Works and Buildings) Bill,
2r., 3913; *com.*, Schedule (Defence), 4042;
 (Post and Telegraphs), 4047; (Common-
 wealth Offices, London), 4077
 Australian Cattle, Argentine, *q.*, 5981
 Australian Industries Preservation Bill, *2r.*,
 4599; *ad. rep.*, 5184
 Ben Tillett, *q.*, 5082
 Bounties Bill, *2r.*, 2442; *com.* (notice of
 conditions), 2782; (regulations), 2855; First
 Schedule (mohair), 3387; (rice), 3469;
 (coffee), 3582, 3714; (dates), 4384
 Caucus Influence, *expl.*, 4085
 Commonwealth Salaries Bill, *com.* (taxation
 by States), 1576
 Compulsory Repurchase of Land, *address*,
 142-4
 Customs Tariff Bill, *1r.*, 7547; *2r.*, 7595; *com.*,
 Schedule :
 Agricultural machinery, *n.e.i.*, 8579
 Ammonia Condensor Coils, 9170
 Apparel, &c., *n.e.i.*, 8215
 Arrowroot, 7951
 Butter and Cheese, 7698
 Carbide of calcium, 9268
 Carpets, &c., 8274
 Electrical, &c., appliances, 8808
 Fancy Goods, 9651
 Fire extinguishers, 8774
 Fruits, &c., 7811
 Furniture, 9361
 Glassware, *n.e.i.*, &c., 8491
 Gloves, *cons. req.*, 10931
 Glue, 8518
 Grain and Pulse, prepared, 7912
 Hay and Chaff, 7922; *cons. req.*, 10859,
 10863
 Insecticide, &c., 9284, 9290
 Iron and steel, 9188
 Iron Pipes, &c., 9084
 Iron, plate and sheet, 8563
 Lamps, 8571
 Liquorice, 7760
 Meats, &c., 8012, 8015
 Milk, 8020
 Oilmen's Stores, 8050
 Oils, 8440; *cons. req.*, 11230, 11233
 Paints, &c., 8460, 8462
 Paper, *n.e.i.*, 9760
 Piece Goods, 8148; *p.o.*, 8165, 8166
 Rice, 8068
 Sausage Casings, 8018
 Screws, 8782
 Steam road rollers, 8662
 Steel wheels, &c., 9186

Russell, Senator W.—continued.

Customs Tariff Bill (Schedule)—continued.

Stone and Marble, 8535, 8552
Stripper Harvesters, 8583
Tallow, &c., 8379, 8380
Tanks, 8614
Tea, 8109
Timber, 9556; *cons. req.*, 11601, 11604
Voltoids of sal-ammoniac, 9279
Weighing machines, 8619, 8623
Wicker, Bamboo, &c., *n.e.i.*, 9569
Wire netting, 9156

Defence:

Easter Encampment, Nairn, *q.*, 9137
Officers, *supply*, 8906
Rifle Range, Brisbane, *supply*, 4042

Disputed Elections and Qualifications Bill, 2R., 5578; recom. (pending petitions), 5778

Division, *p.o.*, 8165, 8166
Electoral Law Amendment, *address*, 146-7

Excise Procedure Bill, 2R., 5384

Excise Tariff (Agricultural Machinery) Act, *adj.*, 5768; *supply*, 6328; *q.*, 10920, 11221 (*see* New Protection)

Federal Capital, *address*, 146; *q.*, 828 (*see* Seat of Government Bill)

Government, position of, *address*, 140-1

Harvesters, Price of, *q.*, 9796

High Commissioner, *q.*, 3798. (*See* London Offices)

Immigration, *address*, 142-6; *q.*, 4244; *supply*, 5804-6

Income Tax, Victoria, *m.*, 1278

Invalid and Old-age Pensions Bill, 2R., 12024 (*see* Old-age Pensions)

Judiciary Bill, *com.* (jurisdiction of High Court), 942; *expl.*, 1054

Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway, *address*, 146

Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway Survey Bill, 2R., 1373; *com.*, (obligation to construct), *p.o.*, 1515

Labour Party, *address*, 144

Land Settlement, *q.*, 4244, 4707; *supply*, 5804-6

Land Taxation, *address*, 143-6

London Offices, Commonwealth, *supply*, 3914, 4077 (*see* High Commissioner)

New Protection (Tariff), 7547, 7595 (*see* Excise Tariff, &c.)

Northern Territory, *address*, 141-2

Old-age Pensions, *address*, 142; *q.*, 9422 (*see* Invalid and Old-age Pensions Bill)

Opposition, Selection of Leader, *supply*, 6327-8

Parliamentary Allowances Bill, *com.* (commencement), 2119

Parliament Gardens, *supply*, 5884

Post Offices:

Unley, *supply*, 7547

Gawler, *q.*, 5082, 7569

Postal Service:

Letter-boxes, residences, *supply*, 4047

Office hours, *q.*, 5082

Pillar-box clearances, *supply*, 3914

Sale of Stamps, *q.*, 5082, 7569

Quarantine Bill, *com.* (proclamation of ports), 5325

Reid, Right Hon. G. H., M.P., attendance in Parliament, *address*, 147

Seat of Government Bill, *q.*, 12101 (*see* Federal Capital)

Russell, Senator W.—continued.

Senate Election, South Australia, *address*, 146-7; *q.*, 3364; *m.*, (*p.o.*, 4396), 4797; *q.*, 4893

Standing Orders Committee, *m.*, 37

Supply Bill (No. 1), 1R., 139

Supply Bill (No. 2), *com.* (issue and application), 1934

Supply Bill (No. 3), *com.* (schedule), The Parliament, 5884; External Affairs, 5894; 3R., 5907

Supply Bill (No. 4), 1R., 6327; *com.*, 6350

Supply Bill (No. 5), *com.*, Schedule (Defence), 8906

Tariff:

Address, 141; *supply*, 3915-6

Tobacco Combine, *adj.*, 2051; *m.s.o.*, 3051

Wire Netting, *q.*, 1814, 1926

Salmon, Hon. C. C., Laanecoorie:

Additional Sitting Day, *m.*, 6519

Advertising Australia, *q.*, 10754-5, 11156; *expl.*, 11046

Australian Industries Preservation Bill, 2R., 9112; *com.* (definition), 9130; (Burden of Proof), 9108; *q.*, 9191

Bounties Bill, 2R., 821

Census Statistics: Representation of Victoria, *q.*, 10484

Chairman of Committees, *m.*, 317

Child Mortality, New South Wales, *q.*, 2998

Courtesy Calls, Official, *supply*, 9418

Customs Tariff Bill, 3R., 7466; *cons. req.*, (sago, &c.), 10499; (hay and chaff), 10536; (matches), 10549, 10550, 10552, 10553; (apparel), 10567; (hats, &c.), 10603; *expl.*, 10605; (arms, &c.), 10658; (motive power machinery) (*p.o.*, 10681), 10684, 11536; (manufactures of metals), 10691, 10698; (rock drills), 10712, 10725, 10729; (electrical machines), *p.o.*, 10736-9; (locks), 10798; (oils), 10915, 10983, 11111; (catalogues), 11073; (timber), 11152; (kinematographs, &c.), 11065; (licht-pausrohpapier), 11171; (hoists, patent), 10685 (*see* Tariff Resolutions (Customs).)

Defence:

Adult Military Training, *m.*, 2255

Appointments, Military, *q.*, 4200

Cadets Encampment, *q.*, 9955

Criticism by Lt.-Col. Onslow, *q.*, 11703

Disclosure of information, *q.*, 12157

Empire Rifle Matches, *q.*, 11019

Government Policy, *adj.*, 7540

Guns, lights, &c., *supply*, 3745

Medical Reserve Corps, *q.*, 6968, 10609

Military Board, *q.*, 3589, 3972, 7458

New "Service" Bridle, *q.*, 3852

Officers' records, *q.*, 2234

Reserve Officers, *q.*, 4518

Rifle Association, Victoria, *q.*, 2995

Rifles, *supply*, *q.*, 5237

Training of Forces, *q.*, 6025

Federal Capital, *q.*, 10965

Government Business, precedence, *m.*, 2801;

High Commissioner, *q.*, 5416

Immigration, *supply*, 9416-7

Inspector-General of Public Works, *supply*, 9787, 9792

Mail Service to Europe, *m.*, *p.o.*, 6500-1

New Protection (Tariff): *by* Google

Tobacco, 4208

Salmon, Hon. C. C.—*continued.*

Newspaper advertisements, *q.*, 3269
 Parliament, Reflections on, *obs.*, 10983, 11111
 Parliamentary Allowances Bill, *m.*, 1922
 Patent Medicines and Secret Drugs, *m.*, 888;
expl., 2313; *adj.* (*p.o.*, 3095), 3100
 Petitions containing incorrect statements, *p.o.*,
 2999
 Plummer, Mr. J., *q.*, 10754-5; *expl.*, 11046
 Postal Service:
 Deputy Postmaster-General, Victoria, *supply*,
 4850
 Privilege, signatures to petition, *m.*, 3412
 Procedure, *adj.*, 9236
 Public Service:
 States Officials, Work by, *q.*, 7297
 Quarantine Bill, *2r.*, 523; *com.* (scope of
 quarantine), 1431, 1452; (general definitions),
 1536, 1544; (proclamation of ports), 1550;
 (surveillance), 1719; (quarantine by vessel),
 1721; (power to destroy animals), 1728;
 (liability of owners and agents for pro-
 visions, &c., for quarantined persons), 1730;
 (penalty for importing contrary to proclama-
 tion), 1732; (persons may be vaccinated),
 1734; (examination of imported animals),
 1763; *expl.*, 1764
 Rural Industries, development, *q.*, 12158
 Seizure of Japanese Goods by Customs, *q.*,
 6024
 Shipping Combine, alleged, *adj.*, 3963
 Supply:
 External Affairs (Administration), 9416
 Home Affairs (Public Works Staff), 9787,
 9792
 The Parliament (Gardens), 8966
 Works and Buildings (Treasury) (*p.o.*, 3595);
 (Defence), 3745
 Supply Bill (No. 2) *ad. rep.*, 1870
 Tariff:
 Kerosene Duties, *q.*, 7299
 Progress Report to Senate, *m.*, 10817
 Tariff Resolutions (Customs):
 Agricultural Machinery, &c., 6554, 6556,
 6557 6564
 Apparel, *cons. req.*, 10567
 Arms, &c., *cons. req.*, 10658
 Bags, &c., *m.* to report, 5733
 Blacking, &c., 6852
 Cameras, &c., 7393
 Carbon Bisulphide 7392
 Carbonate of Ammonia, 6979
 Catalogues, &c., 7181; *cons. req.*, 11073
 Commonwealth and State Government Im-
 ports, 7428
 Confectionery, &c. (*p.o.*, 5218), 5256
 Cosies and Cushions, 5740
 Dry Plates, 7395
 Electrical Machines, *cons. req.*, *p.o.*, 10736,
 10739
 Engines, &c., 6716
 Fuse, 7388
 Gas Analysis Apparatus, &c., 6931, 6933
 Glucose, 4633
 Glue, &c., 6952, 6954
 Glycerine, 6998
 Governors, Importations for, 7421
 Grain and Pulse, 5352
 Hats, &c., 5970, 5974; *cons. req.*, 10603;
 expl., 10605
 Hay and Chaff, 5436; *cons. req.*, 10536
 Hoists, Patent, *cons. req.*, 10685
 Insecticides, 6979, 6981

Salmon, Hon. C. C.—*continued.*

Tariff Resolutions (Customs)—*continued.*
 Jewellery, 7144
 Kinematographs, &c., *cons. req.*, 11065
 Licht-pausroh papier, *cons. req.*, 11171
 Liquid Removers, &c., 6895
 Locks, *cons. req.*, 10798
 Manufacture of Metals, *cons. req.*, 10691,
 10698
 Matches, *cons. req.*, 10549, 10550, 10552,
 10553
 Meats, &c., 5457, 5458
 Milk, 5517
 Motive Power Machinery, 6658; *cons. req.*,
 (*p.o.*, 10681), 10684, 11536
 Musical Instruments, 7358
 Nails, 6601
 Oils, 6872; *cons. req.*, 10915, 10983, 11111
 Opium, 6995
 Paper and Stationery, 7239
 Piece Goods, 5823 (*p.o.*, 5849)
 Roasting Dishes, &c., 6911
 Rock Drills, *cons. req.*, 10712, 10725, 10729
 Rubber Manufactures, 7161
 Rubber, Waterproof Piece Goods, Rebate,
 7413
 Sago, &c., *cons. req.*, 10499
 Scientific Apparatus, 7409, 7410, 7411
 Steam Road Roller, 6681
 Stone and Marble, 6958
 Tanks, 6622
 Timber, &c., 7096; *cons. req.*, 11152
 Tobacco, 4296
 Tool Handles, 7120
 Wine, 4142
 Wire Netting, 4571; (*p.o.*, 4574)
 (See Customs Tariff Bill.)
 Tariff Resolutions (Excise):
 Glucose, 4638
 Tobacco, (*p.o.*, 4305)
 Telegraphs and Telephones:
 Forms, telegraph, *q.*, 11704
 Guarantees, telephone, *q.*, 3589
 Underground Wires, *q.*, 10131, 10609
 Women's Work Exhibition, *supply*, 1870-1;
adj., 4955; *q.*, 6673

Sampson, Mr. S., Wimmera:

Address-in-Reply, *m.*, 326
 Advertising Resources of Commonwealth,
supply, 9600
 Bounties Bill, *2r.*, 897; first schedule
 (period), 1067; (olives), 1111
 Breweries, Registration of, *q.*, 9482
Budget, m., 2964
 Coast Defence Appropriation Bill, *int.*, 12093
 Corn Sacks, *q.*, 7462
 Customs Tariff Bill, *cons. req.*, (hay and
 chaff), 10540; (hats, &c.), 10588; (type, &c.,
 10709; (oils), 10882; (timber), 11033;
 (printing ink), 11094; (directories), 11457
 (See Tariff Resolutions, Customs)
 Defence:
 Thursday Island Defences, *supply*, 11367
 Electoral Act: Counting of Votes, *supply*, 977
 Estimates, Additional, *supply*, 11367, 11396
 Excise Tariff Acts, standard of wages, *q.*,
 6089, 6098
 Excise Tariff (Agricultural Machinery) Act, *q.*,
 6130, 7296; *adj.*, 6366, 12163
 Federal Capital, address, 328

Sampson, Mr. S.—continued.

Financial Relations, Commonwealth and States, *Budget*, 2964-5
 High Commissioner, *address*, 327; *supply*, 8970
 Immigration, *address*, 326-7; *Budget*, 2965-7; *supply*, 8970, 9600, 9629; *q.*, 11389
 Imperial Conference, *address*, 326
 Invalid and Old-age Pensions Bill, 2R., 11959; *com.* (persons disqualified), 11973; (necessary conditions), 11975 (*see* Old-age Pensions)
 Irrigation, *address*, 328-9
 Judiciary Bill, *expl.*, 2852
 Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway Survey Bill, *mes.*, 619
 Land Taxation, *supply*, 8972
 Mail Contract, cancelled, *q.*, 12154
 Manufactures Encouragement Bill, *com.*, (schedule), 12179
 Northern Territory, *address*, 327-8; *q.*, 10524
 Old-age Pensions, *q.*, 11918 (*see* Invalid and Old-age Pensions Bill)
 Postal Service:
 Country Facilities, *supply*, 10160-1
 Contract Offices, *supply*, 11396
 Post and Telegraph Department, Ministerial statement, *m.s.o.*, 11634
 Preferential Trade (Tariff), 4783
 Quarantine Bill, 2R., 555; *com.* (general definitions), 1541; (examination of imported animals), 1722, 1724
 Session, Work of, *adj.*, 12202
 Supply:
 External Affairs (Administration), 8970; (Miscellaneous), 9600, 9629, 11364
 Home Affairs (Electoral Office), 9772; (Miscellaneous), 11367
 Postmaster-General: (Central Staff), 10160, 11306
 Surplus Revenue Bill, 2R., 11762
 Tariff Resolutions (Customs):
 Bags, &c., 5646, 5737
 Blankets, &c., 5720, 5728
 Blue, 4783
 Carbon Bisulphide, 7392
 Confectionery, &c., 5227
 Directories, *cons. reg.*, 11457
 Fruits and Vegetables, 5279, 5282, 5330
 Hats, &c., 5957, 5974, 5975, 5976; *cons. reg.*, 10588
 Hay and Chaff, *cons. reg.*, 10540
 Insecticides, &c., 6990
 Machinery and Machines, and Machine Tools, 6748
 Meats, &c., 5457
 Milk, 5511
 Oils, *cons. reg.*, 10882
 Pianos, 7334
 Piece Goods, 5829
 Printing Ink., *cons. reg.*, 11094
 Rails, &c., 6827
 Roofing Tiles, 6906-8
 Rice, 5532
 Tobacco, 4283
 Timber, &c., 7062; *cons. reg.*, 11033
 Type, &c., *cons. reg.*, 10709 (*see* Customs Tariff Bill)
 Tariff:
 Address, 327
 Budget, 2065
 Consideration of, *q.*, 3733
 Temperature Records, *q.*, 8928

Sampson, Mr. S.—continued.

Telegraphs and Telephones:
 Charges for Telephones, *supply*, 11395
 Country Facilities, *supply*, 10160-1
 Kerang Telephone Service, *q.*, 10963

Sayers, Senator R. J., Queensland:

Address-in-Reply, *m.*, 378
 Advertising Australia, *supply*, 5905-6
 American Fleet. visit of, *q.*, 11983, 12102
 Appropriation Bill, 3R., 10395
 Appropriation (Works and Buildings) Bill, 2R., 3826, 3841; *com.*, schedule (Defence), 4037, 4039, 4041
 Australian Industries Preservation Bill, 2R., 4610; *com.* (Burden of proof), (*p.o.*, 5044), 5098, 5110, 5111; *ad. rep.*, 5184
 Australians, Repatriation of, *address*, 386-7
 Bounties Bill, 2R., 2751; *com.* (appropriation), 2768; (bounties), 2769; (notice of conditions), 2781; (regulations), 2854, 2858, 2863; First Schedule (tobacco), 4252, 4906; (fish), 4267, 4273
 Bills of Exchange Bill, *com.* (presentment of cheque), 2409
 Bounties, *address*, 385
 Business, State of, *adj.*, 1713
 Coast Defence Appropriation Bill, 2R., 12113
 Commonwealth Salaries Bill, *com.* (taxation by States), 957
 Cotton Industry, Queensland, *address*, 382-3
 Cotton-ginning Machinery, *q.*, 829
 Customs Tariff Bill, 2R., 7620; *com.*, Schedule:
 Adding and Computing Machines, *cons. reg.*, 10937
 Agricultural Machinery, 8504
 Ammonia, *cons. reg.*, 11238
 Arms, 8557
 Arrowroot, 7951
 Bananas, 7855
 Coffee, 7779
 Cutlery, 8599
 Electrical Appliances, 8896
 Engines, &c., 8677
 Fish, 7801
 Fishing Nets, 9918
 Fruits, &c., 7822
 Furniture, 9380
 Glue, 8503
 Glycerine, &c., 9297
 Grain and Pulse, prepared, 7917
 Hats, &c., 8207
 Hay and Chaff, 7938; *cons. reg.*, 10861
 Insecticides, &c., 9286
 Lounges and Settees, 9387
 Machinery, &c., 8708
 Manufactures of Metals, *n.e.i.*, 8735, 8746; (*p.o.*, 8749), 8756, 8762
 Matches, 8001
 Milk, 8023
 Mining Engines, &c., 8790, 8795
 Motive Power Machinery, 8640
 Nuts, 8040
 Oils, 8300, 8447
 Paints, &c., 8465
 Piece Goods, 8147, 8165, 8175
 Rails, Fish Plates, &c., *cons. reg.*, 10954, 10957
 Tea, 8115
 Timber, 9462; *cons. reg.*, 11248
 Tobacco, unmanufactured, 7647, 7648

Sayers, Senator R. J.—*continued*.
 Customs Tariff Bill (Schedule)—*continued*.
 Vegetables, *n.e.i.*, 7873
 Weighing Machines, 8623
 Wire Netting, 9166
 Defence:
 Australian Navy, *address*, 389-92
 Cadets, *address*, 392
 Expenditure, *supply*, 12142
 Military, *address*, 389-91
 Naval Agreement, *address*, 383-4
 Protector, *address*, 390
 Rifle Clubs, *address*, 391; *supply*, 12142
 Rifle Range, Brisbane, *supply*, 4037, 4039, 4041
 Transport Waggon, *q.*, 7704; *obs.*, 7843-4
 Division, *p.o.*, 8165
 Electoral Act Amendment, *address*, 384-5
 Estimates, late presentation of, *supply*, 10395
 Hours of Meeting, *m.*, 8079
 Immigration Encouragement, *address*, 380-1; *supply*, 5905-6
 Invalid and Old-age Pensions Bill, *2r.*, 12018; *com.* (persons disqualified), 12031
 Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway, *q.*, 11217
 Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway Survey Bill, *2r.*, 1174; *com.* (power to make survey), 1484
 Labour Conditions, Charters Towers, *address*, 378-9, 385
 Land Settlement, *supply*, 5905-6
 Land Taxation, *address*, 379
 London Offices, Commonwealth, *supply*, 3826-8, 3841-3; *q.*, 8104
 Lone Hand, *supply*, 12145
 Mail Service to Europe, *address*, 387-8
 New Protection (Tariff), 7622; *q.*, 11381-2
 Northern Territory, *address*, 381; *supply*, 1853-5
 Officers' Compensation Bill, *com.* (Colonel Ricardo), 10060
 Paraguay Communistic Settlement, *address*, 386-7
 Parliament House, Accommodation for Senators, *supply*, 8080; Sewering of, *q.*, 9632
 Parliamentary Papers Bill, *com.*, (no action for publishing), 12135
 Personal Explanation, 8979
 Postal Service:
 Departmental Disorganization, 8917-9
 Letter Carriers, Queensland, *supply*, 1853
 Postmaster, Gawler, *q.*, 5082
 Queensland Mails, *q.*, 2031; Cooktown, *q.*, 11987
 Working Hours of, *supply*, 1853, 1855
 Post and Telegraph Department, Royal Commission, *q.*, 9136
 Committee of Inquiry, *m.*, 9532; *q.*, 9632, 11220
 Printing Committee, *m.*, to print paper, *p.o.*, 136; *m.*, to adopt report, 4465, 7843, 8225
 Public Service:
 Centralization of Administration, *supply*, 1852-3
 Inefficiency of, *address*, 383
 Working hours of, *supply*, 1855
 Quarantine Bill, *2r.*, 4405; *com.* (proclamation of ports), 5492
 Questions, answers to, *supply*, 1851
 Repatriated Australians, 387
 Senate Election, South Australia, *m.*, 4804
 Standing Orders, Amendment of, *adj.*, 2623
 State Guarantee: Losses, *supply*, 12138

Sayers, Senator R. J.—*continued*.
 Sugar Industry, *address*, 381
 Supply Bill (No. 2), *1r.*, 1851; *com.* (issue and application), 1941
 Supply Bill (No. 3), *com.*, schedule (External Affairs), 5905
 Supply Bill (No. 5), *1r.*, 8917; *com.*, Schedule (Parliament), 8980
 Supply Bill (No. 1) 1908-9, *1r.*, 12138; *2r.*, 12142; *com.* (schedule), 12145
 Surplus Revenue Bill, *2r.*, 11900
 Tariff, *address*, 379, 381; *supply*, 1942
 Telegraphs and Telephone Service:
 Cypher Telegrams, *q.*, 1330, 1927, 2029, 2031; *adj.*, 1685-7; *supply*, 1851-2
 Departmental Disorganization, 8017-9
 Telegraphic Communication, Queensland, *supply*, 12138
 Tobacco Combine, *m.s.o.*, 3052
 Voting Machines, *m.*, 1274
 Wages in Australian States, *address*, 378-9
 Sinclair, Mr. H., Moreton:
 Advertising Resources of Australia, *supply*, 9626
 Address-in-Reply, *m.*, 329
 Australian Cattle for Argentine, *q.*, 6677
 Bounties, *address*, 330
 Butter Grading, *address*, 334-6; *q.*, 4649, 4958
 Chinese Immigration, *address*, 336
 Coastal Lights, *address*, 334
 Commerce Act, *address*, 334-6
 Corn Sacks, size of, *q.*, 10753
 Customs Tariff Bill, *cons. reg.* (vegetables), 10520; (Standards, &c.), 10709; (Scientific Apparatus), 10906-7, 10908; (Timber), 11146, 11151, 11153, 11162; (Curtains and Blinds), 11440 (*see* Tariff Resolutions (Customs))
 Defence:
 Rifle Ranges, *supply*, 3449
 Electoral Law Amendment, *address*, 333
 Excise Tariff (Agricultural Machinery) Act, *address*, 333-4; *supply*, 5705 (*see* New Protection)
 Farm Implements, Excise Tariff Act, *address*, 334
 Financial Relations: Commonwealth and State, *address*, 331
 Immigration, *address*, 336; *supply*, 9626
 Imperial Conference, *address*, 329-30
 Invalid and Old-age Pensions Bill, *com.*, medical examination), 11978 (*see* Old-age Pensions)
 Kanakas, Repatriation, *address*, 333
 Mails:
 Contractors, Payment of, *q.*, 2313, 5520
 Service to Europe, 331-3
 New Protection (Tariff), 4109-12, 4644 (*see* Excise Tariff)
 Northern Territory, *address*, 331
 Old-age Pensions, *address*, 331 (*see* Invalid and Old-age Pensions Bill)
 Petitions, Prayers of Petitioners, 3619
 Post Offices:
 Beauesert, *supply*, 3531
 Brisbane, *supply*, 3531
 Gatton, *supply*, 3531
 Lighting of, *supply*, 3531
 Railway, *supply*, 3531
 Postal Rates Bill, *q.*, 10524
 Preferential Trade, *address*, 329

Sinclair, Mr. H.—continued.

Preferential Trade (Tariff), 5253
 Prime Minister, Actions of in England, address, 329-30
 Queensland State Elections, address, 329
 Shipping Combine, alleged, adj., 3936
 States Debts, address, 331
 Sugar Bounties, address, 330-1
 Supply:
 External Affairs (miscellaneous), 9626.
 Attorney-General (Secretary's Office), 9727
 Works and Buildings (Trade and Customs), 3446; (Defence), 3449; (Post and Telegraphs, Queensland) 3531; (Telegraph and Telephones, Queensland), 3554
 Tariff:
 Address, 330, 333-4
 Antimony, Duty on, q., 11157
 Petition of Music Teachers, 3619
 Tariff Resolutions (Customs):
 Ale, Porter, and Other Beer, 4109
 Arrowroot, 5445
 Boots, &c., 7158
 Churns, &c., 6569
 Coffee, &c., 5264
 Confectionery, &c., 5253
 Curtains and Blinds, cons. req., 11440
 Fish, 5278
 Glucose, 4628
 Grain and Pulse, 5353
 Hay and Chaff, 5431
 Hogsheads, 7136
 Jewellery, 7150
 Lasts and Trees, 7126
 Leather Manufactures, 7168
 Marine Engines, 6660
 Milk, 5512
 Newspaper, 7196 (p.o., 7209), 7212
 Paper and Stationery, 7242
 Parchment, 7267
 Salt, 5540
 Scientific Apparatus, cons. req., 10906-7, 10908
 Standards, &c., cons. req., 10799
 Sugar, 4765
 Timber, cons. req., 11146, 11151, 11153, 11162
 Tool Handles, 7123, 7124
 Vegetables, cons. req., 10520
 (See Customs Tariff Bill)
 Tariff Resolutions (Excise):
 Glucose, 4644
 Starch, 5548, 5556
 Telegraphs and Telephones:
 Brisbane and Sydney, q., 6677
 Country Districts, Extension, supply, 3554: q., 10464
 Guarantees, supply, 3531
 Guarantees, Telephone, q., 12042
 Insulators, q., 11181
 Telephones, Country Towns, q., 10464
 Trawler, supply, 3446

Smith, Hon. Bruce, K.C., Parker:

Address-in-Reply, m., 408
 Additional Sitting Days, m., 6516
 Adjournment, Special, m., 6503
 Amending Bills, q., 12039
 Bankruptcy Bill, q., 1087-8, 1281
 Bounties Bill, com., First Schedule (tobacco leaf), 1228; (fish), 1304; recom. (specification of bounties), 1384, 1389; 3R., 1403
 British Party Politics, Australian Interference, address, 440-41

Smith, Hon. Bruce, K.C.—continued.

Budget, m. (p.o., 2655), 2708, 2742
 Coast Defence Appropriation Bill, int., 12080; com. (appropriation), 12095
 Closure, q., 6593
 Customs Tariff Bill, cons. req., m., 10503; (stearine, &c.), 10507; (locks, &c.), 10792; (standards), 10799; (oils), 10820, 10880, 10982; (machinery, rebate for Home consumption), 11206. (See Tariff Resolutions (Customs).)
 Debate, Adjournment of, p.o., 10427
 Defence:
 Captain Collins, q., 9476
 Correspondence, British authorities, q., 12041
 Estimates, Reduction of, address, 449-50
 Military Engineer, q., 2793, 2997
 Naval Agreement, address, 450-4; q., 1282, 2689, 3300, 3422, 4309, 10310, 10523, 12200; supply, 11413
 Naval Base, address, 452
 Naval Operations, Victoria, q., 3421
 Naval Policy, q., 9686, 9767; supply, 11413
 Officers, exchange of, address, 449
 Organization, address, 450
 Rifles and Ball Cartridge, q., 9478
 Empire Free-trade, q., 6129
 Federal Capital, m., 313; Budget, 2731; q., 10463. (See Seat of Government Bill.)
 Financial Relations: Commonwealth and States, Budget, 2715-9, 2721-3, 2728-31, 2737-40, 2742; q., 10524, 10876, 10964
 Forrest, Sir J., Attitude at General Elections, address, 410
 Freeman and Wallace, supply, 11344
 Government, Position of the, address, 409-20, 455-6
 High Court as Final Court of Appeal, address, 455
 Hutton, Major-General, address, 449-50
 Immigration, address, 447-9; q., 8938; supply, 9701
 Imperial Conference, q., 297, 298; address, 408, 420-44, 448, 450, 454-5
 Income Tax, Federal Salaries and Allowances, address, 455
 Judiciary Bill, 2R. (p.o.), 3766
 Kanakas, Repatriation of, address, 449
 Labour Conditions and Prices, q., 1974
 Labour Party, Attitude of, 409-20, address, 447-8, 455-6
 Land Settlement, Budget, 2735-6
 Land Tax, Budget, 2735-6
 Lighthouse Engineer, q., 2793
 London Offices, Commonwealth, supply, 1639, 3664
 Mails:
 European Contract, Cancelled, q., 404, 4623
 Service to Europe, expl., 6506
 Manufactures Encouragement Bill, 2R., 6179
 Minister of Trade and Customs, actions in England, address, 438-51
 Naval Agreement, q., 1282
 Navigation Conference, address, 444-7
 New Hebrides, q., 6418, 11326
 Old-age Pensions, supply, 11413
 Parliament, Reflections on, obs., 10982
 Parliamentary Allowances Bill, m., 1888, 1906; com. (amount of allowance), 2002
 Parliamentary Witnesses Bill, com. (Refusing to be sworn), 12073

Smith, Hon. Bruce, K.C.—*continued.*

- Personal Explanations, *q.*, 2653
- Petition, *Tariff, m.*, 3410
- Post and Telegraph Department: Provision for extra services, *q.*, 12154-5
- Preferential Trade, *address*, 420-44; *q.*, 590, 4956
- Preferential Trade (Tariff), 4556
- Prime Minister, absence of, *address*, 408; actions of in England, *address*, 414-55; *q.*, 3300; relations with Labour Party, *address*, 409-20
- Privy Council, *address*, 454-5
- Public Service:
 - Increments, *Budget*, 2719
- Public Works, New South Wales, *q.*, 2997
- Quarantine Bill, *2R.*, 519; *com.* (scope of quarantine), 1431
- Reward of Bravery: Old-age Pensions, *m.*, 696
- Seat of Government Bill, *2R.*, 10348 (*see* Federal Capital)
- Shipping Combine, alleged, *adj.*, 3947
- States Debts: New South Wales Loans, *q.*, 9764
- Supply Bill (No. 1) 1908-9, *int.*, 12098
- Surplus Revenue Bill, *2R.*, 11810
- Supply:
 - External Affairs (miscellaneous), 9701
 - Works and Buildings (Home Affairs, New South Wales) (*p.o.*, 3357); (External Affairs), 3639, 3664; (Defence, New Special Provision), 3682, 11408, 11412
- Tahiti, *q.*, 3734
- Tariff:
 - Budget*, 2708-17, 2720-8, 2732-4-6, 2740-1
 - Collection of reduced duties, *q.*, 3734
 - Cost of Living, increase, *q.*, 3173
 - Hat Mill Machinery, *q.*, 6676, 6677
 - New Protection, *q.*, 1074
 - Order of Consideration, *m.*, 4339, 4628
 - Petition, *m.*, 3410
 - Preferential Trade, *q.*, 4956
 - Reconsideration of Items, *q.*, 6355
 - Tweeds, *q.*, 2792
 - Wire Netting, *q.*, 1974, 2687; precedence to, *m.*, 4339
- Tariff Resolutions (Excise):
 - Snuff, 4325
 - Starch, 5549, 5551, 5552, 5554, 5556
- Tariff Resolutions (Customs):
 - Ale, Porter and other Beer (*p.o.*, 4088)
 - Bags, &c., *m.* to report, 5731, 5733
 - Churns, &c. (*p.o.*, 6568, 6569)
 - Cosies and Cushions, 5740, 5742, 5744
 - Feathers, 5636, 5637
 - Glucose, 4624, 4628
 - Iron, plate and sheet, 6539
 - Locks, &c., *cons. req.*, 10792
 - Machinery, Rebate for Home consumption, *cons. req.*, 11198, 11206
 - Nails, 6597
 - Oils, *cons. req.*, 10820, 10880, 10982
 - Piece Goods, 5807, 5809, 5820
 - Stained Glass Windows, 6916
 - Standards, *cons. req.*, 10799
 - Stearine, 5137; *cons. req.*, 10507
 - Sugar, 4755
 - Textiles, &c., *n.e.i.*, 5632, 5633
 - Weighing Machines (*p.o.*, 6630)
 - Wire Netting, 4556 (*see* 4558)
 - (*See* Customs Tariff Bill.)
- Tion Jack, *q.*, 10969

Spence, Hon. W. G., *Darling:*

- Bounties Bill, *com.* (appropriation), 1013; (specification of bounties), 1059; First Schedule (fish), 1060; (cotton), 1072; (olives), 1117
- Budget, *m.*, 3128
- Coast Defence Appropriation Bill, *int.*, 12091
- Competitive System, Socialism, *Budget*, 3144-5
- Customs Tariff Bill, *cons. req.* (agricultural implements, &c.), 10662, 10670; (rock drills), 10710, 10729; (wire netting), 10761; (glassware), 10905; (timber), 11032, 11166; (catalogues, &c.), 11075; (printing ink), 11094; (works of art), 11190. (*See* Tariff Re-solutions (Customs).)
- Defence:
 - Scheme of Government, *supply*, 11295
- Estimates, Additional, *supply*, 11293
- Immigration, *Budget*, 3128-37
- Invalid and Old-age Pensions Bill, *com.* (persons disqualified), 11960, 11971; (necessary conditions), 11974, 11976
- Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway Survey Bill, *2R.*, 736
- Land policy, *Budget*, 3135, 3138
- Mail Service to Europe, *m.*, 6464
- Manufactures Encouragement Bill, *2R.*, 6173
- New Protection (Tariff):
 - Wire Netting, 4541
- Parliamentary Witnesses Bill, *com.* (preventing witnesses), 11783
- Patent Medicines and Secret Drugs, *m.*, 887
- Postal Service:
 - Postal Officials as Returning Officers, *m.*, 711
 - Undermanning, New South Wales, *supply*, 4858-9, 11295
- Post and Telegraph Department:
 - Administration, *supply*, 11293-5
- Post Offices:
 - Cobar, *auj.*, 4645
 - Contract, *supply*, 3529-30, 4859-60
 - Six o'clock, closing of at, *supply*, 5706
 - Wrightville, *supply*, 4860
- Public Service:
 - Centralisation, *supply*, 11294
 - Transfers, *supply*, 5796-7
- Quarantine Bill, *com.* (persons may be vaccinated), 1738; (examination of imported animals), 1760; *cons. amds.*, 8046
- Reward of Bravery: Old-age Pensions, *m.*, 697
- Servant Girls, immigration of, *adj.*, 2686
- Shipping Combine, alleged, *adj.*, 3948
- Supply:
 - Works and Buildings (Post and Telegraphs), 3529
- Supply Bill (No. 3), *m.*, 5796
- Tariff:
 - Budget*, 3138
 - Government's intention regarding, *adj.*, 3947
 - New Protection, *Budget*, 3139-44
 - Wire-netting, petition, 3732
- Tariff Resolutions (Customs):
 - Agricultural, &c., Machinery, 6576, 6578, 6588; *cons. req.*, 10662, 10670
 - Bags, &c., 5644, 5646
 - Blankets, &c., 5719
 - Catalogues, &c., *cons. req.*, 11075
 - Engines, &c., 6711, 6717
 - Fruits and Vegetables, 5331
 - Furniture, &c., 7004
 - Fuse, 7389

Spence, Hon. W. G.—continued.

Tariff Resolutions (Customs)—continued.

Glassware, *cons. reg.*, 10905
 Hay and Chaff, 5427
 Lead, 6051
 Machinery and parts, 6110
 Machinery and Machines and Machine Tools, 6731
 Marine Engines, 6656
 Mining Engines, &c., 6778, 6785, 6796
 Motive Power Machinery, 6649, 6657, 6660
 Newspaper, 7199, 7205, 7210, 7213
 Paper and Stationery, 7216, 7217, 7218, 7223, 7239, 7241
 Printing, &c., Inks, 7244, 7256; *cons. reg.*, 11094
 Rock Drills, *cons. reg.*, 10710, 10729
 Sheep Shearing Machines, 6588
 Socks and Stockings, 5934
 Stone and Marble, 6967
 Strawboard, 7227
 Tanks, 6625
 Timber, &c., 7043, 7071, 7099; *cons. reg.*, 11032, 11166
 Tin plates, 6118
 Type, 6762
 Wire-netting, 4541; *cons. reg.*, 10761
 Works of Art, *cons. reg.*, 11190
 (See Customs Tariff Bill.)
 Taxation, Direct, *Budget*, 3138-44
 Telegraphs and Telephones:
 Money Orders, *supply*, 4860
 Repairs, *supply*, 4860
 Telephones, delay in supplying, *supply*, 11294-5

Stewart, Senator Hon. J. C., Queensland:

Accommodation for Senators, *supply*, 5881
 Advertising Australia, *supply*, 5901; *q.*, 11218, 11384
 Additional Appropriation Bill, *1R.*, 11608; *com.*, schedule (London Offices), 11617; (Fidelity Guarantee Fund), 11620
 Appropriation Bill, *com.*, (The Parliament), 10286, 10288; (External Affairs), 10293; (Attorney-General), 10303; (Defence), 10384; *3R.*, 10391
 Appropriation (Works and Buildings) Bill, *2R.*, 3820; *com.*, schedule (Defence), 3930, 3933, 4037, 4040, 4042, 4043; (Post and Telegraph), 4048; *3R.*, 4148
 Australian Industries Preservation Bill, *2R.*, 4514; *com.* (burden of proof, &c.), 4915, 4923, 5023, 5102; *ad. rep.*, 5184
 Australian Men of Letters Fund, *supply*, 12144
 Bills of Exchange Bill, *com.* (application of State laws), 669, 672, 677, 1586, 1967; (protection of banker), 2199; (States duty stamps), 2294, 2296
 Bounties Bill, *2R.*, 2754; *com.* (regulations), 2862; First Schedule: (Cotton), 3066; (mohair), 3388; (rubber), 3570; (coffee), 3715; (tobacco), 4902
 Business, order of, *m.*, 5305
 Commonwealth Salaries Bill, *com.* (taxation by States), 1052, 1580, 1582
Commonwealth Year-Book, *q.*, 9422
 Conduct of Business, *adj.*, 587

Stewart, Senator Hon. J. C.—continued.

Customs Tariff Bill, 1R., 7547; com., Schedule:

Arrowroot, 7953
 Bags for bran, &c., 8219, 8220
 Bananas, 7857
 Biscuits, 7676
 Blankets, &c., 8255
 Carpets, 8269
 Coffee, 7766
 Confectionery, 7735
 Engines, &c., 8683
 Fruits, citrus, 7831
 Grain and pulse, prepared (*p.o.* 7898)
 Hops, 7947
 Iron Pipes, &c., 9073, 9086
 Matches, 8002, 8004
 Medicines, 9294
 Nuts, 8039
 Oils, 8388, 8389, 8413, 8414, 8424, 8434, 8438, 8441; *cons. reg.*, 11228
 Peel, 7833
 Piece goods, 8179, 8185, 8186, 8187-8
 Shaft bars, 9643
 Sago and tapioca, 7658, 7662
 Tallow &c., 8378, 8381
 Tea, 8112
 Tobacco, *cons. reg.*, 10843
 Wine, sparkling, 7624, 7627

Defence:

Establishment, *supply*, 3933
 Fremantle Fort, *supply*, 4043
 Hoad, Major-General, *q.*, 6190
 Militia, *supply*, 10384
 Rifle Range, Brisbane, *supply*, 4037-8, 4040, 4042

Disputed Elections and Qualifications Bill, *2R.*, 5593; *com.* (reference of question), 5652, 5656, 5657, 5658, 5659; (parties to the reference), 5660; (powers of Court), 5662
 Dissent from Ruling: Admissibility of Request (Excise Tariff Bill), *m.*, 10023
 Division Bells, *adj.*, 7972; *q.*, 7973
 Electoral Rolls, *supply*, 11617
 Excise Procedure Bill, *com.* (legal representation), 5125; *3R.*, 5393
 Excise Tariff Acts, *q.*, 5175, 5284, 6295; *adj.*, 5766
 Excise Tariff Bill, *com.*, Schedule: (tobacco), 10014; (confectionery), *p.o.*, 10023
 Federal Capital, *supply*, 3821, 3824
 Financial Relations, Commonwealth and States, *supply*, 3820, 3822, 11614-7
 First President of the Senate, *m.*, 3367
 Fretrade within the Empire, speech by Senator Best, *q.*, 11468
Hansard, *q.*, 5177, 5284
 High Commissioner, *supply*, 1848-9, 10293; *q.*, 3798. (See London Offices.)
 High Court, *supply*, 10303
 Hours of Meeting, *m.*, 8077
 Immigration, *q.*, 4705; *supply*, 5901-5
 Invalid and Old-age Pensions Bill, *com.* (persons disqualified), 12032; (limit of pension), 12033. (See Old-age Pensions.)
 Judiciary Bill, *2R.*, 858; *com.* (appeals from State Courts), 947, 951
 Kalgoolie to Port Augusta Railway Bill, *2R.*, 1364; *com.* (power to make survey), 1491
 Kalgoolie to Port Augusta Railway Survey, Cost of Engineers' Conference, *q.*, 7927
 King of Portugal, Assassination of, *q.*, 7794-5, 7841

t, Senator Hon. J. C.—*continued*.
 Settlement and Taxation, *supply*, 3822,
 301-5, 11611-13
 Adon Offices of Commonwealth, *q.*, 4144;
supply, 3824-5, 4148, 11617. (See High
 Commissioner.)
 Mail Service to Europe, *q.*, 5746; *m.*, 6211
 Maitland Coal Miners:
 Postmaster-General, *q.*, 8309
 New Protection, *supply*, 6335, 7548-9
 Northern Territory, *supply*, 1849-50, 3821
 Officers Compensation Bill, 2*r.*, 10054; *com.*,
 (J. Wilson), 10061, 10064, 10068
 Old-age Pensions, *supply*, 3820-1. (See In-
 valid and Old-age Pensions Bill.)
 Order of Business, *m.*, 31-2
 Parliament Gardens: Wages of Gardeners,
supply, 5882
 Parliament House, Accommodation for Sena-
 tors, *supply*, 8979, 8987; *q.*, 9631
 Postal Service:
 Additional Men, Queensland, *q.*, 1233
 Associations of Officers, *supply*, 8905-7
 Boy Labour, *q.*, 1470; *supply*, 1844, 1847
 Carting of Mails, Brisbane, *q.*, 1688
 Chinese Messenger, Cairns, *q.*, 4363
 Letter Carriers and Sorters, *q.*, 1232, 3233,
 10369, 11384, 11471; *supply*, 1847-8
 Post and Telegraph Department:
 Administration, *q.*, 4705; *supply*, 11608-11
 Funds for, *supply*, 12142
 Newspaper delivery, *q.*, 7895, 7926
 Penny Postage, *supply*, 3821
 Stamps, design, *q.*, 5083
 Undermanning, *supply*, 6336, 7547, 8904-5;
q., 7895, 7926
 Working Hours, *supply*, 1844-6
 Post Offices:
 Brisbane, *supply*, 4048
 Postage, Stamps, Commonwealth, *m.*, 5859
 Postal Rates Bill, *q.*, 4036
 Premiers' Conference Report, *m.*, 746
 Printing Committee, Report, *m.*, 680, 935,
 6293, 8222
 Privilege, procedure, Select Committee,
m., 10010
 Public Service:
 Commissioner's Report, *q.*, 8076
 Examination, *q.*, 4144
 Fidelity Fund, *q.*, 11471; *supply*, 11620
 Hours of Work, *supply*, 1844-8
 Inquiry Boards, *q.*, 8700; *supply*, 8907-8
 List of Officers, *q.*, 8076
 Long Service Furlough, *q.*, 11384
 Quarantine Bill, *com.* (liability of owners for
 expenses), 6084
 Referendum, Queensland, *q.*, 2283
 Revenue Leakage, Tasmania, *q.*, 7753
 Snake Bite, antidote, *q.*, 3900
 Special Duties, Federal purposes, *supply*,
 3820
 Standing Orders Committee, *m.*, 35
 State Referendum at Federal Elections, *q.*,
 2514
 Store at Darling Island, *supply*, 3930
 Supply Bill (No. 1) 1908-9, 2*r.*, 12142; *com.*
 (schedule), 12144
 Supply Bill (No. 2), 1*r.*, 1844
 Supply Bill (No. 3), *com.* (schedule), The Par-
 liament, 5881, 5882; External Affairs, 5901
 Supply Bill (No. 4), 1*r.*, 6333
 Supply Bill (No. 5), 1*r.*, 8904; *com.*, schedule
 (Parliament), 8979

Stewart, Senator Hon. J. C.—*continued*.
 Tariff:
 Supply, 6334-5
 Statistics, *q.*, 7542, 7570, 7794
 Telegraphs and Telephones:
 Automatic Transmitters, *q.*, 9536
 Delayed Messages, *q.*, 7751, 7796, 9796,
 10370
 Melbourne and Brisbane, *q.*, 4895
 Message Forms, *q.*, 11471
 Messengers, *m.*, 8555
 Operators, Queensland, *q.*, 9536, 9891;
supply, 10391-2
 Tobacco Combine, *m.s.o.*, 3051
 Usher of Black Rod, *supply*, 10287-8
 Wages Board, *supply*, 6333-4
 Women's Work Exhibition, *adj.*, 4893

St. Ledger, Senator A. J. J., Queensland:

Accommodation for Senators, *supply*, 5881
 Additional Appropriation (Works and Build-
 ings) Bill, *com.* (Defence), schedule, 11695-6
 Address-in-Reply, *m.*, 63
 Adjournment, special, *m.*, 7790
 Advertising Australia, *supply*, 5889, 10302-3,
 10395-6
 Appropriation Bill, 2*r.*, 10273; *com.*, (Ex-
 ternal Affairs), 10293, 10298, 10302; (Home
 Affairs), 10305, 10307; 3*r.*, 10395
 Appropriation (Works and Buildings) Bill,
 2*r.*, 3817; *com.*, schedule (Defence), 3040;
 (Government Printing Office), 4055, 4059;
 (Commonwealth Offices, London), 4078
 Australian Industries Preservation Act, *adj.*,
 4276
 Australian Industries Preservation Bill, 2*r.*,
 4507; *com.* (burden of proof, &c.), 4921,
 5017, 5034, 5043, 5093, 5108, 5111, 5114; *ad.*
rep., 5183
 Bananas, Inspection, *q.*, 4472, 4706, 5178
 Bills of Exchange Bill, *com.* (application of
 State laws), 675, 1588, 1970; (presentment
 of cheque for payment), 750, 2411; (protec-
 tion of banker), 754, 758, 2062, 2195, 2200;
 (protest when notary not accessible), 760;
 (States duty stamps), 2288
 Bounties Bill, 2*r.*, 2648, 2743; *com.* (appro-
 priation), 2767; (offences), 2772, 2773;
 (notice of conditions), 2781; (regulations),
 2849, 2853, 2862; First Schedule (cotton),
 2865; (jute), 3159, 3258, 3263; (mohair),
 3386; (copra), 3400; (rice), 3488; (rubber),
 3565; (coffee), 3579; (dates), 4382
 "Braddon" section, *supply*, 1861
 Business, State of, *adj.*, 1713; order of, *adj.*,
 4618
 Commonwealth Salaries Bill (taxation by
 States), 1054, 1578, 1584; 3*r.*, 1824
 Commonwealth Mail Steamers, *m.*, 2219
 Confidential Documents, Printing of, *supply*,
 4055, 4059
 Criminal Appeals Bill, 2*r.*, 2557
 Customs Certificates: British goods, *m.*, 1962
 Customs and Excise Revenue, *q.*, 11581
 Customs Tariff Bill, 2*r.*, 7596; *m.s.o.*, 10838
 Schedule:
 Agricultural Machinery, 8598
 Ammonia, 9241, 9245; *cons. reg.*, 11238
 Animals, 7656
 Apparel, &c., 8208
 Arrowroot, 7953

St. Ledger, Senator A. J. J.—*continued.*

Customs Tariff Bill (Schedule)—*continued.*

Artificial Plants, &c., 8352
 Bananas, 7852, 7862
 Bayonets, &c., 8349
 Biscuits, 7684
 Blankets, 8245
 Bottles, 8501
 Candles, 7710, 7711
 Carpets, &c., 8272
 Confectionery, 7738
 Electrical Appliances, 8899, 9050, 9058, 9062
 Electrical Machinery, &c., 8884
 Engines, &c., 8687, 8696
 Fire-bricks, &c., 8480
 Fire Extinguishers, 8774
 Fish, 7802
 Fruit and Vegetables, 7819, 7826
 Fruits, citrus, 7830
 Furniture, 9305
 Furs, &c., 8291
 Glue, 8513, 8518
 Grain and Pulse, not prepared, 7889
 Grain and Pulse, prepared, *p.o.*, 7904, 7917
 Hats, &c., 8315
 Hay and Chaff, 7939; *cons. req.*, 10858
 Hops, 7949
 Insecticides, *cons. req.*, 11239
 Iron pipes, &c., 9077
 Lounges and Settees, 9386
 Machinery, &c. (*p.o.*, 8714), 8718
 Machine Tools, 8720
 Machinery, proclaimed, 8721, 8722
 Manufactures of Metals, *n.e.i.*, 8732, 8742, 8754, 8758
 Manures, 9915
 Matches, 8002
 Meats, &c., 8014, 8018
 Milk, 8020, 8024
 Mining Engines, &c., 8791
 Mixed Metalware, 8723
 Motive Power Machinery, 8643; (*p.o.*, 8649), 8659
 Mustard, *cons. req.*, 10870
 Oilmen's Stores, 8051, 8058, 8062
 Oils, 8411, 8440; *cons. req.*, 11226, 11232
 Paints, &c., 8454, 8467
 Paint Boxes, 9654
 Paper Patterns, 9809
 Paper, manufactures of, 9679, 9683
 Paper, printed matter, 9745, 9746
 Peel, 7835
 Pens, 9811, 9812
 Piece Goods, 8177, 8183
 Rails, fish plates, &c., 9063; *cons. req.*, 10952
 Rice, 8071, 8085, 8087
 Roasting Dishes, &c., 8482
 Sago and Tapioca, 7663
 Salt, 8093
 Sausage Casings, 8019
 Slate Slabs, &c., 8530
 Soap, 8008
 Socks, &c., 8341
 Spectacle Frames, &c., 9661
 Standards, &c., 9180
 Stearine, &c., 7716; *cons. req.*, 10852
 Stone and Marble, 8542, 8552, 8553
 Strawboard, 9754, 9757
 Tea, 8114, 8115

St. Ledger, Senator A. J. J.—*continued.*

Customs Tariff Bill (Schedule)—*continued.*

Timber, 9437; *cons. req.*, 11244, 11306, 11309, 11604
 Trimmings, &c., *n.e.i.*, 8349
 Vegetables, dried, &c., 7876
 Vegetables, *n.e.i.*, 7873
 Vehicles, 9827, 9828
 Waddings, &c., 8329, 8331
 Wine, sparkling, 7625
 Wire Netting, 9160
 Cypher telegrams, *supply*, 1860
 Defence:
 Increased vote, *supply*, 3819
 Rifle Range, Brisbane, *supply*, 4040;
 Scheme of Government, *supply*, 8921-2
 Small Arms and Cordite Factories, *supply*, 11695
 Disputed Elections and Qualifications Bill, *com.* (pending petitions), 5599, 5600; (reference of question), 5655, 5658; (parties to the preference), 5660
 Excise Procedure Bill, *com.* (dismissal of employes), 5194
 Excise Tariff (Agricultural Machinery) Act, *q.*, 5980, 11220; *supply*, 6336-8. (*See New Protection.*)
 Expenditure, Commonwealth, *supply*, 10273-6
 Exports, Statistical tables, *q.*, 1816
 Financial Relations, Commonwealth and States, *supply*, 1861, 3819, 10273-6; *q.*, 7976
 Fruit: Customs Inspection Fees, *q.*, 4472, 4706, 5178
 Government, Position of, *address*, 63-4, 71-2
 High Commissioner, *address*, 71; *supply*, 4078-81, 10293. (*See London Offices.*)
 High Court as Final Court of Appeal, *address*, 75-6
 Immigration, *address*, 73-5; *q.*, 4705; *supply*, 3819, 5889, 10395-6
 Imperial Conference, *address*, 63, 66-71
 Industries Preservation Act, *adj.*, 4278
 Income Tax: Federal Salaries and allowances, *address*, 75-6
 Judiciary Bill, *2r.*, 564; *com.* (jurisdiction of High Court), 940, 942; (appeals from State Courts), 944, 946, 951; *expl.*, 974, 1055
 Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway Survey Bill, *2r.*, 1246; *com.* (power to make survey), 1477, 1494; (obligation to construct), *p.o.*, 1514-5
 Labour Bureaux, *q.*, 11303
 Labour Party, attitude of, *address*, 74
 Land, alienated and unalienated, *q.*, 4364
 Land Monopoly, alleged, *supply*, 5888-91
 London Offices, Commonwealth, *supply*, 3817, 3818, 4078; *q.*, 3796, 4470. (*See High Commissioner.*)
 Mails:
 Service to Europe, *m.*, 6209; *address*, 71, 72-3
 Mail Contract, Cancelled, *address*, 71; *q.*, 4363, 11220
 Maitland Coal Miners:
 Postmaster-General, *adj.*, 8362
 New Protection (Tariff), 7599; *q.*, 11382, 11473. (*See Excise Tariff, &c.*)
 Northern Territory, *supply*, 1861; *q.*, 5084
 Pair Book, entries, *m.*, 3502
 Papua, *q.*, 8700; *supply*, 8921, 10298-9
 Parliament, treatment of, by Prime Minister, *address*, 66-7

St. Ledger, Senator A. J. J.—*continued.*

- Parliamentary Witnesses Bill, *com.* (preventing witnesses from giving evidence), 766
 Personal explanation, speech by Senator Turley, 11467; *adj.*, 11912
 Postal Service :
 Administration, Queensland, *supply*, 1860-1
 Dismissed Servants, *q.*, 6296, 7568
 Disorganization, *supply*, 8920
 Penny Postage, *q.*, 1233
 Preferential Trade, *address*, 67-69; Tariff, 7605-6
 Prime Minister and the Reid-McLean Government, *address*, 63-4; actions of in England, *address*, 66-71
 Printing Committee, *m.*, 4469
 Printing Office, *supply*, 4035
 Privilege, procedure, Select Committee, *m.*, 10009, 10258
 Public Service :
 Gratuities for Suggestions, *supply*, 10307
 Superannuation Fund, *q.*, 7704; *supply*, 8921
 Quarantine, *q.*, 1816, 2405, 4243, 5011
 Quarantine Bill, 2R., 5204; *com.* (arrangements with States), 5306, 5308; (proclamation of ports), 5326, 5483, 5489, 5670, 5986, 5988; (master to deliver health report), 5999; (master and medical officer to answer questions), 5999; (other persons prohibited from quitting vessel), 6003; (surveillance), 6003-4; (goods), 6006, 6062; (animals), 6065; (liability of owners for expenses), 6070, 6072; (persons able to support themselves), 6217
 Royal Agricultural Show, adjournment, *m.*, 2063
 Senate Election, South Australia, *q.*, 8286, 8423
 South Australian Election: High Court Judgment, *q.*, 2068
 Standing Orders, amendment of, *adj.*, 2622
 Standing Orders Committee, *m.*, 37
 State Legislatures, *supply*, 8905
 Statistical Branch, *supply*, 10305-6
 Supply Bill (No. 2), 1R., 1850; *com.* (issue and application), 1935, 1943
 Supply Bill (No. 3), *com.* (schedule), The Parliament, 5881; External Affairs, 5888
 Supply Bill (No. 4), 1R., 6336
 Supply Bill (No. 5), 1R., 8920; *com.*, schedule (Trade and Customs), 8995
 Surplus Revenue Bill, 2R., 11891; *com.* (commencement), 11905
 Tariff :
 Address, 63-6, 69-70
 Debate, duration of, *adj.*, 7564
 Submission of, *q.*, 1023
 Supply, 1943, 3817
 Wire Netting, *q.*, 1026
 Telegraphs and Telephones :
 Operators, telegraph, *adj.*, 10400
 Thursday Island, *supply*, 11696
 Tobacco Combine, *adj.*, 2050; *m.s.o.*, 3052
 Unification, remarks by Postmaster-General, *q.*, 7653
 Vacancy in Senate, South Australia, *q.*, 2068; *m.*, 4742
 Voting Machines, *q.*, 7543
 Year Book, *adj.*, 9191

Storrer, Mr. D., *Bass :*

- Advertising Australia, *Budget*, 2604
 Blakney, E. A., *q.*, 9476; *supply*, 9786
 Bookkeeping System, *Budget*, 2602-3
 Bounties Bill, *com.* (specification of bounties), 1059; First Schedule (cotton), 1082; (mohair), 1104; Second Schedule, 1324; *cons. amts.*, 6402, 6404
 Budget, 2601, 3282
 Business, conduct of, *adj.*, 4461
 Cable, Tasmania and Mainland, *Budget*, 2604, *q.*, 8929
 Chairman of Committees, *m.*, 316
 Corn Sacks, *q.*, 6355
 Customs Tariff Bill, *cons. reg.*, (stearine, &c.), 10509, 10513; (bags, &c.), 10571; (hats, &c.), 10603; (piece goods), 10628, 11465, 11528-30; (oils), 11552; (locks), 10776; (stone and marble), 11000; (furniture), 11014; (directories, &c.), 11079; (timber), 11138, 11149, 11162; (curtains and blinds), 11442; (insecticides), 11010. (*See* Tariff Resolutions (Customs).)
 Defence :
 Boots, *q.*, 9477, 10607
 Light Horse Brigade Camp, *q.*, 6595
 Rifle Ranges, *supply*, 3456
 Elective Ministries, *Budget*, 2601
 Electoral Officers, *m.*, 713; *Budget*, 2603
 Financial Relations, Commonwealth and States, *Budget*, 2602-3-5; *q.*, 11742
 Hours of Sittings, *adj.*, 3362
 Judiciary Bill, 2R., *m.*, resumption of debate, 3773
 Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway, *Budget*, 2604
 Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway Survey Bill, *com.* (power to make survey of route), 740
 Mails :
 Service to Europe, *m.*, 6495
 Tasmania, *q.*, 6131, 10874; *adj.*, 6504, 6073
 Northern Territory, *Budget*, 2605
 Old-age Pensions, *Budget*, 2605; *supply*, 9349
 Order of Business: Days and Hours of Sitting, *adj.*, 6187
 Parliamentary Allowances Bill, *com.* (amount of allowance), 2008
 Postal Service :
 Launceston, unsatisfactory service at, *adj.*, 2345; *Budget*, 2603
 Money Orders, Mangana, *q.*, 3173
 Officials, Launceston, *q.*, 5328
 Parcels Post Offices, *q.*, 7027
 Post Offices :
 Launceston, *supply*, 3530
 Six o'clock Closing, *supply*, 5705
 Preferential Trade (Tariff), 4969
 Printing Committee, *m.*, 4517
 Quarantine Bill, *com.* (scope of quarantine), 1531; (examination of imported animals), 1755, 1762; *cons. amts.*, 8957
 Questions without notice, *q.*, 11793
 Shipping Combine, alleged, *adj.*, 3958
 Sitting Days and Hours, *adj.*, 6187
 Special Adjournment, *m.*, 741; 2007
 Sugar Bounty, *Budget*, 2603

Storror, Mr. D.—continued.

Supply :

Home Affairs (Public Service Commissioner), 9786
Works and Buildings (Home Affairs), *p.o.*, 3348; (Defence, Tasmania), 3456; (Post and Telegraph, Tasmania), 3539; Wireless Telegraphy), 3555

Tariff :

Budget, *m.*, 2601-2-6-7, 3282
Chairs, *q.*, 2564, 2688
Preference, *Budget*, 2606
Senate's Requests : Increases, *obs.*, 10603

Tariff Resolutions (Customs) :

Animals, 4769
Arms, 6034, 6037, 6038
Arrowroot, &c., 5445
Bags, &c., 5644, 5737; *cons. req.*, 10571
Blacking, &c., 6856
Candles, 4969
Canvas and Duck, 5930
Carpets, 5739
China, &c., 6899
Confectionery, &c., 5234, 5241, 5254
Cosies and Cushions, 5739, 5749, 5743
Curtains and Blinds, *cons. req.*, 11442
Directories, &c., *cons. req.*, 11079
Droppers, &c., 6832
Electrical Machinery, 6806, 6808
Fireworks, 7382
Fishing Nets, &c., 7375
Furniture, &c., 7002; *cons. req.*, 11014
Grain and Pulse, 5347
Glue, &c., 6949
Hats, &c., 5971; *cons. req.*, 10603
Hay and Chaff, 5433
Hops, 5444
Insecticides, *cons. req.*, 11010
Iron, plate and sheet, 6534
Lead, 6051, 6052
Leather Manufactures, 7166
Liquid Removers, &c., 6894
Locks, &c., 6114-5; *cons. req.*, 10776
Mining Engines, &c., 6789, 6793, 6796-7
Motive Power Machinery, 6647
Nails, 6606
Oils, 6863, 6867; *cons. req.*, 11552
Paper and Stationery, 7218, 7222, 7243
Perambulators, &c., 7282
Pianos, 7353
Piece Goods, 5816, 5845; *cons. req.*, 10628, 11465, 11528, 11530
Potatoes, 5341
Printing, &c., inks, 7245, 7257, 7263
Rails, &c., 6825
Regalia, 5641
Rice, 5529
Saws, &c., 6748, 6752-3
School Pens, &c., 7143
Scientific Apparatus, 7410
Stained Glass Windows, 6918
Starch, 5552
Steam Road Roller, 6701
Stearine, &c., 5134, 5158; *cons. req.*, 10509, 10513
Stone and Marble, 6964; *cons. req.*, 11000
Sugars, 4766
Timber, &c., 7076, 7103, 7104, 7105, 7106; *cons. req.*, 11138, 11162
Tool Handles, 7119, 7123
Trimmings, 5938
Vehicles, 7286
Weighing Machines, 6629

Storror, Mr. D.—continued.

Tariff Resolutions (Customs)—continued.

Wicker, &c., 7109
Wire Netting (*p.o.*, 4577)
Wood, Wicker, and Cane, 6999
(*See Customs Tariff Bill.*)

Telegraphs and Telephones :

Insulators, Kaolin clay, *q.*, 3853, 5911
Messengers, *Budget*, 2604
Tasmanian Cable, *q.*, 8929, 11526
Wireless Telegraphy, *q.*, 3301, 12154; *supply*, 3555, 11917

Story, Senator W. H., South Australia :

Adjournment, Special, *m.*, 7787
Bicycle Industry, *q.*, 5978, 6294, 7569; *supply*, 6345-7
Bounties Bill, *com.*, First Schedule (mohair), 3385; (tobacco), 4159, 4167, 4259; *ad. rep.*, 4585
Customs Tariff Bill, *com.*, Schedule :
Ammonia, 9243
Arrowroot, 7950
Bicycles, &c., 9820
Doors, 9640
Engines, &c., 8691
Graphite, &c., 8370, 8371
Lamps, 8570
Manufactures of Metals, *n.e.i.*, 8761, 8762
Manures, 9906, 9915
Nuts, 8033
Piece Goods, 8166
Rubber Hose, &c., 9667
Salt, 8092
Slate Slabs, &c., 8531, 8532, 8537, 8547, 8548, 8550, 8551
Spectacle Frames, &c., 9660
Steel Wheels, &c., 9183, 9185, 9186
Timber, 9424, 9445, 9455, 9473; *cons. req.*, 11252, 11306, 11308, 11601, 11606
Vegetables, dried, &c., 7881
Vehicles, 9830, 9831
Weighing Machines, 8621, 8622, 8623
Defence :
Contingencies, *supply*, 8998
Division, *p.o.*, 8166
Excise Tariff Bill, *com.*, Schedule : (tobacco), 10018; (glucose), 10034
Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway Bill, *com.*, (survey), 1482
Painters' Wages, Telegraph Branch, *q.*, 5647
Pair Book, *expl.*, 3147
Parliamentary Allowances Bill, 3R., 2183
Parliament House, entertainment of strangers, *q.*, 6009
Post Office, Stockwell, *q.*, 10252
Supply Bill (No. 4), 1R., 6345
Supply Bill (No. 5), *com.* Schedule (Defence), 8998
Telegraph Service :
Painting of poles, *q.*, 7703, 7795, 7842
Tobacco Combine, *adj.*, 2043

Symon, Senator Hon. Sir J. H., K.C.M.G., K.C., South Australia :

Additional Appropriation Bill, 1R., 11503
American Fleet, visit of, *q.*, 11469; 11470
Appropriation Bill, 2R. (*p.o.*, 10276, 10277), 10280
Appropriation (Works and Buildings) Bill, 3R., 4152

Symon, Senator Hon. Sir J. H., K.C.M.G., K.C.
—continued.

Australian Industries Preservation Act, *q.*, 4035
Australian Industries Preservation Bill, 2R., 4374; *com.* (burden of proof), 5012, 5013, 5019; (*p.o.*, 5044-5), 5087
Bills, Circulation of, prior to First Reading, *supply*, 1836
Bills of Exchange Bill, 2R., 657; *com.* (presentment of cheque), 2410, 2412
Bounties Bill, 2R., 2515; *com.* (appropriation), 2766, 2767; (offences), 2774; (regulations), 2849; First Schedule (rice), 3407, 3470; (dates), 4386
Business, Order of, *obs.*, 650-1; *q.*, 10919, 11579; progress of, *supply*, 5878-9
Coal Combine, alleged, *adj.*, 3690
Commonwealth Salaries Bill, *com.* (taxation by States), 1568, 1571; 3R., 1816
Conduct of Business, *adj.*, 585
Customs Tariff Bill, *m.s.o.*, 10833; *q.*, 10919; *m.*, 11585; Schedule:
Agricultural Machinery, 8597
Animals, 7653, 7654, 7655, 7656, 7657
Bananas, 7860
Biscuits, 7668, 7680, 7682
Blue, 7685, 7693
Butter and Cheese, 7699
Candles, 7707
Coffee, 7776
Confectionery, 7723, 7733, 7743, 7745
Electrical Machinery, &c., 8799, 8804, 8807, 8869, 8886
Electrical and Gas Appliances, 9043
Fire Extinguishers, 8773
Fish, 7798, 7801
Fruits and Vegetables, 7813
Fruits, Citrus, 7829
Ginger, 7833
Glue, 8510, 8519
Grain and Pulse, not prepared, 7888, 7889
Grain and Pulse, prepared, 7894, 7896; (*p.o.*, 7897-8, 7906), 7910, 7916
Iron, Plate and Sheet, 8565
Isinglass, 8064
Lamps, 8568, 8569, 8570
Liquorice, 7756
Mustard, 8031
Mustard Seed, 8030
Nuts, 8033, 8034, 8038
Oilmen's Stores, 8042, 8044, 8046, 8049, 8062
Onions, 7884
Piece Goods, 8163, 8167, 8179, 8182; *cons. req.*, 10923
Rice Root, 7698
Rubber Hose, &c., 9666, 9669
Sago and Tapioca, 7660
Salt, 8093
Screws, 8780, 8781
Slate Slabs, &c., 8529, 8531
Slipper Forms, &c., 9664
Spectacle Frames, &c., 9659
Stearine, &c., 7719; *cons. req.*, 10850, 10853
Stone and Marble, 8536, 8549
Timber, 9424, 9428, 9449, 9455, 9460, 9540; (*p.o.*, 9551)
Tobacco, *cons. req.*, 10842
Tool Handles, 9634
Type, &c., 8771
Vegetables, *n.e.i.*, 7872
Vegetables, dried, &c., 7878
Weighing Machines, 8620, 8624
Wicker, Bamboo, &c., *n.e.i.*, 9566, 9568

Symon, Senator Hon. Sir J. H., K.C.M.G., K.C.
—continued.

Disputed Elections and Qualifications Bill, 2R., 5570; *com.* (pending petitions), 5598; (amendment of section 2 of principal Act), 5648; (reference of question), 5650, 5653; *recom.* (reference of question), 5084
Excise Tariff (Agricultural Machinery) Act, *q.*, 10920
Finance, Powers of Senate, *supply*, 10282-4
Financial Relations, Commonwealth and States, *supply*, 11503-6
Free-trade within the Empire, speech by Senator Best, *q.*, 11468
Hours of Meeting, *m.*, 8078
Immigration, *supply*, 10281-2
Immigration Restriction Act, *q.*, 1471
Imperial Conference, *q.*, 563, 649, 2405, 2512
Judiciary Bill, 2R., 830; *com.* (jurisdiction of High Court), 936, 941
Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway Survey Bill, *q.*, 931-2; 2R., 1342; *com.* (power to make survey), 1472, 1487, 1498, 1502, 1506; (appropriation of moneys), 1511
Land Settlement, *supply*, 10281
Linlithgow, Marquis of, death of, *m.*, 8505
London Offices, Commonwealth, *supply*, 4152-4
Mail contract cancelled, *q.*, 4363
Navigation Bill, *q.*, 2405
Northern Territory, *q.*, 1232, 1330, 8554, 9041, 9421; *supply*, 1839; *adj.*, 9735, 9742
Papua, *supply*, 11506-12
Parliamentary Allowances Bill, 2R., 2073; *com.* (short title), 2116; (amount of allowance), 2118
Printing Committee, *m.*, 935; (*p.o.*, 7845), 7846, 7847, 8224
Privilege, Procedure, Select Committee, *m.*, 10257
Public Service:
Commissioner, *supply*, 10280-1
Civil Positions, *supply*, 10282
Quarantine Bill, 2R., 4406; *com.* (arrangements with States), 5315; (proclamation of ports), 5396, 5473, 5476
Questions, Responsibility for Answers, *q.*, 7799
Seamen, Compensation to Injured, *q.*, 3463
Senate Election: South Australia, *m.*, 2512; Report of Committee, *m.*, 4393, 4396; (*p.o.*, 4396), 4708; *q.*, 5011, 5083
Senate, Rights of, *m.*, 11585
Sugar Bonus, *supply*, 10284
Supply Bill (No. 2), 1R., 1836; 2R., 1930
Supply Bill (No. 3), 1R., 5878
Tariff:
British preference, *q.*, 7542
Debate, Duration of, *adj.*, 7564
Presentation to Senate, *q.*, 4036, 4143
Statistics, *q.*, 7542
Supply, 1837-8, 1931
Wire Netting, *q.*, 1814
Telegraphs and Telephones:
Interrupted service between Victoria and South Australia, *q.*, 8506, 8555
Thomas, Hon. J., Barrier:
Address-in-Reply, *m.*, 194
Attorney-General, *q.*, 10786
Bounties Bill, *com.*, First Schedule (coffee), 1215; 3R., 1408
British Party Politics: Australian interference, *address*, 203-5
Budget, *m.*, 2676

Thomas, Hon. J.—*continued.*

Business, Conduct of, *q.*, 6024
 Butter Freights, *q.*, 3934
 Customs Tariff Bill, *cons. req.* (timber), 11122; (*p.o.*, 11027), 11147; (curtains and blinds), 11438, 11442; (works of art), 11576; *m.*, 11430. (*See* Tariff Resolutions (Customs).)
 Deputy Postmaster-General, Victoria, *supply*, 5791
 Electoral :
 Address, 194-5
 Officials as Returning Officers, *m.*, 698, 718
 Financial Relations, Commonwealth and States, *q.*, 10462
 House, Rights of, *m.*, 11430
 Imperial Conference, *address*, 198-205
 Invalid and Old-age Pensions Bill, 2R., 11958; *com.* (necessary conditions), 11974; (occasional short absences), 11977. (*See* Old-age Pensions.)
 Labour Party, *address*, 206; *supply*, 9348, 9351
 Land Values Taxation, *supply*, 9348
 Mails :
 Cancelled Mail Contract, *q.*, 10701, 10786
 Federal Mail Fleet, *q.*, 773, 988, 1181
 Service to Europe, *adj.*, 594; *q.*, 80; *address*, 199-201; (*p.o.*, 589); *q.*, 5801; *m.*, to print contract, 6126; *m.*, to approve, 6389; (*p.o.*, 6500-1)
 Minister of Trade and Customs, Actions in England, *address*, 198-205
 Old-age Pensions, *address*, 205; *supply*, 9314; (*p.o.*, 9346), 9348, 10459. (*See* Invalid and Old-age Pensions Bill.)
 Parliamentary Allowances Bill, *com.* (amount of allowance), 1999
 Post and Telegraph Department :
 Expenditure, *supply*, 10244
 Mauger, Mr., as Acting Postmaster-General, *q.*, 158
 Retiring Age, *supply*, 10241
 Royal Commission, *supply*, 10458
 Stamp, Commonwealth, *supply*, 10243
 Postal Service :
 Broken Hill, *supply*, 5792
 Inspectors, *supply*, 5792
 Temporary Employés, *supply*, 10241-2
 Prayers in Parliament, *q.*, 5782
 Preferential Trade, *address*, 201-5
 Preferential Trade (Tariff), 4544, 4576, 4948
 Prime Minister, Actions of, in England, *address*, 198-205
 Public Service :
 Classification, *supply*, 5791
 Transferred Officers, *supply*, 5791
 Seat of Government Bill, *q.*, 11703
 Secret Drugs, Cures, and Foods, *q.*, 80, 647, 772, 879, 880, 1516, 4519, 4649, 4842, 4926, 5129, 5497, 6023, 6355, 8815, 10309, 11521; *m.*, 883, 897, 1510, 1749, 1975
 Shipping Combine, alleged, *adj. (expl.)*, 3955, 3959
 State Importations, New Zealand, *q.*, 5802
 Supply :
 Postmaster-General : (Central Staff), 10240, 10249
 Supply Bill (No. 3), *m.*, 5791
 Supply Bill (No. 4), *m.*, 6281

Thomas, Hon. J.—*continued.*

Tariff :
 Address, 195, 205-6
 Budget, 2676-83
 Kerosene Duties, *q.*, 7298
 Lead, rebate, *q.*, 6421
 New Protection, Budget, 2678
 Order of Consideration, *m.*, 4627
 Wire Netting, Budget, 2678, 2683
 Tariff Resolutions (Customs) :
 Bags, &c., 5645
 Candles, 4948
 Cartridges, 7382
 Curtains and Blinds, *cons. req.*, 11438, 11442
 Engines, &c., 6713
 Fireworks, 7382
 Fruits and Vegetables, 5278
 Fuse, 7389
 Glucose, 4627
 Marine Engines, 6655
 Mining Engines, &c., 6786
 Motive Power Machinery, 6662
 Newspaper, 7209, 7212
 Paper and Stationery, 7238
 Piece Goods, 5841, 5843, 5855
 Rice, 5531
 Timber, &c., 7022, 7072, 7084, *cons. req.* (*p.o.* 11027), 11122, 11147
 Weighing Machines, 6628
 Wire Netting, 4544, 4572, 4576
 Works of Art, *cons. req.*, 11576
 (*See* Customs Tariff Bill)
 Telegraphs and Telephones :
 Toll System, *supply*, 10242, 10240-50
 Walpole, Mr. R. S., *q.*, 11018, 11019

Thomson, Hon. Dugald, North Sydney :

Advertising Resources of Australia, *supply*, 9515, 9606
 Australian Industries Preservation Bill, 2R., 9114; *com.* (definition), 9130, 9131; (answers to questions), 9227; 3R., 9588
 Australians, repatriation of, *supply*, 11359
 Board of Trade Correspondents, *q.*, 4957
 Bounties Bill, *cons. amts.*, 6404
 Business, Order of, *m.*, 10126-7
 Commonwealth Salaries Bill, *com.* (Taxation by States), 3881, 3894
 "Counsels of the Empire," speech, by Mr. Deakin, *q.*, 5803
 Customs Tariff Bill, *cons. req.*, (sago, &c.), 10497; (stearine), 10505; (liquorice), 10517, 10518; (vegetables), 10520; (matches), 10547, 10548, 10550, 10551, 10552; (tea), 10560; (apparel), 10567; (gloves), 10579, 11460; (hats, &c.), 10585; (piece goods), 10628, 11528; (waddings, &c.), 10634, 10635, 10637; (arms, &c.), 10657, 10659; (cutlery), 10672, 10674; (motive power machinery), 10682; (aluminium goods), 10707; (locks), 10789, 10797; (standards, &c.), 10801; (wheels), 10804; (electrical and gas appliances), 10744, 11546; (oils), (*p.o.*, 10884), 10885, 10897, 10912, 10995; (roofing tiles), 10900, 10902; (furniture), 11012; (timber), 11028, 11148, 11149, 11567, 11572; (talking machines, &c.), 11066; (catalogues, &c.), 11071; (directories, &c.), 11079, 11452; (advertisements, &c.), 11080, 11081, 11083; (printing ink), 11095, 11567, 11572; (light-pausrohpapier), 11170; (machinery, rebate for

Thomson, Hon. Dugald—*continued.*

home consumption), 11203; (curtains and blinds), 11441; (electrical machinery), 11448, *p.o.*, 11149; (pulley blocks), 10681; *p.o.*, 11539-41. (*See* Tariff Resolutions (Customs).)

Decimal Coinage, *q.*, 11325-6

Defence :
 Naval Policy, *supply*, 11471
 Supplies, preference to Great Britain, *supply*, 10082; *q.*, 10608
 Vote for, *supply*, 11274

Disputed Elections and Qualifications Bill, *q.*, 6095

Electoral Rolls, *q.*, 1506

Estimates, Additional, *supply*, 11272, 11300, 11359, 11374

Excise Procedure Bill, *2R.*, 7480

Excise Tariff Acts, standard of wages, *q.*, 6096

Expenditure, Commonwealth, *supply*, 9405, 9957-61, 9974, 11272

Federal Capital, *q.*, 9475; *supply*, 9887. (*See* Seat of Government Bill)

Finance, Federal, *supply*, 11272

Financial Relations, Commonwealth and States, *q.*, 11785, 11786

Fire Insurance Bill, *2R.*, 1608

Freeman and Wallace, *m.*, 10126-7; *supply*, *m.*, 11351

German Islands, Pacific, *q.*, 6813, 7250

Honorary Minister's Expenses, *supply*, 9483, 9487

Immigration, *supply*, 9515, 9606

Imports, Classification of, *supply*, 9995

Invalid and Old-age Pensions Bill, *2R.*, 11959; *com.* (who may receive pensions), 11964, 11967. (*See* Old-age Pensions.)

Iron Bounties Bill, *q.*, 5691

Labour Caucus, *q.*, *p.o.*, 10968

Labour Party, Mr. Watson's resignation of leadership, 5327

Mail Service to Europe, *q.*, 4623, 6229; *m.*, 6435, 6440; (*p.o.*, 6501)

Manufactures Encouragement Bill, *2R.*, (*p.o.*, 6235); *com.* (schedule), 12179

Navigation Bill, *q.*, 9192

New Hebrides, *supply*, 9415

Officers Compensation Bill, *cons. mes.*, 7499

Old-age Pensions, *supply*, 9326. (*See* Invalids and Old-age Pensions Bill)

Opium, sale of, *q.*, 3970

Paner, Government tenders, *q.*, 10081

Papua, *q.*, 10965, 11422

Parliament :
 Library, *supply*, 11300
 Reflections on, *obs.*, 10995

Parliamentary Witnesses Bill, *com.* (refusing to be sworn), 12075

Post and Telegraph Department :
 Revenue and Expenditure, *m.*, 9954
 Speech by Secretary, *q.*, 9092
 Stamps, Printing of, *supply*, 9974
 Vote for, *supply*, 11274

Preferential Trade (Tariff), 5068

Public Service Bill, *2R.*, 12064

Quarantine Bill, *com.* proclamation of ports), 1552

Quarantine, *supply*, 9084

Railway Gauge, Uniform, *q.*, 9208

Repatriation, *supply*, 11159

Seat of Government Bill, *2R.*, 10361. (*See* Federal Capital)

Thomson, Hon. Dugald—*continued.*

Shipping, differential treatment of, *q.*, 11790, 11921

Supply :
 Defence : (Central Administration), 10082
 External Affairs (Administrative), 9405, 9415; (Executive Council), 9483, 9487; (Miscellaneous), 9515, 9606
 Home Affairs (Census and Statistics), 9879; (Miscellaneous), 9887
 Parliament (Library), 11300
 Treasury (The Treasury), 9957; (Government Printer), 9974; (incidental expenses), 11374
 Trade and Customs (Quarantine), 9984; (South Australia), 9995
 Works and Buildings (Home Affairs), 11407; (Defence), 11411

Surplus Revenue Bill, *2R.*, 11727

Tariff :
 Alterations, List of, *q.*, 6834
 Kerosene Duties, *q.*, 7299, 7458
 New Protection, *supply*, 4009, 4010, 4130, 4134
 Senate's Requests, *q.*, 10079
 Tartaric Acid, *q.*, 11098

Tariff Resolutions (Customs) :
 Acetic acid, &c., 6409
 Advertisements, 7194; *cons. req.*, 11080, 11081, 11083
 Agricultural, &c., Machinery, 6054, 6559, 6561, 6563, 6575, 6581, 6589
 Ale, Porter, and other Beer (*p.o.*, 4006-7), 4009, 4010, 4130, 4134
 Aluminium Goods, *cons. req.*, 10707
 Ammonia, condenser coils, &c., 6113
 Antimony, 6830
 Apparel, 5625; *cons. req.*, 10567
 Arms, 6033, 6037; *cons. req.*, 10657, 10659
 Bags, &c., *m.*, to report, 5730, 5734
 Bags, baskets, &c., 7359
 Barbed wire, 6830
 Biscuits, 4776
 Blacking, &c., 6854, 6855
 Boats, &c., 7359, 7360
 Bottle stoppers, 6935
 Bottles, empty, 6930
 Candles, 5068
 Canvas and duck, 5930
 Casks, &c., 7131
 Catalogues, &c., 7171, 7172, 7177, 7179, 7187; *cons. req.*, 11071
 Cigarettes, 4304
 Coffee, 5262
 Confectionery, &c., 5159, 5172, 5234, 5241, 5257, 5259
 Corks, 7379, 7381
 Curled hair, &c., 7359
 Curtains and Blinds, *cons. req.*, 11441
 Cutlery, *cons. req.*, 10672, 10674
 Cylinders, 6114
 Directories, &c., 7189; *cons. req.*, 11079, 11452
 Droppers, 6831
 Electrical and Gas Appliances, 6808, 6809; *cons. req.*, 10744, 11546
 Electrical Machinery, *cons. req.*, 11448; (*p.o.*, 11449)
 Engines, &c., 6706, 6708
 Fancy goods, 7140
 Fish, 5267
 Fishing nets, &c., 7374
 Fruits and vegetables, 5279
 Furniture, *cons. req.*, 11012

Thomson, Hon. Dugald—*continued.*

Tariff Resolutions (Customs)—*continued.*

Glass, polished, &c., 6921
 Gloves, 5939; *cons. req.*, 10579, 11460
 Glue, &c., 6950
 Governors, importations for, 7403, 7406
 Grain and pulse, 5350, 5357
 Hats, &c., 5947; *cons. req.*, 10585
 Iron and steel tubes, 6112
 Iron and steel, 6841
 Iron, plate and sheet, 6530
 Jewellery, 7149
 Lamps, &c., 6043, 6047, 6048
 Lasts and Trees, 7126
 Lead, 6050
 Leather manufactures, 7166
 Licht-pausrohpapier, *cons. req.*, 11170, 11171, 11172
 Liquorice, *cons. req.*, 10517, 10518
 Locks, *cons. req.*, 10789, 10797
 Machinery, rebate for home consumption, *cons. req.*, 11203
 Machinery and parts, 6102
 Machinery and Machines and Machine Tools, 6740, 6745
 Manures, 7370
 Matches, 5446; *cons. req.*, 10547, 10548, 10550, 10551, 10552
 Meats, &c., 5455
 Milk, 5509, 5519
 Milling silk, 5929
 Motive power machinery, *cons. req.*, 10682
 Motor cars, &c., 7293
 Nails, 6596, 6607, 6612, 6619
 Naphthalene, 6977
 Oils, 6861, 6863; *cons. req.* (*p.o.*, 10884, 10885), 10897, 10912, 10995
 Paints and colours, 6883, 6885, 6888, 6889, 6890
 Paper and stationery, 7215, 7219, 7223, 7242
 Pianos, 7351
 Piece Goods, 5806, 5852; *cons. req.*, 10628; (*p.o.*, 11528)
 Plates, &c., 6830
 Potatoes, 5343
 Potato flour, 5345
 Printing, &c., inks, 7244, 7261; *cons. req.*, 11095
 Pulley blocks, &c., *cons. req.*, 10686, 11539-41
 Rails, &c., 6820, 6826
 Rennet liquid, 5462
 Roofing tiles, &c., 6906, 6908; *cons. req.*, 10900, 10902
 Saccharin, 6973
 Saddlers' Webs, &c., 5929
 Sago, *cons. req.*, 10497
 Salt, &c., 5535, 5536, 5542
 Sausage casings, 5459
 Saws, &c., 6748, 6750
 Scrap iron, &c., 6832
 Screws, 6771
 Stained Glass Windows, 6919
 Standards, &c., *cons. req.*, 10801
 Stearine, &c., 5141; *cons. req.*, 10505
 Stone and marble, 6964
 Strawboard, 7224
 Sugar, 4688, 4762
 Tanks, 6621
 Talking machines, &c., *cons. req.*, 11066
 Tea, (*p.o.*, 5465); *cons. req.*, 11066
 Tents, &c., 5938
 Textiles, &c., *n.e.i.*, 5633, 5634

Thomson, Hon. Dugald—*continued.*

Tariff Resolutions (Customs)—*continued.*

Timber, &c., 7032, 7068, 7085, 7096, 7097, 7104, 7107, 7108; *cons. req.*, 11028, 11148, 11149, 11567, 11572
 Tin plates, 6116, 6833
 Tobacco, 4241
 Varnishes, 6893
 Vegetables, dried, &c., 5341; *cons. req.*, 10520
 Waddings, &c., 5927; *cons. req.*, 10634, 10635, 10637
 Weighing machines, 6629
 Wheels, *cons. req.*, 10804
 Wire cloth, &c., 6833
 (*See Customs Tariff Bill.*)
 Tariff Resolutions (Excise):
 Cigarettes, 4312, 4313
 Glucose, 4643
 Saccharin, 5557
 Telegraphs and Telephones:
 Metallic Circuits, &c., 6725
 Wires, undergrounding, *supply*, 11407
 Tenders, public, British preference, *supply*, 10082; &c., 10608, 11525, 11703, 12198
 Transferred Properties, &c., 11921
 Transferred Services, revenue and expenditure, *m.*, 11709
 Victoria, Population, &c., 10525

Thomson, Mr. John, *Courper*:

Bounties Bill, *com.* (specification of bounties), 1061; First Schedule (coffee), 1209
 Butter Boxes, &c., 6591
 Butter Grading, &c., 1413
 Defence:
 Military Instruction, &c., 2123
 Estimates, Additional, 11392
 Grain Bags, &c., 7414
 Iron Industry, &c., 11420
 Mails, Conveyance of, &c., 1595
 Manufactures Encouragement Bill, &c., 11742
 New Hebrides, &c., 10700
 New Protection (Tariff):
 Tobacco, 4290
 Postal Service:
 Contract Offices, *supply*, 11392-3
 Reclassification, &c., 10875
 Postal Votes, &c., 1181
 Preferential Trade (Tariff), 4950, 4968
 Public Service:
 Allowances, Special, *supply*, 11392
 Undermanning, Customs, &c., 11624
 Quarantine Bill, *com.* (fumigation of vessels), 1621
 Shipping Combine, alleged, *adj.*, 3956
 Supply:
 Postmaster-General (offices and lines), 11392
 Tariff:
 Timber, Butter-box, &c., 2564
 Tariff Resolutions (Customs):
 Agricultural, &c., Machinery, 6579
 Candles, 4950, 4955, 4968, 5081, 5132
 Fishing nets, &c., 7374, 7375
 Furniture, 7018
 Hats, &c., 5962
 Iron, plate and sheet, 6542
 Piece goods, 5921
 Timber, &c., 7048, 7071, 7085, 7091
 Tobacco, 4289
 Telegraphs and Telephones:
 Delays in delivery of telegrams, &c., 5328
 Lines, maintenance, *supply*, 11392

Trenwith, Senator Hon. W. A., Victoria:

Additional Appropriation (Works and Buildings) Bill, *com.*, schedule (Defence), 11693
 Address-in-Reply, *m.*, 376-8
 Adjournment, Special, *m.*, 7788
 Agricultural Implement Makers' Union, *adj.*, 5496
 Bills of Exchange Bill, *com.* (application of State laws), 673, 1590; (presentment of cheque for payment), 2058, 2410; (protection of banker), 2108, 2206; (States duty stamps), 2287; (post dated cheques), 2298
 Bounties Bill, *com.* (notice of conditions), 2780; (regulations), 2851, 2852, 2859; *com.*, first schedule (cotton), 2870, 2871; (jute), 3166, 3167, 3258; (mohair), 3374; (rice), 3488; (coffee), 3708; (tobacco), 4901; *cons. mes.*, 6412
 Coast Defence Appropriation Bill, *2r.*, 12112
 Commonwealth Salaries Bill, *com.* (taxation by State), 1052
 Customs Tariff Bill, *m.*, 11587; *com.* (schedule):
 Ammonia, 9242; (*p.o.*, 9245, 9246, 9251)
 Animals, 7657
 Apparel, &c., 8202
 Artificial Plants, &c., 8352
 Bananas, 7871
 Bicycles, &c., 9818
 Biscuits, 7680
 Blue, 7688
 Boots, &c., 9663
 Carbide of calcium, 9266
 Coffee, 7772
 Combs, &c., 9653
 Confectionery, 7724
 Electrical, &c., appliances, 8890
 Electrical machinery, &c., 8802
 Fish, 7803
 Furniture, 9357
 Furs, &c., 8290
 Gloves, *cons. req.*, 10931
 Glue, 8502, 8511
 Grain and Pulse, prepared (*p.o.*, 7902), 7909
 Hats, &c., 8311, 8319, 8320
 Insecticides, &c., 9288
 Leather, 9676
 Liquid Removers of Paint, &c., 8473
 Machinery, &c., 8706
 Matches, 7965, 7984
 Meats, &c., 8015
 Milk, *expl.*, 8026
 Motive power machinery (*p.o.*, 8649)
 Nails, 8601, 8609
 Nuts, 8034
 Oilmen's Stores, 8042, 8048, 8060
 Oils, 8429, 8448
 Onions, 7886
 Paints, &c., 8466
 Paper, writing and typing, 9799
 Piece Goods, 8168, 8172, 8181
 Printing Ink, 9804
 Printing Roller Composition, 8525
 Pulley Blocks, &c., *cons. req.*, 10939
 Rails, Fishplates, &c., *cons. req.*, 10957
 Rice, 8070
 Salt, 8002
 Spices, 8099
 Socks, &c., 8341
 Spectacles, frames, &c., 9659
 Steel wheels, 9186
 Strawboard, 9748, 9756

Trenwith, Senator Hon. W. A.—continued.

Customs Tariff Bill (Schedule)—*continued.*
 Tallow, &c., 8385
 Tanks, 8615
 Tea, 8111
 Timber, 9463, 9548; (*p.o.*, 9550); *cons. req.*, 11244, 11256, 11602
 Tool Handles, 9636
 Type, &c., 8768
 Vegetables, dried, &c., 7875, 7877
 Wine, Sparkling, 7629
 Wire-netting, 9165
 Wood Articles, 9578
 Defence:
 Small-arms Factory, *supply*, 11693
 Disputed Elections and Qualifications Bill, *com.* (powers of Court), 5662; *recom.* (reference of question), 5985
 Dissent from Ruling: Admissibility of Request (Customs Tariff Bill), *m.*, 9251; (Excise Tariff Bill), *m.*, 10023
 Excise Tariff Bill, *com.*, Schedule: (confectionery), *p.o.*, 10023-4
 Imperial Conference, *address*, 376-8
 Invalid and Old-age Pensions Bill, *2r.*, 12014
 Judiciary Bill, *com.* (appeals from State Courts), 945
 Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway Survey Bill, *2r.* (*p.o.*), 1025-6-7; *com.* (power to make survey), 1487
 Officers Compensation Bill, *2r.*, 10054; *com.* (J. Wilson), 10068
 Order of Business, *m.*, 34
 Parliament House, Entertainment of Strangers, *q.*, 6059
 Parliamentary Papers Bill, *com.* (no action for publication), 12133
 Parliamentary Witnesses Bill, *com.* (resisting apprehension), 765
 Preferential Trade, *address*, 377-8
 Prime Minister, Actions of, in England, *address*, 377
 Printing Committee, *m.*, 2283
 Privilege, Procedure, Select Committee, *m.*, 10006
 Quarantine Bill, *com.* (arrangements with State), 5307; (Proclamation of ports), 5397, 5482; (animals), 6066; (liability of owners for expenses), 6071, 6076, 6081; (persons able to support themselves), 6218; (vaccination), 6224
 Senate, Rights of, *m.*, 11587
 Standing Orders, Amendment of, *adj.*, 2622
 Standing Orders Committee, *m.*, 36
 Supply Bill (No. 2), *com.* (issue and application), 1945
 Supply Bill (No. 4), *1r.*, 6332
 Tariff:
 Debate, duration of, *adj.*, 7564
 Tobacco Combine, *m.s.o.*, 3051; (*p.o.*, 3053); *m.*, 3059
 Wages Boards, *supply*, 6332-3

Tudor, Hon. F. G., Yarra:
 Address-in-Reply, *m.*, 336
 Advertising Resources of Australia, *supply*, 9618
 Bounties Bill, *com.*, first schedule (tobacco leaf), 1227; (fish), 1301
 Budget, 3296
 Chinese Immigration, *address*, 336
 Coastal Steamers, *q.*, 928

Tudor, Hon. F. G.—*continued.*

Commerce Act, *address*, 336
Corio Division, Irregularities at General Election, *q.*, 194
Customs Tariff Bill, *cons. reg.* (gloves), 10578; (hats, &c.), 10580, 10591, 10618; (socks, &c.), 10646, 10651; (manufactures of metals), 10706; (wire), 10808; (*p.o.*, 10811), 10812; (furniture), 11012; (leather), 11070; (catalogues), 11075; (directories), 11078, 11456; (card-board), 11091; (timber), 11149; (electrical machinery), 11446. (*See* Tariff Resolutions (Customs))

Defence:

Area for Manœuvring and Artillery Practice, *supply*, 3454
Enlistment, *q.*, 4748
Lang, Bombardier, *q.*, 2313

Electoral:

Amendment of Law, *address*, 342-3
Officials as Returning Officers, *m.*, 707
Rolls, *q.*, 11259

Election Expenses Reimbursement Bill, *com.* (Appropriation), 12197

Employers' Federation of Victoria, *address*, 336-7

Excise Tariff (Agricultural Machinery) Act, *q.*, 4748, 4926; *adj.*, 6366, 12166; *q.*, 7115. (*See* New Protection)

Expenditure in Excess of Votes, *supply*, 3544

Factory Legislation, Tasmania, *address*, 341-2

Government Printing Office, *q.*, 6812

Grain Bags, size of, *q.*, 9845

Immigration Restriction Act, *address*, 336

Immigration, *supply*, 9618

Invalid and Old-age Pensions Bill, *com.* (invalid), 11978. (*See* Old-age Pensions)

Iron Ore, exportation, *q.*, 6407

Labour Party, *address*, 339-41

Mails:

Service to Europe, *m.*, *expl.*, 606; *m.*, *p.o.*, 6501

Manufactures Encouragement Bill, *com.* (schedule), 12178

National Physique, School Inspection, *q.*, 3302, 3585, 3972

New Protection, *q.*, 2843, 5328, 7116. (*See* Excise Tariff, &c.)

New Protection (Tariff):

Tobacco, 4287

Officers Compensation Bill, *cons. mes.*, 7499

Old-age Pensions, *address*, 338; *supply*, 9324; *q.*, 12038. (*See* Invalid and Old-age Pensions Bill)

Papua, Solomon Island, and New Hebrides, *q.*, 3508

Patriot, Western Australia, *address*, 338-40

Piano Industry, *q.*, 11261

Post Offices:

Contract Offices, *supply*, 3523, 3528

Cue Postmaster, *q.*, 6406

Expenditure, *supply*, 3523

Hawthorn, *supply*, 3527

Melbourne, *supply*, 3523, 3527-8, 3536

Northam, *supply*, 3535

Sydney, *supply*, 3523, 3527

Postal Service:

Boy Labour, Shepparton, *q.*, 1412

Boy Letter-carriers, *q.*, 504, 1181

Deputy Postmaster-General, Victoria, *supply*, 4854

Overtime, *q.*, 2313

Parcels Delivery, *q.*, 11424, 11628, 11794

Promotions, Victoria, *q.*, 4842

Tudor, Hon. F. G.—*continued.*

Preferential Trade (Tariff), 4571, 5079

Printing Office, Government, *supply*, 3592-3

Public Service:

Examinations, *q.*, 7459

Increments, *adj.*, 3298; *q.*, 6812

Repatriated Australians, *adj.*, 1326

Starch Workers' Conditions, *address*, 337

States' Officers, Services by, *supply*, 9728

Sugar Excise Act, *q.*, 3173

Sugar Industry, *address*, 338, 342

Supply:

Attorney General (High Court), 9728

External Affairs (Administration), 9482; (Miscellaneous), 9618

Works and Buildings (Trade and Customs), 3441; (defence, Tasmania), 3454; (post and telegraph, New South Wales), 3509, 3523; (post and telegraph, Victoria), 3527; (post and telegraph, Western Australia), 3535; (telegraphs and telephones, New South Wales), 3543; (Treasury), 3592

Supply Bill (No. 2), *m.*, 1790

Tariff:

Comparative columns, *q.*, 1747

Comparative table of rates, *q.*, 2791, 2889

Harvesters, *q.*, 1748

Index, *q.*, 1714

Kerosene Duties, *q.*, 7299

Order of consideration, *m.*, 4347

Wire Netting, precedence to item, *m.*, 4347

Tariff Resolutions (Customs):

Acetic Acid, &c., 6669

Agricultural, &c., machinery, 6552, 6559

Ale, Porter, &c., (*p.o.*, 3296), 3296

Arms, 6035

Bags, &c., 5643, 5646

Bananas, 5339

Bicycles, &c., 7272

Blacking, &c., 6847

Blankets, &c., 5728

Boats, &c., 7359

Cameras, &c., 7394

Candles, 5079

Cardboard, *cons. reg.*, 11091

Catalogues, &c., *cons. reg.*, 11075

Confectionery, &c., 5167, 5246, 5259

Cosies and cushions, 5739

Crust or Rough-tanned Goat Skins, 7168

Cycle parts, &c., 7283, 7284, 7454

Directories, &c., *cons. reg.*, 11078 11456

Dry Plates, 7396

Electrical Machinery, *cons. reg.*, 11446

Fancy Goods, 7140, 7142

Furniture, &c., 7007; *cons. reg.*, 11012

Glass, bevelled, &c., 6914

Glass, polished, &c., 6921, 6922

Gloves, *cons. reg.*, 10578

Glucose, 4631

Glue, &c., 6949

Grain and pulse, 5351

Hats and Caps, 5941, 5959; *cons. reg.*, 10580, 10591, 10618

Inks, &c., for Leather, 7399

Insecticides, &c., 6979

Jewellery, 7143, 7148, 7149

Leather, 7166, 7168; *cons. reg.*, 11070

Machinery and parts, 6104

Manufactures of Metals, *cons. reg.*, 10706

Matches, 5452

Oilmen's Stores, 5524

Paints and Colours, 6892

Paper and Stationery, 7235, 7240

Tudor, Hon. F. G.—continued.

Tariff Resolutions (Customs)—continued.

- Parasols, &c., 7454
- Perambulators, &c., bodies, 7283
- Piece goods, 5851, 5925
- Printing, &c., inks, 7244, 7253
- Rice, 5527
- Rubber Manufactures, 7162
- Shooks, 7136
- Socks and Stockings, 5933, 5935; *cons. reg.*, 10646, 10651
- Stained Glass Windows, 6914
- Stearine, &c., 5144
- Stone and Marble, 6959, 6964, 6965
- Tea, 5464
- Textiles, &c., n.e.i., 5632
- Timber, &c., 7072, 7098, 7102, 7103, 7106; *cons. reg.* 11149
- Tobacco, 4217, 4287
- Wire Cloth, &c., 6833
- Wire, *cons. reg.*, 10808; (*p.o.*, 10811), 10812
- Wire Netting, 4571
- Yarns, 7377

(See Customs Tariff Bill)

Tariff Resolutions (Excise) :

- Budget, *m.*, 3296
- Cigarettes, 4320, 4324
- Glucose, 4639
- Saccharin, 5558
- Starch, 5548, 5552
- Sugar, 4766
- Tobacco, 4306
- Telegraphs and Telephones :
- Line Repairers, &c., test, *q.*, 12152
- Operators, telegraph, *q.*, 4519, 4843
- Supplementary lists, telephone, *q.* 11743
- Telephone Charges, Melbourne suburbs, *q.*, 2348; *supply*, 3509, 3527, 3544; Mileage Rates, *q.*, 6726
- Trunk Telephone Rates, *q.*, 501, 590, 975; *supply*, 3544
- Trawler, Steam, *q.*, 3301; *supply*, 3441

Turley, Senator H., Queensland :

- Additional Appropriation Bill, *com.*, schedule (External Affairs), 11617; (Electoral), 11620
- Advertising Australia, *supply*, 5896
- Appropriation (Works and Buildings) Bill, *com.*, schedule (Defence), 3934, 4038
- Australian Industries Preservation Bill, 2R., 4600; *com.* (burden of proof), 5041; (*p.o.*, 5044-5); *ad. rep.*, 5178
- Bills of Exchange Bill, *com.* (protest), 2418
- Bounties Bill, *com.* (appropriation), 2767; (jute), 3264; (copra), 3401; (rice), 3488; (rubber), 3565, 3570; (tobacco), 3730; *recom.* (tobacco), 4904
- Coal Combine, alleged, *adj.*, 3703
- Coast Defence Appropriation Bill, 2R., 12117
- Customs Tariff Bill, *com.* Schedule :
- Carbide of Calcium, 9264
- Peel, 7834
- Stone and Marble, 8551
- Timber, 9444, 9451, 9469, 9472, 9545; *cons. reg.*, 11249, 11308, 11605
- Yarns, 9920
- Defence :
- Establishment, *supply*, 3934
- Rifle Range : Toowong, *supply*, 4038; Brisbane, *supply*, 4039
- Electoral Rolls, *supply*, 11620; *q.*, 11983

Turley, Senator H.—continued.

- Excise Procedure Bill, *com.* (legal representation), 5122
- Immigration, *q.*, 650, 1929; *m.*, 2055; *supply*, 5896, 5901
- Invalid and Old-age Pensions Bill, 2R., 12019
- Judiciary Bill, *com.* (appeals from State Courts), 952
- Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway Survey Bill, 2R., 1161; *com.* (power to make survey), 1478
- Land Settlement, *supply*, 5896-5901
- Mails :
- Service to Europe, *q.*, 6294, 6297, 6408, 6410
- Officers' Compensation Bill, *com.* (S. Burnett), 10069; (short title), 10070
- Order of Business, *adj.*, 693
- Quarantine Bill, 2R., 5285; *com.* (proclamation of ports), 5491
- Repatriation, *supply*, 11617
- Senate Election, South Australia, *m.*, 4834
- St. Ledger, Senator, personal explanation, *adj.*, 11910
- Sugar-cane Fields, Queensland, *q.*, 5175, 5284
- Supply Bill (No. 2), *com.* (issue and application), 1040
- Supply Bill (No. 3), *com.* (schedule), External Affairs, 5896
- Supply Bill (No. 4), *com.* (schedule), 6348

Yardon, Senator J., South Australia :

- Additional Appropriation (Works and Buildings) Bill, 2R., 11690; *com.*, schedule (Defence), 11695
- Appropriation Bill, *com.* (Home Affairs), 10305, 10306
- Coast Defence Appropriation Bill, *com.* (appropriation), 12127
- Customs Tariff Bill, Schedule :
- Ammonia, 9242, 9244
- Antimony, 9171
- Bicycles, &c., 9821
- Blankets, Printing, 9946
- Electrical and Gas Appliances, *cons. reg.*, 10948, 11597
- Electrotypes, &c., 9169
- Furniture, 9369
- Goods brought back, 9946
- Hay and Chaff, *cons. reg.*, 10864
- Insecticides, &c., 9284, 9290; *cons. reg.*, 11240
- Leather, &c., 9677
- Manures, 9914
- Naphthaline, 9275
- Oils, *cons. reg.*, 11223, 11232
- Paper, n.e.i., 9758
- Paper, Manufactures of, 9681, 9802
- Paper Patterns, 9810
- Paper, Printed, 9745
- Pianos, 9840
- Printing Ink, 9805
- Spectacles and Frames, &c., 9659
- Stearine, *cons. reg.*, 10854
- Strawboard, 9756
- Wicker, Bamboo, &c., n.e.i., 9570
- Wire Netting, 9103
- Wood Articles, 9573, 9574, 9576
- Defence :
- Drill Halls, *supply*, 11690
- Small Arms and Cordite Factories, *supply*, 11695

Vardon, Senator J.—continued.

Excise Tariff Bill, *com.*, Schedule : (Glucose), 10039
 Harvesters, Price of, *q.*, 10919, 11220
 Invalid and Old-age Pensions Bill, *2R.*, 12025; *com.* (commencement), 12026; (who may receive pensions), 12027; (necessary conditions), 12033; (investigation by Registrar), 12036
 Northern Territory, *adj.*, 9741
 Parliamentary Papers Bill, *2R.*, 12130
 Petition, Printing of, *m.*, 10251
 Postal Service :
 Mitchell, South Australia., *q.*, 9632
 Post and Telegraph Department :
 Administration, *adj.*, 9533
 Cabinet Committee, *adj.*, 9533; *q.*, 11580
 Statistical Branch, *supply*, 10305, 10306
 Surplus Revenue Bill, *2R.*, 11805; *com.* (commencement), 11906

Walker, Senator Hon. J. T., New South Wales:

Acts and Documents, *q.*, 6061
 Address-in-Reply, *m.*, 59
 Advertising the Commonwealth, *supply*, 5886
 Adjournment, Early, *m.*, 487
 Appropriation (Works and Buildings) Bill, *2R.*, 3817; *com.*, schedule (telegraphs and telephones), 4049; (Government Printing Office), 4055; (Commonwealth Offices, London), 4063; *3R.*, 4144
 Australian Industries Preservation Bill, *2R.*, 4513; *com.* (burden of proof, &c.), 4914, 4923, 5016, 5040; *ad. rep.*, 5181
 Bills of Exchange Bill, *2R.*, 663; *com.* (indorsement in blank and special indorsement), 748; (presentment of cheque for payment), 750, 2056, 2058, 2060, 2410, 2412; (protection of banker), 751, 754, 2201; (protest when notary not accessible), 760; (bank holidays), 2210; (second schedule), 2284; (State stamp duty), 2293; (post-dated cheques), 2297, 2298; (alteration of promissory note), 2299, 2300; *recom.* (presentation of cheque for payment), 2414
 Bounties, *address*, 59-60
 Bounties Bill, *2R.*, 2761; *com.*, first schedule, (cotton), 2864, 2871, 3069; (New Zealand flax), 3076; (coffee), 3707; (tobacco), (*p.o.*, 4161; 4164); (fish), 4263; (wool tops), 4386, 6391; *ad. rep.*, 4585
 Commonwealth Salaries Bill, *com.* (Taxation by States), 1051, 1583, 1584
 Defence :
 Military School, *q.*, 4143
 Naval Agreement, *address*, 60
 Rifle Matches, Sydney, *q.*, 5083, 5283, 6189
 Direct Taxation, *supply*, 3817
 Dominion of New Zealand, *q.*, 3795
 Excise Procedure Bill, *com.* (exclusion of lawyers), 5126
 Federal Capital, *address*, 61-2; *q.*, 2844-5; *supply*, 3817
 Financial Relations, Commonwealth and States, *address*, 60; *supply*, 3817, 6313-4
 First President of the Senate, *m.*, 3366
 Government Printing Office, Victoria, *supply*, 4055
 High Commissioner, *address*, 60-1; *q.*, 3797 (see London Offices)
 High Court as Final Court of Appeal, *address*, 61

Walker, Senator Hon. J. T.—continued.

Immigration : Encouragement, *address*, 62; *q.*, 3900
 Imperial Conference, *address*, 59
 Income Tax : Federal Salaries and Allowances, *address*, 61
 Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway, *address*, 62
 Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway Survey Bill, *2R.*, 1359; (*p.o.*, 1032); *com.* (appropriation of moneys), 1510
 Kanakas : Repatriation, *address*, 61; *supply*, 5886
 London Offices of Commonwealth, *supply*, 3817, 4063, 4144; *q.*, 4706, 5177, 5857 (see High Commissioner)
 Mails :
 Mail Contract, cancelled, *address*, 61; *q.*, 249, 649, 3558
 Map of Australia, *supply*, 6351
 Maranoa Farmers' Association, *expl.*, 500
 Navigation Conference, *address*, 59
 New Guinea, *address*, 61, 62
 New Hebrides, *address*, 62-3; *q.*, 4245, 4708; *supply*, 5886
 Northern Territory, *address*, 60; *q.*, 3145
 Order of Business, *adj.*, 693
 Pair Book, Entries, *m.*, 3503
 Parliamentary Allowances Bill, *2R.*, 2080
 Post Offices :
 Early Closing, *q.*, 6409
 Preferential Voting, *address*, 61
 Prime Minister, Actions of in England, *address*, 59
 Quarantine Bill, *address*, 62; *2R.*, 5203; *com.* (arrangements with States), 5305, 5307; (proclamation of ports), 5306; (other persons prohibited from quitting vessel), 6002; (release), 6005; (goods), 6062; (power to destroy animals), 6069; (liability of owners for expenses), 6071, 6079
 Standing Orders, Amendment of, *adj.*, 2623
 Supply Bill (No. 2), *com.*, Defence : (Central Administration), 1949
 Supply Bill (No. 3), *com.* (schedule), External Affairs, 5886
 Supply Bill (No. 4), *1R.*, 6313
 Tariff :
 Address, 59, 62
 Vacancy in Senate, South Australia, *address*, 63
 Wireless Telegraphy, *supply*, 4049, 6313

Watkins, Hon. D., Newcastle:

Advertising Australia, *supply*, 1794-5
 Coal Miners' Strike, *q.*, 6024
 Commonwealth and States, relations, *q.*, 9582
 Customs Tariff Bill, *cons. req.* (stearine), 10511; (fish), 10519; (gloves), 10577; (arms, &c.), 10656; (electrical machines), (*p.o.*, 10733; (locks), 10776; (wheels), 10804, 10806; (oils), 10883. (See Tariff Resolutions (Customs).)
 Defence :
 Adamstown Rifle Range, *q.*, 10077
 Cordite Factory, *supply*, 3738
 Dismissals, Militia, *q.*, 9581
 Harbor Defence, *q.*, 9479
 Long Service Medals, *q.*, 9953, 10462
 Musketry Returns, *q.*, 3734, 3972
 Re-boring Rifles, *q.*, 9479

Watkins, Hon. D.—continued.

Discharged Coal Miners, Victoria, *q.*, 2233
 Federal Capital, *q.*, 10131
 Immigration, *q.*, 771, 928, 1087, 1231, 1281, 1413; *adj.*, 930; *supply*, 1793-5
 Insurance Companies, *q.*, 12158
 Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway, *q.*, 9191, 9388
 Mail Contract, cancelled, *q.*, 352
 Maitland Coal Miners, *q.*, 8812
 Old-age Pensions, *supply*, 9330, 9351
 Supply: Works and Buildings (Defence), 3738
 Supply Bill (No. 2), *m.*, 1793
 Tariff:
 Petition, *m.*, 3410
 Wire Netting, seizure, *q.*, 2231
 Tariff Resolutions (Customs):
 Arms, &c., *cons. reg.*, 10656
 Cartridges, 7381
 Electrical and Gas Appliances, 6809
 Electrical Machines, *cons. reg.*, 10733
 Engines, &c., 6707
 Fish, *cons. reg.*, 10519
 Furniture, &c., 7004
 Gloves, *cons. reg.*, 10577
 Locks, *cons. reg.*, 10776
 Meats, &c., 5456
 Mining Engines, &c., 6772, 6784, 6799
 Oils, *cons. reg.*, 10883
 Rubber Waterproof, Piece Goods, Rebate, 7413
 Sausage casings, 5461
 Stearine, *cons. reg.*, 10511
 Tool Handles, 7119
 Wheels, *cons. reg.*, 10804, 10806
 Wire Netting (*p.o.*, 4574, 4575)
 (See Customs Tariff Bill)
 Telegraphs and Telephone:
 Newcastle Telephones, *q.*, 6726, 7169, 11521

Watson, Hon. J. C., South Sydney:

Address-in-Reply, *m.*, 217; *Budget*, 2366
 Agriculture, small increase of, *Budget*, 2368
 Australian Industries Preservation Bill, *2r.*, 9022
 Borrowing, Commonwealth, *Budget*, 2371-2
 Bounties Bill, *2r.*, 793; *com.* (specification of bounties), 1057; First Schedule (cotton), 1068; (rice), 1189; (fish), 1306; (fruits—dried), 1317; *p.o.*, 1313; (combed wool), 1318; *recom.*, 1379; (specification of bounties), 1386; (regulations), 1389, 1390; *3r.*, 1398; *cons. amds.*, 6402
 Budget, *m.*, 2366
 Business, Order of, *adj.*, 7457; *q.*, 7461
 Capital and Labour, relations of, *address*, 219
 Carruthers, Mr., public utterances of, *supply*, 3429-31; *expl.*, 3438-9, 3440
 Chairman of Committees, *q.*, 80; *m.*, to appoint temporary Chairman, 83
 Coast Defence Appropriation Bill, *int.*, 12089
 Contingencies, details, *supply*, 5788
 Customs Tariff Bill, *3r.*, 7467; *cons. reg.* (*p.o.*, 10502-3); *m.*, 10503; (stearine), 10506; (hay and chaff), 10533; (matches), 10547; (fancy goods), 11057; (leather), 11069; (directories), 11077; (works of art), 11184; (machinery, rebate for home consumption), 11202; (electrical and gas appliances), *p.o.*, 11545-6; (date of amendment), *p.o.*, 10503
 (See Tariff Resolutions (Customs))

Watson, Hon. J. C.—continued.

Defence:
 Area for Manœuvring and Artillery Practice, *supply*, 3455-6
 Australian Navy, *address*, 219-20
 Bayly, Colonel, *supply*, 5790
 Loan Policy, *Budget*, 2372
 Military Forces, *address*, 220-1
 Naval Agreement, *address*, 219-20
 New Special Provision, *supply*, 3678
 Price, Colonel, *supply*, 5790
 Small Arms Factory, *supply*, 3678, 5789
 Torpedo Fleet, *address*, 220
 Dissent from Ruling, Relevancy of Amendment (Tariff Resolutions), *m.*, 7093
 Excise Tariff Acts, Standard of Wages, *q.*, 6098
 Federal Capital, *q.*, 193; *address*, 224-5; *adj.*, 208 (see Seat of Government Bill)
 Federal Expenditure, *Budget*, 2370-1
 Federation, public feeling as to, *supply*, 3427, 3429-31
 Financial Relations, Commonwealth and States, *address*, 222-4; *Budget*, 2373-4, 2376
 Forrest, Sir J., resignation, *Budget*, 2366-7
 Government, Position of the, *address*, 218; *supply*, 10452, 10461
 Immigration, *Budget*, 2368
 Iron Bounties Bill (see Manufactures Encouragement Bill)
 Iron Industry, Bounty, *Budget*, 2382-4
 Judiciary Bill, *2r.*, *m.* (resumption of debate), 3768; *com.* (not to apply to pending cases in State Court), 3794
 Labour Party, *address*, 218; *supply*, 3429; announcement of resignation of leadership, 5326
 Land Settlement, *Budget*, 2368-9
 Land Taxation, *Budget*, 2369
 Loan policy, *Budget*, 2372
 London Offices, Commonwealth, *supply*, 3612
 Mail Service to Europe, *m.*, 6444
 Manufactures Encouragement Bill, *q.*, 5690; *obs.*, 5804; *com.* (authority to pay bounties), 12168
 Marine Survey, Australian survey ship, *q.*, 8930
 Northern Territory, *address*, 222
 Officers Compensation Bill, *cons. mcs.*, 7497
 Old-age Pensions, *address*, 222, 224; *Budget*, 2373-4-5-6
 Parliamentary Allowances Bill, *m.*, 1897; *com.* (amount of allowance), 1994, 1997, 2002
 Parties, Political, State of, *address*, 217-8
 Petition, Tariff, *m.*, 3409
 Postal Service:
 Expenditure, *Budget*, 2370
 Penny Postage, *address*, 224
 Post and Telegraph Department:
 Control by Commissioners, *supply*, 10452
 Royal Commission, *supply*, 10452, 10461
 Preferential Trade, *address*, 221; *Budget*, 2377-8
 Prime Minister, Congratulations, *obs.*, 3735
 Printing Committee, *m.* (*p.o.*), 770-1
 Privilege, Signatures to Petitions, *m.*, 3417
 Public Service:
 Commissioner, *supply*, 10452
 Increments, *Budget*, 2369-70
 Sweating, *supply*, 10453
 Quarantine Bill, *com.* (scope of quarantine), 1444; *cons. amds.*, 8953
 Quorum, *p.o.*, 6800

Watson, Hon. J. C.—continued.

Seat of Government Bill, 2R., 10335 (*see Federal Capital*)
 Shipping Combine, alleged, *adj.*, 3941
 Special Adjournment, *m.*, 2028, 6292
 States Rights, *supply*, 3427-31
 Sugar Bounty, *Budget*, 2370-1; *supply*, 3428
 Supply:
 Works and Buildings (Home Affairs), 3427;
 (Trade and Customs), 3438, 3440; (De-
 fence, Tasmania), 3455; (External Affairs),
 3632; (Defence, new special provision),
 3678
 Supply Bill (No. 3), *int.*, 5788
 Surplus Revenue Bill, 2R., 11842
 Tariff:
 Address, 219
 Amendments, Date of (*p.o.*, 10502-3); *m.*,
 10503
 Budget, *m.*, 2367, 2376-96, 2476; (*p.o.*,
 3294)
 Commission's Reports, *a.*, 2655
 New Protection, *Budget*, 2390-5; *supply*,
 4095-4103, 4133-4
 Petition, *m.*, 3409
 Recommittal of items, *obs.*, 7441
 Refunds, *q.*, 1748
 Wire Netting, *Budget*, 2387-89; precedence
 to item, *supply*, 4123
 Tariff Resolutions (Customs):
 Ale, Porter, and other Beer (*p.o.*, 3204),
 4095, 4122, 4133
 Apparel, 5615
 Arms, 6034
 Books, *n.e.i.*, 7269
 Bottles, empty, 6945, 6948
 Commonwealth and State Government Im-
 ports, 7426
 Directories, &c., *cons. req.*, 11077
 Electrical and Gas Appliances, *cons. req.*,
 p.o., 11545-6
 Electrical Machinery, 6807-8
 Engines, &c., 6713, 6715
 Fancy Goods, *cons. req.*, 11057
 Gas Analysis Apparatus, &c., 6929
 Glass, bevelled, &c., 6915, 6917, 6920
 Graphite, &c., 6850
 Glucose, 4629
 Hats, &c., 5969, 5972
 Hay and Chaff, *cons. req.*, 10533
 Hessians, &c., 5931
 Leather, 7449; *cons. req.*, 11069
 Liquid Removers, &c., 6894
 Machinery and parts, 6101, 6105
 Machinery and Machines and Machine Tools,
 6724, 6734
 Machinery, rebate for home consumption,
 cons. req., 11202
 Matches, *cons. req.*, 10547
 Motive Power Machinery, 6655, 6657
 Nails, 6616
 Oils, 6862, 6865, 6868
 Oilmen's Stores, 5523
 Paints and Colours, 6801
 Pianos, 7317, 7240
 Piece Goods, 5808; (*p.o.*, 5847-9), 5916
 Printing, &c., Inks, 7255
 Rails, &c., 6817
 Rice, 5527
 Spirits and Spirituous Liquors, 4135
 Stained Glass Windows, 6915, 6917, 6920
 State Imports, 7426
 Stearine, &c., *cons. req.*, 10506

Watson, Hon. J. C.—continued.

Tariff Resolutions (Customs)—*continued.*
 Sugar, 4678
 Textiles, &c., *n.e.i.*, 5632
 Timber, &c., 7073, 7077, 7081 (*p.o.*, 7292-3)
 Type, 6757
 White Sheep and Lamb Skins, *ad. rep.*,
 7449
 Wine, 4139
 Wire Netting (*p.o.*, 4574, 4575, 4576, 4577),
 4578, 4579
 Works of Art, *cons. req.*, 11184
 (*See Customs Tariff Bill.*)
 Tariff Resolutions (Excise):
 Cigarettes, 4316
 Starch, 5555
 Sugar, 4767
 Tobacco, 4306
 Transferred Properties, *Budget*, 2372-3
 Treasurer's Advance, *supply*, 85
 Wire Netting, seizure by New South Wales
 Government, *Budget*, 2387-8

Webster, Mr. W., Gwydir:

Address-in-Reply, *m.*, 467
 Australian Industries Preservation Bill, *com.*
 (answers to questions), 9235
 Bounties Bill, *com.* (appropriation), 1008;
 (specification of bounties), 1060; First Sche-
 dule (cotton), 1068; (mohair), 1103
 Budget, *m.*, 2271
 Business, Order of, *adj.*, 7457
 Customs Tariff Bill, *cons. req.* (socks, &c.),
 10651; (rock drills), 10726; (stone and
 marble), 11000; (oils), 11115. (*See Tariff*
 Resolutions, Customs.)
 Electoral Rolls, *q.*, 9847
 Federal Capital, *m.*, 311; *q.*, 773, 7460, 8815,
 supply, 8861
Gazette, *m.*, 11330
 Government, position of, *supply*, 10472
 Harvesters, Price of, *q.*, 9584
 Hospitals, States' Borders, *q.*, 9194; *supply*,
 3435
 Immigration, *supply*, 1790-3
 Invalid and Old-age Pensions Bill, 3R., 12097.
 (*See Old-age Pensions.*)
 Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway Survey
 Bill, *mes.*, 642
 Manufactures Encouragement Bill, *int.*, 5914;
 2R., 6186, 6253
 New Protection, woollen trade, *q.*, 3622
 Newspaper, Commonwealth, *q.*, 10702
 Officers Compensation Bill, *m.*, 7497
 Old-age Pensions, *supply*, 9332. (*See Invalid*
 and Old-age Pensions Bill.)
 Parliamentary Allowances Bill, *com.* (amount
 of allowance), 2007
 Post and Telegraph Department:
 Administration, Sydney, *q.*, 988; *supply*,
 10412-5
 Cabinet Committee, *q.*, 9477, 9764, 10879;
 supply, 10156; *adj.*, 11467; *obs.*, 11669
 Correspondence, delays, *adj.*, 3362
 Deputy Postmasters-General, *supply*, 10411
 Fidelity Guarantees, *supply*, 10412-5
 Ministerial Statement, *obs.*, 11668
 Money Order Office, Sydney, *supply*, 10414
 Royal Commission, *q.*, 9477; *supply*, 10402,
 10406-16, 10472
 Select Committee, *q.*, 7458

Webster, Mr. W.—continued.

Postal Service :

- Boy letter-carriers, *q.*, 3854
- Clarke, Mrs., compensation to, *q.*, 3423, 7463; *supply*, 3434
- Complaints, remedy of, *q.*, 8936
- Contract Offices, *supply*, 10413
- Extensions of Service, *q.*, 8938
- Furloughs, *supply*, 10413
- McDonnell, Mr., late, *q.*, 3622; *supply*, 3435
- Overwork and overtime, Sydney, *Budget*, 2271-82; *adj.*, 3362; *supply*, 3433-5, 4849-50; *q.*, 3422, 3853-4, 4649, 7417, 8936, 8937; *supply*, 10408, 10411
- Permanent Hands, *q.*, 8937
- Relieving Staff, *supply*, 10413
- Reports, *q.*, 8936
- Statutory Day's Work, *q.*, 8937
- Superannuation Fund, *supply*, 10414
- Sydney Mail Branch, *supply*, 10413
- Temporary Hands, *q.*, 8936, 8937; *supply*, 10409
- Widow's Grant, Mrs. J. Clarke, *q.*, 8938

Post Offices :

- Curlewis, *supply*, 3432
- Moree, *q.*, 8936

Postage stamps, printing, *q.*, 6098

Public Service Act, *q.*, 3854

Public Service Bill, 2*r.*, 12063

Supply :

- Postmaster-General (Central Staff), 10155
- Works and Buildings (Home Affairs), 3432; (Post and Telegraph, New South Wales), 3511

Supply Bill (No. 2), *m.*, 1790

Supply Bill (No. 5), *m.*, 8861

Surplus Revenue Bill, 2*r.*, 11853

Tariff :

- Petition, 4517
- Wire Netting, *q.*, 3422; precedence to item, *m.*, 4354, 4355

Tariff Resolutions (Customs) :

- China, &c., 6899
- Fishing Lines, 7452
- Hats, &c., 5967, 5969
- Hay and Chaff, 5366 (*p.o.*, 5441)
- Insecticides, &c., 6901
- Liquid Removers, &c., 689c
- Machinery and Machines and Machine Tools, 6740
- Military Band Instruments, 7358, 7359
- Oils, *cons. reg.*, 11115
- Paints and Colours, 6888, 6889, 6890, 6891
- Rock Drills, *cons. reg.*, 10726
- Socks, &c., *cons. reg.*, 10651
- Stone and Marble, 6967; *cons. reg.*, 11000
- Timber, &c., 7073, 7090, 7102, 7108
(See Customs Tariff Bill.)

Telegraphs and Telephones :

- Condenser System, *supply*, 10410
- Country Exchanges, *q.*, 9300
- Delays, Telegraphic, *supply*, 10410; *q.*, 11625
- Extensions of Service, *q.*, 8938
- Fire in Melbourne, defective connexion, *q.*, 6834
- Select Committee, *q.*, 7458, 7459
- Telegraphists' Hours, *supply*, 10412
- Toll system, *supply*, 3511-13, 10411

Wilks, Hon. W. H., Dalley :

Address-in-Reply, *m.*, 456

Advertising Australia, *Budget*, 2661-2; *supply*, 9518; *q.*, 11156

American Fleet, visit of, *q.*, 9089, 9474, 11180

Australian Industries Preservation Bill, 9021; *com.* (answers to questions), 9221, 9226, 9234; 3*r.*, 9586

Banking Bill, *Budget*, 2661

Bounties Bill, 2*r.*, 923; *com.* (appropriation), 1000, 1007, 1018, 1021; First Schedule (cotton), 1073; (mohair), 1099; (sunflower seed), 1187; (rice), 1190; (tobacco leaf), 1222; (fish), 1296; (fruits—dried), *p.o.*, 1315

Budget, *m.*, 2607, 2656

Business of the Session, *supply*, 8832

Capital Site, *supply*, 2895

Coast Defence Appropriation Bill, *int.*, 12079

Commonwealth Salaries Bill, *com.* (Taxation by States), 3896

Contingencies, *supply*, 5793

Corn Sacks, size of, *supply*, 9989

Customs Administration, *q.*, 11257

Customs Tariff Bill, 3*r.*, 7466; *cons. reg.* (rice root), 10502; (confectionery), 10514-6; (hay and chaff), 10538; (gloves), 10578, 11460; (hats, &c.), 10580, 10593, 10597, 10612; (parasols), 10621; (waddings, &c.), 10639; (agricultural implements, &c.), 10661, 10665; (manufactures of metals), 10693; (rock drills), 10711, 10727; (electrical machines), 10742, 11450-1; (electrical and gas appliances), 10746; (wire netting), 10762; (locks), 10782, 10790; (oils), 10819, 10894, 10972-5, 11100, 11112; (glassware), 10904, 10905; (insecticides), 11004; (slipper forms), 11068; (timber), 11124; (news paper), 11089; (cardboard), 11092; (works of art), 11184; (curtains and blinds), 11438; (piece goods), 11462, 11530; (log band saws), *p.o.*, 11543; (rebate on machinery), 11199; *m.*, 10816, 11426, 11438. (See Tariff Resolutions (Customs).)

Defence :

Adult Military Training, *m.*, 225

Bayly, Colonel, *supply*, 5794

Direct Taxation for, *address*, 466

Expenditure, *supply*, 9998, 11297

Naval Agreement, *address*, 462; *q.*, 1377-8; *Budget*, 2660-1

Naval Construction, *q.*, 4308

Naval Depot, *q.*, 8815, 8938; *adj.*, 9039

Policy, *supply*, 3353

Price, Colonel, *supply*, 5794

Small Arms Factory, *Budget*, 2661

Departmental Administration, Centralization, *supply*, 8831

Dissent from Ruling, Admissibility of Amendment (Tariff Resolutions), *m.*, 7093

Dockers, *adj.*, 6504

Electoral :

Electoral Act, *supply*, 2893, 9768

Postal Officials as Returning Officers, *m.*, 703

Rolls, *supply*, 9970

Election Expenses Reimbursement Bill, 2*r.*, 12106; *com.* (appropriation), 12197

Electoral (Disputed Returns) Bill, 2*r.*, 2577

Estimates, additional, 11295, 11362, 11367

Excise Tariff (Agricultural Machinery) Act, *supply*, 5695; *adj.*, 6364, 12166. (See New Protection.)

Wilks, Hon. W. H.—*continued.*

Excise Tariff (Spirits) Act, *supply*, 5695
 Federal Capital, *address*, 463-4; *q.*, 7459;
supply, 8831, 9887; *q.*, 8927
 Financial Relations, Commonwealth and
 States, *address*, 462; *Budget*, 2660; *supply*,
 3352, 3354-7, 11296
 Financial Statistics supplied by Treasury offi-
 cials, *supply*, 3351, 3356
 Freeman and Wallace, *supply*, *m.*, 11356
 Government Business, precedence, *m.*, 2799
 Governor-General, *supply*, 9883
 Grievance Day, *obs.*, 10406
 High Commissioner, *address*, 457, 462; *Rud-*
get, 2661; *supply*, 9520. (*See* London
 Offices.)
 House, Rights of, *m.*, 11426, 11438
 Immigration, *Budget*, 2661-2; *supply*, 8966,
 9518, 11362
 Imperial Conference, *address*, 456, 457, 459;
supply, 11363
 Imports and Exports, *Budget*, 2659
 Judiciary Bill, 3*r.*, 3858
 Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway Survey
 Bill, *mes.*, 628
 Labour Party, *address*, 460-2, 463, 466-7; *Bud-*
get, 2608-9-10-11-12, 2656-7-8-9
 Land Tax, *Budget*, 2662
 Logue, Cardinal, speech by, *q.*, 11154
 London Offices, Commonwealth, *Budget*, 2661;
supply, 3634, 3670, 9488. (*See* High Com-
 missioner.)
 Manufactures Encouragement Bill, 2*r.*, 6274;
com. (authority to pay bounties), 12170
 Mails:
 Cold Storage, 598
 European Contract, cancelled, *address*, 458-9;
 supply, 1785-6, 2894-6; *Budget*, 2662; *q.*,
 2890, 2964
 Service to Europe, *adj.*, 192; *q.*, 193, 5520;
 m., 6480, 6502
 New European Contract, *m.*, to print, 6125
 Melbourne Offices, Commonwealth, *q.*, 5801
 Minister of Trade and Customs, actions in
 England, *address*, 457-60
 Ministerial Responsibility, Delegation of,
address, 458
 Municipal Rates, payment by Commonwealth,
q., 11795
 Nationalization of Monopolies, *address*, 460
 Navigation Conference, *address*, 464-5
 New Protection, *q.*, 5208, 6095; *supply*, 5793,
 6281. (*See* Excise Tariff, &c.)
 New Protection (Tariff):
 Tobacco, 4291, 4293, 4294
 Wire Netting, 4457
 Officers Compensation Bill, *m.*, 7500
 Old-age Pensions, *supply*, 9316, 9349, 9350
 Opposition, Position of the, *address*, 456;
 Leader of, 457
 Papua, *q.*, 9476
 Parliament:
 Alleged Corruption, *adj.*, 9794; *q.*, 9844
 Exhibits of Mineral Specimens, *adj.*, 1412
 Expenditure, Commonwealth, *supply*, 9964-6
 Maintenance of, *supply*, 11368
 Reflections on, *obs.*, 10975, 11000, 11112
 Parties, Position of, *address*, 460; *Budget*,
 2663
 Parliamentary Allowances Bill, *m.*, 1916;
com. (amount of allowance), 1995, 2003;
 (excess may be paid to Consolidated
 Revenue), 2010, 2012

Wilks, Hon. W. H.—*continued.*

Patent Medicines and Secret Drugs, *supply*,
 1785; *Budget*, 2663; *adj.*, 3096; *q.*, 9092
 Patents Office, *q.*, 501
 Paying Officer of the Commonwealth, London,
supply, 11362
 Petition, Tariff, *m.*, 3410
 Post and Telegraph Department:
 Administration by Commissioners, *supply*,
 8831, 10157
 Cabinet Committee, *supply*, 10156-9, 11297
 Ministerial Statement, *m.s.o.*, 11632
 Royal Commission, *supply*, 10406
 Vote for, *supply*, 11295
 Postal Service:
 Centralization, *Budget*, 2663
 Package Postage, *supply*, 5695
 Penny Postage, *Budget*, 2662
 Stamps, Printing of, *supply*, 3596, 9970,
 9973
 Sweating of Officers, *Budget*, 2661
 Post Offices:
 Melbourne, *supply*, 3530
 Sydney, *supply*, 3530
 Preferential Trade, *address*, 459-60; *q.*, 2122;
 Tariff, 4789, 4880
 Prime Minister, Actions of in England,
address, 456-7; as regards other Depart-
 ments, *address*, 458
 Printing Office, Government, *supply*, 3589,
 3596
 Privilege, Procedure, Select Committee, *q.*,
 9794, 9844, 10076; *m.*, 10128; *ad rep.*, 12052
 Privilege, Signatures to Petitions, *m.*, 3412
 Public Service:
 Allowance, special, *supply*, 11367
 Board of Inquiry: Officer's Costs, *supply*,
 10158
 General Administration, *supply*, 11297
 Public Service Bill, 2*r.*, 12059
 Public Works Expenditure, *m.*, 7506
 Quarantine Bill, 2*r.*, 551; *com.*, (scope of
 quarantine), 1522; *cons. amds.*, 8941
 Secret Drugs, Mr. Beale's Report, *q.*, 9092
 Sessions, duration of, *supply*, 5794
 Shipping Combine, alleged, *adj.*, 3061
 Smuggling, Queensland, *supply*, 9989
 States Debts, *address*, 462
 Statutes, Commonwealth, *supply*, 3596
 St. Patrick's Day, *q.*, 9092; *supply*, 10158
 Supply:
 Attorney-General (Secretary's Office), 9726
 Defence: (Central Administration), 9998
 External Affairs (Administration), 8966;
 (London Office), 9488; (Miscellaneous),
 9518
 Home Affairs (Electoral Office), 9768; Public
 Works Staff), 9787; (Meteorological), 9879;
 (Governor-General), 9883; (Miscellaneous),
 9887, 11367
 Postmaster-General: (Central Staff), 10156
 The Parliament (Gardens), 8965
 Trade and Customs: (Queensland), 9989;
 (South Australia), 9991
 Treasury, 9964; (Government Printer), 9970,
 9973
 Works and Buildings (Home Affairs), (*p.o.*,
 3319), 3350; (Trade and Customs), 3444;
 (Post and Telegraphs), 3460, 3525, 3530;
 (Telegraphs and Telephones), 3545;
 (Treasury), 3589, 3596; (External Affairs),
 3634, 3670
 Supply Bill (No. 2), *m.*, 1785; *ad rep.*, 1871

Wilks, Hon. W. H.—*continued.*

Supply Bill (No. 3), *int.*, 5792
 Supply Bill (No. 4), *m.*, 6280
 Supply Bill (No. 5), *m.*, 8830
 Supply Bill (No. 1), 1908-9, 2R., 12186; 3R., 12196
 Surplus Revenue Bill, 2R., 11845

Tariff :

Address, 458, 465-6
 British Manufactured Goods, *q.*, 2122
 Budget, 2607-9, 2663-76
 Consideration by Senate, *q.*, 6023
 Goods in Transit, *q.*, 1746
 Hat Leathers, *q.*, 4748; *adj.*, 4794; *supply*, 4846
 Incorrect copies, *q.*, 1864
 Industries, Preferential Treatment of, *supply*, 4846
 New Protection, *supply*, 4088, 4090-5
 Notice of New Duties, *q.*, 2122
 Order of consideration, *supply*, 4126-7; *m.*, 4331, 4357, 4359, 4360, 4625-6
 Petition, *m.*, 3410
 Pianos : Disclosure of Information, *q.*, 7415, 7462
 Preferential Duties, *q.*, 1864
 Progress Report to Senate, *m.*, 10816
 States Governments' Importations, *q.*, 2233
Supply, 1785-7, 1799-1800, 1872, 3351, 3352, 3354, 3356
 Wire Netting, *supply*, 4126-7; precedence to item, 4126-7, 4331, 4357, 4359, 4360

Tariff Resolutions (Customs) :

Agricultural, &c., Machinery, 6055, 6555, 6578, 6584; *cons. req.*, 10661, 10665
 Ale, Porter, &c. (*p.o.*, 3296), 3297, 4088, 4126
 Amylic, Alcohol and Fusel Oil, 4138
 Bayonets, &c., 5939
 Bicycles, &c., 7270, 7281
 Blacking, &c., 6856
 Blue, 4780, 4784, 4789
 Boats, &c., 7360
 Bottles, empty, 6946
 Buggy Shafts, 7128, 7130
 Candles, 4880, 4953
 Cardboard, *cons. req.*, 11092
 Carriages, &c., *n.e.i.*, 7291, 7292
 Catalogues, &c. (*expl.*, 7183), 7186
 Churns, &c., 6568
 Confectionery, &c., 5160, 5171, 5243; *cons. req.*, 10514, 10516
 Curtains and Blinds, *cons. req.*, 11438
 Droppers, 6832
 Electrical and Gas Appliances, *cons. req.*, 10746
 Electrical Machines, *cons. req.*, 10742, 11450-1
 Engines, &c., 6707
 Feathers, 5634
 Fish, 5269, 5273, 5278
 Fruits and Vegetables, 5281
 Glassware, 6925, 7453; *cons. req.*, 10904, 10905
 Gloves, 5940; *cons. req.*, 10578, 11460
 Governor's Stores, 7149
 Grain and Pulse, 5351
 Hay and Chaff, *cons. req.*, 10538
 Hats, &c., 5945; *cons. req.*, 10580, 10593, 10597, 10612
 Honey, &c., 5444

Wilks, Hon. W. H.—*continued.*Tariff Resolutions (Customs)—*continued.*

Horse Shoe Nails, &c., 6608
 Infants' foods, 5521, 5524
 Insecticides, &c., 6986; *cons. req.*, 11004
 Iron, plate and sheet, 6534
 Locks, *cons. req.*, 10782, 10790
 Log Band Saws, *p.o.*, 11543
 Machinery and parts, 6104
 Machinery and Machines, and Machine Tools, 6734
 Machinery, rebate for home consumption, *cons. req.*, 11199
 Manufactures of Metal, *cons. req.*, 10693
 Manures, 7361
 Matches, 5449
 Meats, &c., 5456
 Motive Power Machinery, 6637, 6656
 Nails, 6608
 Oils, 6864, 6870; *cons. req.*, 10819, 10894, 10972, 11100, 11112
 Paints and Colours, 6878, 6886, 6889
 Paper, *cons. req.*, 11089
 Parasols, *cons. req.*, 10621
 Perambulators, &c., 7282
 Photographs, 7267
 Pianos, 7303, 7336, 7345, 7353, 7357
 Piece goods, *cons. req.*, 11462, 11530
 Potatoes, 5342
 Rabbit Traps, 6115
 Rails, &c., 6825
 Regalia, 5641
 Rice, 5526
 Rice Root, *cons. req.*, 10502
 Rock Drills, *cons. req.*, 10711, 10727
 Sausage casings, 5460
 Slipper Forms, *cons. req.*, 11068
 Steam Road Rollers, 6693
 Stripper Harvesters, 6571
 Stone and Marble, 6961
 Sugar, 4756, 4764
 Textiles, &c., *n.e.i.*, 5633
 Timber, &c., 7039, 7086, (*p.o.*, 7093), 7096, 7100, 7101, 7102, 7104; *cons. req.*, 11124
 Tin Plates, 6117
 Tobacco, 4290
 Vehicles, 7284-5, 7289
 Waddings, &c., *cons. req.*, 10639
 Wire Netting, 4457, 4572; *cons. req.*, 10762
 Wire Cloth, &c., 6833
 Works of Art, *cons. req.*, 11184
 (See Customs Tariff Bill.)

Tariff Resolutions (Excise) :

Sugar, 4767, 4768

Telegraph and Telephone Service :

Compensation for non-delivery of telegrams, *supply*, 10157.
 Exchange, Expenditure, *supply*, 3525
 Inter-State Telegraph Connexion, *q.*, 5209
 Operators, Telephone, *supply*, 3546
 Special Telegraph Rates, Newspapers, *supply*, 3545-6
 Telephone Rates, *supply*, 3460-1, 3545
 Trunk Line, Sydney and Melbourne, *supply*, 3545-6

Tobacco : Customs Duties, *q.*, 1868
 Trawler, *supply*, 3444-5, 5793
 Treasurer's Advance, *supply*, 1785
 Warning Light, Sydney Post Office, *q.*, 2890; *supply*, 2894, 2895, 9880
 Women's Work Exhibition, *supply*, 1871-2

Willis, Hon. H., Robertson :

Advertising Australia, *q.*, 11050
 Anti-Trust Legislation, *q.*, 4278
 Australian Industries Preservation Bill, 2R., 9029
 Bounties Bill, *com.*, First Schedule (mohair), 1093, 1097, 1100, 1104; (olives), 1112; (coffee), 1216; *p.o.*, 1219; (tobacco leaf), 1223, 1226; (fish), 1308; *p.o.*, 1312; *recom.* (specification of bounties—fish), 1381; 3R., 1410
 Budget, *m.*, 2815
 Bureau of Agriculture, *q.*, 11328
 Coast Defence Appropriation Bill, *int.*, 12089
 Contingencies, details, *supply*, 5790
 Customs :
 Launch, Sydney, *supply*, 3443
 Laboratory, Victoria, *supply*, 3444
 Officers, Sydney, *q.*, 4279-80
 Customs Tariff Bill, *cons. req.*, (Hats, &c.), 10611; (Parasols), 10620; (Socks, &c.), 10648; (Arms, &c.), 10659; (Agricultural Implements, &c.), 10668; (Motive Power Machinery), 10681-3; (Kitchen Utensils), 10708, 11167; (Rock Drills), 10712; (Wire Netting), 10765; (Standards, &c.), 10803; (Oils), 10882, 10883, 10986; (Roofing Tiles), 10901; (Insecticides), 11007-8; (Furniture), 11014; (Leather), 11070; (Paper), 11074; (Works of Art), 11186; (Machinery, rebate for home consumption), 11205. (*See* Tariff Resolutions (Customs).)
 Defence :
 Australian Navy, *q.*, 4411
 Bayly, Col., *supply*, 5791
 Cadets, *Budget*, 2819-20; *q.*, 6674, 11920
 Defence Ammunition, *q.*, 2235; *supply*, 3610
 Expenditure, *supply*, 10112
 Inferior Guns, importation of, *q.*, 11016, 11054
 Launceston Magazine, *supply*, 3450
 Naval Agreement, *q.*, 1378; *Budget*, 2819
 Northern Rifle Association, *q.*, 10080
 Policy, *supply*, 3609
 Preference to Australians, *supply*, 10113
 Price, Col., *supply*, 5791
 Protector, *supply*, 3450
 Riflemen, free travelling, *supply*, 3453
 Rifle Ranges, *supply*, 3448-9; *q.*, 10701
 Scheme, Government, *supply*, 10113
 Special material, *supply*, 3609
 Electoral Rolls, *q.*, 11327
 Estimates, Additional, 11277
 Excise Tariff (Agricultural Machinery) Act, *adj.*, 12167. (*See* New Protection.)
 Federal Capital, *q.*, 3588, 8927, 11096; *supply*, 8835. (*See* Seat of Government Bill.)
 Financial Relations, Commonwealth and States, *Budget*, 2816, 2820-5; *supply*, 3334-5, 11277; *q.*, 5209, 8816, 10700, 11016
 Franco-British Exhibition, *q.*, 9009, 10751
 Freeman and Wallace, *supply*, 10235
 Government Business, Precedence, *m.*, 2796
 Government, position of, *supply*, 10476
 Governor-General, *supply*, 9884
 High Commissioner, *Budget*, 2820. (*See* London Offices.)
 Immigration, *supply*, 8969
 Immigration Restriction Act, *supply*, 9988
 Invalid and Old-age Pensions Bill, 2R., 11962. (*See* Old-age Pensions.)
 Japan, Possible War with, *q.*, 4411
 F.6950.—E

Willis, Hon. H.—continued.

Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway, *supply*, 3334; *q.*, 5328
 Labour Party, *Budget*, 2821
 Lighthouses, *supply*, 9889
 London Offices, Commonwealth, *q.*, 5209, 6676, 7299, 9952, 11097, 12155. (*See* High Commissioner.)
 Mail Contract, cancelled, *Budget*, 2818
 Manufactures Encouragement Bill, 2R., 6261
 Map of Australasia, *supply*, 9889
 New Protection (Tariff), 4117-9; *q.*, 5239, 7300, 7463. (*See* Excise Tariff (Agricultural Machinery) Act.)
 Northern Territory, *supply*, 3333-4; *q.*, 6728
 Old-age Pensions, *Budget*, 2820. (*See* Invalid and Old-age Pensions Bill.)
 Order of Business : Days and hours of sitting, *adj.*, 6187
 Papua, *q.*, 10077, 10131, 11054, 11523
 Parliament, Reflections on, *obs.*, 10986
 Parliamentary Papers Bill, *com.* (publication), 11672
 Post and Telegraph Department :
 Cabinet Committee, *q.*, 10078, 11096
 Commissioners, Control by, *supply*, 10147, 10476, 11524
 Correspondence, Delays, *adj.*, 3360
 Heads, Appointment of, *supply*, 10147, 10235-6
 Royal Commission, *q.*, 8817
 Vote for, *supply*, 11278
 Post Offices :
 Bondi, *supply*, 3514
 Brisbane, *supply*, 3532
 Cloncurry, *supply*, 3532
 Coolgardie, *supply*, 3535
 Gatton, *supply*, 3532
 Katoomba, *supply*, 3514
 Northam, *supply*, 3535
 Roma, *supply*, 3334
 Sydney, *supply*, 3513-4
 Postal Service :
 Charwoman, *q.*, 2235
 Correspondence, Delay, *q.*, 7300
 Overtime, *q.*, 2651; *Budget*, 2817
 Overwork by Officials, Sydney, *supply*, 3515
 Postmasters, Regrading of, *q.*, 11260
 Promotion, *Budget*, 2817-18
 Stamps, printing of, *supply*, 3590-1; uniform, *q.*, 6677
 Preferential Trade, *q.*, 1413
 Printing Committee, *m.*, 2229
 Printing Office, Government, *supply*, 3590
 Private Members' Business, *adj.*, 2685; *q.*, 8926
 Privilege, Procedure, Select Committee, *q.*, 10075
 Privilege, signatures to petitions, *m.*, 3414
 Public Service : Gratuities for Suggestions, *supply*, 9889
 Quarantine Bill, *com.* (scope of quarantine), 1454; (general definitions), 1538; (appointment of officers), 1547; (proclamation of ports), 1551; *p.o.*, 1562, 1564; *cons. amds.*, 8945
 Quarantine : Transferred Properties, *q.*, 11018
 Questions, method of asking, *p.o.*, 10076
 Repatriated Australians, *adj.*, 1328
 Seat of Government Bill, *q.*, 3588; *supply*, 10476. (*See* Federal Capital.)
 Sessions, duration of, *supply*, 5791

Willis, Hon. H.—*continued.*

Sitting Days and Hours, *adj.*, 6187
 State Debts, *q.*, 10700
 Supply Bill (No. 3), *m.*, 5790
 Supply Bill (No. 5), *m.*, 8835
 Supply :
 Defence (Central Administration), 10112
 External Affairs (Administration), 8969
 Home Affairs (Governor-General), 9884;
 (Miscellaneous), 9889
 Postmaster-General (Central Staff), 10146,
 10235
 Trade and Customs (Queensland), 9988
 Works and Buildings (Home Affairs), 3333;
 3423; (Trade and Customs), 3440, 3443;
 (Defence), 3448, 3449, 3450, 3453; (Post
 and Telegraph), 3513, 3532, 3535; (Tele-
 graphs and Telephones), 3549; (Treasury),
 3590; (Special Defence), 3609
 Surplus Revenue Bill, *2r.*, 11730

Tariff :

Budget, 2815, 2820, 2825-30
 Consideration in Divisions, *q.*, 5131
 Electrical Equipment, *q.*, 2231, 2232
 Fodder Duties, *q.*, 5239
 Melbourne Railways, duties on electric
 equipment, *q.*, 6727
 Motions to recommit items, 7453
 Order of Consideration, *m.*, 4120, 4128,
 4243, 4625, 4628
 Piano, exhibit, *q.*, 7115
 Wire Netting, *q.*, 2792, 3586, 3587, 4199

Tariff Resolutions (Customs) :

 Agricultural Implements, &c., *cons. req.*,
 10668
 Ales, Porter, and other Beers, (*p.o.*, 4007),
 4009, 4117, 4120, 4128
 Apparel, 5626, 5630
 Arms, &c., *cons. req.*, 10659
 Bicycles, &c., 7277
 Boats, &c., 7360
 Cigarettes, 4304
 Commonwealth and States Governments' Im-
 ports, 7433
 Confectionery, &c., 5213, 5244
 Corks, 7380
 Curled Hair, &c., 7359
 Engines, &c., 6700, 6720
 Feathers, 5635
 Fish, 5276, 5278
 Fruits and Vegetables, 5281
 Furniture, &c., 7004, 7005; *cons. req.*,
 11014
 Glassware, *n.e.i.*, 6926
 Glucose, 4629
 Glue, &c., 6955
 Governors, importations for, 7419
 Grain and Pulse, 5347, 5349
 Hats, &c., *cons. req.*, 10611
 Hay and Chaff, 5760
 Insecticides, &c., 6980; *cons. req.*, 11007-8
 Kitchen Utensils, *cons. req.*, 10708
 Leather, *cons. req.*, 11070, 11074
 Machinery, rebate for Home consumption,
 cons. req., 11205
 Machinery and Machines and Machine Tools,
 6721, 6722, 6732, 6742
 Manures, 7362
 Mining Engines, &c., 6782
 Motive Power Machines, *cons. req.*, 10681-3
 Oils, *cons. req.*, 10882, 10883, 10986
 Paper, *cons. req.*, 11074
 Parasols, *cons. req.*, 10620

Willis, Hon. H.—*continued.*

Tariff Resolutions (Customs)—*continued.*

 Perfumed Spirits, 4139
 Pianos, 7328, 7357
 Potato Flour, 5345
 Rails, &c., 6819
 Rock Drills, *cons. req.*, 10782
 Roofing Tiles, *cons. req.*, 10901
 Salt, 5538
 Saws, &c., 6751
 Screws, 6769, 6771
 Smelling Bottles, &c., 6926
 Socks, &c., *cons. req.*, 10648
 Spirits and Spirituous Liquors, 4136, 4137
 Standards, &c., *cons. req.*, 10803
 Steam Road Rollers, 6683
 Stearine, &c., 5156
 Tanks, 6625
 Timber, &c., 7057, 7068, 7090, 7095, 7098
 Tool Handles, 7120
 Type, 6755, 6767, 6768
 Weighing Machines, 6626, 6631
 Wine, 4201
 Wire Netting, 4439; *cons. req.*, 10765
 Works of Art, *cons. req.*, 11186
 (See Customs Tariff Bill.)

Tariff Resolutions (Excise) :

 Cigarettes, 4325
 Glucose, 4640
 Tobacco, 4306

Telegraphs and Telephones :

 Bureau, Sydney, *q.*, 11917
 Decrease of Revenue, *q.*, 6675
 Melbourne and Sydney, *q.*, 6726
 New Switchboard, Sydney, *q.*, 5209
 Rates, *supply*, 3514-5, 3549
 Wire, *q.*, 10701

 Trawler, *supply*, 3440-1; *q.*, 5691
 Wireless Telegraphy *q.*, 11918

Wilson, Mr. J. G., *Corangamite* :

 Australian Industries Preservation Bill, *com*
 (answer questions), 9233
 Bounties Bill, *com.* (appropriation), 1005;
 First Schedule (New Zealand flax), 1090;
 (flax and hemp), 1091; (mohair), 1092;
 (copra), 1105; (cotton seed), 1106; (palm
 fruit), 1129, 1181, 1184; (peanuts), 1184;
 (sunflower seed), 1186; (fish), 1290, 1294
 1301; (fruits—dates), 1309
 Business, Order of, *m.*, 10127
 Collins, Captain, salary of, *supply*, 1811
 Customs Tariff Bill, *cons. req.* (oils), 10881,
 11555; (glass), 10906, 10907, 10908; (insec-
 ticides), 11002, 11009, 11010 (*p.o.*, 11563),
 11563; (advertisements), 11086; (surgical ap-
 pliances, &c.), 11192; (directories), 11458;
 (timber), 11571. (See Tariff Resolutions
 (Customs).)
 Defence :
 Supply of Rifles, *q.*, 1753
 Dominion of New Zealand, Congratulations
 m., 3853
 Federal Capital, *supply*, 1889
 Financial Relations, Commonwealth and States,
 q., 11785
 Freeman and Wallace, *m.*, 10127
 Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway Survey
 Bill, *2r.*, 725
 London Offices, Commonwealth, *supply*, 1811,
 1880
 Mail Contract, Cancelled, *q.*, 881, 987

Wilson, Mr. J. G.—*continued.*

Old-age Pensions, *q.*, 9298, 11790
 Papua: Mr. Ardlie, *q.*, 12199
 Parliamentary Allowances Bill, *adj.*, 1813;
q., 1866; *ar.*, 1996; *com.* (amount of allow-
 ance), 1992
 Parliamentary Witnesses Bill, *com.* (escape
 from custody), 11781; (preventing wit-
 nesses), 11783
 Patent Medicines and Secret Drugs, *q.*, 879,
 1087; *m.*, 893
 Post and Telegraph Department:
 Ministerial Statement, *m.s.o.*, 11631
 Quarantine Bill, *com.* (scope of quarantine),
 1465; (general definitions), 1535, 1543, 1545;
 (appointment of officers), 1546; (proclama-
 tion of ports), 1552; (vessels to enter first
 port of entry), 1623; (master to notify out-
 break of disease), 1624; (examination of
 imported animals), 1753, 1756, 1762; *cons.*
amds., 8942
 Repatriated Australians, *adj.*, 1326
 Supply Bill (No. 2), *m.*, 1799, 1805; *com.*,
 External Affairs: (London Offices), 1811;
ad rep., 1879
 Surplus Revenue Bill, *ar.*, 11775
 Tariff:
 Pianos, Disclosure of information, *adj.*,
 7539
 Submission of, *adj.*, 1469
Supply, 1799, 1879-80
 Tariff Resolutions (Customs):
 Advertisements, 7192; *cons. req.*, 11086
 Agricultural Machinery, &c., 6053
 Ale, Porter, and other Beer, 4087, 4119
 Apparel, 5601, 5628
 Blankets, &c., 5728
 Cameras, &c., 7393, 7394, 7395
 Canvas and Duck, 5930
 Carbon, Bisulphide, 7392-3
 Cartridges, 7381
 Directories, *cons. req.*, 11458
 Diving Dresses, 5639
 Feathers, 5634, 5637
 Fireworks, 7382
 Fish, 5273
 Fringes, 5931
 Glass, *cons. req.*, 10906, 10907, 10908
 Hats, &c., 5957, 5967, 5971, 5974, 5975
 Insecticides, &c., 6990; *cons. req.*, 11002,
 11009, 11010 (*p.o.*, 11563), 11563
 Lamps, &c., 6043, 6045
 Magazines, 7192
 Meats, &c., 5457
 Nails, 6620
 Naphthaline, 6977
 News Printing Ink, 7264, 7265
 Newspaper, 7205
 Oils, *cons. req.*, 10881, 11555
 Outside Packages, 7354, 7411
 Paper and Stationery, 7218
 Pianos, 7323, 7345, 7354
 Pictures, 7398
 Piece Goods, (*p.o.*, 5850)
 Printing, &c., Inks, 7254, 7264
 Regalia, 5641
 Salt, &c., 5534, 5536
 Scientific Instruments, 7408, 7410, 7411
 Slate Slabs, &c., 6957
 Steam Road Rollers, &c., 6679
 Stone and Marble, 6961, 6964

Wilson, Mr. J. G.—*continued.*

Tariff Resolutions (Customs)—*continued.*
 Surgical, &c., Instruments and Appliances,
 7406, 7407; *cons. req.*, 11192
 Timber, &c., 7090, 7095, 7102, 7106; *cons.*
req., 11571
 Tool Handles, 7119, 7122
 Undertakers' Requisites, 7399
 Weighing Machines, 6631
 Wood Articles, 7110
 Wood, Wicker, and Cane, 7001
 (See Customs Tariff Bill.)
 Treacle seized as Opium, *q.*, 6675
 Women's Work Exhibition, *supply*, 1880

Wise, Mr. G. H., Gippeland:

Address-in-Reply, *m.*, 24
 Adjournment, Special, *m.*, *p.o.*, 6967
 Advertising Australia, *Budget*, 3117
 Australian Industries Preservation Bill, *com.*
 (burden of proof), 9203
 Baxter Income Tax case, *adj.*, 3556
 Bounties Bill, *ar.*, 825; *3r.*, 1403
 Budget, *m.*, 3117
 Butter Importation, Philippines, *q.*, 5210
 Customs Tariff Bill, *cons. req.*, (matches),
 10555; (rock boring machines), *p.o.*,
 10733; (wire-netting), 10764; (piece goods),
 11551. (See Tariff Resolutions (Customs).)
 Defence:
 Policy, *Budget*, 3122
 Excise Procedure Bill, *ar.*, 7486; *com.* (em-
 ployment of counsel), 7489
 Factory Legislation, *address*, 26
 Federal Capital, *Budget*, 3127-8
 Federal Expenditure, *Budget*, 3117
 Federal Powers, *address*, 25-6
 Financial Relations, Commonwealth and States,
Budget, 3117-8, 3120, 3128
 High Court as Final Court of Appeal, *ad-
 dress*, 25
 Immigration, *Budget*, 3123-4
 Imperial Conference, *address*, 24-5
 Income Tax: Federal Salaries and Allow-
 ances, *address*, 25
 Japanese Goods, Sale of, *q.*, 6132
 Kanakas: Repatriation, *address*, 25
 London Offices, Commonwealth, *supply*, 3669;
q., 4648
 Mail Contract Cancelled, *address*, 26-7
 Navigation Conference, *address*, 24-5
 Parliamentary Allowances Bill, *m.*, 1914;
com. (amount of allowance), 2000
 Postal Service:
 Penny Postage, *adj.*, 2994
 Preferential Trade, *Budget*, 3127
 Public Service:
 Increments, *Budget*, 3120-1
 Quarantine Bill, *com.* (liability of owners and
 agents for provisions, &c., for quarantined
 persons), 1732; (persons may be vaccinated),
 1737, 1739
 Seat of Government Bill, *ar.*, 10355
 Shipping Combine, Alleged, *adj.*, 3965
 Supply: Works and Buildings (External Af-
 fairs), 3669
 Tariff: *m.*, 3117
Address, 26-8

Wise, Mr. G. H.—*continued.*

Tariff Resolutions (Customs) :

- Agricultural, &c., Machinery, 6563
 - Blankets, &c., 5729
 - Buckets, &c., 7139
 - Glucose, 4635
 - Matches, *cons. req.*, 10555
 - Mining Engines, &c., 6791
 - Piece goods, *cons. req.*, 11531
 - Rock Boring Machines, *cons. req., p.o.*, 10733
 - Salt, 5540
 - Timber, &c., 7088, 7094
 - Wire Netting, *cons. req.*, 10764
(*See Customs Tariff Bill.*)
- Tariff Resolutions (Excise) :
- Glucose, 4642

Wynne, Hon. Agar, *Balaclava* :

- Australian Industries Preservation Bill, *com.*
(burden of proof), 9025, 9135
- Bounties Bill, 2R., 809; *com.*, First Schedule
(cotton seed), 1108; (tobacco leaf), 1223;
(fish), 1292
- Coast Defence Appropriation Bill, *int.*, 12092
- Customs Tariff Bill, *cons. req.*, (socks, &c.),
10646; (rock drills), 10711; (oils), 10884,
10992, 11119; (talking machines, &c.),
11066; (slipper forms), 11068; (paper),
11083; *m.*, 11439. (*See Tariff Resolutions*
(Customs).)
- House, Rights of, *m.*, 11430
- Immigration, *supply*, 9700
- Judiciary Bill, 2R., 3786
- Mail Service to Europe, *q.*, 589-90; *m.*, 591
- Parliament, Reflections on, *obs.*, 10992
- Parliamentary Allowances Bill, *m.*, 1900

Wynne, Hon. Agar—*continued.*

- Preferential Trade (Tariff), 4789
- Quarantine Bill, *com.* (scope of quarantine),
1524; (power to destroy animals), 1729;
cons. amds., 8948
- Supply :
 - External Affairs (Miscellaneous), 9700
 - Works and Buildings (External Affairs), 3656
- Tariff Resolutions (Customs) :
 - Blankets, &c., 5729
 - Blue, 4789
 - Books, *n.e.i.*, 7269
 - Bottles, empty, 6945
 - Commonwealth and State Government Im-
ports, 7427
 - Confectionery, &c., 5245
 - Grain and Pulse, 5357
 - Hay and Chaff, 5438
 - Iron, plate and sheet, 6539
 - Machinery and Machines and Machine Tools,
6739
 - Meats, &c., 5456, 5457
 - Mining Engines, &c., 6785
 - News Printing Ink, 7266
 - Newspaper, 7198
 - Oils, 6862; *cons. req.*, 10884, 10992, 11119
 - Paints and Colours, 6887, 6888
 - Paper and Stationery, 7218, 7221, 7222;
cons. req., 11083
 - Rock Drills, *cons. req.*, 10711
 - Slipper Forms, *cons. req.*, 11068
 - Socks, &c., 5935; *cons. req.*, 10646
 - Stearine, &c., 5135, 5147
 - Talking machines, &c., *cons. req.*, 11066
 - Tanks, 6626
 - Timber, &c., 7061, 7095, (*p.o.*, 7092)
 - Type, 6767. (*expl.*, 6768)
(*See Customs Tariff Bill.*)

PART II.

SUBJECTS.

ATTORNEY-GENERAL. (Bills of Exchange; Bankruptcy; Foreign Corporations; Marriage Divorce; Service of Process; Recognition of Laws; Judiciary and Courts; Crown Law Offices; Parliamentary Draftsmen.)

BILLS.

CONSTITUTION. (Interpretation, and Amendment of.)

DEFENCE. (Naval and Military Defence; Control of Railway Transport for Defence.)

DIVISIONS.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS. (Fisheries, extra-territorial; Naturalization and Aliens; Immigration and Emigration; Influx of Criminals; Pacific Islands; High Commissioner; Communications with States; Executive Council Offices; Territories of the Commonwealth; Issue of Passports; Consular Appointments; People of Special Races; Issue of Royal Commissions.)

GOVERNMENT. (The Ministry and Ministers.)

GOVERNOR-GENERAL.

HOME AFFAIRS. (Acquisition of Property; Acquisition, Construction, and Control of Railways, with State Consent; Rivers, Control of, Subject to Irrigation; Census and Statistics; Public Works; Federal Capital Site and Territory; Inter-State Commission; Electoral and Franchise Acts and Elections; Public Service; Meteorological Bureau.)

PAPERS.

PARLIAMENT. (Opening, and Prorogation of; Address-in-Reply; Election of the President, Mr. Speaker, and Chairmen of Committees; Deputy Chairmen of Committees; Standing Committees; Business, Order and Conduct of; Library; Officers of Parliament; *Hansard*, &c.)

PETITIONS.

POSTMASTER-GENERAL. (Posts, Telegraphs, and Telephones; Ocean Mail Services and Cables; Meteorological Observations.)

RULINGS. (The President, Mr. Speaker, and Chairmen of Committees.)

TRADE AND CUSTOMS. (Trade and Commerce, including Navigation, Shipping, and Customs; Distillation; Excise; Copyright; Trade Marks; Bounties; Patents; Lighthouses, Lightships, Beacons, and Buoys; Quarantine; Weights and Measures.)

TREASURY. (Taxation, exclusive of Customs and Excise; Public Loans, and taking over of State Public Debts; Currency; Banking; Insurance; Coinage; Government Printing; Audit; Expenditure by Commissions; Public Accounts; Custody of Public Moneys; Finances, General Supervision of; Pensions and Invalid and Old-age Pensions.)

EXPLANATION OF ABBREVIATIONS.—*Adj.*, adjournment; *ad. rep.*, adoption of report; *amdt.*, amendment; *com.*, committee; *cons. amdts.*, consideration of amendments; *cons. req.*, consideration of requests; *cons. mes.*, consideration of message; *expl.*, explanation; *int.*, introductory stages of Bill; *mes.*, message; *p.o.*, point of order; *m.*, motion; *obs.*, observations; *q.*, question; *recom.*, recommended; *1r.*, *2r.*, *3r.*, first, second, or third reading; *m.s.o.*, motion to suspend Standing Orders.

ATTORNEY-GENERAL.

APPEAL, FINAL COURT OF.

Senate:

High Court as, *address*, 16, 25, 51, 61, 75, 283, 455

AUSTRALIAN INDUSTRIES PRESERVATION ACT.

[See TRADE AND COMMERCE, "MONOPOLIES, TRUSTS, AND COMBINES."]

ATTORNEY-GENERAL—continued.

BANKRUPTCY.

House of Representatives:

Questions by—

Mr. B. Smith as to refusal to permit a representative of Sydney Chamber of Commerce to attend conference on Bankruptcy Bill, 1087; as to consultation with Chambers of Commerce and other public bodies on provisions of draft Bill, 1088; as to refusal to allow perusal of by public bodies, 1281

ATTORNEY-GENERAL—*continued.*

Bankrupt^y—*continued.*

Questions by—

Mr. Liddell as to supply of copies of draft Bankruptcy Bill, 1088, 1281

Mr. Bowden as to reference of Bankruptcy Bill to a Royal Commission before its submission to Parliament, 1089

Mr. Glynn as to whether a Bankruptcy Bill will be introduced this session, 4086

BARRISTERS' COMBINE.

House of Representatives:

Question by Mr. Catts as to alleged combine amongst Barristers to regulate appearances before the High Court, 6729, 10081

BAXTER INCOME TAX CASE.

Senate:

Question by Senator Neild as to cost of Mr. Garran's visit to London in connexion with, 3901

House of Representatives:

Representation of Commonwealth on application for leave to appeal to Privy Council in the, *adj.*, 3556

Question by Mr. Crouch as to result of application for leave to appeal to Privy Council, 6811

BEALE, Mr. O. C., REPORT BY:

[*See* EXTERNAL AFFAIRS.]

COMMISSIONS, ROYAL.

Senate:

Question by Senator Pearce as to introduction of Bill for protection of witnesses before, 8

COMMONWEALTH SALARIES AND ALLOWANCES ACT.

House of Representatives:

Question by Mr. Glynn as to amendment of, to provide for crediting amount of State income tax paid against future liability, 11327

CONCILIATION AND ARBITRATION ACT.

House of Representatives:

Amendment of, *address*, 125

Questions by Mr. King O'Malley as to whether in any Bill to amend, the Government will include a provision for appeals from a Judge of a State Court, a State Industrial Authority, or a Wages Board to, 4927, 5046

CONCILIATION AND ARBITRATION COURT.

Senate:

Reimbursement of Expenses of Proceedings by Harvester Employees Union, *supply*, 8993-5

Travelling Expenses, *supply*, 10303

ATTORNEY-GENERAL—*continued.*

Conciliation and Arbitration Court—*continued*

Questions by—

Senator Findley as to position of workers in connexion with applications to, for exemption under Excise Tariff (Agricultural Machinery) Act, 5177

Senator de Largie as to latest awards of Arbitration Courts and Wages Boards, 8103, 8154

Senator E. J. Russell as to action taken in connexion with alleged wrongful dismissal of trade unionists from Jumbunna Colliery, 8104

House of Representatives:

Printing of Award of President of, *adj.*, 5800

CONSTITUTION ALTERATION (SENATE ELECTIONS) ACT.

Senate:

Question by Senator McColl as to alleged flaw in, 9237

CUSTOMS PROSECUTIONS.

[*See* TRADE AND CUSTOMS.]

GUARANTEE, CANCELLED MAIL CONTRACT.

Senate:

Nature of, *supply*, 8923

Questions by—

Senator Neild as to proceedings for recovery under, 8672

Senator Mulcahy as to whether Commonwealth Law officers were satisfied as to protection of Commonwealth interests under, 8868; drafting of contract, 8672

Senator St. Ledger as to action instituted under, 11220

House of Representatives:

Question by—

Mr. Fairbairn as to proceedings for recovery under, 8816

Mr. Thomas as to reported visit of Attorney-General to England in connexion with, 10786

[*See* POSTMASTER-GENERAL, "MAIL CONTRACT, EUROPEAN."]

HIGH COURT.

Tipstaffs, *supply*, 10303

Travelling Expenses, *supply*, 10303

Senate:

Wire Netting Case, Proceedings in, *supply*, 5860, 5875, 5880-1

Questions by—

Senator Dobson as to whether the Government intended to submit legislation preventing appeals direct to the High Court from a single Judge of a State Supreme Court, 829

Senator Neild as to the number of criminal appeals from each of the States addressed to; numbers granted and dismissed, 1567

Senator Chataway as to date of commencement of long vacation, 5858

ATTORNEY-GENERAL—continued.

High Court—continued.

House of Representatives:

Maintenance of Authority of, *supply*, 884a
States Officers, Compensation, *supply*,
9728-34

Taxation of State Imports—Stating of
Case for, *supply*, 6291

Travelling of Judges' Associates, *supply*,
9727-8

Wire Netting Case, Proceedings in, *supply*,
6291

Work of, *supply*, 9728

Questions by—

Mr. O'Malley as to maintenance of
authority of, 9388

Mr. Crouch as to reciprocity between
Victoria and New South Wales in
the admission of barristers, 10075

Mr. J. H. Catts as to delay in de-
livery of judgment of, in Harvester
cases, 11420

Mr. McDonald as to costs in cases in
which the Commonwealth was a
party, 11742

PUBLIC SERVICE AND STATE INCOME TAX.

House of Representatives:

Questions by—

Mr. Glynn as to decision of High Court
with respect to rights of transferred
officers, 11260; as to payment of State
income tax, 11327

Mr. Page as to action to protect rights
of public servants who paid income
tax, 11327

SENATE VACANCY.

[See PARLIAMENT, THE, "SENATE VACANCY IN."]

STATE STEAMSHIP SUBSIDIES.

Senate:

Question by Senator O'Loughlin as to
opinion of Crown Law Officer on agree-
ment with Archibald Currie and Co. for
carriage of goods between Victoria and
Singapore, 5746

House of Representatives:

Question by Mr. Hutchison as to consti-
tutionality of, 1181

WALPOLE, Mr. R. S.

House of Representatives:

Question by Mr. O'Malley as to state-
ments by, concerning a class contest,
11018

WEBB v. OUTTRIM.

House of Representatives:

Question by Mr. Poynton as to printing
of decision of Privy Council, 773

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION BILL.

Senate:

Question by Senator Guthrie as to when
to be introduced, 5177, 6061

BILLS.

ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATION BILL 1907-8.

House of Representatives:

Order of leave, Bill presented and passed
through all its stages, 11418; message
from Senate, 11675

Senate:

Bill received from House of Represen-
tatives, *m.s.o.* and *1R.* moved, 11473;
debated, 11475, 11608; Bill read a first
and second time and considered in
com., 11617; *ad. rep.* and Bill read a
third time 11621

**ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATION (WORKS AND
BUILDINGS) BILL 1907-8.**

House of Representatives:

Order of leave, Bill presented and passed
through all its stages, 11418; message
from Senate, 11734

Senate:

Bill received from House of Representa-
tives and *m.s.o.* moved and debated,
11621; agreed to and Bill read a first
time, 11622; *2R.*, moved, 11622; debated,
11688; Bill read a second time and con-
sidered in *com.*, 11691; *ad. rep.* and
3R., 11697

**ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATION BILL 1905-6 AND
1906-7.**

House of Representatives:

Order of leave, 11418; Bill presented and
passed through all its stages, 11419;
message from Senate, 11734

Senate:

Bill received from House of Representa-
tives, 11622; *m.s.o.*, Bill read a first
time and *2R.* moved, 11623; *2R.* debated
and agreed to and Bill passed through
its remaining stages, 11697

**ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATION (WORKS AND
BUILDINGS) BILL 1905-6 AND 1906-7.**

House of Representatives:

Order of leave, 11418; Bill presented and
passed through all its stages, 11419;
message from Senate, 11734

Senate:

Bill received from House of Representa-
tives, *m.s.o.* and *1R.* moved, 11623; Bill
read a first time and *2R.* moved and
debated, 11624; Bill read a second time,
and passed through remaining stages,
11697

APPROPRIATION BILL.

House of Representatives:

Int., 10251; order of leave, Bill presented
and passed through all its stages, 10251;
Bill returned from Senate without re-
quest, 10461; assent reported, 10483

BILLS—continued.

Appropriation Bill—continued

Senate:

Bill received from House of Representatives, *m.s.o.* and *1R.* moved and debated, 10260; agreed to, and *2R.* moved, 10261; debated, 10269; Bill read a second time and considered in *com.*, 10285 [Parliament, 10285; External Affairs, 10290; Attorney-General, 10303; Home Affairs, 10304; Treasury, 10370; Trade and Customs, 10372; Defence, 10372; Postmaster-General, 10388]; *ad. rep.* and *3R.* moved and debated, 10391; Bill read a third time, 10399; assent reported, 10828

APPROPRIATION (WORKS AND BUILDINGS) BILL.

House of Representatives:

Int., 3749; order of leave, Bill presented and passed through all its stages, 3749; message from Senate, 4243; assent reported, 4361

Senate:

Bill received from House of Representatives and *1R.*, 3706; *2R.* moved, 3798; debated, 3804, 3811, 3841, 3901; Bill read a second time, 3930; considered in *com.*, 3930, 4037; *ad. rep.*, 4083; *3R.* moved and debated, 4144; Bill read a third time, 4155; assent reported, 4362

AUDIT BILL.

House of Representatives:

Message recommending appropriation, 12076

AUSTRALIAN INDUSTRIES PRESERVATION BILL.

Senate:

Order of leave and *1R.*, 4144; *2R.* moved, 4365; debated, 4374, 4483, 4502, 4585, 4908; Bill read a second time, 4914; considered in *com.*, 4914, 5012, 5084; reported, 5113; *m. that ad. rep. be made an order of the day for to-morrow*, moved and debated, 5113; agreed to, 5114; *ad. rep.* moved and debated, 5178; agreed to, 5193; *3R.*, 5285; Bill returned from House of Representatives with *amds.*, 9580; *cons. amds.* and *ad. rep.*, 10071; assent reported, 10828

House of Representatives:

Bill received from Senate and *1R.*, 5366; *2R.* moved, 8960; debated, 9011, 9101; Bill read a second time, 9129; considered in *com.*, 9129, 9194, 9391; reported, 9391; *recom.*, 9391; reported, 9393; *ad. rep.*, 9481; *m.s.o.* moved and negatived, 9481-2; *3R.* moved and debated, 9585; Bill read a third time, 9597; message from Senate, 10126; assent reported, 10483

BILLS—continued.

BILLS OF EXCHANGE BILL.

Senate:

Order of leave, 132, *1R.*, 250; *2R.* moved, 651; debated, 657; Bill read a second time, 668; considered in *com.*, 668, 747, 1584, 1705, 1965, 2055, 2194, 2283; *recom.*, 2284; reported, 2300; *recom.*, 2407; *ad. rep.*, 2419; *3R.*, 2514

House of Representatives:

Bill received from Senate and *1R.*, 2579

BOUNTIES BILL.

House of Representatives:

Message recommending appropriation, 157; considered in *com.*, 561; order of leave and *1R.*, 563; *2R.* moved, 775; debated, 787, 897, 989; Bill read a second time, 997; considered in *com.*, 997, 1056, 1090, 1181, 1290 (*p.o.*, 1311-16); reported, 1325; *recom.*, 1378; *m.s.o.*, *ad. rep.* and *3R.* moved, 1392; debated, 1393; agreed to, 1411; Bill returned from Senate with *amds.*, 5175; *cons. amds.*, 6401; *ad. rep.*, 6405; Bill returned from Senate with a message and *cons. mes.*, 6439; assent reported, 6834

Senate:

Bill received from House of Representatives and *1R.*, 1471; *2R.* moved, 1707; debated, 2301, 2419, 2514, 2553, 2627, 2743; Bill read a second time, 2765; considered in *com.*, 2765, 2846, 2958, 3066, 3149, 3257, 3370, 3464, 3559, 3706, 4155, 4245, 4382, 4482; reported, 4483; *ad. rep.* moved and debated, 4580; agreed to, 4585; *recom.* moved and debated, 4836; agreed to and *recom.*, 4841, 4896; reported, 4908; *ad. rep.*, 5012; *3R.*, 5084; Bill returned from House of Representatives, and *cons. mes.*, 6410; *ad. rep.*, and message from House of Representatives, 6414; assent reported, 7541

COAST DEFENCE APPROPRIATION BILL.

House of Representatives:

Message recommending appropriation, 12043; *cons. mes.*, 12076; resolution reported, *m.s.o.*, *ad. rep.*, order of leave, Bill read a first and second time and considered in *com.*, 12094; *ad. rep.* and *3R.*, 12095; message from Senate, 12198

Senate:

Bill received from House of Representatives, *m.s.o.*, *1R.*, and *2R.* moved, 12106; debated, 12107; Bill read a second time and passed through its remaining stages, 12126

BILLS—continued.

COMMERCE (TRADE DESCRIPTIONS) BILL.

House of Representatives:

Order of leave and *IR.*, 6133

COMMONWEALTH SALARIES AND ALLOWANCES BILL.

Senate:

Order of leave, 132; *IR.*, 250; *2R.* moved, 500; Bill read a second time, 878; considered in *com.*, 878, 954, 1043, 1568; reported, 1584; *ad. rep.*, 1704; *3R.* moved and debated, 1816; Bill read a third time, 1833; Bill returned from House of Representatives with an *amdt.*, 3901; *cons. amdt.* and *ad. rep.*, 4084; assent reported, 4362

House of Representatives:

Bill received from Senate and *IR.*, 1926; *p.o.*, 3860-2; *2R.* moved, 3862; debated, 3867; Bill read a second time and considered in *com.*, 3881; reported, *m.s.o.*, and Bill passed through its remaining stages, 3897; message from Senate, 4142; assent reported, 4361

CONCILIATION AND ARBITRATION BILL.

Senate:

Order of leave and *IR.*, 5467

CONSTITUTION ALTERATION (SENATE ELECTIONS) BILL.

Senate:

Assent reported, 7

House of Representatives:

Assent reported, 23

CRIMINAL APPEALS BILL.

Senate:

Order of leave, 30; *IR.*, 248; *2R.* moved, 959, 2543, 3493

CUSTOMS TARIFF AMENDMENT BILL.

House of Representatives:

Order of leave, and *IR.*, 11795; *2R.* moved, 12053; Bill read a second time, considered in *com. ad. rep.*, and *m.s.o.* moved and debated, 12054; *m.* agreed to and Bill read a third time, 12055; message from Senate, 12198

Senate:

Bill received from House of Representatives, *m.s.o.*, *IR.* *2R.* moved, 12102; Bill read a second time, and considered in *com.*, 12103; *ad. rep.*, and *3R.*, 12105

BILLS—continued.

CUSTOMS TARIFF BILL.

House of Representatives:

Order of leave, Bill read a first and second time, and considered in *com.*, 7456; reported, 7456; *ad. rep.*, 7465; *3R.* moved and debated, 7465; Bill read a third time, 7471; Bill returned from Senate with requests, 10126; *cons. req.* (*p.o.*, 10484), 10487, 10526, 10576, 10610, 10653, 10703, 10757, 10789, 10811, 10817, 10880, 10970, 11019, 11056, 11098, 11159, 11183; progress report and *m.* to re-commit item 15, moved, 10815, and negatived, 10816; *ad. rep.* debated, 10816; and agreed to, 10817; *ad. rep.*, and ordered that Bill be returned to Senate, 11215; message from Senate, and *m.*, that it be made an order of the day for later date moved, 11380; agreed to, 11381; *m.*, to refrain from determining constitutional rights, and to consider message forthwith moved, 11424; debated, 11425; agreed to, 11437; *m.*, that resolution be incorporated in message, 11437; agreed to, 11438; *cons. req.*, 11438, 11526; *m.*, to fix dates of *amendts.* agreed to, 11578; *ad. rep.*, and Bill ordered to be returned to Senate, 11579; message from Senate, 11722

Senate:

Bill received from House of Representatives and *IR.* moved and debated, 7545; Bill read a first time, *m.s.o.*, and *2R.* moved, 7553; debated, 7574; Bill read a second time, 7622; considered in *com.*, 7622, 7623, 7653, 7704, 7755, 7797, 7850, 7895 (*p.o.* 7896-7906), 7906, 7928, 7977, 8020, 8080, 8105, 8157, 8232, 8286, 8309, 8365, 8424, 8483, 8508, 8555, 8617 (*p.o.*, 8644-52), 8652, 8673, 8701, 8869, 9042, 9139, 9237, 9253, 9353, 9422, 9537, 9634, 9797, 9893; reported, and *m.s.o.* moved and debated, 10041; agreed to; *ad. rep.* and *amdt.* to recom. moved and debated, 10042-50; *recom.* negatived and *ad. rep.* agreed to, 10050-1; message from House of Representatives, and *m.s.o.* moved, 10830; debated, 10831; agreed to, and *cons. mes.*, 10841, 10921; message from House of Representatives, and *cons. mes.*, 11221, 11304; *ad. rep.*, 11321; message from House of Representatives, and *m.s.o.*, 11581; *m.*, that message be considered forthwith, and that action of House of Representatives in dealing with reiterated requests is in compliance with constitutional position of Senate, moved and debated, 11583; agreed to, 11588; *cons. mes.*, 11588; resolutions reported, 11607; *m.* to *recom.* message, moved, 11678; debated, 11679; agreed to, *recom.*, *ad. rep.*, and *3R.*, 11688

[See TRADE AND CUSTOMS—"TARIFF"—for Schedule.]

DEFENCE ACT 1903 AMENDMENT BILL.

Senate:

Order of leave, 1330; *IR.*, 1814; *2R.* moved, 2873; debated, 5673

BILLS—continued.

DISPUTED ELECTIONS AND QUALIFICATIONS BILL.

Senate:

Order of leave, 5284; 1R., 5285; 2R., moved, 5467; debated, 5561; Bill read a second time, 5595; considered in *com.*, 5596, 5648; reported, 5666; *re-com.*, 5774, 5981; *ad. rep.*, *m.s.o.*, and 3R., 5986; Bill returned from House of Representatives without *amdt.*, 6353; assent reported, 6409

House of Representatives:

Bill received from Senate and 1R., 6056; 2R., moved, 6370; debated, 6372; Bill read a second time and considered in *com.*, 6378; *ad. rep.*, *m.s.o.*, and 3R., 6389; assent reported, 6440

ELECTION EXPENSES REIMBURSEMENT BILL.

House of Representatives:

Message recommending appropriation; appropriation in *com.*, *m.s.o.*, *ad. rep.*, order of leave; 1R., 12196; 2R., moved and debated, 12196; Bill read a second time and considered in *com.*, 12197; *ad. rep.*, and 3R., 12198; message from Senate, 12201

Senate:

Bill received from House of Representatives, *m.s.o.*, 1R., and 2R., moved, 12148; debated, 12149; Bill read a second time, and passed through its remaining stages, 12149

ELECTORAL (DISPUTED RETURNS) BILL.

House of Representatives:

Order of leave and 1R., 1612; 2R., moved, 2574; debated, 2577

EXCISE PROCEDURE BILL.

Senate:

Order of leave moved and debated, 4472; agreed to, 4482; 1R., 4616; 2R., moved, 5114; Bill read a second time and considered in *com.*, 5118, 5193; reported, 5194; *ad. rep.*, 5285; 3R., moved and debated, 5370; agreed to, 5395; message from House of Representatives, 7545; assent reported, 8221

House of Representatives:

Bill received from Senate and 1R., 5465; 2R., moved, 6056; debated, 7472; Bill read a second time and considered in *com.*, 7487; *ad. rep.*, 7490; *m.s.o.* and 3R., 7491; assent reported, 8812

EXCISE TARIFF BILL.

House of Representatives:

Bill presented and passed through all its stages, 7456; Bill returned from Senate with a request, 10126; *cons. req.*, *ad. rep.*, and ordered that Bill be returned to Senate, 11215; message from Senate, 11722

BILLS—continued.

Excise Tariff Bill—continued.

Senate:

Bill received from House of Representatives and 1R., 7545; Bill read a second time and considered in *com.*, 7623, 9951, 10014; reported with a request, and *ad. rep.*, 10040; message from House of Representatives, 11221; 3R., 11688

EXCISE TARIFF (STARCH) BILL.

House of Representatives:

Order of leave and 1R., 11795; 2R., moved, 12055; Bill read a second time and passed through its remaining stages, 12056; message from Senate, 12198

Senate:

Bill received from House of Representatives, *m.s.o.*, 1R., and 2R., moved and debated, 12105; Bill read a second time and passed through its remaining stages, 12106

FIRE INSURANCE BILL.

House of Representatives:

Order of leave and 1R., 989; 2R., moved, 1596; debated, 1608, 1612; alteration in order of day for resumption of debate, 2566

INVALID AND OLD-AGE PENSIONS APPROPRIATION BILL.

House of Representatives:

Message recommending appropriation, 12043; appropriation in *com.*, resolution reported, *m.s.o.* moved, and debated, 12095; agreed to, *ad. rep.*, order of leave, Bill read a first and second time, and considered in *com.*, 12096; *ad. rep.* and 3R., 12097; message from Senate, 12198

Senate:

Bill received from House of Representatives, *m.s.o.*, 1R. and 2R., moved and debated, 12126; Bill read a second time and passed through its remaining stages, 12127

INVALID AND OLD-AGE PENSIONS BILL.

House of Representatives:

Order of leave and 1R., 11795; 2R., moved, 11922; debated, 11926; Bill read a second time and considered in *com.*, 11963; reported, *recom.*, *ad. rep.*, *m.s.o.*, and 3R., 11982; message from Senate, 12095.

Senate:

Bill received from House of Representatives, *m.s.o.*, 1R., and 2R., moved, 11995; debated, 12000; Bill read a second time and considered in *com.*, 12026; *ad. rep.* and 3R., 12038

BILLS—continued.

JUDICIARY BILL.

Senate:

Order of leave, 132; 1R., 250; 2R. moved, 487; debated, 564, 830 (*m.* to adjourn debate negative, 861); Bill read a second time, 878; considered in *com.*, 878, 936; *ad. rep.*, 954; 3R., 1023; message from House of Representatives, 3829; assent reported, 4705

House of Representatives:

Bill received from Senate and 1R., 1083; 2R. moved, 3749; *m.* to adjourn debate moved and agreed to, 3759; *m.* for resumption of debate at later hour moved, 3760; debated, 3762; agreed to and debate on 2R. resumed, 3774; Bill read a second time and considered in *com.*, 3792; *ad. rep.*, 3795; 3R. moved and debated, 3855; Bill read a third time, 3860; assent reported, 4646

KALGOORLIE TO PORT AUGUSTA RAILWAY SURVEY BILL.

House of Representatives:

Message recommending appropriation, 158; consideration in *com.*, 559, 606; *ad. rep.*, order of leave, and 1R., 647; 2R. moved and debated, 718; Bill read a second time, and considered in *com.*, 737; *ad. rep.* and 3R., 741; Bill returned from Senate with an amendment, 1742; *cons. amdt.*, 2017; *ad. rep.*, 2025; assent reported, 2511

Senate:

Bill received from House of Representatives and 1R., 745; 2R. moved, 1023 (*p.o.* 1023-33), 1132, 1233, 1330; Bill read a second time, 1376; considered in *com.*, 1377, 1471; reported, 1516; *ad. rep.*, 1568; 3R. moved and debated, 1689; Bill read a third time, 1704; message from House of Representatives, 2032; assent reported, 2512

MANUFACTURES ENCOURAGEMENT BILL:

House of Representatives:

Mes. recommending appropriation, 5801; *cons. mes.*, 5912; *ad. rep.*, order of leave, and 1R., 5914; 2R. moved, 6026; debated, 6133, 6232 (*p.o.* as to constitutionality of *amdt.* providing for nationalization of iron industry, 6232-35); Bill read a second time and committed *pro forma*, 6279; considered in *com.*, 12168

MARINE INSURANCE BILL.

House of Representatives:

Order of leave and 1R., 4959

NAVIGATION BILL.

Senate:

Order of leave and 1R., 3149; 2R. moved, 3234

NORFOLK ISLAND BILL.

House of Representatives:

Order of leave and 1R., 11705

BILLS—continued.

OFFICERS COMPENSATION BILL.

House of Representatives:

Message recommending appropriation, 7493; *cons. mes.* and appropriation in *com.*, 7494; *ad. rep.*, order of leave, Bill read a first time and passed through its remaining stages, 7502; Bill returned from Senate without amendment, 10126; assent reported, 10483

Senate:

Bill received from House of Representatives and 1R., 7545; 2R. moved, 10051; debated, 10052; Bill read a second time and considered in *com.*, 10058; *ad. rep.*, 10070; *m.s.o.* and 3R., 10071; assent reported, 10828

PAPUA BILL.

House of Representatives:

Order of leave and 1R., 22; 2R. moved, 1414; debated, 1415

PARLIAMENTARY ALLOWANCES BILL.

House of Representatives:

Message recommending appropriation and *cons. mes.*, 1883; *ad. rep.*, order of leave and 1R., 1924; *m.*, that 2R. be an order of the day for to-morrow, moved and debated, 1924; agreed to, 1926; 2R. moved, 1977; debated, 1979; Bill read a second time and considered in *com.*, 1991; reported, *m.s.o.*, and Bill passed through its remaining stages, 2017; Bill returned from Senate without amendment, 2262; assent reported, 2511

Senate:

Bill received from House of Representatives and 1R., 2032; 2R. moved, 2071; debated, 2073, 2099; Bill read a second time and considered in *com.*, 2116; *ad. rep.*, 2119; 3R. moved and debated, 2180; Bill read a third time, 2194; assent reported, 2512

PARLIAMENTARY PAPERS BILL.

House of Representatives:

Order of leave and 1R., 10136; 2R. moved, 11671; debated and Bill read a second time and considered in *com.*, 11672; reported and *recom.*, 11780; *ad. rep.*, *m.s.o.* and 3R., 11780; Bill returned from Senate with an amendment and *cons. amdt.*, 12198

Senate:

Bill received from House of Representatives, *m.s.o.* and 1R., 11866; 2R. moved, 12127; debated, 12128; Bill read a second time and considered in *com.*, 12131; *ad. rep.* and 3R., 12137; message from House of Representatives, 12148

PARLIAMENTARY WITNESSES BILL.

Senate:

Order of leave, 354; 1R., 563; 2R. moved, 763; Bill read a second time and considered in *com.*, 764; *ad. rep.*, 766; 3R., 830

BILLS—continued.

Parliamentary Witnesses Bill—continued.

House of Representatives:

Bill received from Senate and 1R., 807; 2R. moved, 3897; debated, 3898; Bill read a second time, 11780; considered in com., 11780, 12066

POSTAL RATES BILL.

House of Representatives:

Order of leave moved and debated, 774; agreed to and 1R., 775

PUBLIC SERVICE APPEALS BILL.

House of Representatives:

Order of leave and 1R., 1611

PUBLIC SERVICE BILL.

House of Representatives:

Order of leave and 1R., 11796, 2R. moved, 12056; debated, 12057

QUARANTINE BILL.

House of Representatives:

Order of leave and 1R., 352; 2R. moved, 504, debated, 510; Bill read a second time, 559; considered in com., 559, 1416, 1517, 1619, 1717, 1753; *ad. rep.*, 1775; 3R., 1883; Bill returned from Senate with *amds.*, 6292; *cons. amds.*, 8939; *ad. rep.*, 8959; assent reported, 9845

Senate:

Bill received from House of Representatives and 1R., 1833; 2R., 2941; debated, 4397, 5194, 5285; Bill read a second time, 5304; considered in com., 5304, 5395, 5473, 5666, 5986, 6062, 6217; *m.s.o.*, *ad. rep.*, and 3R., 6227; message from House of Representatives, 8925; assent reported, 9795

REMUNERATION OF LABOUR DEFINITION BILL.

Senate:

Order of leave, 4796; 1R., 4841; *m.* that Bill be printed and 2R. made an order of day for following day, 4841

SEAMEN'S COMPENSATION BILL.

Senate:

Order of leave, 11581; 1R., 11866

SEAT OF GOVERNMENT BILL.

House of Representatives:

Message recommending appropriation, 157; appropriation in com., *ad. rep.*, order of leave and 1R., 647; 2R. moved and debated, 10311

SUPPLY BILL NO. 1.

House of Representatives:

Message and *m.*, 81; *m.s.o.*, 82; appropriation in com., 84; *ad. rep.*, order of leave, and Bill presented and passed through all its stages, 85; Bill returned from Senate without request, 192; assent reported, 193

BILLS—continued.

Supply Bill No. 1—continued.

Senate:

Bill received from House of Representatives and *m.s.o.* moved, 39; agreed to and resolved that Bill be read a first time on following day, 40; 1R. moved, 137; debated, 138; agreed to, Bill read a second time and considered in com., 139; *ad. rep.* and 3R., 140; assent reported, 247

SUPPLY BILL NO. 2.

House of Representatives:

Appropriation in com., 1775; *m.s.o.*, *ad. rep.*, resolution of ways and means adopted, order of leave, Bill read a first and second time and considered in com., 1809; reported, 1812; *ad. rep.* moved and debated, 1868-9; agreed to and 3R., 1883; Bill returned from Senate without request, 2017; assent reported, 2120

Senate:

Notice of *m.s.o.*, 1815; Bill received from House of Representatives and 1R. moved and debated, 1833; agreed to, 1864; 2R. moved, 1920; debated, 1930; Bill read a second time and considered in com., 1932; reported and *ad. rep.* moved and debated, 1952; agreed to and 3R. moved and debated, 1953; Bill read a third time, 1955; assent reported, 2055

SUPPLY BILL NO. 3.

House of Representatives:

Appropriation in com., 5783; *m.s.o.*, *ad. rep.*, order of leave, and Bill passed through all its stages, 5800; Bill returned from Senate without request, 5977; assent reported, 6118

Senate:

Bill received from House of Representatives, *m.s.o.*, and *m.* that 1R. be taken on following Wednesday, agreed to, 5774; 1R. moved and debated, 5860; agreed to, 5877; 2R., moved, 5877; debated, 5878; Bill read a second time and considered in com., 5881; *ad. rep.*, and 3R. moved and debated, 5907; Bill read a third time, 5908; assent reported, 6092

SUPPLY BILL NO. 4.

House of Representatives:

Appropriation in com., 6279; *m.s.o.*, *ad. rep.*, order of leave, 1R., 6286; 2R. moved and debated, 6286; Bill read a second time and considered in com., 6288; *ad. rep.* and 3R., 6292; Bill returned from Senate without request, 6439; assent reported, 6591

Senate:

Bill received from House of Representatives, and *m.s.o.* moved and debated, agreed to, and 1R. moved and debated, 6300; agreed to, Bill read a second time and considered in com., 6347; *ad. rep.*, 6353; 3R., 6410; assent reported, 7541

BILLS—continued.

SUPPLY BILL NO. 5.

House of Representatives:

Appropriation in *com.*, 8820-63; *ad. rep.*, *m.s.o.*, order of leave, Bill presented and passed through all its stages, 8863; Bill returned from Senate without request, 9039; assent reported, 9088

Senate:

Bill received from House of Representatives, *m.s.o.*, and *IR.*, moved and debated, 8900; Bill read a first and second time, 8925; considered in *com.*, 8925, 8979; *ad. rep.* and *3R.*, 9007; assent reported, 9040

SUPPLY BILL NO. 1, 1908-9.

House of Representatives:

Message recommending appropriation, 12043; appropriation in *com.*, 12097; *m.s.o.*, *ad. rep.*, order of leave, *IR.*, and *m.* that *2R.* be made an order of the day for following day moved, 12098; agreed to, 12099; *2R.* moved and debated, 12180; Bill read a second time, *m.s.o.*, *ad. rep.* and *3R.* moved, 12190; Bill read a third time, 12196; message from Senate, 12201

Senate:

Bill received from House of Representatives, *m.s.o.*, and *IR.* moved and debated, 12137; Bill read a first time, and *2R.* moved, 12140; debated, 12141; Bill read a second time and considered in *com.*, 12144; *ad. rep.* and *3R.*, 12148

SURPLUS REVENUE BILL.

House of Representatives:

Order of leave moved, debated, and agreed to, 9010; *IR.*, 9420; *mes.* recommending appropriation, 9845; *cons. mes.* appropriation in *com.*, resolution reported and *ad. rep.* moved and debated, 11670; agreed to, 11671; *2R.* moved, 9847; *amdt.* to postpone consideration until financial relations can be dealt with as a whole, 9875; second reading debated, 9856, 11709-23, 11745 [*m.* to adjourn debate moved and negatived, 11757], 11796; Bill read a second time, 11861; considered in *com.*, 11861; *ad. rep.* and *3R.*, 11863; message from Senate, 11982

Senate:

Bill received from House of Representatives, *m.s.o.*, *IR.*, and *2R.*, moved 11866; debated 11874; Bill read a second time and considered in *com.*, 11903; *ad. rep.*, and *3R.*, 11909

CONSTITUTION.

ALTERATION OF.

Senate:

Questions by—

Senator E. J. Russell as to enabling the Commonwealth, if necessary, to regulate wages and conditions of labour, 7543

Senator St. Ledger as to taking steps towards the unification of all or any of the State jurisdictions, 7653

Senator McColl as to dealing with alleged flaw in Constitution Alteration (Senate Elections) Act, 9237

House of Representatives:

Questions by—

Mr. Catts as to enabling the Government to nationalize coal mines and other public utilities, 5910

Mr. McDonald as to uniform industrial legislation, 6096

Sir John Forrest if financial proposals of Government necessitate an amendment of Constitution, 9390, 11016

Mr. McWilliams as to whether, if decision of High Court be adverse. Government can proceed with the policy of new protection without an amendment of the Constitution, 10132

BILLS.

House of Representatives:

Determination of constitutionality of, by High Court, *ways and means*, 3996, 4092

BRADDON SECTION.

Senate:

References to, *supply*, 1861, 3807-8, 3815-16, 3821-3, 3843, 3901

House of Representatives:

References to, *Budget*, 1643, 2126, 2144, 2354, 2373-6, 2464-5, 2496-2500, 2582-4, 2602, 2660, 2692-7, 2718, 2721-2, 2728-31, 2741-2, 2820-1, 2906-7, 2916, 2922, 2965, 2974, 2970, 3007-15, 3036-40, 3116, 3120, 3177, 3189-90, 3199-3201, 3316-8; *expl.*, 2654; *supply*, 3342-4, 3352; *ways and means*, 4016

CARRUTHERS, MR. J. H.

House of Representatives:

Question by Mr. O'Malley as to a vote for the erection of a statue of Mr. J. H. Carruthers, as a "nullifier of," 2311

COMMONWEALTH LEGISLATION.

Senate:

Appointment of officer by States to report on constitutionality of, *address*, 18, 400, 478

Question by Senator McGregor, 564

DRAFT OF.

House of Representatives:

Motion by Mr. Johnson for a return relative to the Conference of Premiers on alteration of, agreed to, 774

CONSTITUTION—*continued.*

EXCISE TARIFF (AGRICULTURAL MACHINERY) ACT.

Senate:

Constitutionality of, *obs.*, 7547-52, 7593, 7606-7, 7612-3, 7619-20; *supply*, 8993-5
Question by Senator E. J. Russell as to amendment of Constitution, if held to be *ultra vires*, 7543

House of Representatives:

Constitutionality of, *ways and means*, 3996, 4092; *supply*, 6329-31, 6336-45

FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS, COMMUNICATION WITH.

House of Representatives:

Question by Mr. Crouch as to power of direct communication with, 10181

INTERPRETATION OF.

House of Representatives:

Questions to Ministers involving, *obs.*, 1181
Question by Mr. Reid as to whether Government had consulted law officers on constitutionality of excise exemptions and Commonwealth mark, 4200

[*See RULINGS, THE PRESIDENT AND MR. SPEAKER.*]

SECESSION.

House of Representatives:

Agitation for, *Budget*, 2728, 2900, 3010, 3033, 3036; *supply*, 3429-31, 3438-40, 3535-7

SENATE'S RIGHT OF REQUEST. [*See PARLIAMENT.*]

STATE RIGHTS.

Senate:

Legal proceedings concerning the seizure of wire netting by the Government of New South Wales, *supply*, 5860, 5875
Validity of steamship subsidy by Victoria, *supply*, 6317, 6319

Questions by—

Senator Colonel Neild as to judgment of Full Court of New South Wales, that goods imported by that State are not dutiable, 2406

Senator O'Loughlin as to steamship subsidy by Victoria, 5746

House of Representatives:

Taxation of State imports, *supply*, 6291; *ways and means*, 7400-3, 7422-40

Questions by—

Mr. Hutchison as to right of State to subsidize vessels to carry its products to ports outside Commonwealth, 1181

Mr. Watkins as to whether importation of wire netting is covered by decision of Supreme Court of New South Wales, 2231

Mr. J. Cook as to an appeal from decision of Supreme Court of New South Wales on taxation of State imports, 2231; by Mr. Glynn, 2232

CONSTITUTION—*continued.*

WAIVER OF SECTION OF.

House of Representatives:

Question by Mr. Wilks, as to whether Prime Minister will waive section in Constitution exempting Commonwealth from payment of municipal rates, 11795

DEFENCE.

ADMINISTRATION.

Senate:

Efficiency of, *supply*, 3904-6, 10372-88

House of Representatives:

Efficiency of, *supply*, 9997, 10003

AMMUNITION.

Senate:

Artillery, *supply*, 4062
Cordite, manufacture of, *supply*, 3709, 11690, 11692-3
Defective, *adj.*, 4616, 4619
Tests, *adj.*, 4619

Questions by—

Senator Pearce, as to defective ammunition, 3463; as to cartridge blanks, 9237, 9796, 10255; as to contracts for cartridges, 9796; as to percussive caps, 11986

House of Representatives:

Artillery, *supply*, 3602, 3608
Cordite, manufacture of, *supply*, 3737-41
Damaged, supply of, to cadets and rifle clubs, *Budget*, 2819; *supply*, 3603, 3610, 3737

Hake, Mr., Report by, *m.*, 7530

Questions by—

Mr. Bowden as to practice ammunition for cadets, 3620, 3733

Mr. Kelly as to artillery ammunition, 1595

Mr. Henry Willis as to damaged ammunition, 2235; Mr. Bowden, 3301, 3422, 7116

AMMUNITION AND SMALL ARMS FACTORIES.

Senate:

Cordite Factory, Maribyrnong, *supply*, 11690, 11692-3
Expenditure on, *supply*, 3905
Lithgow Factory, *supply*, 11689, 11691-6
Necessity for, *supply*, 3814
Question by Senator Colonel Neild as to establishment of, 6409

House of Representatives:

Cordite Factory, *supply*, 11286
Expenditure for, *Budget*, 1637; *supply*, 3613, 3678-83
Hake, Mr., Report by, *m.*, 7530
Ministerial statement, *m.*, 7530
Necessity for, *address*, 348; *Budget*, 2661, 3271; *supply*, 3735, 3736
Policy of Government, *Budget*, 3110
Report by Brigadier-General Gordon, *adj.*, 743

DEFENCE—continued.

Ammunition and Small Arms Factories—continued—

Questions by—

- Mr. Crouch as to cordite and small arms factories, 3621, 8818, 11329
- Mr. Crouch as to remarks by Brigadier-General Gordon on proposed arsenal, 9767
- Mr. Kelly as to cost of cordite and small arms factories, 9389
- Mr. Page as to establishment of, 158, 6355, 6356, 6419; Mr. Bowden, 6023, 6356, 11792; Mr. Bamford, 6356

ARMS. [See RIFLES.]

ARTILLERY : GUNS, &C.

Senate:

- Field Artillery, guns, *supply*, 10376
- Ammunition waggons for field guns, *supply*, 4058-62

House of Representatives:

- Guns at Sydney Heads, *Budget*, 1637, 2270
- Guns, purchase of, *supply* 3614
- Guns, lights and emplacements for fixed defences, *supply*, 3741-48
- Guns, 18½ pounders, *supply*, 10001, 10082
- Ammunition Waggons and Field Artillery Guns, *supply*, 3602-11
- Question by Mr. Kelly as to distribution of 18½ pounder guns, 9479, 10077

ARTILLERY FORCES. [See MILITARY FORCES.]

ARTILLERY RANGES.

House of Representatives:

- Provision of, *supply*, 3453, 3454, 3455
- Questions by—
- Mr. Batchelor as to artillery practice at Nairne, 10700
- Mr. Crouch as to field artillery ranges, 6024
- Mr. Kelly as to field artillery ranges, 1595

BANDS.

House of Representatives:

- Pay of Bandsmen, *supply*, 10125
- Question by Mr. J. H. Catts as to cadet bands, 5239

BARRACKS.

Senate:

- Fremantle, *supply*, 11696
- Question by Senator Mulcahy as to Barrack Reserve, Hobart, 2615

CADETS. [See MILITARY AND NAVAL CADETS.]

CAMPS.

Senate:

- Extension of period, *supply*, 10379
- Question by Senator W. Russell as to camp at Nairne, 9137

House of Representatives:

- Questions by—
- Mr. J. Cook as to leave for telegraphists to attend military camps, 10079
- Mr. Coon as to Easter camp, Victoria, 9581

DEFENCE—continued.

Camps—continued.

Questions by—

- Mr. Crouch as to pay of men attending camps, 9581, 9955
- Mr. Crouch as to Easter camp, Victoria, 10609, 10787, 11097
- Mr. Kelly as to transport delays, Easter camps, 10484; by Mr. Crouch, 10484
- Mr. Page as to training camp at Heidelberg, 7248, 7297
- Sir John Quick as to camp in Bendigo district, 9193
- Mr. Salmon as to food at cadets' camp, 9955

[See TRAINING GROUNDS.]

COLLINS, CAPTAIN.

Senate:

- Position of, in Department, *supply*, 10294-5-6
- Question by Senator Clemons as to appointment of, 1814, 1928

House of Representatives:

- Position of, in Department, *supply*, 9487-9, 10109, 10114
- Salary of, *supply*, 1811
- Question by Mr. Crouch as to political utterances of, 7111; by Mr. B. Smith as to position of, 9476

COMPENSATION.

Senate:

- Beuley, F. W., case of, *supply*, 11620
- Question by Senator Colonel Neild as to Officers Compensation Bill, 7753, 10829, 10919

House of Representatives:

- Bayly, Colonel, case of, *supply*, 5790-1, 5794
- Mitchell case, *supply*, 5797
- Payment of, *supply*, 11390
- Question by Mr. Maloney as to compensation to Bombardier Shergold, 9955
- [See OFFICERS COMPENSATION BILL, under "BILLS."]

CONTRACTS.

Senate:

- Waggons, *supply*, 3906, 4059
- Questions by—
- Senator Pearce as to contract for ammunition waggons, 4245, 4264
- Senator Pearce as to cartridge contract, 9796

House of Representatives:

- Tenders: British preference, *supply*, 10082
- Questions by—
- Mr. Crouch as to contract for stores, 7116
- Mr. Mathews as to contract for bridles, 9380
- Mr. Storrer as to contract for boots, 9477, 10607; by Mr. Joseph Cook, 9478

DEFENCE—continued.

COUNCIL OF DEFENCE.

House of Representatives:

- Government Scheme of Defence, *supply*, 8826
- Question by Mr. Kelly as to opinion of on Defence policy of Government, 8812-3

COMMITTEE OF DEFENCE, IMPERIAL.

House of Representatives:

- Report of, *m.*, 7526; *supply*, 10116
- Question by Mr. Kelly as to reports concerning, 588

DEFENCE, COAST AND HARBOR.

House of Representatives:

- Appropriation for, *supply*, 11285
- Ministerial statement, *m.*, 7523-6
- Policy of Government, *supply*, 3600, 3615, 3677
- Submarine mining, *supply*, 3745
- Question by Mr. Watkins as to guns for harbor defence, 9479

[See COAST DEFENCE APPROPRIATION BILL, under "BILLS."]

DEFENCE, NAVAL.

Senate:

- Australian Navy, Projected, *address*, 150, 215, 219, 229, 235, 389, 479; *supply*, 11512
- Docking of Warships, *supply*, 6311
- Forces, distribution of, *supply*, 1950
- Report of Naval officers, *supply*, 10380, 10384

Questions by—

- Senator de Largie as to vessels suitable for defence and mail services, 2179
- Senator Millen as to use of submarines, 7754
- Senator Needham as to construction of torpedo boats, 1813, 1927, 4471, 11301; by Senator Dobson, 2179
- Senator Needham as to docking of warships, 6191
- Senator Pearce as to policy of Government, 5177, 5367, 5465-6
- Senator Pearce as to reports from officers sent to England, 5367; by Senator de Largie, 5466; by Senator Needham, 9633, 11580

House of Representatives:

- Australian Navy, Projected, *address*, 324; *Budget*, 2940; *supply*, 3599; *m.*, 7517, 7523
- Base, Australian Naval, *address*, 452; *m.*, 7516
- Depôt, Sydney, *adj.*, 9039-40
- Depôt, Williamstown, *supply*, 10104
- Dockyard, Commonwealth, *Budget*, 3271; expenditure on, *supply*, 3598
- Expenditure on, *supply*, 10000, 10001, 11408
- Ministerial Statement, *m.*, 7512-26
- Requirements of Commonwealth, *supply*, 10115, 10121
- Submarines, *supply*, 3743; *m.*, 7517, 7524
- Torpedo Fleet, *address*, 191, 220, 235; *supply*, 1780-2, 3742, 11286, 11408-18, *m.*, 7525

DEFENCE—continued.

Defence, Naval—continued.

Questions by—

- Mr. J. H. Catts as to shipbuilding yards, 10483
- Mr. Johnson as to policy of Government, 5237
- Mr. Kelly as to tenders for vessels, 1749; by Mr. Johnson, 1750
- Mr. B. Smith as to correspondence, 9686, 9767
- Mr. Wilks as to Naval Depôt, Sydney, 8815, 8938
- Mr. Wilks as to offer of English firm to build vessels, 4308; by Mr. Hughes, 4308
- Mr. H. Willis as to Government policy, 4411

[See COAST DEFENCE APPROPRIATION BILL under "BILLS."]

DEFENCE, NAVAL AGREEMENT.

Senate:

- Policy of Government, *address*, 47, 57, 60, 77, 150, 374, 383; *supply*, 11513

Questions by—

- Senator Needham as to policy of Government, 1131, 2514
- Senator Pulsford as to exchange on payments, 10251

House of Representatives:

- Policy of Government, *address*, 96, 112, 169, 173, 191, 215, 219, 228, 242, 351, 450; *Budget*, 1636, 2127, 2143, 2270, 2660, 2695, 2819, 2940, 3001, 3225, 3228, 3289, 3340, 3354; *supply*, 1806; *adj.*, 3230; *supply*, 3601, 3602; Ministerial Statement, *m.*, 7512-26

Questions by—

- Mr. Kelly as to continuation of Australian contribution, 1377
- Mr. Kelly as to views of Mr. Ewing, Minister of Defence, 12041; by Mr. Reid, 12041
- Mr. Mahon as to correspondence, 2998; by Mr. B. Smith, 10310, 12041, 12200
- Mr. B. Smith as to policy of Government, 1282, 2689, 3300, 3422, 4309, 10523; by Mr. Wilks, 1377; by Mr. Kelly, 1377, 12041; by Mr. Willis, 1378; by Mr. Johnson, 1378, 7461, 8815, 12040, 12041

DEFENCE: SCHEME OF—

Senate:

- Appropriation for, *supply*, 11622
- Policy of Government, *supply*, 5873, 5877, 6311, 7545, 7552, 8915, 8922
- Question by Senator Dobson as to Government scheme, 5560; by Senator Pearce, 5560

DEFENCE—continued.

Defence: Scheme of—continued.

House of Representatives:

Appropriation for, *supply*, 11274, 11408-18
Cost of, *supply*, 3608, 10096, 10112
Criticism of Government Scheme, *supply*, 8826, 8828, 8832, 8846, 8850, 10095
Militia, position of, under Government policy, *supply*, 9998, 10095
Policy of Government: Ministerial Statement, *m.*, 7509-36
Preparation of, *supply*, 3605

Questions by—

Mr. Bowden as to criticisms of, 8927, 9009

Mr. Crouch as to proposed legislation, 9193

Mr. Kelly as to preparation of strategic scheme, 1087

Mr. Kelly as to criticisms invited from members of forces on Government policy, 8812-3, 11743; by Mr. Reid, 8812-3; by Mr. Mahon, 8813; by Mr. Chanter, 8813

Mr. Kelly as to advice of Imperial Defence Committee, 12040

Mr. Kelly as to circulation of Government Bill, 9389

Mr. Maloney as to oath of fidelity to Australia, 9299

Mr. O'Malley as to taxation for defence purposes, 11419

DRILL HALLS.

Senate:

Colah, *supply*, 11691

Expenditure on, *supply*, 3904, 3933, 11690

House of Representatives:

Question by Sir John Quick as to drill hall for cadets at Bendigo, 11097

EXPENDITURE.

Senate:

Burden of, *address*, 286

Details of, *supply*, 1949, 3803, 3904, 8008

Special, *supply*, 3799

House of Representatives:

Estimated, under new scheme, *m.*, 7534

Increase of, *Budget*, 1633, 1636, 2463, 3118; *m.*, 7534; *supply*, 3328, 9999, 10001, 10083, 10112, 10124

Loan Expenditure, *Budget*, 2463

Ministerial statement, *m.*, 7509-36

Retrenchment, *address*, 450

Special, *Budget*, 3340

Question by Mr. King O'Malley as to taxation for defence purposes, 11628

[See also under "DEFENCE, SCHEME OF," and COAST DEFENCE APPROPRIATION BILL, under "BILLS."]

FLAG.

House of Representatives:

Australian flag, adoption of, *supply*, 10119, 10120.

Questions by—

Mr. Atkinson as to Australian ensign, 9192

Mr. B. Smith as to deposition of Union Jack, 10969

DEFENCE—continued.

FORTIFICATIONS.

Senate:

Albany, *supply*, 10379, 10384

Thursday Island, explosion, *supply*, 11620, 11696, 12146

Question by Senator Chataway as to explosion at Thursday Island, 11678

House of Representatives:

Albany, *supply*, 10116

Batteries, *supply*, 3742

Expenditure on, *supply*, 3599, 3741-8

Fremantle, *supply*, 3446, 3447, 4043

Guns at Sydney Heads, *Budget*, 1637, 2270

Guns, *supply*, 3741, 3744, 3747, 3748

Lights, *supply*, 3741

Port Jackson, *supply*, 3446, 3743, 3746

Townsville, *supply*, 10116

Questions by—

Mr. Bamford as to dynamite explosion, Green Hill Fort, Thursday Island, 10750, 11627; by Mr. J. H. Catts, 12040

Sir John Forrest as to Albany Forts, 9845

HORSES.

Senate:

Sickness of, South Australian encampment, *supply*, 8995

Question by Senator W. Russell as to sickness of, 9137

House of Representatives:

Supply of, *supply*, 10117

HUTTON, MAJOR-GENERAL.

Senate:

Command of, *supply*, 10372-3, 10383

House of Representatives:

Promotion of officers, *supply*, 10097-8, 10100-1, 10107

Scheme of Defence, *supply*, 10094-5

MAPS.

Senate:

Military, *supply*, 9000

House of Representatives:

Ordnance, *supply*, 3605

MEDICAL CORPS.

House of Representatives:

Equipment, *supply*, 3603

Reserve, *adj.*, 7540

Question by Mr. Salmon as to medical reserve, 6968, 10609

MILITARY BOARD.

Senate:

Amendment of rules by, *supply*, 5860

Membership of, *supply*, 5867

Work of, *supply*, 10084-6

House of Representatives:

Composition of, *supply*, 8833

Functions of, *supply*, 3605, 3606

Questions by—

Mr. Salmon as to meetings of, 1977, 3589; as to membership, 3972, 7458

Mr. Kelly as to consultation of, re Government Defence policy, 8812-3, 8926

DEFENCE—continued.

MILITARY CADETS.

Senate:

Cost of System, *m.*, 5981
Contingencies, *supply*, 8997-8
Instructors, Staff Officers, *supply*, 8914
Medical Examinations, *q.*, 3586, 3936
Training of, *address*, 391, 393, 479; *supply*, 3604, 8997

Questions by—

Senator Neild as to rank and services of staff officers, 8672, 8866
Senator Neild as to training and equipment, 11219
Senator Pearce as to extension of Force in Western Australia, 3464, 3706

House of Representatives:

Enrolment, *Budget*, 2819
Expenditure on, *Budget*, 1633; *m.*, 7529
Medical examination of, *supply*, 10083
Ministerial statement, *m.*, 7529
Training of, *address*, 130, 235; *Budget*, 3270

Questions by—

Mr. Bowden as to rifle practice, 3620, 3733
Mr. Carr as to cadets at Parramatta camp, 11792
Mr. J. H. Catts as to bands, 5239
Mr. J. H. Catts as to numbers and miniature ranges, 5329, 6228
Mr. Crouch as to instructors, 988
Mr. Crouch as to cadets at Easter camp, Langwarrin, 11097, 11182
Mr. Hall as to Gordon Club, New South Wales, 11180
Mr. Hughes as to Corowa corps, 5328
Mr. Hutchison as to medical examination, 3586, 7248
Mr. McWilliams as to cadet officers, 9090
Mr. Page as to 2nd Battalion, 1089
Sir John Quick as to drill-room for Bendigo cadets, 11097
Mr. Salmon as to food at cadets' camp, 9955

[See UNIFORMS AND EQUIPMENT.]

MILITARY COMMANDANTS, STATE.

Senate:

Inspections by, *supply*, 10374
Western Australian Commandant, *supply*, 10380, 10384

House of Representatives:

Appointments, *supply*, 3611, 3612, 3613, 10086
Queensland Commandant, *supply*, 10111-2
New South Wales Commandant, *supply*, 10093

Questions by—

Mr. Crouch as to Western Australian Commandant, 11702
Mr. Reid as to active service of, 2122, 2906

[See RIFLE CLUBS.]

DEFENCE—continued.

MILITARY FORCES.

Senate:

Allotment of units, *adj.*, 4618
Conduct of militiamen in Brisbane, *supply*, 10384
Corps of Guides, *supply*, 8998, 9000
New South Wales, strength, *supply*, 1034
Western Australia, inspection of troops, *address*, 15

Questions by—

Senator Pearce, as to allotment of units, 4471
Senator Chataway, as to appointments, 4471

House of Representatives:

Equipment, *supply*, 10097, 10117
Intelligence Corps, *m.*, 7532
Mobilization, *supply*, 10117
Organization of, *address*, 450
Volunteers, statement by Minister of Defence, *supply*, 7546

Questions by—

Mr. Crouch as to marriage regulations, 4311
Mr. Crouch as to enlistment, 4748, 7249
Mr. Crouch as to rations, 4927, 5240
Mr. Crouch as to medical examinations, 4310
Mr. Crouch as to guards of honour, 9099, 9299, 9686
Mr. Crouch as to discharge fees, 9685
Mr. Crouch as to Military Staff clerks, 10789
Mr. Watkins as to musketry returns, 3734, 3972

Artillery.

Senate:

Training, *supply*, 10376-8
Western Australia batteries, *supply*, 10377

House of Representatives:

Chief of Ordnance, *supply*, 3611, 3612, 10087
Forces at Thursday Island, *supply*, 1050, 10375
Inspector of Ordnance, *supply*, 10104
Instruction, Field Artillery, *supply*, 10109
Lang, Bombardier, treatment of, *adj.*, 2343, 2344, 2511
Machinery Section, ordnance, *supply*, 10104

Ministerial statement, *m.*, 7530

Officers, *supply*, 10090
Training, *supply*, 10002, 10088, 10111

Questions by—

Mr. Batchelor as to artillery practice at Nairne, 10700
Mr. Crouch as to artillery sergeants, 980
Mr. Crouch as to Bombardier Lang, 1089, 2313, 2348
Mr. Crouch as to pay of acting bombardiers, 2348
Mr. Crouch as to armament artificers, 2450
Mr. Crouch as to commanding officers, 2691
Mr. Crouch as to field artillery training, 11261

DEFENCE—continued.

Military Forces—continued.

Questions by—

- Mr. Crouch as to training of No. 6 Company, R.A.A., 9686
- Mr. Crouch as to discharge money paid by members of R.A.A., 11097
- Mr. Crouch as to payments to R.A.A., Victoria, 11793
- Mr. Crouch as to bullying of recruits, 11920; by Mr. Maloney, 11921
- Mr. Kelly as to ranges and ammunition, 1595
- Mr. McDougall as to Militia Garrison Artillery, 10464

Engineers.

House of Representatives:

- Equipment, *supply*, 3610
- Officers, appointment of, *supply*, 10089.
- Question by Mr. Bruce Smith as to appointment of military engineer, 2793, 2997

Infantry.

Senate:

- Equipment, *supply*, 10378
- Officers' allowances, *supply*, 7545
- St. George's Rifles, Badges, *supply*, 5862
- Question by Senator Guthrie as to officers of 10th Regiment, 8423

House of Representatives:

- Bayonets, *supply*, 3610, 3611, 3735
- Questions by—
- Mr. Fairbairn as to short bayonets, 4842
- Mr. McWilliams as to Derwent Regiment, 2122
- Sir John Quick as to Bendigo battalion, 1867
- Mr. Watkins as to dismissal of militiamen connected with dispute at Adamstown range, Newcastle, 9581

Light Horse.

Senate:

- Revolvers for, *supply*, 3905

House of Representatives:

- Condoblin Corps, *supply*, 5799, 10122
- Corps, new, formation of, *supply*, 5799, 10084, 10122
- Equipment, *supply*, 3603, 3905, 10099
- Questions by—
- Mr. Harper as to camps, officers, parades, and instructional staff, 6595
- Mr. Palmer as to Quarter-Master of the 9th Regiment, 12157
- Sir John Quick as to 9th Victorian Regiment, 11385, 12156
- Mr. Salmon as to new service bridle, 3852

DEFENCE—continued.

MILITARY FORCES, INSPECTOR-GENERAL OF.

Senate:

- Inspection, St. George's Rifles, *supply*, 5862
- Report by, *supply*, 10373-81, 10384
- Question by Senator Stewart as to Inspector-General's official visit to Armidale, 6190

House of Representatives:

- Functions of, *supply*, 10087, 10094
- Government Defence Scheme, *supply*, 8834
- Question by Mr. Reid as to active service of, 2122, 2996

MILITARY HEAD-QUARTERS STAFF:

House of Representatives:

- Question by Mr. Salmon as to leakage of information from, 12157

MILITARY OFFICERS.

Senate:

- Allowances, *supply*, 7545, 10382
- Cadet instructors, *supply*, 8914
- Instructional staff, *supply*, 10384
- Pay, *supply*, 8913, 8914, 8915, 8996, 10385-8
- Promotion, *supply*, 5863, 8996-7
- Shortage of, *supply*, 3905, 8916, 10374, 10383
- Training of, *supply*, 11516
- Uniforms, cost of, *supply*, 10374, 10380, 10381

Questions by—

- Senator Guthrie as to officers of 10th Infantry Regiment, 8423
- Senator Colonel Neild as to rank and services of staff officers commanding cadet corps, 8672, 8866, 10253
- Senator Colonel Neild as to case of Major Dove, 10253-4

House of Representatives:

- Allowances for quarters, *m.*, 9481
- Carrington, Colonel, *supply*, 10106
- Cox, Colonel, 10098, 10100, 10105, 10108
- D.A.A.G., Victoria, *supply*, 10125
- Engineers, &c., *supply*, 10089
- Exchange of, *address*, 449; *m.*, 7531; *adj.*, 7540
- Expert instructors, proposed appointment of, *m.*, 7530
- General officer commanding, suggested appointment of, *supply*, 10001
- Harding, Major, *supply*, 10104-5
- Instruction abroad, *supply*, 3615
- Lyster, Colonel, *supply*, 10111, 10112
- Ministerial Statement, *m.*, 7530-2
- Names and services, *m.*, 4087
- Promotions, *supply*, 5785, 5787, 5795, 10086-90, 10098, 10100-1-3, 10105-7, 10124; *m.*, 7531; *adj.*, 7540
- "Rankers," *Budget*, 2937; *supply*, 10089, 10103
- Riley, Colonel, *supply*, 10106
- Routine work, *supply*, 10109
- Shortage of, *supply*, 3454, 3608, 10084, 10110, 10115

DEFENCE—continued.

Military Officers—continued.

Staff, and Government Defence Scheme, *supply*, 8833

Training of, *address*, 215, 348; *m.*, 7530-2; *supply*, 10118

Uniforms and equipment, cost, *supply*, 3605

Questions by—

Mr. Bamford as to employment of alien servants by officers, 11627; Mr. W. H. Irvine, 12156-7; Mr. Kelly, 12156

Mr. Bowden as to allowances for quarters, 10077

Mr. J. Cook as to case of Colonel Cox, 11386

Mr. Crouch as to Sydney class of instruction, 2123

Mr. Crouch as to appointments, 4200

Mr. Crouch as to cost of officers' uniforms and swords, 10401

Mr. Crouch as to examinations for instructional staff commissions, 11793

Mr. Hutchison as to conduct of Lieut. Russell, 1752, 1976; as to conduct of Sergeant Hanks, 1976

Mr. Johnson as to criticisms by officers in Parliament, 12043

Mr. Kelly as to case of Captain Crouch, 11703

Mr. Mahon as to officers supplying information to members of Parliament, 8813

Mr. Maloney as to examination for rank of major, Victorian Scottish Regiment, 6232

Mr. McWilliams as to cadet officers, 9090

Mr. Page as to promotions, 974; Mr. J. Cook, 5600, 6594

Mr. Page as to commands of "unattached" officers, 10080

Mr. Page as to speech by Lt.-Colonel Onslow, 11702; Mr. Salmon, 11703

Mr. Salmon as to records of officers, 2234

Mr. Salmon as to reserve, 4518

Mr. Salmon as to training abroad, 6025

[See "COMPENSATION."]

MILITARY SCHOOL [see TRAINING, MILITARY].

NATIONAL GUARD.

House of Representatives:

Proposed formation of, Ministerial Statement, *m.*, 7528-31

Question by Mr. Kelly as to estimated expenditure for, 8926

NAVAL AGREEMENT [See DEFENCE, NAVAL.]

NAVAL CADETS.

Senate:

Training of, *address*, 479.

House of Representatives:

Educational Standard, *Budget*, 2270

Ministerial Statement, *m.*, 7526

[See PROTECTOR, GUNBOAT.]

DEFENCE—continued.

NAVAL FORCES.

Senate:

Distribution of, *supply*, 1950

Torpedo Practice, *supply*, 4062

House of Representatives:

Naval Brigade, *Budget*, 3271

Training of Crews, *Budget*, 1633; *m.*, 7517; *supply*, 10118

Questions by—

Mr. Bruce Smith as to torpedo practice, 3269, 3421

Mr. Mathews as to retiring age, 7116

Mr. Watkins as to long service medals for Naval Brigade, 9953, 10462

[See DEFENCE, NAVAL.]

NORTHERN TERRITORY.

Senate:

Defence of, *supply*, 142; *address*, 190, 239, 375, 381

House of Representatives:

Defence of, *Budget*, 2939; *supply*, 3450, 3609

PENSIONS.

House of Representatives:

Question by Mr. Kelly as to establishment of pensions system, 11385

PROTECTOR, GUNBOAT.

Senate:

Alterations to, *supply*, 4043

Cadet Training, *address*, 479

Expenses connected with, *supply*, 12147

Seaworthiness of, *address*, 390

House of Representatives:

Repairs, *supply*, 3450

REGULATIONS, RULES, AND ORDERS.

Senate:

Amendment of, *supply*, 5860-2

Number of, *supply*, 10381

House of Representatives:

Question by Mr. Atkinson as to regulation *re* Australian Ensign, 9192

REPORTS.

Senate:

Inspector-General's report, *supply*, 10373-8, 10384

House of Representatives:

Bridges, Colonel, Report on Swiss System: Ministerial Statement, *m.*, 7528

Gordon, Brigadier-General, Report on ammunition and small-arms factory, *adj.*, 743

Hake, Mr., Report on manufacture of explosives, *m.*, 7530

Question by Mr. Crouch as to Colonel Bridges' report on European military systems, 2347

DEFENCE—continued.

RIFLE CLUBS.

Senate:

Allowances, *supply*, 7545
Ammunition for, *supply*, 1950
Expenditure on, *supply*, 1949
Musketry Course, *supply*, 10379
Promotion of, *address*, 391
Western Australian Clubs, *supply*, 10380

Questions by—

Senator Findley as to Berringa Club,
2616, 5978
Senator Pearce as to friction with State
Commandants, 6061, 6294, 7572

House of Representatives:

Burrage Rifle Corps, projected, *supply*,
5799
Cowra, *supply*, 10123
Expenditure on *Budget*, 1633; *m.*, 7529;
supply, 10113
Ministerial Statement, *m.*, 7529, 7533
Promotion of, *Budget*, 3271; *supply*, 4037,
8850, 10122
Railway fares, *supply*, 3451, 3453
Temora, *supply*, 10123

Questions by—

Mr. Salmon as to supply of rifles,
2995, 5237; Mr. McDougall, 11158
Mr. Poynton as to accommodation at
Port Adelaide Rifle Ranges, 9585
Sir John Quick as to registration of
West Shelbourne Club, 8926
Mr. Salmoa as to Competitions, 2995

RIFLE MATCHES.

Senate:

Question by Senator Pearce as to tents
at Sydney matches, 5083; by Senator
Walker, 5083, 5283, 6189

House of Representatives:

Questions by—

Mr. Salmon as to Women's Exhibition
Rifle Matches, 6673
Mr. Salmon as to Empire Rifle
Matches, 11019
Mr. Willis as to prize money, Single-
ton Rifle Matches, 10080

RIFLE RANGES.

Senate:

Brisbane, *supply*, 4037-43, 11690
Burnie, *supply*, 10379
Chatswood, *supply*, 3934
Expenditure on, *supply*, 11689-90
Hobart, *supply*, 4044, 11697
Randwick, *supply*, 3905
Singleton, *supply*, 3934
Williamstown, *supply*, 11690

Questions by—

Senator Findley as to Berringa Range,
7841
Senator McColl as to Kerang Range,
8424
Senator Mulcahy as to Sandy Bay,
Hobart, 4142

DEFENCE—continued.

Rifle Ranges—continued.

House of Representatives:

Brisbane, *supply*, 3449, 3450
Cairns, *supply*, 3450
Elwood, *supply*, 3451
Extension of, *supply*, 3452, 3456
Ipswich, *supply*, 3449
North Pine, *supply*, 3450
Parramatta, *supply*, 3450, 3451, 10091,
10102
Ryde, 10092-3, 10102
Telephones for, *supply*, 3449
Williamstown, *supply*, 3451
Questions by—

Mr. Bowden as to Flemington
(N.S.W.) Range, 10609, 10653
Mr. J. H. Catts as to miniature ranges,
5329
Mr. Joseph Cook as to Buffalo Hill
Range, 9009, 10701
Mr. Johnson as to supply of Morris
tubes, 9478; Mr. Hedges, 9478
Mr. Mathews as to Williamstown
Range, 9581
Mr. O'Malley as to Ulverstone Range,
2449
Mr. Poynton as to Adelaide Ranges,
9585
Mr. Watkins as to repairs to Adams-
town Range, 10077
Mr. Willis as to Singleton Range,
10701

RIFLES.

Senate:

Defective, *supply*, 9000
Supply of, *supply*, 3905
Question by Senator Neild as to rifles
for cadets, 11219

House of Representatives:

Cadet rifles and spare parts, *supply*, 3603,
3610
Manufacture of, *supply*, 3680-2, 3736,
5789, 5796
Supply of, Ministerial Statement, *m.*,
7529-30

Questions by—

Mr. Palmer as to supply of, 1753
Mr. Salmon as to supply for Rifle
Clubs, 2995, 5237; Mr. McDougall,
11158
Mr. B. Smith as to supply of, 9478
Mr. Watkins as to re-boring of, 9479
Mr. Willis as to rifles for cadets, 6674,
11920

SIGNALLING.

Senate:

Stations, *supply*, 3934

House of Representatives:

Stations, *supply*, 3604

STAFF, IMPERIAL GENERAL.

Senate:

Proposed formation of, *address*, 10

House of Representatives:

Proposed formation of, *address*, 95
Officers, Appointment to, *m.*, 7532

DEFENCE—*continued.*

STORES.

*House of Representatives:*Director of, *supply*, 1811, 10109[*See CONTRACTS.*]THURSDAY ISLAND. [*See MILITARY FORCES*; also "FORTIFICATIONS."]

TRAINING GROUNDS.

*House of Representatives:*Bacchus Marsh, *supply*, 3453Langwarrin, *supply*, 3452Monaro, *supply*, 3610Nepean Peninsular, *supply*, 3452, 3453, 3454

TRAINING, MILITARY.

*Senate:*Compulsory, *address*, 374, 393Necessity for, *address*, 11

Question by Senator Pearce as to Military school, Melbourne University, 4143

*House of Representatives:*Ministerial Statement, *m.*, 7528Necessity for, *m.*, 1282, 2236; *Budget*, 2937, 2939

Question by Mr. Page as to training camp at Heidelberg 7248, 7297

TRANSPORT.

*Senate:*Waggon, breakdown of, *obs.*, 7843-6

Question by Senator Sayers as to breakdown of transport waggons, 7704; by Senator Neild, 7704, 7752

House of Representatives:

Question by Mr. Kelly as to delays in connexion with Easter camps, 10484; by Mr. Crouch, 10484

UNIFORMS AND EQUIPMENT.

*Senate:*Badges, *supply*, 5862Boots, *supply* of, *supply*, 5861, 5875Contracts, Western Australia, *supply*, 10380, 10384Great Coats, *supply* of, *supply*, 5862Infantry, equipment, *supply*, 10378Light Horse, equipment, *supply*, 3603, 3905, 10099Military Forces, equipment, *supply*, 10097, 10117Officers' uniforms, expensiveness of, *supply*, 10374, 10380-1Regulations as to military clothing, *m.*, 249

Questions by—

Senator Croft as to *supply* of belts and other leather equipment, 9042

Senator de Largie as to sweating conditions in manufacture of uniforms, 5859, 6295

Senator McGregor as to cadet uniforms, 249; Senator Needham, 11580

DEFENCE—*continued.*Uniforms and Equipment—*continued.*

Questions by—

Senator Needham as to military saddles, 10920

Senator Neild as to *supply* of military boots, 9734, 9892-3

Senator Neild as to cadet uniforms and equipment, 11219

Senator Pearce as to contracts for uniforms, 353; Senator Lynch, 354; Senator Needham, 9706, 11303

*House of Representatives:*Engineers' equipment, *supply*, 3610Medical Corps, equipment, *supply*, 3603National Guard, projected, suggested uniform of, *m.*, 7529

Questions by—

Mr. J. Cook as to *supply* of boots, 9478

Mr. Crouch as to cost of officers' uniforms and swords, 10401

Mr. Crouch as to Australian uniforms used at English military tournament, 11056

Mr. Fairbairn as to equipment of mounted cadets, 9090

Mr. Hutchison as to cadet uniforms, 21, 192

Mr. Maloney as to badge of 11th Light Horse, 883; as to uniforms and equipment of senior cadets, 11793

Mr. McWilliams as to cadet head coverings, 10130

Mr. Salmon as to new service bridle, 3852

VETERANS.

House of Representatives:

Questions by—

Sir John Forrest as to provision for veterans of wars, 6593, 9092, 11702, 11920, 12040; Mr. Maloney, 6593; Mr. Hutchison, 12040

Sir John Forrest as to treatment of wounded South African soldiers, 11701

VOLUNTEERS. [*See MILITARY FORCES.*]

WORKS AND BUILDINGS.

*Senate:*Store, Darling Island, *supply*, 3930

Question by Senator Mulcahy as to the Barrack Reserve, Hobart, 2615

*House of Representatives:*Boat Harbor, Swan Island, *supply*, 3440Expenditure, Details, *supply*, 12191Launceston Magazine, *supply*, 2450

DIVISIONS.

Senate:

Adjournment, *m.*, 587, 2963

Adjournment, special, 7790

Australian Industries Preservation Bill, 2R., 4914; *com.*, proposed new section 15A (burden of proof), *amdt.*, to leave out words that the assessments of the prosecutor shall be deemed to be proved in absence of proof to contrary, 4923; that proposed new section be agreed to, 4924; proposed new section 15b (power to require persons to answer questions and produce documents), *amdt.*, to insert words enabling application to be made to a Judge for leave to examine persons, 5046; *amdt.*, to insert "apply *ex parte* to a Judge in chambers for leave to examine," 5106

Bills of Exchange Bill, *com.*, clause 100 (protest when notary not accessible), *amdt.*, to leave out "and the services of a notary cannot be obtained," 763, 2418; clause 7 (stamp duty), that sub-clause 2 stand as printed, 1973; clause 81 (protection of banker), 2209; new clause 7A (validity of unstamped bills), 2297; new clause 81A (post-dated cheques), 2299

Bounties Bill, 2R., *amdt.*, that a system of agricultural education should be established, 2765; *com.*, clause 9 (regulations) on paragraph A., 2863; on paragraph C., 2864; on paragraph D., 2864; that progress be reported, 2962; (New Zealand flax), 3158; (flax and hemp), 3158; (jute), 3267; (mohair), 3394; (copra), 3405; (rice), request to increase the bounty, 3487; that the item be agreed to, 3489; (rubber), 3577; (coffee), 3722, 3725; tobacco leaf, to leave out words "quality to be prescribed," 4262; on item tobacco leaf, 4262; (fish), 4276; *m.*, to recommit, 4840; *recom.* (copra), 4840; (coffee), 4841, 4866; (tobacco leaf), 4908; *cons. amdts.* (copra), 6412; (tobacco leaf), 6412

Commonwealth Salaries Bill, 2R., 878; *com.*, clause 2 (taxation), *amdt.*, to insert "before and" before "after," 1045; *amdt.*, to leave out word "allowances," 1054

Disputed Elections and Qualifications Bill, 2R., *m.*, that the debate be adjourned, 5472

Excise Procedure Bill, *com.*, new clause 4a (exclusion of counsel or solicitor), *amdt.*, to leave out word "or," 5128; to insert the word "agent," 5128

Excise Tariff Bill, *com.*, (schedule) glucose, request to make the duty on confectionery containing, 2d. per pound, 10040

Invalid and Old-age Pensions Bill, *com.*, clause 15 (age of women pensioners), *amdt.*, to insert "upon the passing of a joint address by both Houses of Parliament," 12027

Judiciary Bill, 2R., that the debate be adjourned, 861; that the Bill be read a second time, 878; *com.*, clause 2 (matter in which jurisdiction of High Court is exclusive), that the clause stand as printed, 942; new clause, 7A (special leave to appeal), 954

DIVISIONS—continued.

Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway Survey Bill, 2R., *amdt.*, that the Bill should be withdrawn, pending agreement with South Australia, 1364; that the Bill be read a second time, 1376; *com.*, clause 2 (survey), *amdt.*, to require the formal consent of the South Australian Parliament, 1502; *amdt.*, to require an additional Act for further expenditure, 1513; 3K., 1704

Linotype operators, *m.*, 5406

London Offices, on proposed vote for, 4083

Parliamentary Allowances Bill, 2R., 2116; *com.*, clause 1 (title), *amdt.*, to make the Bill come into operation sixty days after the meeting of the next Parliament, 2117; 3R., 2194

Parliamentary Papers Bill, 2R., 12130

Privilege: Select Committee on Procedure, *m.*, 10013, 10260

Promotions in Customs Department, *m.*, that a paper be printed, 137

Public Service, List of Officers, that a paper be printed, 8228

Quarantine Bill, *com.*, clause 13 (prohibition of removal of animals, plants, or goods from any State or part of the Commonwealth), *amdt.*, to add proviso that prohibition should not extend to removal from one part of a State to any other part of same State, 5493; clause 59 (liability of owners), *amdt.*, to make owners liable for one-half cost in case of passengers, and whole cost in case of crew, 6088; on the clause, 6088, clause 75 (vaccination), *amdt.*, to exempt persons having conscientious objections, 6225

Senate: Usher of the Black Rod, *supply*, request to reduce salary by £1, 10290

Supply Bill (No. 2), *com.*, clause 2 (appropriation), request to reduce amount by one-third, 1947

Surplus Revenue Bill, 2R., 11903; *com.*, clause 1 (commencement), *amdt.*, to make Bill come into operation on 1st July, 1908, 11907; clause 4 (trust accounts), *amdt.*, to insert "after 1st July, 1908," 11909

Transport Waggon, breakdown of, *m.*, that a paper be printed, 7846

Tariff, *com.*, item 12, wine, sparkling, request to make the duty 24s. per gallon, 7628; to make the duty 20s. per gallon, 7631; to make the duty 15s. per gallon, 7631; item 18, tobacco manufactured, *n.e.i.*, to make the duty 3s. 3d. per pound, 7645; item 19, tobacco, unmanufactured, but entered to be locally manufactured into tobacco or cigarettes, unstemmed, to make the duty 1s. 9d. per pound, 7649; item 22, cigar tobacco, unmanufactured, to make the duty 2s. per pound, 7651; item 33A, horned cattle, to leave out the item, 7655; item 33B, sheep, to leave out the item, 7656; item 33C, pigs, to leave out the item, 7657; item 33D, horses, to leave out the item, 7658; item 34, sago and tapioca, to make the item free, 7666; item 35, biscuits, to make the item free, 7680; to make the duty 1d. per pound, 7684; item 36, laundry blue, to make the duty 1d. per pound, 7695; to make the duty 1½d. per pound, 7695; to make the duty 1½d. per pound

DIVISIONS—*continued.*

(United Kingdom), 7697; item 39, butter and cheese, to make the item free, 7709; item 40A, candles, paraffine wax, to make the duty (General Tariff), 1½d. per pound, 7709; item 42, stearine, paraffine wax, &c., to make the duty ¼d. per pound, 7720; item 45A, confectionery n.e.i., to make the duty 2d. per pound (General Tariff), 7740; to make the duty 2½d. per pound, 7741; to make the duty 2d. per pound (United Kingdom), 7745; to make the duty 3d. per pound (United Kingdom), 7746; item 45F, cocoa butter, to make the duty 1½d. per pound (General Tariff), 7747; item 46C, liquorice, to make the duty 2d. per pound, 7757; to insert words "except for medicinal purposes," 7761; item 47, coffee, to make the item free, 7780; item 47B, coffee and chicory, to make the duty 5d. per pound, 7782; item 53, fish, to insert words "smoked or preserved by cold process," 7808; item 53G, fresh New Zealand blue cod, 7808; item 54, fruits, dried, that the item be postponed, 7828; item 54A, currants, to make the duty 2d. per pound, 9948; item 54B, dates, to make the duty 2d. per pound, 9949; item 56, fruit, citrus, to make the duty 1d. per pound, 7831; item 57, ginger, that the item be free, 7833; item 58, peel, preserved, to make the duty 2d. per pound, 7835; item 59, bananas, to make the item free, 7872; item 60, vegetables, n.e.i., to make the duty 1s. per cental, 7873; item 61, vegetables, dried, to make the item free, 7879; to make the duty 15 per cent., 7880; to make the duty 15 per cent. (United Kingdom), 7880; item 61A, herbs, dried, to make the duty 4d. per pound, 7883; to make the duty 4d. per pound (United Kingdom), 7883; item 62, onions, to make the item free, 7888; item 63, potatoes, to make the item free, 7888; item 65C, cornflower, to make the goods free, 7906; to make the duty ½d. per pound, 7914; to make the duty 1d. per pound, 7914; to make the duty (United Kingdom), 1d. per pound, 7918; item 65CC, oatmeal, that the goods be free, 7920; that the duty be 2s. per cental, 7920; item 67, hay and chaff, to make the duty 1s. per cwt., 7944; item 68, straw, to make the item free, 7944; item 69, honey, jams, &c., to make the duty 1½d. per pound, 7945; to leave out the preferential duty, 7946; to make the duty (United Kingdom), 1d. per pound, 7947; item 70, hops, to make the duty (United Kingdom), 4d. per pound, 7947; to make the duty (United Kingdom), 5d. per pound, 7949; item 75, arrowroot, to make the item free, 7950; to make the duty 1d. per pound, 7955; item 76, macaroni, to make the item free, 7956; item 77, malt, to make the duty (United Kingdom), 5s. per cental, 7956; item 78, malt extract, to make the item free, 7960; to make the duty (United Kingdom), 1d. per pound, 7960; item 79A, matches and vestas, to make the item free, 7972; to make the duty 6d. per gross boxes, 7998; to make the duty 1s. 6d. per gross, 7999; to make the duty

DIVISIONS—*continued.*

(United Kingdom), 1s. per gross, 8008; to make the duty (United Kingdom), 9d. per gross, 8008; item 80A, fresh or smoked meats, to make the duty 1d. per pound, 8011; item 80B, potted or concentrated meats, to make the goods free, 8013; to make the duty 20 per cent., 8013; to make the duty (United Kingdom), 20 per cent., 8013; item 80B, meat preserved by cold process, to insert "poultry and game," 8018; item 83A, milk, preserved, sweetened, to make the duty 1½d. per pound, 8025; to make the duty (United Kingdom), 1d. per pound, 8025; item 84, mustard seed, that the goods be free, 8030; item 85, mustard, that the goods be free, 8031; to make the duty 2d. per pound, 8031; to make the duty (United Kingdom), 2d. per lb., 8031; item 88, oilmen's stores, to make the goods free, 8045; to make the duty 15 per cent., 8046; item 88A, invalids' diabetic food, to leave out the word "diabetic," 8058; to leave out the words "not manufactured in the Commonwealth," 8062; item 91B, isinglass, to make the duty (United Kingdom) 10 per cent., 8065; item 93B, curry, to make the duty 25 per cent., 8066; to make the duty 30 per cent., 8066; to make the duty (United Kingdom) 20 per cent., 8066; item 94A, rice, uncleaned, to make the goods free, 8082; to make the duty 1s. 6d. per cental, 8085; to make the duty 2s. 4d. per cental, 8086; item 94C, rice, n.e.i., to make the duty 4s. 3d. per cental, 8088; item 95, salt, to make the duty (United Kingdom) 10 per cent., 8088; item 96B, salt, n.e.i., to make the duty 12s. 6d. per ton, 8095; item 100A, toilet soap, to make the duty (United Kingdom), 20 per cent. or 3d. per pound, 8097; item 100B, soap, n.e.i., to make the duty 20 per cent., 8098; to make the duty (United Kingdom), 20 per cent., 8098; item 101A, spices, unground, to make the goods free, 8098; item 101B, spices, ground, to make the duty 2d. per pound, 8099; item 104B, potato flour, to make the duty ½d. per pound, 8102; item 104B, tapioca flour, to make the duty ½d. per pound, 8102; item 105A, tea, in packets, to make the goods free, 8114; to reduce size of packets from 20 pounds to 5 pounds, 8116; to make the duty ½d. per pound, 8116; item 123A, piece goods, woollen or containing wool, to leave out words, "and rubbered waterproof cloth of any material," 8126; to make the duty 20 per cent., 8134; to make the duty 25 per cent., 8149; to make the duty (United Kingdom), 20 per cent., 8149; item 123B, piece goods, woollen or containing wool, to insert words, "not containing silk or having silk worked thereon," 8164; to leave out the words "women's and children's dress goods," 8170; to leave out 5 ounces and substitute 6½ ounces, 8178; to make the duty 10 per cent., 8181; item 123D, piece goods, velvets, &c., to make the goods free, 8187; item 123E, cotton, linen, and other piece goods, &c., to make the goods free, 8188; item 123G, rubbered waterproof cloth, to make the duty

DIVISIONS—continued.

30 per cent., 8194; item 106, apparel and attire, woollen or silk, to make the duty 25 per cent., 8208; to make the duty 35 per cent., 8209; item 106B, corsets, to make the goods free, 8210; to make the duty 15 per cent., 8210; to make the duty (United Kingdom) 10 per cent., 8211; item 107, apparel and attire, n.e.i., to make the duty 30 per cent., 8212; to make the duty 40 per cent., 8216; to make the duty (United Kingdom) 35 per cent., 8216; item 110, feathers, to make the duty 25 per cent., 8217; item 112, bags and sacks, to make the duty (United Kingdom) 10 per cent., 8217; item 114, blankets, flannels, &c., to insert after "flannels," "whether plain, fancy, or printed," 8232; to make the duty 20 per cent., 8238; to make the duty 22½ per cent., 8249; to make the duty 30 per cent., 8253; to make the duty (United Kingdom) 25 per cent., 8260; item 115, carpets, &c., to make floor cloths free, 8272; to make the item free, 8273; to make the duty 10 per cent., 8275; item 116, coir mats, to make the duty 15 per cent., 8277; item 117, cosies, cushions, &c., to insert after "quilts," "sewn and padded," 8280; to leave out "table covers" and "counterpanes," 8283; to make the duty 15 per cent., 8286; to make the duty 17½ per cent., 8287; item 118, curtains and blinds, to make the goods free, 8289; item 119A, furs, being apparel and attire, to make the duty 25 per cent., 8291; item 119B, fur and other skins, n.e.i., to make the duty 10 per cent. (United Kingdom), 8292; item 119C, hatters' fur, to make the duty (United Kingdom), 10 per cent., 8292; item 120A, gloves, to amend the item by leaving out "men's gloves of all kinds and materials," and inserting "gloves, being harvesting, driving, housemaids', and gardening," 8295; to make the goods free, 8295; item 102B, gloves, n.e.i., to make the goods free, 8297; item 121A, wool felt hats, to make the duty on an *ad valorem* basis, 8319; to make the duty 12s. per doz., 8319; to make the duty 16s. per doz., or 35 per cent., whichever rate returns the higher duty, 8319-20; item 121B, fur felt hats, to make the duty 25s. per doz., or 35 per cent., 8320; item 122, parasols, sunshades, and umbrellas, to make the duty 20 per cent. (United Kingdom), 8326; item 124, waddings and cotton wool, to insert after wool, "n.e.i.," 8331; to make the duty 20 per cent., 8333; item 132, socks and stockings of all kinds, to leave out the words "of all kinds," 8338; to make the duty on socks and stockings, woollen, or containing wool, 20 per cent., 8338; item 133A, tents, tarpaulins, sails, and flags, to make the duty (United Kingdom) 10 per cent., 8347; item 133B, flags and banners, to make the duty (United Kingdom) 15 per cent., 8347; item 136, artificial plants, flowers, &c., to make the duty 25 per cent., 8352; item 137, wigs, &c., to change the form of the item 8354; item 230, blacking, &c., to make the duty 25 per cent., 8367; to make the duty 30 per cent., 8368; to

DIVISIONS—continued.

make the duty 35 per cent., 8368; item 231, graphite or plumbago, to make the goods free, 8373; to make the duty 5 per cent., 8373; to make the duty 10 per cent., 8374; to make the duty 15 per cent., 8374; item 232, bronzing and metal powders, to make the goods free, 8376; item 233A, greases, to leave out the words "in packages not exceeding 4 pounds in weight," 8383; to make the goods free, 8385; item 234A, oils, quarter pints and smaller sizes, to make the duty qd. per doz., 8388; item 234(1), oils, castor, linseed, colza, to make the duty 1s. per gallon, 8389; item 234J, oils, lubricating mineral, to make the duties, on issue of proclamation (General Tariff), 4d. (United Kingdom), 3½ per gallon, 8414; item 234K, oils, mineral, to make the duty 3d. per gallon, 8417; to make the duty 2d. per gallon, 8417; item 234L, solar and residual oils, to insert the word "crude" before the word "residual," 8440; to make the duty 1d. per gallon, 8444; item 236A, paints and colours, ground in liquid, to make the duty 4s. 6d. per cwt., 8452; to make the duty (United Kingdom), 4s. per cwt., 8455; item 236B, paints and colours, prepared for use, to make the duty 6s. 9d. per cwt., 8456; to make the duty 6s. per cwt. (United Kingdom), 8457; item 236D, colours, dry, to make the duty 3s. 3d. per cwt. or 20 per cent., whichever rate returns the higher duty, 8461; to make the duty 2s. 6d. per cwt. (United Kingdom), 8469; item 236E, dry white lead, to make the duty 2s. 3d. per cwt., 8470; to make the duty (United Kingdom), 2s. per cwt., 8471; item 236G, barytes, to make the duty 2s. per cwt., 8472; item 238, liquid removers of paint, to make the goods free, 8473; item 239, blacks, &c., to leave out the words "ultramarine blue," 8476; to make the item free, 8478; item 247, fire and glazed bricks, &c., to make the duty 20 per cent., 2481; item 253B, tumblers, globes, &c., to make the duty (General Tariff), 35 per cent. (United Kingdom), 25 per cent., 8493; item 260, bottles, on a request to leave out the word "filled" and insert in lieu thereof "containing goods not subject to ad val. duty," *amdt.*, to leave out "ad val.," 8498; item 260C, bottles over 10 ounces, to make the duty per dozen, 1½d., 8500; item 260E, bottles over 60 ounces fluid capacity (General Tariff), 25 per cent. (United Kingdom) 20 per cent., *amdt.*, to leave out "25" and insert "15," and to leave out "20" and insert "10," 8501; to insert "20" and "15," 8502; item 261A, glue, to make the duty 2d. per pound, 8514; to make the duty 3d. per pound, 8516; to make the duty 1d. per pound, 8516; to make the duty 1½d. per pound, 8516; to make the duty (United Kingdom), 1d. per lb., 8516; item 262, printing roller composition, to make the duty 25 per cent., 8527; to make the duty 30 per cent., 8527; to make the duty (United Kingdom), 25 per cent.,

DIVISIONS—*continued.*

8527; item 264, slate slabs, &c., to make the duty (United Kingdom), 10 per cent., 8528; item 268A, marble, unwrought, to make the item free, 8546; item 268B, stone and marble, slabs or scantlings, to make the item free, 8548; to make the duty 10 per cent., 8548; item 268CC, to make slabs over 4 feet by 2 feet square, free, 8550; item 268C, to make the duty (United Kingdom), 15 per cent., 8550; item 268D, stone and marble, wrought, n.e.i., to make the duty 40 per cent., 8551; to make the duty 35 per cent., 8553; to make the duty (United Kingdom), 20 per cent., 8553; item 140A, iron, plate and sheet, corrugated, galvanized, to make the duty 15s. per ton, 8567; to make the duty 20s. per ton, 8567; to make the duty 25s. per ton, 8567; to make the duty (United Kingdom), 15s. per ton, 8567; item 141A, oil lamps, &c., to make the duty 20 per cent., 8570; item 141C, lamp and gas stoves, to make the duty (United Kingdom), 10 per cent., 8570; to make the duty (United Kingdom), 15 per cent., 8570; item 143, sheet lead and lead piping, to make the duty (United Kingdom), 15s. per ton, 8573; item 144, mangles, &c., to make the duty 15 per cent., 8574; item 145, agricultural, horticultural, and viticultural machinery and implements, n.e.i., to make the item free, 8576; to make the duty 10 per cent., 8577; item 152A, agricultural machinery, &c., to make the item free, 8588; item 152B, to insert the words, "sheep shearing machines, not including the flexible shafting or any part above it," 8598; item 153, cutlery, n.e.i., to make the item free, 8598; to make the duty 10 per cent., 8599; to make the duty, 15 per cent., 8599; to make the duty (United Kingdom) 10 per cent., 8599; item 156A, horseshoe nails, to make the duty 5s. per cwt., 8603; to make the duty 6s. per cwt., 8606; to make the duty 7s. 6d. per cwt., 8606; to make the duty (United Kingdom), 6s. per cwt., 8607; item 156B, brads, picture rails, &c., to make the duty 3s. per cwt., 8611; to make the duty 4s. per cwt., 8612; to make the duty (United Kingdom), 4s. per cwt., 8612; item 157, tanks, to make the duty for every 100 gallons capacity, 3s., 8619; item 158, weighing machines, &c., to make the item free, 8624; to make the duty 10 per cent., 8624; to make the duty 15 per cent., 8624; to make the duty (United Kingdom), 15 per cent., 8624; item 159, adding and computing machines, &c., to make the item free, 8625; item 160A, motive power machinery, to insert the words, "hot-air engines," 8629; to insert the words, "high-speed reciprocating engines, coupled with generators or dynamo electric machines," 8644; to insert words, "to be used in industrial enterprises," 8652; to insert words, "to be used in mines," 8652; to insert the words, "water tube boilers," 8656; item 160B, motive power machinery, to make the duty 12½ per cent., 8660; to make the duty 15 per

DIVISIONS—*continued.*

cent., 8660; to make the duty (United Kingdom), 15 per cent., 8661; item 161, locomotives, traction and portable engines, to insert words to make the duty operate on issue of proclamation, 8662; to make the duty 12½ per cent., 8663; to make the duty 15 per cent., 8664; to make the duty (United Kingdom), 15 per cent., 8665; item 162A, engines, n.e.i., to make the item free, 8671; item 162B, fans for mines, to make the item free, 8693; to make the duty on fans for mines and factories, 5 per cent., 8695; item 162B, machines and machinery, n.e.i., to make the duty 12½ per cent., 8695; to make the duty 15 per cent., 8696; to make the duty 20 per cent., 8696; item 165AA, machinery and parts used in manufacture of fibrous materials, to make the item free, 8719; item 165A, machines, n.e.i., to make the duty 10 per cent., 8719; to make the duty (United Kingdom), 10 per cent., 8720; item 169, mixed metal ware and plated ware, n.e.i., to make the duty 20 per cent., 8723; to make the duty (United Kingdom), 15 per cent., 8723; item 170A, manufactures of metal, n.e.i., to make the duty 20 per cent., 8740; to make the duty 30 per cent., 8756; to make imports from the United Kingdom free, 8756; to make the duty on them 1 per cent., 8757; to make the duty (United Kingdom), 2 per cent., 8757; to make the duty (United Kingdom), 25 per cent., 8761; item 170B, articles made entirely of aluminium, for household use, to make the item free, 8762; item 171, saws, n.e.i., to make the item free, 8763; item 173, type, to make the duty 10 per cent., 8772; to make the duty 15 per cent., 8772; to make the duty (United Kingdom), 15 per cent., 8772; item 174, fire extinguishers, to make the item free, 8775; to make the duty 10 per cent., 8775; to make the duty (United Kingdom), 10 per cent., 8776; to make the duty (United Kingdom), 15 per cent., 8776; item 175A, screws with nuts, to make the duty 15 per cent., 8780; to make the duty 20 per cent., 8780; to make the duty (United Kingdom), 10 per cent., 8780; item 176B, rotary and percussive rock drills, to make the duty 5 per cent., 8795; item 176E, coal-cutting machines, to make the item free, 8797; item 177A, dynamo electric machines, up to capacity of 500 horsepower, to leave out "500," 8803; to insert instead of "500," the figure "1," 8808; to insert "10," 8810; to make the item free, 8810; to make the duty 10 per cent., 8810; to make the duty (United Kingdom), 15 per cent., 8811; item 177B, dynamo electric machines, over capacity of 500 horse-power, to make the item free, 8811; item 177C, regulating apparatus for electrical purposes, to make the item free, 8870; item 177D, electric apparatus and fittings, to make the item free, 8871; item 177E, electric heating and cooking appliances, to make the item free, 8877; to make the duty 20 per

DIVISIONS—continued.

cent., 8885; item 177F, electric fittings, not containing metal, to leave out the words, "to be dutiable according to material," 8887; item 178A, electroliers, gasaliers, &c., to make the duty 30 per cent., 9045; to make the duty 25 per cent., 9045; to make the duty 22½ per cent., 9049; item 178B, gas meters, to make the duty 25 per cent., 9051; to make the duty (United Kingdom) 20 per cent., 9051; item 178BB, incandescent filament and vapour lamps, to make the item free, 9050; item 178BB, telephones, switch boards and appliances, to make the item free, 9061; item 178C, electrical and gas appliances, n.e.i., to make the duty 17½ per cent., 9062; item 180, rails, to make rails free, 9071; to make the duty 12½ per cent., 9072; to make the duty 20 per cent., 9073; item 181, iron pipes, to make the duty 45s. per ton, 9085; to make the duty (United Kingdom), 35s. per ton, 9086; item 186, wire netting, to make the item free, 9168; item 189, plates, sheets, pipes and tubes of any metal, to make the duty 10 per cent., 9170; item 190, antimony, to make the duty 10 per cent., 9172; item 217, standards, &c., to make the duty 17½ per cent., 9183; item 273A, vinegar, to make the duty 4d. per gallon, 9238; item 275, carbonate, anhydrous, muriate, &c., to make muriate of ammonia free, 9241; to make the duty on muriate of ammonia, 5 per cent., 9245; to make the duty on the item 10 per cent., 9247; item 276, carbonic acid gas, to make the item free, 9256; to make the duty per lb. 1½d., 9256; item 277, carbide of calcium, to insert new paragraph making duty operative on issue of proclamation, 9267; to make the duty 10 per cent., 9269; item 278A, salicylic acid, &c., to make the duty 20 per cent., 9271; to make the duty 15 per cent., 9271; item 278B, saccharin, to make the duty 15s. per pound, 9273; to make the duty (United Kingdom), 20s. per pound, 9273; to leave out words, "saponaceous mixture of creosote," 9274; item 281, naphthaline, to make the duty (United Kingdom), 20 per cent., 9275; item 284B, insecticides and disinfectants, to make the duties (General Tariff), 25 per cent., (United Kingdom), 15 per cent., 9292; item 292, medicines, to make the duty 10 per cent., 9294; to make the item free, 9294; to make the duty (United Kingdom), 5 per cent., 9295; to make the duty (United Kingdom), 10 per cent., 9295; item 295, perfumery, to make the duty 25 per cent., 9295; to make the duty (United Kingdom), 20 per cent., 9295; item 295B, petroleum jelly, to insert "in packages containing not less than 3 cwt., free," 9296; item 299, furniture, n.e.i., to make the duty (United Kingdom), 30 per cent., 9382; item 300C, chairs, of wicker, bamboo or cane, to make the duties (General Tariff), 7s. 6d. or 45 per cent. (United Kingdom), 6s. 9d., or 40

DIVISIONS—continued.

per cent., 9387; item 303A, timber, undressed, to make the item free, 9454; to make the duty 1s. per 100 super. feet, 9461; item 303B, New Zealand pine, to make the duty 1s. per 100 feet, 9465; item 303B1, to insert new paragraph *re* timber undressed and New Zealand pine, imposing duties, "as soon as it is certified to Parliament by the Minister, that similar timber fitted for the requirements of local industries can be produced in the Commonwealth in sufficient quantities," 9467; item 303D, timber in sizes less than 7 in. x 2½ in., to insert new paragraph D1, imposing duty of 1s. per 100 feet on timber in sizes less than 7 ft. 6 in. by 10 in. by 2½ in. for door stocks, 9470; to make the duty on item 303D1. 1s. 6d. per 100 feet, 9473; to make the duty 2s., 9473; item 303N, prepared hubs, to leave out words, "not of elm," 9547; item 303T, picture and room mouldings, to make the duty 20 per cent., 9553; item 303U, brom stocks, to make the item free, 9555; item 303V, elm hubs, to make the duty 1s. each, 9555; item 303, to insert new definition of "superficial foot," 9563; to insert new definition of "superficial face," 9563; item 304, wicker, bamboo, and cane, to make the duty 45 per cent., 9570; to make the duty 30 per cent., 9571; item 305, basketware, to make the duty 45 per cent., 9571; to make the duty (United Kingdom), 30 per cent., 9572; item 306, wood, all articles made of, to make wood type and printers' wood rules free, 9575; to make the duty on wood type 15 per cent., 9576; to insert words, "also boxes containing cigars," 9578; to insert words, "wood rules for school use, free," 9580; item 309, tool handles, unattached, to insert after "unattached," the words, "including adze and axe handles," 9638; to make the duty 30 per cent., 9638; item 310, adze, axe, scythe and bent-wood handles, insert words, "axe handles, free," 9639; item 311, doors of wood, to make the duty on doors, sizes 12 inches and over, each 3s. 6d., 9640; item 312, photograph frames, &c., to make the duty 20 per cent., 9641; item 315, buggy shafts, to make the duty 3s. 6d. per pair, 9641; item 316, shafts, n.e.i., to make the duty 15 per cent., 9643; item 321, shaft bars, to make the duty 35 per cent., 9643; item 322, casks, &c., n.e.i., to insert the words "full or," 9644; item 323, hogsheds, to make the duty 12s. each, 9648; to make the duty 5s. each, 9648; item 325, buckets and tubs, to make buckets free, 9650; item 326, fancy goods, to make the item free, 9650; to make the duty 10 per cent., 9651; to make the duty 25 per cent., 9652; to make the duty 20 per cent., 9653; item 343, spectacle cases, to make the duty (United Kingdom), 10 per cent., 9658; item 344, spectacles and spectacle frames and glasses for spectacles, to make the item free, 9661; item 345, boots

DIVISIONS—continued.

and shoes, to make the duty 30 per cent., 9662; to make the duty on infants' sizes 15 per cent., 9663; item 347, slipper forms, to leave out the words, "and stuff," 9664; to make the item free, 9665; item 348, boots, rubber, to make the item free, 9665; item, 349, rubber and other hose, to make the duty 15 per cent., 9670; item 350, rubber, manufactures, n.e.i., to insert new paragraph B, "surgical bandages, elastic stockings," &c., free, 9671; to leave out the word "tyres," 9674; item 353B, leather, to make the item free, 9676; to make the duty 15 per cent., 9677; to make the duty 2d. per square foot, 9678; to make the duty (United Kingdom), 1½d. per square foot, 9678; item 356A, paper, manufactures of, to make the duty 4d. per pound, 9681; to make the duty 6d. per pound, or 3c per cent., 9682; to make the duty (United Kingdom), 4½d. per pound, or 30 per cent., 9682; item 356A1, specimen illustrations and prospectuses, &c., to make the item free, 9683; item 356C, Australian directories, &c., to make the duty (United Kingdom), per pound 6d., 9744; item 356J, cartridge and blotting paper, to make the item free, 9746; item 356K, to make the duty 1s. per cwt., 9756; to make the duty 2s. per cwt., 9757; item 356M, to leave out the words, "cardboard, pasteboard," 9759; to make the duties on cardboard and pasteboard, 20 per cent. and 15 per cent., 9762; item 356N, millboard, &c., to make the item free, 9762; item 356Q, gummed paper, to make the duty 20 per cent., 9798; item 356AA, writing and typing paper, to make the item free, 9800; item 357B2, matrices for stereotyping purposes, to make the duty, for every square inch over 12 inches, 1d., 9802; item 361, ceramic transfers for pottery, to make the item free, 9806; item 366, globes, geographical, to make the item free, 9814; item 372, bicycles, to make the duty 25s. or 30 per cent., "whichever rate returns the higher duty," 9821; item 380A, vehicles, to make the duty on Boston chaises, dog-carts, &c., each £6 12s., 9829; item 380B, buggies, to make the duty each £9 18s., 9830; item 384A, pianos, grand, to make the duty 25 per cent., 9841; to make the duty (United Kingdom), 20 per cent., 9841; item 384B, pianos, upright, to make the duty 25 per cent., 9898; to make the duty (United Kingdom), 20 per cent., 9899; item 391, filters, to make the item free, 9901; item 392B, oars and sculls, to make the item free, 9902; item 395B, brushes, to make the item free, 9903; item 397, manures, to insert new paragraph A, superphosphates, per ton (General Tariff), 10s. United Kingdom), 5s., 9916; to make the duties (General Tariff), 5s. (United Kingdom), free, 9917; item 399, fishing nets, &c., to leave out words "and lines," 9918; to make the item free, 9919; item 400, yarn, to make the item free, 9921; item 400E, yarn, n.e.i., to make the item

DIVISIONS—continued.

free, 9923; item 408A, small corks, to make the duty 1s. per pound, 9926; item 409A, explosives, cartridges, to make the item free, 9927; item 409C, fuse, to make the duty per coil, 1d., 9930; item 410, lantern slides, &c., to insert the words "stereoscopic views," 9935; to make the duty 25 per cent., 9936; item 427, surgical appliances, to make the item free, 9940; item 442, surgical and dental and veterinary instruments, to leave out the words "operating tables," 9943; item 445, goods which have been passed by the Customs and subsequently sent out of the Commonwealth for repairs, to leave out the words "upon payment of duty on the dutiable value only of any repairs or additions to the goods," and insert the word "free," 9945; item 447, blankets for printing machines, to leave out the words "when imported with the machines of which they form a necessary working part," &c., 9947; that the Bill be recommitted, 10050, 10051; *m.*, to suspend Standing Orders to enable a message from House of Representatives to be taken into consideration without the Bill being returned to the Senate, 10841; *cons. mes.*, item 21A, tobacco, unstemmed, 10843; item 21B, 10843; item 36, blue, 10845; item 42, stearine, paraffine wax, &c., 10854, 10855; item 67, hay and chaff, 10867; item 85, mustard, 10870; item 105, tea, 10922; item 123B, piece goods, woollen, 10924; item 115, carpets, 10926; item 118, curtains and blinds, 10926; item 120A, men's gloves, 10927; item 120B, gloves, n.e.i., 10934; item 143, sheet lead, 10936; item 153, cutlery, 10937; item 162A, pulley blocks, &c., 10940; item 176F, rock-boring machines, 10942; item 177A, electrical machines, 10946; item 178B, gas meters, 10950, 11598, 11688; item 180, steel sleepers, 10958; item 205, locks, 10950; item 217, standards, steel fencing, &c., 10960; item 234II, oils, 11226; item 234JJ, oils, lubricating, mineral, 11229; item 234, O, kerosene, 11234; item 261A, glue, 11236; item 261C, gelatine, 11236; item 262, printing roller composition, 11236; item 268, stone and marble, 11237; item 275, ammonia, 11238; item 284, insecticide, 11241; item 303A, timber, 11253; item 303B, New Zealand pine, 11254, 11600; item 303D, timber, undressed, 11255; item 301 (definition of "superficial foot"), 11308, 11309, 11607; item 356C, Australian directories, &c., 11314; item 417, works of art (stained glass windows), 11319, 11607; item 427, surgical appliances n.e.i., 11320; *m.*, to recommit items 95 and 154, 11687

Tobacco Combine, *m.*, for appointment of Select Committee, 3065

Transport Waggon, breakdown of, *m.*, that a paper be printed, 7846

House of Representatives:

Australian Industries Preservation Bill, *com.*, clause 4 (15A.) (burden of proof), *amdl.*, to insert the words "*prima facie* evidence of the statements contained therein," 9213; clause 4 (15B) (power to

DIVISIONS—continued.

require persons to answer questions), *amdt.*, to leave out "by writing under his hand require," and insert "by summons or affidavit apply to the Judge . . . such Court being invested with Federal jurisdiction," 9227; *amdt.*, to insert proviso that any person believed by Comptroller-General to be a party to the offence shall be compelled to answer interrogatories and make discovery of documents, 9232; *amdt.* to leave out "Fifty pounds" and insert "one month's imprisonment," 9235; *m.s.o.*, 9481

Bounties Bill, *com.*, clause 2 (appropriation), that the clause stand as printed, 1022; schedule, *amdt.*, to substitute "1908" for "1907," 1067; *amdt.*, to leave out the words "cotton ginned," 1083; *amdt.*, to leave out "mohair," 1104; on item "olives," 1129; to leave out item "coffee," 1217; on item "tobacco," 1230; *cons. amdt.*s., copra, 6404, 6440

Business, Government, Precedence of, 2806

Chairman of Committees, *m.*, 317

Disputed Elections and Qualifications Bill, *m.*, to suspend Standing Orders, 6389

Invalid and Old-age Pensions Bill, *com.* (qualifications for pension), *amdt.*, to insert words "except as prescribed," 11973

Judiciary Bill, 2R., that the debate be adjourned, 3759; that resumption of debate be an order of the day "for this day at a later hour," 3774

Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway Survey Bill, *m.*, 647; *com.*, clause 2 (survey), *amdt.*, to secure undertaking from States, 740; on Senate's amendment requiring assent of South Australian Parliament, 2025

London Offices, *supply*, to provide that terms and conditions of any contract be submitted to Parliament, 3676; on proposed vote, 3676

Mail Contract, European, Agreement with Orient Company, *amdt.*, *re* Commonwealth ownership of fleet, 6498; *re* reduction of period from ten years to seven, 6499; *re* inclusion of provisions as to freight for frozen meat and fruit, 6501; *re* docking of ships in Australia, 6502; *re* omission of proviso as to vessels calling at Hobart, 6502; *re* payment of extra subsidy by Queensland, 6502; that the motion be agreed to, 6503

Manufactures Encouragement Bill, 2R., *amdt.*, to make provision for nationalization of iron industry, 6278; that the Bill be read a second time, 6279

Old-age Pensions, *supply*, *amdt.*, to insert in motion, words expressing opinion that funds be provided by direct taxation on unimproved value of land, 9351; *amdt.*, providing that Government should "take steps towards giving" effect to will of people, 9351

Parliamentary Allowances Bill, *m.*, *amdt.*, to provide that additional allowance should not be paid until after next general election, 1923; affirming expediency of making appropriation for purposes of Bill, 1923; *com.*, clause 3 (allowance), *amdt.*, to reduce £600 to £500, 1992

DIVISIONS—continued.

Petition *re* the Tariff, that the petition be received, 3410

Post and Telegraph Department, *supply*, *amdt.*, to reduce salary of Secretary by £1, 10250; *supply*, *amdt.*, expressing opinion that a Royal Commission should be appointed to inquire into and report upon the postal, telegraphic, and telephonic systems—that the debate be adjourned, 10451, 10460

Quarantine Bill, *com.*, clause 4 (definition), *amdt.*, to insert "into the Commonwealth," 1534; clause 9 (officers), *amdt.*, to insure appointment of legally-qualified medical and veterinary officers, 1547; clause 75 (persons may be vaccinated), on clause as amended, 1741; clause 53 (imported animals), *amdt.*, to insert "who shall be a qualified veterinary surgeon," 1764; *cons. amdt.*s., clause 45 (quarantine surveillance), to add new sub-clause, 8959

Supply Bill, No. 2, *m.*, to reduce amount, 1808

Surplus Revenue Bill, 2R., 11861

Tariff, *com.*, Tobacco, manufactured, 4302; tobacco, hand-made, 4305; to secure priority of consideration for item 34, 4361; that all items down to item 186 be postponed, 4361; that wire netting be free, 4573; wire netting (General Tariff), 5 per cent. (United Kingdom), free, 4577; wire netting (General Tariff), 5 per cent. (United Kingdom), 5 per cent., 4578; wire netting (General Tariff), 10 per cent. (United Kingdom), 5 per cent., 4579; that certain items be postponed, 4627; cane sugar, 4763; invert sugar, invert syrup, and priming sugar, 4764; horses, 4771; animals, living, except horses, 4773; blue, proposed duty, 1d. per lb., 4787; blue, proposed duty, 1½d. per lb., 4793; item 40, candles, proposed duty, 1d. per lb., 4954; candles, proposed duty, 1½d. per lb., 4954; candles, proposed duty (United Kingdom), 1d., 5132; candles, proposed duty (United Kingdom), 1½d., 5134; item 42, stearine, paraffine wax, &c., proposed duty, ½d. per lb., 5159; item 45A, confectionery n.e.i., proposed duty, 2d. per lb., 5236; confectionery n.e.i., proposed duty, 2½d. per lb., 5254; confectionery n.e.i., proposed duty, 3d. per lb., 5255; confectionery n.e.i., proposed duty (United Kingdom), 2d. per lb., 5255; item 45C, cocoa and chocolate, proposed duty, 1½d. per lb., 5258; item 47B, coffee roasted or ground, &c., proposed duty, 5d. per lb., 5264; item 53A, fish, fresh, smoked, dried, or preserved, proposed duty, 1d. per lb., 5272; proposed duty (United Kingdom), 20 per cent., 5273; item 53C, fish, preserved, in tins, that the goods be free, 5277; proposed duty, 1d. per lb., 5277; item 54A, currants, proposed duty, 2d. per lb., 5283; item 54B, dates, that the goods be free, 5330; item 66C, cornflower, proposed duty, ½d. per lb., 5355; proposed duty, 1d. per lb., 5356; proposed duty, 1½d. per lb., 5356; cornflower, proposed duty (United Kingdom), 1½d. per lb., 5357; item 68, hay and chaff, amendment to make the goods free until

DIVISIONS—*continued.*

31st October, 1908, 5441, until 1st May, 1908, 5443; after 31st October, 1907, 5443; item 81B, meats, potted, proposed duty, 20 per cent., 5455; meats, potted (United Kingdom), 20 per cent., 5455; item 83, sausage casings, that the goods be free, 5461; item 105A, tea, in packets, that the goods be free, 5464; item 84A, milk, preserved, proposed duty, 14d. per lb., 5518; item 89, oilmen's stores, proposed duty, 15 per cent., 5522; item 89A, infants' food, to insert words "and invalids," 5525; item 94A, rice, uncleaned, that the goods be free, 5533; proposed duty, 2s. per cental, 5533; item 94C, rice n.e.i., proposed duty, 4s. per cental, 5534; proposed duty, 5s. per cental, 5534; item 96B, salt, n.e.i., proposed duty, 12s. 6d. per ton, 5543; item 100, soap, proposed duty (United Kingdom), 20 per cent. or 34d. per lb., "whichever rate returns the higher duty," 5546; excise duty, starch, made from rice, to add the words "or other materials imported," 5554; item 106, apparel and attire, woollen or silk, proposed duty, 25 per cent., 5624; proposed duty, 30 per cent., 5624; proposed duty, 35 per cent., 5626; proposed duty, 37½ per cent., 5627; proposed duty (United Kingdom), 30 per cent., 5627; item 107, apparel and attire, of any material, n.e.i., proposed duty, 25 per cent., 5631; proposed duty, 30 per cent., 5631; item 108, articles, n.e.i., proposed duty, 25 per cent., 5634; item 110, feathers, dressed, proposed duty, 25 per cent., 5638; item 114, bags and sacks, *amdt.*, to omit words "and salt, gypsum, and manure bags," 5647, 5737; item 115, blankets, proposed duty, 25 per cent., 5729; proposed duty (United Kingdom), 20 per cent., 5730; item 118, cosies and cushions, and the like articles, *amdt.*, to insert "eiderdown" before "quilts," 5742; *amdt.*, to insert after "quilts," the words "other than cotton or linen," 5743; proposed duty, 20 per cent., 5744; item 124A, piece goods, *amdt.*, to add rubbered waterproof cloth to item, 5809; item 124A, piece goods, woollen or containing wool, n.e.i., proposed duty, 20 per cent., 5837; proposed duty, 25 per cent., 5837; item 124A1, piece goods, viz., women's and children's dress goods, proposed duties (General Tariff), 20 per cent. (United Kingdom), 15 per cent., 5846; proposed duties, 10 per cent. and 5 per cent., 5850; item 124D, velvets, velveteens, &c., *amdt.*, to omit words, "tucked linens or cottons," 5853; item 124E, cotton, linen, jute, &c., *amdt.*, to leave out "cotton, linen," 5915; proposed duty, 5 per cent., 5918; that goods from the United Kingdom be free, 5918; item 124F, piece goods other than wool or silk, proposed duty (General Tariff), 5 per cent., 5926; proposed duty, 10 per cent., 5927; item 133, socks and stockings, proposed duty, 20 per cent., 5937; item 122A, wool felt hats, proposed duties, per dozen (General Tariff), 16s., (United Kingdom), 12s., 5956; item 122B, fur felt hats, proposed duty, General Tariff, 30 per cent., 5966; proposed duty, General Tariff, 35 per

DIVISIONS—*continued.*

cent., 5957; proposed duty, 40 per cent., 5959; proposed duty, 50 per cent., 20s., 5964; proposed duty, 17s. 6d. per dozen, 5972; proposed duty, 20s. per dozen, 5973; proposed duty, 21s. per dozen, 5973; proposed duty, 22s. 6d. per dozen, 5975; item 122E, grass hoods for manufacture into hats, that the goods be free, 5976; item 144B, lamp fittings, proposed duty, 15 per cent., 6042; proposed duty, 20 per cent., 6043; item 144C, lamp, gas, and electrical stoves, proposed duty (General Tariff), 20 per cent., 6046; proposed duty (United Kingdom), 15 per cent., 6047; item 143A, iron corrugated galvanized, proposed duty, 30s. per ton, 6547; proposed duty (United Kingdom), 20s. per ton, 6548; iron galvanized not corrugated and corrugated not galvanized, proposed duty, 20s. per ton, 6548; proposed duty (United Kingdom), 10s. per ton, 6549; item 147, mangles, &c., proposed duty, 12½ per cent., 6549; item 148, agricultural and horticultural machinery, n.e.i., *amdt.*, to omit "feed grinders," 6557; proposed duty, 12½ per cent., 6563; item 149, chaffcutters, &c., proposed duty (United Kingdom), 15 per cent., 6565; item 150, combined corn sheller, husker, and bagger, &c., proposed duty, 20 per cent., 6567; proposed duty (United Kingdom), 20 per cent., 6567; item 151, churns, &c., proposed duty, 12½ per cent., 6568; proposed duty (United Kingdom), 15 per cent., 6568; proposed duty (United Kingdom), 20 per cent., 6570; item 155, agricultural machinery, *amdt.*, to omit "sheep shearing machines," 6589; *amdt.*, to insert "feed grinders," 6589; proposed duty, 5 per cent., 6590; item 159A, horseshoe nails, proposed duty, 6s. per hundredweight, 6607; proposed duty, 7s. per hundredweight, 6608; proposed duty, 7s. 6d. per hundredweight, 6608; proposed duty (United Kingdom), 7s. per hundredweight, 6609; proposed duty (United Kingdom), 7s. 3d. per hundredweight, 6609; item 159B, brads, proposed duty, 3s. 6d. per hundredweight, 6618; proposed duty, 4s. per hundredweight, 6619; proposed duty, 4s. 6d. per hundredweight, 6620; proposed duty, 5s. per hundredweight, 6620; proposed duty (United Kingdom), 4s. per hundredweight, 6620; item 160, tanks, that the item be free, 6626; item 161A, adding and computing machines, that the goods be free, 6633; item 162A, motive power machinery and appliances, except gas producers, &c., *amdt.*, to except hot air engines, 6656; proposed duty (General Tariff), 5 per cent., 6663; item 162B, motive power machinery and appliances, n.e.i., proposed duty, 20 per cent., 6672; proposed duty, 15 per cent., 6672; item 163, locomotives, traction and portable engines, &c., *amdt.*, to leave out "traction and portable engines," 6699, proposed duty, 20 per cent., 6700; proposed duty, 25 per cent., 6702; proposed duty, 15 per cent., 6702, 6703; item 164, engines, n.e.i., &c., *amdt.*, to

DIVISIONS—continued.

insert hoists "used for underground mining," 6712; proposed duty, 20 per cent., 6715; item 166, machinery and machines, and machine tools, n.e.i., *amdt.*, to leave out "machines used in the tanning of hides and skins," 6723; item 172, saws, n.e.i., proposed duty, 15 per cent., 6752; item 174, printers' type, proposed duty (United Kingdom), 15 per cent., 6768; item 176A, screws, with nuts, proposed duty, 25 per cent., 6772; item 177, mining engines and machinery, proposed duty, 20 per cent., 6793; proposed duty, 15 per cent., 6796; item 177B, rotary and percussive rock drills, proposed duty, 20 per cent., 6798; proposed duty, 15 per cent., 6799; item 181, rails, &c., to insert "except steel," 6828; to insert after "rods" "and steel sleepers," 6828; item 230, blacking, &c., proposed duty, 25 per cent., 6857; proposed duty, 35 per cent., 6857; item 234, oils, quarter pints, and smaller sizes, proposed duty, 9d. per dozen, 6867; item 236A, paints ground in liquid, proposed duty, 3s. per hundredweight, 6886; item 236B, paints prepared for use, to leave out words "or ad. val.," 6889; item 236D, dry white lead, proposed duty, 1s. 9d. per hundredweight, 6891; item 243, earthenware, &c., *amdt.*, to leave out "crucibles, scarifiers, mufles," 6905; item 244, roofing tiles, proposed duty, 25 per cent., 6908; item 249, glass, proposed duty, 25 per cent., 6920; proposed duty (United Kingdom), 25 per cent., 6920; item 253, glassware, n.e.i., proposed duty, 25 per cent., 6923; proposed duty (United Kingdom), 20 per cent., 6927; item 255, glass, viz., gas analysis, apparatus, &c., that the goods be free, 6935; item 268A, marble, unwrought, to insert the word "white," 6963; item 268B, slabs or scantlings, proposed duty, 10 per cent., 6965; proposed duty (United Kingdom), 25 per cent., 6966; item 278A, salicylic acid and other food preservatives, proposed duty, 20 per cent., 6972; item 279, cresylic acid, proposed duty, 15 per cent., 6977; proposed duty, 20 per cent., 6978; item 283A, phenyles, liquid disinfectants, sheep washes, &c., that the goods be free, 6992; item 294, perfumery, proposed duty, 20 per cent., 6998; item 303A, timber, undressed, *amdt.*, to leave out, 7083; *amdt.*, to insert the word "oregon," 7085; *amdt.*, to insert words providing that New Zealand white pine for making fruit cases in bond be free, 7091; *amdt.*, providing that New Zealand white pine for making butter boxes and fruit cases be free, 7094; that the goods be free, 7095; item 303A1, New Zealand pine, that the goods be free, 7100; item 303A, veneers, proposed duty, 3s. per 100 feet super., 7105; item 306, wood, all articles made of, n.e.i., proposed duty, 25 per cent., 7110; item 309, tool handles, proposed duty, 15 per cent., 7123; proposed duty (United Kingdom), 15 per cent., 7124; item 325, fancy goods, proposed duty, 20 per cent., 7142; item 342, boots, shoes, &c., proposed duty, 30 per cent., 7158; item 342A, children's boots

DIVISIONS—continued.

and shoes, 7159; item 346, rubber and other hose, 20 per cent., 7159; item 348, rubber and rubber manufactures, proposed duty, 20 per cent., 7163; item 350A, leather, rubber, and composition belting, proposed duty, 20 per cent., 7166; item 351A, paper, manufactures of, *amdt.*, to leave out words, "and cartons," 7183; proposed duty, 3d. per pound, 7184; proposed duty, 4d. per pound, 7185; item 352D, printing paper in rolls or folios, *amdt.*, to leave out words "known as newspaper," &c., 7202; that the goods be free, 7213; item 352C, paper, browns, and sugar, &c., proposed duty, 4s. 6d. per cwt., 7222; item 352K, paper, n.e.i., including cardboard, &c., *amdt.*, to leave out words "cardboard, pasteboard," 7236; proposed duty, 15 per cent., 7237; item 354, printing and stenciling inks, n.e.i., *amdt.*, to leave out words "per pound," 7246; proposed duty, 3d. per pound, 7247; proposed duty, 4d. per pound, 7247, 7263; proposed duty, 5d. per pound, 7263; proposed duty (United Kingdom), 4d. per pound, 7264; item 355, news printing "invoiced at under 3d. per pound," *amdt.*, to omit 6d. and substitute 1s., 7264; item 369, bicycles, &c., n.e.i., proposed duty, 30 per cent., 7281; item 373, perambulators and go-carts, proposed duty, 25 per cent., 7282; item 381A, pianos, grand and semi-grand, proposed duty, 25 per cent., 7344; proposed duty (United Kingdom), 20 per cent., 7345; item 381B, pianos, upright, *amdt.*, to insert after "upright" "except outside packages," &c., 7356; item 406C, fuse, n.e.i., proposed duty (General Tariff), 3d. per coil; (United Kingdom), 4d. per coil, 7391; item 407, cameras, &c., *amdt.* to insert "nitrate of silver and chloride of gold," 7394; proposed duty, 25 per cent., 7394; item 425, articles imported for official use of Governor-General, *amdt.*, to insert new paragraph exempting articles imported for State Governors, 7404; *amdt.*, providing that exemption shall not apply to any Governor-General, State Governor, or Lieutenant-Governor appointed after 12th December, 1907, 7420; item 442A, scientific instruments, *amdt.*, to insert "of other material than glass," 7410; item 15, hay and chaff, *m.*, to recommit, 10815, *cons. reg.*, item 36, blue, 10501; item 42, stearine and paraffine wax, 10514; item 46, liquorice, 10519; item 61B, herbs dried, 10521; item 67, hay and chaff, 10546; item 79, matches and vestas, 10555; item 85, mustard, 10557; item 96, salt, 10559; item 105, tea in packets, 10561; item 107, apparel and attire, n.e.i., 10570; item 113, bags, sacks, &c., 10574; item 114, blankets, flannels, &c., 10576; item 115, carpets, 10577; item 121A, wool felt hats, 10592, 10593; item 121B, fur felt hats, 10596; item 121E, caps and sewn hats, 10619; item 122, parasols, 10623; item 123F, piece-goods, n.e.i., 10629; item 124, wadding and cotton wool, 10642; item 132, socks and stockings, 10655; item 143, sheet lead, 10660; item 145, agricultural

DIVISIONS—continued.

machinery, n.e.i., 10662; item 152, agricultural machinery and implements, 10666; item 153, cutlery, 10674; item 170A, manufactures of metals, n.e.i., 10699; item 176D, rotary and percussive rock-drills, 10724; item 176F, rock-boring machines, 10732; item 177D, electric apparatus and fittings, 10742; item 180, rails, fish plates, &c., 10749; item 186, wire-netting, 10775; item 217, standards, &c., 10804; item 226, wire, n.e.i., 10814; item 234JJ, oils, lubricating, mineral, 10881; item 244, roofing tiles, 10903; item 256, scientific apparatus, test tubes, 10908, 10909; item 262, printers' roller composition, 10998; item 268A, marble unwrought, 11000; item 284A, insecticides, 11009, 11010; item 299, furniture, n.e.i., 11011; item 299B, lounges, &c., of wicker, 11015; item 299C, chairs, of wicker, 11015; item 312, photographic frames, 11057; item 326, fancy goods, 11058; item 344, spectacles and spectacle frames, 11067; item 347, slipper forms, 11068; item 356A, manufactures of paper, 11075; item 356C, Australian directories, &c., 11080; item 356D, printed matter, n.e.i., 11088; item 234, O. and P., 11120, 11121; item 303A (timber, undressed, 11144; item 303 (definition of "superficial foot"), 11150; item 303, timber (definition of "surface"), 11166; item 364, pens, n.e.i., 11169; item 408, corks, 11175; item 410, lantern slides, 11177; item 417, works of art (stained glass windows), 11191; item 427, surgical appliances, 11192; item 442, surgical and dental instruments, &c. (dental chairs), 11193; item 384B, pianos, 11213; item 384C, pianos, n.e.i., 11214; *m.*, that the House refrain from the determination of its constitutional rights or obligations in reference to Senate's message, 11437; *recons. req.*, item 118, curtains and blinds, n.e.i., 11442; item 143, sheet lead and lead piping, 11443; item 356D, Australian directories, 11459; item 123B, piece goods, woollen or containing wool, 11534; item 160, motor car machinery, 11538; item 178B, gas meters, 11547; item 217, standards and pillars, 11550; item 248, roasting dishes, &c. (plumbago), 11562; item 284, insecticides, &c., 11567; item 303B, timber (New Zealand pine), 11571; item 303 (measurement of timber), 11573; item 417, works of art (stained glass), 11577

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS.

ABORIGINES.

House of Representatives:

Treatment of, in Western Australia, *adj.*, 471
Question by Mr. Mahon as to alleged cruelty to, in Western Australia, 7115

ADVERTISING AUSTRALIA.

Senate:

Lone Hand advertisements, *supply*, 12145
Means to be adopted, *supply*, 12144
Necessity for, *supply*, 3814-5, 3846
Reuter's Messages, Arrangements for, *supply*, 6349-50
Vote for, *supply*, 5886-5906, 6348, 10278, 10302-3

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—continued.

Advertising Australia—continued.

Questions by—

Senator de Largie as to whether the Government will consider the question of advertising in English Labour journals, 11302
Senator Findley as to advertisements to appear in *Standard*, 11302; Senator Chataway, 11303, 11472; as to intention of, Senator Stewart, 11218, 11384
Senator Givens as to whether English journals would not be friendly to Australia if subsidized to the extent of £65 a page for being so, 11303
Senator Gray as to price paid for advertising in *Standard*, 11218, 11302
Senator Pulsford, 11302
Senator McGregor as to rate per word paid for Reuter's Messages, 6407
Senator Pearce as to intentions of Government with respect to, 766
Senator Pulsford as to whether the Government assert that there are newspapers published in England that are distinctly unfriendly to Australia, 11302

House of Representatives:

Necessity for, *supply*, 1794-5; *Budget*, 2604, 2661, 2971-2, 3117-8, 3215; *supply*, 9515-20, 9600, 9604-8, 9610-2, 9620, 9695, 9983
Standard, arrangement with, *supply*, 11359; vote for *supply*, 11359
Motion by Mr. Kelly for return of publications that have received payment for articles or services for, and the names of persons with whom the Government negotiated, 10880

Questions by—

Mr. Thomas Brown as to "overlapping" of States, and Commonwealth Government's advertisements, 7026
Mr. J. H. Catts as to securing services of Newtown Band at Franco-British Exhibition as part of scheme for, 9842
Mr. Kelly as to publications purchased for the purpose of, 10523, 10576
Mr. Liddell as to accuracy of statement in Sydney *Morning Herald* of number of copies of *Australia To-Day* purchased by the Government, 10607
Mr. Kelly as to purchase of article appearing in, and copies of the *Lone Hand*, 10652, 10753-4, 10879; Mr. Johnson, 10786
Mr. Johnson as to writer of *Lone Hand* article, 10753; as to delivery of copies of *Lone Hand* purchased, 10753; as to whether pressmen other than Mr. Fox, of the *Bulletin*, were prepared to contribute articles at the price paid to Mr. Fox, 10753; Mr. Reid, 10754
Mr. Salmon as to whether in purchasing copies of *Lone Hand* the Government had followed a precedent set by Mr. Reid when Prime Minister, 10754; as to whether Mr. Reid had as Prime Minister paid £400 for the writing of certain articles, 10755, 11046

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—continued.

Advertising Australia—continued.

- Mr. O'Malley as to whether the writing of articles advertising the Commonwealth would be thrown open to competition, 10755
- Mr. Kelly as to the appointment of some impartial authority to judge applications to write articles advertising Australia, 10755
- Mr. Livingston as to services of Mr. Price, Premier of South Australia, in England, 10878
- Mr. Johnson as to whether the Prime Minister was aware that in the issue of the *Lone Hand* purchased for, an article unfavorable to Sydney appeared, 10879, 10963
- Mr. Willis as to subvention paid to London *Standard* Newspaper Company for, 11050
- Mr. Reid as to scheme for transmission of cablegrams to be open to the whole of the British press, 11051
- Mr. Page as to arrangement with *Standard*, 11097, 11156
- Mr. Wilks as to general scheme for; as to utilizing services of Captain Collins for purpose, 11156
- Mr. Salmon as to copies of *Australia To-day*, 11156
- Mr. Kelly as to whether any payment had been made to Mr. Randolph Bedford in connexion with the issue of the *Clarion*, 11261
- Mr. Sampson as to whether London *Standard* is not an uncompromising opponent of "Little Englander" views, 11389
- Mr. Kelly as to whether London *Daily Telegraph* is not also an uncompromising opponent of "Little Englander" views, 11389

AGRICULTURAL INSTITUTE, ROME.

Annual Payment to, *supply*, 9627-8

AMERICAN FLEET, VISIT OF.

Senate:

- Acceptance of Commonwealth invitation announced, 9421.
- Correspondence tabled, 9951
- Expenditure on entertainment of, *supply*, 11490

Questions by—

- Senator Neild as to tabling of copy of invitation to, 8554
- Senator Neild as to invitation to President Roosevelt, and to Imperial authorities to provide adequate representation of British Navy, 9138, 9236; invitation to Vice-President, or American Minister of State, 9236
- Senator Pulsford as to fleet obtaining goods free of Customs duties, 11301
- Senator Mulcahy as to concessions to residents of other States desiring to visit Sydney or Melbourne during visit of, 11468, 11581, 11983
- Senator McGregor as to co-operation of Commonwealth with States Governments in entertainment of, 11468-9; Senator Symon, 11469

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—continued.

American Fleet, Visit of—continued.

Questions by—

- Senator Symon as to limit of expenditure in entertaining, 11469-70; Senator Clemons, 11469; Senator Findley, 11470; Senator Pulsford, 12102
- Senator Needham as to invitation to Fleet to visit Fremantle, 11469
- Senator Stewart as to invitation to visit Queensland, 11469
- Senator Symon as to invitation to visit Adelaide, 11469
- Senator Mulcahy as to invitation to visit Hobart, 11469
- Senator Chataway as to separation of Commonwealth expenditure from other expenditure on entertainment of, 11470
- Senator Givens as to making functions self-supporting by levying a charge upon all desiring to plaster their advertisements on to the visit of the Fleet, 11470
- Senator Sayers as to whether any of the money appropriated for the entertainment of the Fleet would be spent in entertaining the men of the Australian Squadron, 11983, 12102

House of Representatives:

- Acceptance of Commonwealth invitation announced, 9474, 9951
- Expenditure on entertainment of, *supply*, 11366
- Reception Committee, names of announced, *adj.*, 11300

Questions by—

- Mr. Wilks as to invitation to British Government to provide special representation of Navy, 9089, 9474, 11180
- Mr. O'Malley as to whether Fleet would visit a Tasmanian port, 9089
- Mr. Bowden as to date of arrival and duration of visit of Fleet, 9474
- Mr. Johnson as to steps taken to give fitting reception to, 10607; Mr. Reid, 10607
- Mr. Bowden as to entertainment of, 11180
- Mr. Hedges as to whether the Fleet would visit Fremantle, 11180
- Mr. Crouch as to source of information as to places to be visited by, 11180
- Mr. J. H. Catts as to supply of liquor to sailors of, 11419
- Mr. Mathews as to landing place at Melbourne, 11525

ARGENTINE REPUBLIC.

Senate:

- Question by Senator W. Russell, as to embargo on importation of Australian cattle, 5981

House of Representatives:

- Question by Mr. Glynn, as to embargo on importation of Australian cattle, 5911

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—*continued.*

AUSTRALIAN MEN OF LETTERS' FUND.

Senate:

Administration of, *supply*, 10302
Payments from, *supply*, 12144

House of Representatives:

Explanation of, *supply*, 9518, 9520-1

Questions by—

Mr. Mahon as to administration of, 4647
Mr. Chanter as to when Committee would be appointed to administer, 10179

AUSTRALIANS, REPATRIATION OF (*see* IMMIGRATION)

BANK CLERKS:

House of Representatives:

Question by Mr. O'Malley, as to salaries paid to, 11155

BEALE, MR. O. C.

Senate:

Question by Senator Mulcahy, as to whether report by has been suppressed, and whether the Government have received the second part of the report, and intend to take action thereon, 8286

House of Representatives:

Payments to, *supply*, 9968-70
Report by, *obs.*, 2612-4; *Budget*, 2663; *adj.*, 3091, 3899; *supply*, 9975-82
Motion by Mr. Deakin for printing of revised report by, 7508

Questions by—

Mr. Wilks as to circulation of report, and protecting Bill, 9092
Mr. Liddell as to withdrawal from circulation of Report by, 2995
Mr. Catts as to cost of printing, 6595, 6813; Mr. Liddell, 11159
Mr. Kelly as to tabling of papers connected with appointment of, as Royal Commission; and with publication of report, 9580, 9845
Mr. Johnson as to payments to and cost of printing report by, 9956
Mr. Thomas as to presentation of report to Governor-General, 1516; as to cheap issue of, 1075; as to when Bill to validate use of quotations from report by would be introduced, 10309
Mr. Hedges as to protests against publication of report by; and as to threatened legal proceedings for publication of statements contained in report by, 10309
Mr. Liddell as to withdrawal of Revised Report by, 11159; as to what there is in Revised Report by, requiring special legislation before it can be published, 11261

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—*continued.*

BOARD OF TRADE CORRESPONDENTS.

House of Representatives:

Questions by—

Mr. Crouch as to whether Prime Minister was consulted in appointment of, 4957
Mr. D. Thomson as to whether claim to be consulted in appointment of, was made, and if so involved consultation with British Government in appointment of Australian Agents-General, 4957

BRITISH JOURNALISTS.

Senate:

Question by Senator Lynch as to grant in aid of visit of in connexion with Commercial Congress, 9353

House of Representatives:

Question by Mr. Thomas Brown as to proposed visit to Australia of, 7117

CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN, RT. HON. SIR HENRY.

House of Representatives:

Death of, *obs.*, 10522-3

CHINESE:

Senate:

Questions by—

Senator Chataway as to application of Excise laws to Chinese in Melbourne, 6061
Senator Pearce as to registration of on lines of recent Transvaal legislation, 9236, 9422

House of Representatives:

Questions by—

Mr. Hutchison as to registration of, 9844-5
Mr. O'Malley as to employment of on British ships, 11179
Mr. Maloney as to deportation of opium smugglers, 11525

[*See* IMMIGRATION.]

COLONIAL OFFICE:

House of Representatives:

Re-arrangement of, *obs.*, 6094

Questions by Mr. Crouch, as to speech by Lord Elgin, Secretary of State for the Colonies, as to prevention of employment of lascars on ocean-going steamers, 1975; as to control of Australian affairs by Dominions Department of, 5130, 6406; as to whether Government were consulted prior to offer of Governor-Generalship to Earl of Dudley, 9388; as to tabling of despatch relating to creation of Dominions Department, 9389; as to reorganization of, 11736

COMMERCIAL CONGRESS. [*See* BRITISH JOURNALISTS.]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—continued.

COMMONWEALTH AND STATES.

Senate:

Conferences between representatives of, *supply*, 11502, 11504
Relations between, *supply*, 3815-6, 4072, 4080, 8995, 11517-20

[See PREMIERS' CONFERENCES; also TREASURY.]

House of Representatives:

Relations between, *Budget*, 3010-1, 3036-8, 3117, 3194-5; *supply*, 3330, 3353, 3357-9, 3427-31, 3438-40, 3534-5, 3536-7, 4017, 9209, 9713, 9717-20
Question by Mr. Watkins as to alleged attacks made on States by Commonwealth Government, 9582

Commonwealth Gazette—

Senate:

Printing and Distribution of, *supply*, 10290

House of Representatives:

Motion by Mr. Webster for return as to cost and sale of, agreed to, 11330

COTTON PRODUCTION:

House of Representatives:

Question by—
Senator Dobson, as to communication with British Cotton Growing Association, 650

COUNSELS OF THE EMPIRE.

House of Representatives:

Question by Mr. Dugald Thomson as to interpretation to be put upon remarks of Prime Minister with respect to, 5803

EMPIRE FREE TRADE.

Senate:

Questions by Senator Stewart and Senator Symon, as to speech by Senator Best on, 11468

House of Representatives:

Question by Mr. B. Smith, as to whether Prime Minister is prepared to advocate scheme of, 6129

EMPIRE, THE, COHESION OF:

House of Representatives.

Questions by—
Mr. Wilks as to statements attributed to Cardinal Logue, 11154
Mr. Johnson as to whether Cardinal Logue's statements were not a result of the passing of resolutions by the Commonwealth Parliament dictating British domestic policy and legislation, 11154
Mr. Knox as to whether the Prime Minister would cable to London a contradiction of Cardinal Logue's statements, 11155; Mr. Johnson, 11155

FANNING ISLAND.

House of Representatives:

Question by Mr. Bowden as to reported sale or transfer of, 6835

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—continued.

FIRES IN NEW SOUTH WALES.

Senate:

Reply to message of sympathy in connexion with, announced, 4036
Question by Senator Neild as to message of sympathy from the Senate, in connexion with recent fires at Murwillumbah and Bangalow, 3364

House of Representatives:

Message of sympathy from House of Representatives in connexion with fires at Murwillumbah and Bangalow, *adj.*, 3363
Reply to message announced, 3850

FOREIGN RELATIONS:

House of Representatives:

Question by Mr. Crouch as to power of Commonwealth Government under section 51, sub-section xxix., of Constitution to direct communication with Foreign Governments, 10181

FRANCO-BRITISH EXHIBITION.

House of Representatives:

Questions by—
Mr. Willis as to representation of Commonwealth at, 9009, 10751
Mr. J. H. Catts as to securing services of Newtown Band to perform at, 9842

GERMAN CONVICT SETTLEMENT.

Senate:

Question by Senator Neild as to attitude of Government in relation to threatened establishment of, in the Pacific, 7791, 7841

GERMAN NAVY.

House of Representatives.

Question by Mr. McDougall as to alleged intention of German naval authorities to station a first-class cruiser in the South Seas, 11628
GOVERNOR-GENERAL [See COLONIAL OFFICE].

HIGH COMMISSIONER.

Senate:

Appointment of, *address*, 51, 60, 153, 484; *supply*, 1847, 1848, 3810, 3921, 4067, 4069, 10292-6
Duties of, *address*, 71, 3818, 3826, 3846, 3849, 4069, 4072
Questions by—
Senator Walker as to when Bill would be introduced to provide for the appointment of, 3797
Senator Needham as to whether the name of the, would be submitted for approval of Parliament, 3797
Senator Stewart as to whether the Right Honorable G. H. Reid was to be appointed, 3798
Senator W. Russell as to whether the Government would announce the name of the, 3798
Senator Lynch as to whether the Government will hasten the appointment of, 4706
Senator Lynch as to appointment of, in order to answer reflections upon Australia, 7571

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—*continued.*

High Commissioner—*continued.*

House of Representatives:

Appointment of, *address*, 88, 101, 118, 174, 186, 327, 457, 462; *supply*, 1812; *Budget*, 2661, 2916, 2965, 2972, 2977; *supply*, 3617, 3625, 3632, 3634, 3636, 3640-1, 3652, 3655-9, 3667-8, 3674, 8967-8, 9518-9, 9610-1, 9623, 9627, 9695, 9715, 9720

Expenditure in connexion with office of, *supply*, 11266

Questions by—

Mr. Salmon as to appointment of, 5416
Mr. Glynn as to transfer of duties of States Agents-General to, 5208-9
Mr. Johnson, as to Bill to provide for, 9091

HISTORICAL RECORDS.

Senate:

Vote for Collection of, *supply*, 10295-6

HONOURS.

House of Representatives:

Albert Medal, Recommendation of Diver Hughes for, *adj.*, 2994-5

Questions by—

Mr. Crouch as to whether honours recently conferred upon Australian citizens were granted on the recommendation of, or after consultation with, the Federal Executive, 1751
Mr. Mahon as to conferring of Albert Medal on Diver Hughes, of Bonnie Vale, Western Australia, 2566, 2793

HOSPITALS, BORDER.

House of Representatives:

Question by Mr. Webster as to bringing position of border hospitals under notice of Premiers' Conference, 9194

IMMIGRATION.

Senate:

Aliens, Influx of, *supply*, 10291-2
Attitude of Labour Party with regard to, *address*, 74, 79, 154, 256, 261, 275, 278
Australians, Repatriation of, *address*, 155, 386; *supply*, 11617
Chinese, smuggling of, *adj.*, 9007-8
Contract Immigrants, *address*, 266, 367, 479
Immigration League, work of, *supply*, 4072, 5886-5906
Immigrants introduced to New South Wales, *adj.*, 4276-8
Land available for Immigrants, *supply*, 5887-5906
Motion by Senator Turley for return giving particulars of contract immigrants introduced into Queensland, 2055
Norwegians, Inducements offered to, *address*, 479
Policy of, *address*, 73, 79, 142, 153, 261-7, 275, 360, 367, 381, 389, 394, 479; *supply*, 3819, 3827, 3911, 4070, 4078, 5887-5906, 10281, 10395, 11486

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—*continued.*

Immigration—*continued.*

Questions by—

Senator Chataway as to warning issued in Great Britain to intending emigrants, 29
Senator Turley as to contract immigrants introduced for the Colonial Sugar Refining Company, 650
Senator Findley as to whether immigrants who left vessels at Fremantle had been introduced by Mr. Hughes under contract for the Colonial Sugar Refining Company, 650
Senator Findley as to whether Spanish immigrants who left their ships at Fremantle under contract to Colonial Sugar Refining Company had infringed the provisions of the Contract Immigrants Act, 830
Senator Croft as to whether Afghans introduced in charge of camels had complied with regulations under the Immigration Restriction Act, 1131
Senator Croft as to terms on which a linguist is employed under the Immigration Restriction Act, 1471, 1688; Senator Symon, 1471; Senator Clemons, 1471, 1689; Senator Chataway as to nationality of linguist referred to, 1689
Senator Lynch as to character of immigrants introduced for Queensland sugar industry, 1689, 1816
Senator Turley as to particulars of contract immigrants for Queensland, 1929
Senator Walker as to steps taken by Government to encourage European, 3990
Senator O'Loughlin as to States Governments providing land for agricultural immigrants, 4243; by Senator W. Russell, 4707
Senator Findley as to whether the Government are responsible for advertisement on which people have been induced to emigrate to Australia, 4244
Senator Millen as to whether Labour Party repudiated their professed desire for immigration, 4244
Senator W. Russell as to whether the Immigration League would assist the Government in circulating the facts concerning the Commonwealth, 4244
Senator Neild as to alleged luring of immigrants to New South Wales under false pretences, 4244
Senator Chataway as to alleged dissatisfaction of immigrants to New South Wales, 4365
Senator Chataway as to statements in *Times* alleging unsuitability of Queensland and Northern Territory for white labour, 4471
Senator St. Ledger as to statements made by Mr. Ben Tillett, 4705; by Senators Croft, Stewart, and Millen, 4705

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—continued.

Immigration—continued.

Questions by—

Senator Lynch as to comments on contract immigration legislation by Senator Pulsford, 4706

Senator Chataway as to publication in England of information disclosed in Conciliation and Arbitration Court to meet statement published by Mr. Ben Tillett, 5081; by Senator W. Russell, 5082

Senator Croft as to introduction of miners for Great Cobar Mine, 5178

Senator Macfarlane as to bond required in connexion with admission to Hobart Hospital of invalid, German seaman, 5838

Senator Neild as to deportation of Syed Kamal Shah, 5980

Senator Findley as to alleged influx of Chinese, 7927

Senator Findley as to action taken in connexion with Bulgarian immigrants, 8075

Senator Needham as to grant to Victorian Immigration League, 8156, 8230

Senator Findley as to amounts granted to Victorian and Tasmanian Leagues, 8230

Senator de Largie as to Leagues to whom grants had been made being established in States in which there is no land available for immigrants, 8230

Senator Pearce as to whether Leagues were asked to give any account of the manner in which grants made to them were spent, 8231, 8285; Senator Needham, 8231

Senator Chataway as to whether any grant has been made to the Queensland Immigration League, 8231

Senator de Largie whether in future Leagues representing States in which there is land available for settlement would be given some of the money granted for this purpose, 8231

Senator Lynch as to whether the Government did not think it would be wise to distribute money for the encouragement of immigration through one agency, 8232

Senator Pearce as to whether the Government, in view of the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada, declaring unconstitutional a British Columbia Act on the lines of the Immigration Restriction Act, will take steps to denounce the protocol under which Queensland is made a party to the Anglo-Japanese Treaty, 8507

Senator Henderson as to influx of Chinese into Western Australia, 9236

Senator Pearce as to registration of Asiatics on the lines of recent Transvaal legislation, 9236, 9222

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—continued.

Immigration—continued.

Questions by—

Senator Pulsford as to steps taken to give effect to section 3, paragraph A, of Immigration Restriction Act, 9633

Senator Pearce as to accuracy of statement by Mr. A. McLeod with respect to Chinese immigration published in Perth *Daily News*, 10370

Senator Neild as to demand for bonds for invalided foreign sailors, 10829, 10920; as to amount of bond required for sick Russian sailor at Adelaide, 11221

Senator de Largie as to steps necessary to prevent smuggling of Asiatics into the Commonwealth, 12101

House of Representatives:

Attitude of Labour Party with regard to *address*, 324, 447-9; *adj.*, 1327; *supply*, 1794; *Budget*, 2662, 2992-3, 3022

Australians, Repatriation of, *adj.*, 1325-9; *Budget*, 3215; *supply*, 11359, 11362, 11364

Chinese, influx of, *supply*, 9395, 9407, 9413

Contract Immigrants, *adj.*, 1743-4, 2344; *Budget*, 3130, 3134; *supply*, 3425

Consumptives, Introduction of, *adj.*, 1679-84

Effect of, on Wages, *Budget*, 2681-2

General Booth's Scheme of, *Budget*, 3000

Immigration Advertisements, *adj.*, 1231; *Budget*, 3129-30

Immigration, Assisted, *adj.*, 1327

Immigration Leagues, *adj.*, 929, 930, 1231; *supply*, 1788-95, 1811; *Budget*, 2368, 3132, 3136; *adj.*, 2686; *supply*, 9626, 9725

Immigration Restriction Act, *address*, 336

Immigration Statistics, *Budget*, 2662

Introduction of Foreign Labour for Sugar Industry, *address*, 163

Motion by Mr. Frazer for return giving particulars of prosecutions against aliens escaping from ships since the passage of the Immigration Restriction (Amended) Act 1905, 1596

Policy of, *address*, 51, 102, 162, 173, 232, 326, 336, 447; *adj.*, 1326-9; *Budget*, 1641, 2269, 2356, 2368, 2913, 2965, 2990-1, 2999-3001, 3018, 3020-2, 3123, 3129-37, 8966-75, 9407, 9416-8, 9597-600, 9602-29, 9690-724; *supply*, 11363

Questions by—

Mr. Bamford as to administration of Contract Immigrants Act, 244; as to agreements made by Colonial Sugar Refining Company with Spaniards and other contract immigrants, 502-3, 2344

Mr. Frazer as to landing of alleged lunatic at Fremantle, 502; Mr. Liddell, 648

Mr. Johnson as to undesirables amongst repatriated Australians, 503

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—continued.

Immigration—continued.

Questions by—

- Mr. Liddell as to whether a native-born Australian can be refused admission if, during a temporary absence from the Commonwealth, he develops insanity, 502, 648
- Mr. Maloney as to whether surgeons on ships conveying repatriated Australians had been paid, 928
- Mr. Watkins as to whether immigrants landing at the present time are under agreement; and, if so, whether their agreements have been examined to see if they are in accordance with the Act, 1087
- Mr. Watkins as to whether the Government have subsidized the Immigration League, 771, 928, 1231
- Mr. J. H. Catts as to whether the attention of the Government had been called to Dr. Arthur's letter to Mr. Marshall Lyle, and whether the subsidy paid to the Immigration League, if any, would be discontinued in view of the statements in Dr. Arthur's letter, 881; Mr. Watson, 882
- Mr. Watkins as to whether the Immigration League was responsible for advertising for miners for New South Wales when many in the State were out of employment, 928, 1231
- Mr. Bamford as to when the Prime Minister would be able to reply to deputation that had waited upon him in reference to immigration of contract labourers, 1281, 1743
- Mr. Watkins as to whether the attention of the Government had been called to Mr. Carruthers' statement that 2,000 miners were required in New South Wales, 1281
- Mr. Watkins as to whether the Acting Prime Minister would take steps to contradict statements appearing in certain immigration advertisements; and also that made by Mr. Carruthers as to the need for miners in New South Wales, 1413
- Mr. Bowden as to whether the attention of the Government had been called to the settlement scheme formulated by the Salvation Army; whether the Government will communicate with States Governments with a view to offering inducements to the Salvation Army to establish settlements in Australia, 1596
- Mr. Liddell as to cases in which the Immigration Restriction Act has been enforced to prevent the introduction of immigrants suffering from consumption, 1516
- Mr. Liddell as to action taken to avoid danger threatened by admission of consumptives, 2314
- Mr. Bamford as to whether agreements between the Colonial Sugar Refining Company and immigrants indentured from Europe were made within the Commonwealth, 3423

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—continued.

Immigration—continued.

Questions by—

- Mr. Carr as to Government action in connexion with unregulated immigration to New South Wales, 4518
- Mr. Bamford as to dissatisfaction of Spanish immigrants to Queensland, 4647
- Mr. Hutchison as to references by Mr. J. M. Reid to introduction of white artisans under contract, 5046
- Mr. Thomas Brown as to bringing advantages of settlement in Australia under notice of persons at present emigrating from America and Canada to Great Britain, 6727; Mr. Joseph Cook, 6727
- Mr. Bamford as to strike of Spanish immigrants at Geraldton, 7113
- Mr. Frazer as to tabling of report of officers appointed to inquire into alleged smuggling of Chinese, 8816
- Mr. B. Smith as to accuracy of statements appearing in *British Australasian*, 8938
- Mr. Kelly as to advertising opportunities afforded by Australia to industrial immigrants, 9090
- Mr. Johnson as to enforcement of Immigration Restriction Act in respect to admission of Japanese to Thursday Island, 9582
- Mr. J. H. Catts as to appointment of immigration lecturers, 9420
- Mr. Thomas Brown as to whether in view of the fact that there were 249 applicants for one block of land at Wagga, it is desirable to encourage immigration of people desiring to settle on the land, 9765
- Mr. Kelly as to statement by Hon. T. Price in London that there is plenty of land in South Australia available for immigrants, 9765
- Mr. Hutchison as to influx of Chinese, 9844
- Mr. O'Malley as to whether, in view of statements by Premier of Victoria immigrants would not be introduced until provision was made for their future, 10130
- Mr. Kelly as to whether the Prime Minister would ascertain the views of Premiers of States other than Victoria, 10130
- Mr. Palmer as to statement of Premier of Victoria that railway construction projected would render 3,000,000 acres in Victoria available for settlement, 10130
- Mr. Maloney as to whether the Prime Minister is in agreement with the Premier of Victoria on the immigration question, 10179
- Mr. Crouch as to printing in block type of new ideas on the subject of immigration by the honorable member for Flinders, 10179
- Mr. McDougall as to land in Victoria available for immigrants, 10179

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—continued.

Immigration—continued.

Questions by—

Mr. Thomas Brown as to payments on vouchers by Dr. Arthur, of the New South Wales Immigration League, 10401

Mr. Crouch as to Conference of self-governing States on question of restriction of Asiatic immigration, 10483

Mr. Mathews as to whether desertion of foreign sailors to accept employment on coal-fields constitutes a breach of the Immigration Restriction Act, 10483

Mr. Thomas Brown as to alleged effort of Dr. Arthur to promote immigration of Russian Jews, 10756

Mr. O'Malley as to statements of Mr. E. Osler concerning exodus of Victorian farmers to Queensland, 10877

Mr. Kelly as to statements made by Mr. Price in England, and contention of members of Labour Party that there is no land available for settlement, 10877

Mr. Fairbairn as to whether reference by Mr. O'Malley to statements by Mr. Osler did not suggest "stinking fish" policy, 10877

Mr. Batchelor as to whether Mr. Price's remedy for lack of land for settlement was not a progressive land tax, 10878

Mr. Fuller as to applications for land thrown open to settlement in Queensland, 10878

Mr. Kelly as to immigration of Scottish fishermen, 10965

Mr. Thomas Brown as to statement in Sydney *Daily Telegraph*, and introduction of undesirable immigrants, 11096; as to negotiations by Dr. Arthur to bring about exclusive settlements of Russian and Italian aliens, 11329; as to whether any money had been granted to Dr. Arthur or Immigration League since 1st November, 1907, for immigration purposes, 11329; as to action of League in promoting immigration of non-English-speaking aliens, 11707

Mr. Hutchison as to statements by Premier of New South Wales, 11386; Mr. Carr, 11388

[See ADVERTISING AUSTRALIA.]

IMPERIAL CONFERENCE.

Senate:

Secretariat, establishment of, *address*, 70
Services of Mr. Deakin at, *address*, 59, 77, 292, 370, 377, 393, 473

Work of, *address*, 10, 58, 67, 148, 370, 393, 473

Questions by—

Senator Symon as to supply of copies of Report of, 563, 649

Senator Symon as to Papers laid before, 2405, 2512

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—continued.

Imperial Conference—continued.

House of Representatives:

Articles by Mr. Richard Hain, *Budget*, 3228-30, 3288-91

Expenses of Commonwealth Representatives, *supply*, 1873, 11361-3

Representations by Mr. Deakin and Sir Wm. Lyne, *address*, 420-44, 456; *supply*, 1806-8; *Budget*, 3289; *supply*, 3846

Secretariat, establishment and powers of, 92, 101, 172, 178, 179, 216, 324, 420-44

Services of Mr. Deakin at, *address*, 24, 27, 90, 101, 105, 169, 189, 210, 227, 236, 326, 329, 345, 459; *Budget*, 2660; *supply*, 11363

Speeches by Sir Wm. Lyne, *address*, 178, 202, 210, 345

Work of, *address*, 101, 159, 170, 178, 189, 216, 227, 234

Questions by—

Mr. B. Smith as to report of, 297-8;

Mr. Reid, 208; Mr. Joseph Cook, 470

Mr. Crouch as to election of Australian Representatives at future Conferences, 5416

[NAVIGATION CONFERENCE, *see* TRADE AND CUSTOMS, "NAVIGATION AND SHIPPING"]

IMPERIAL INSTITUTE.

House of Representatives:

Assistance to, *supply*, 9404

INDIA.

Senate:

Circular issued by Indian Government on purchase of Remounts in Australia, *supply*, 8902-4

Question by Senator Millen as to Indian Government's proposal with respect to purchase of Remounts, 8867, 10073, 10253

JAPAN.

Senate:

Relations of Commonwealth with, *supply*, 11486-8

Question by—

Senator Pearce as to Anglo-Japanese treaty, 8507

Senator Pulsford as to representation of Australia at Tokio Exhibition, 11383

House of Representatives:

Question by—

Mr. McDougall as to truth of statement that projected Japanese steel and iron works were to be supplied with Australian ore, 6593

JAVA.

Senate:

Victorian subsidized trade with, 6317, 6319

House of Representatives:

Question by—

Mr. Crouch as to influx of Japanese and other Orientals into; and appointment of Commonwealth Representative at Batavia, 2998

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—*continued.*

KEIR HARDIE, MR.

Senate:

Question by Senator Dobson as to speeches by, in India, 4245

KANAKAS.

Senate:

Repatriation of, *address*, 61; *supply*, 5886, 5893, 6348-9, 8987-8, 12144

House of Representatives:

Labour cf, Confined to Sugar Industry, *address*, 236

Repatriation of, *address*, 333; *supply*, 1806, 8841, 9686-90, 9707-8, 11378

Questions by—

Mr. Johnson as to alleged murder of Repatriated Islanders, 502

Mr. Mahon as to payment by Queensland Government towards expense of repatriation of, 9684

LAND FOR SETTLEMENT. [See IMMIGRATION.]

LINLITHGOW, MARQUIS OF.

Senate:

Motion, by Senator Best, of sympathy upon death of, 8504; debated, 8504; agreed to, 8505

Reply to motion of sympathy announced, 9040

House of Representatives:

Motion, by Mr. Deakin, of sympathy upon death of, 8818; agreed to, 8819

Reply to motion of sympathy announced, 9088

LOGUE, CARDINAL. [See EMPIRE, THE COHESION OF].

LONDON DOCKS.

House of Representatives:

Question by Mr. Glynn as to communication with Imperial Government suggesting improvements to make better provision for repacking and storage of perishable produce, 6726, 9684

LONDON OFFICES OF THE COMMONWEALTH.

Senate:

Captain Collins, Duties of, *supply*, 10295-6

Establishment of, *supply*, 10292, 10294-5

Site for, *adj.*, 3711; *supply*, 3800-2, 3805-6, 3814, 3817-8, 3824-8, 3841-3, 3845-8, 3849, 3902-4, 3908-12, 3914-5, 3917-21, 3923-30, 4063-83, 4144-54, 11617, 12144

Questions by—

Senator Mulcahy as to whether the sanction of Parliament would be obtained before the Commonwealth was bound to the acquisition of any property for, 3683

Senator Macfarlane as to when option for purchase of lease of site for, would expire, 3683

Senator Millen as to conflict between answers given by Senator Best and Sir William Lyne on subject of the acquisition of a site for, 3796

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—*continued.*

London Offices of the Commonwealth—*continued.*

Questions by—

Senator St. Ledger as to whether copy of cable sent by Sir William Lyne in connexion with the site would be tabled, 3796

Senator Stewart as to whether negotiations for lease of site were being conducted directly with London County Council or through an agent, 4144

Senator Millen as to negotiations for the acquisition of site, 4362

Senator Chataway as to consultation with Premier of Victoria with respect to style of proposed buildings, 4470

Senator St. Ledger as to consultation with Premier of States other than Victoria with respect to character of proposed buildings, 4470

Senator Walker as to whether offer made for site has been accepted, 4706

Senator Walker as to negotiations for acquisition of site, 5177, 5857

Senator Colonel Neild as to present position of negotiations for the acquisition of a site, 7543

Senator Millen as to reported termination of negotiations with London County Council, 7700

Senator Sayers as to steps being taken to secure a site, 8104

House of Representatives:

Administration in London of Commonwealth Affairs, *supply*, 1802, 1804

Captain Collins, Duties of, *supply*, 3624-5, 3629, 3633-4, 3637, 9488-9

Establishment of, *supply*, 1802, 1810-11; *Budget*, 2916-7, 8966, 8970-5

Expenditure in, *supply*, 9488

Site for, *Budget*, 1641-2; *supply*, 1811, 1875-6, 1879-80, 1882; *Budget*, 2661, 2917; *supply*, 3616-9, 3622-76, 3740, 11361

Questions by—

Mr. Bowden as to alleged appointment of Mr. Petherick in, 2567

Mr. Knox as to whether Australian architects would be given an opportunity to submit competitive designs for, 3732

Mr. Page as to whether Australian labour and materials would be used in construction of, 3732

Mr. Johnson as to whether the opinion of the Senate would be obtained before the Acting Prime Minister negotiated with the London County Council as with the authority of Parliament, 3732, 3851

Mr. B. Smith as to reason for delay in submitting vote for, 3732

Mr. Liddell as to consultation with Premier of Victoria with respect to type of buildings, 4622

Mr. Wise as to steps taken to acquire site, 4648

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—*continued.*

London Offices of the Commonwealth—*continued*—

Questions by—

- Mr. Glynn as to acquisition of site, 5208
 Mr. Willis as to design for, 5209;
 as to offers of sites, 9952; as to whether
 final arrangements had yet been made
 for purchase of site, 6676, 7299, 12155
 Mr. Crouch as to speeches delivered in
 London by Captain Collins, 7111
 Mr. Kelly as to means of supplying
 information to, on Commonwealth
 affairs, 9476-7
 Mr. B. Smith as to position of Captain
 Collins in London, 9476

MARINE SURVEYS.

Senate:

- Marine Survey of North-west Coast of
 Tasmania, *supply*, 5880, 5885, 6324-5
 Marine Survey of North-west Coast of
 Western Australia, *supply*, 5880, 5884-5,
 6347
 Motion by Senator de Largie for tabling
 of correspondence with Imperial Govern-
 ment on Marine Survey of the North-
 west coast of Australia, 650
 Questions by Senator de Largie as to steps
 taken to provide for survey of north-
 west coast, 7702, 8868; as to need for,
 11864; as to expenditure of Common-
 wealth money on survey of Tasmanian
 coast, 11985

House of Representatives:

Questions by—

- Mr. Hedges as to Commonwealth con-
 tribution to cost of Marine Survey of
 North-West Coast of Western Aus-
 tralia by Admiralty, 2450
 Mr. Mahon as to Marine Survey of
 North-West Coast of Western Aus-
 tralia, 2450
 Mr. Bamford as to whether survey of
 North-West Coast is to be made, 4519
 Sir John Forrest as to information in
 possession of Government with respect
 to survey of North-west Coast of Aus-
 tralia, 7249, 8929
 Mr. Watson as to acquisition of an Aus-
 tralian survey ship, 8930

MEDICAL DEGREES.

House of Representatives:

- Question by Mr. Maloney as to registra-
 tion of, 10574

METEOROLOGICAL SURVEY [See NIMROD POLAR
 EXPEDITION].

NEW CALEDONIA.

House of Representatives:

- Question by Mr. Bruce Smith as to dif-
 ferential treatment of French and Aus-
 tralian Merchants trading with, 6418

NEW GUINEA [See PAPUA].

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—*continued.*

NEW GUINEA, GERMAN.

Senate:

- Question by Senator Lynch as to dis-
 abilities of British subjects in, 11678
 [See PAPUA]

NEW HEBRIDES.

Senate:

- Assistance to British Settlers, *address*, 62;
supply, 5886, 5893
 Australian Settlers in, Treatment of,
supply, 11485
 Mail Service, *supply*, 5885

Questions by—

- Senator Walker as to admission under
 special Tariff conditions of British-
 grown produce, 4245
 Senator Walker as to grants to British
 maize-growers in, 4708
 Senator Chataway as to whether it is
 a condition of the grants to British
 maize-growers in, that they shall em-
 ploy only white labour, 4708, 4895
 Senator Millen as to appointment of
 French Judge to Joint Commission,
 8867

House of Representatives:

- Australian settlers, treatment of, *supply*,
 9411
 Appointment of English Judge to Joint
 Commission, *supply*, 9410
 Policy of Commonwealth with respect to,
supply, 9410-2, 9415, 9419, 9512-3, 9514-5
 Mail Service, *supply*, 1806-12
 Motion by Mr. Johnson for return showing
 disbursement of vote of £500 for assist-
 ance to British Settlers in, 470
 Motion by Mr. Johnson for return show-
 ing value of British imports and exports
 between Australia and, 1378
 Taxation of imports from, *supply*, 9410-1,
 9413-4
 Trading Facilities with, *supply*, 11364
 Questions by—

- Mr. Johnson as to whether steps have
 been taken under the New Hebrides
 Convention for appointment of Joint
 Court for the settlement of disputes,
 647
 Mr. Johnson as to basis of distribution
 of grant of £500, 1413, 1596
 Mr. Johnson as to breach by French
 traders of terms of Anglo-French Con-
 vention, 2121
 Mr. Joseph Cook as to whether the
 Government declined to consider the
 grievances of the Presbyterian Mis-
 sion in the, 3268, 3301, 3419
 Mr. Bamford as to tenders for mail
 service to, 3508-9; Mr. Tudor, 3508
 Mr. B. Smith as to differential treat-
 ment of French and British settlers,
 6418
 Mr. Maloney as to efficacy of virus
 used for the destruction of rats in,
 6675

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—*continued.*New Hebrides—*continued.*

Questions by—

Mr. Johnson as to desirability of appointing British Judge to Joint Commission; and as to transfer of centre of British administration from Fiji to Sydney, 8818

Mr. Bowden as to preferential trade with, 8929

Mr. J. Thomson as to alleged neglect of interests of British residents, 10700

Mr. Harper as to establishment of Joint Court, 10788

Mr. Johnson as to representations to Imperial authorities concerning grave condition of affairs in, 10877

Mr. B. Smith as to urgency of appointment of British Commission to, 11326

[See PACIFIC ISLANDS.]

NEW ZEALAND.

Senate:

Motion by Senator Best that a message of congratulation be sent to, on the assumption of the title of "Dominion," 3811

Reply to message of congratulation, 4036

Question by Senator Walker as to whether a congratulatory message would be sent to, on the assumption of the title of "Dominion," 3795

House of Representatives:

Motion by Mr. Deakin that a message of congratulation be sent to, on assumption of title of "Dominion," 3852-3

Reply to message of congratulation, 4085

Question by Mr. Thomas as to freight on State importations, 5802

NORFOLK ISLAND.

Senate:

Transfer to Commonwealth, Objection of Residents to, *supply*, 11486

House of Representatives:

Question by Mr. Maloney as to making the island a Territory of the Commonwealth, 9957

"NIMROD" POLAR EXPEDITION.

Senate:

Questions by Senator Neild as to grant in aid of, 7701, 7754; applications for, 7849

House of Representatives:

Motion by Mr. Deakin for printing of letter from Professor David, 7492; debated, 7492-3; agreed to, 7493

Question by Mr. Crouch as to promise that Lieutenant Shackleton would complete meteorological and electric survey of Australia, 10875

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—*continued.*

NORTHERN TERRITORY.

Senate:

Agreement for transfer, *address*, 78, 401; *supply*, 1835-6, 1839, 1849-50, 1853-5

Expenditure in, *supply*, 1948, 3809, 11266, 11270

Transfer of, to Commonwealth, *address*, 10, 50, 60, 142, 263, 282, 295, 357, 374, 381; *supply*, 1835, 1849, 1861, 3809; *adj.*, 9735-42

Visit of Parliamentary Party to, *address*, 15, 78, 141, 281

Questions by—

Senator Findlev as to whether Government of South Australia will be requested to discontinue sales of land until the agreement with the Commonwealth for transfer of, has been dealt with, 828, 1130

Senator Chataway as to mining development in, 830, 931, 1130

Senator Symon as to elimination from Agreement for transfer of conditions with respect to proposed construction of transcontinental railway from Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta, 1232, 1330

Senator Millen as to when the Senate would be afforded an opportunity to discuss proposed Agreement for transfer of, 1232; Senator Sir Josiah Symon, 9041, 9421

Senator Walker as to printing and circulation of Agreement for transfer of, 3145

Senator St. Ledger as to transfer of, in relation to suggested construction of linking railway by Queensland Government, 5084

Senator Dobson as to whether the Government intended to preserve rights *bond fide* acquired in respect of lands in, 8554, 8616

Senator McGregor as to steps to be taken in respect of lessees or conditional purchasers in, who have forfeited their rights through non-fulfilment of conditions, 8854

Senator Symon as to whether it would not be wise to acquire the, before deciding how lands and residents are to be dealt with, 8554

Senator Gray as to appointment of Royal Commission to secure information before Parliament is asked to consent to transfer, 8699

House of Representatives:

Agreement for transfer, *address*, 106, 169, 190, 239-41; *supply*, 3327

Alienation of lands in, *adj.*, 2346

Auditing of Accounts of, *supply*, 9070

Development of, *Budget*, 1642, 3116

Expenditure on, under Agreement, *Budget*, 2465

Motion by Mr. Johnson for return showing particulars of all lands alienated in, 469; questions, 2566, 4413

Motion by Mr. J. H. Catts, for return showing area and value of Crown and alienated lands and particulars of revenue and expenditure in, 470; *adj.*, 3362; question, 4519

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—continued.

Northern Territory—continued.

Settlement in, *supply*, 9722Transfer of, to Commonwealth, *address*, 106, 121, 128, 162, 186, 190, 222, 239, 325, 327, 331, 345, 347; *Budget*, 2132, 2271, 2605, 2979, 3272; *supply*, 3333-4
Visit of Parliamentary Party to, *address*, 128, 239

Questions by—

Mr. Fuller as to conditions on which land is held by private companies, 158; Mr. Glynn, 158

Mr. Batchelor as to report on finances of, 194

Mr. J. H. Catts as to suggested resumption of, by British Government, to be populated with blacks from India, and right of British Government to resume, 1280; Mr. Glynn, 1280

Mr. H. Willis as to whether negotiations for transfer are still proceeding, and, if so, whether the Prime Minister has noticed that the South Australian Government are adding to the debt of the Territory, 6728

Mr. Glynn as to passing by South Australian Parliament of motion affirming conditions of transfer of, 7112

Sir John Forrest as to when Bill to ratify Agreement would be submitted, 9100

Sir John Forrest as to necessity for referendum of electors of South Australia to give effect to proposed transfer of, to Commonwealth, 9480

Mr. Sampson as to when agreement will be dealt with, 10524

Mr. Poynton as to purchase and distribution of Mr. Searcy's work on, 10786

OLYMPIAN GAMES.

House of Representatives:

Question by Mr. Maloney as to subsidiary fund to defray expenses of Australian competitors at, 9388

PACIFIC ISLANDS.

*House of Representatives:*Mail service to, *supply*, 1806, 1810, 1812

Motion by Mr. Johnson for return showing value of British imports and exports between Australia and, 1378

Policy of the Commonwealth with respect to, *supply*, 9410-2, 9415, 9419, 9512-3, 9514-5Trade with Commonwealth, *supply*, 1806-7, 1812

Questions by—

Mr. D. Thomson as to position of Australian claims in connexion with treatment of Australian vessels trading to German Islands, 6813, 7250

Mr. Bamford as to tenders for mail service to, and terminal port, 3508-9; Mr. Tudor, 3508

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—continued.

PAFUA.

*Senate:*Administration of, *address*, 61; *Budget*, 1642; *supply*, 8921, 10296-302, 11483-5, 11506-12Administrator, appointment of, *supply*, 10297-300; *adj.*, 11698-700Annual Report of Administrator of, *supply*, 8920Development of, *supply*, 5885, 10301-2Free-trade with, *address*, 62Labour Ordinance, *adj.*, 11698-700Land, administration in, *supply*, 8921, 11483-5, 11506-12, 11520Mail Service to, *supply*, 5885

Motion by Senator Pearce for return of all officials employed in administration of, 8869

Questions by—

Senator Pearce as to report on copper fields, and monthly reports of Director of Mines and Agriculture, 353

Senator Chataway as to conditions for tenders for steam service to, 1926

Senator Pearce as to tabling of report of Mines and Lands Department, 7701

Senator St. Ledger as to communication from unofficial members of Legislative Council on withholding of Assent to Land Ordinance, 8700

Senator Pearce as to alleged massacres in, 9237

Senator Pearce as to circulation of copies of Ordinances, 9353

Senator Millen as to action of Governor of German New Guinea in disputed territory, 11300

Senator Givens as to appointment of Administrator at an early date, 11678

*House of Representatives:*Acting Administrator, *adj.*, 9794-5Administration of, *address*, 108, 174; *supply*, 6289, 8975, 8977-8, 9396-405, 9409, 9412, 9418, 9419, 9420, 9491-501, 9506-9Administrator, appointment of, *supply*, 9405, 9495, 9501-6, 9508-9, 9511Death rate of Natives employed in mines, *supply*, 6289-90, 9394Development of, *supply*, 6289, 9407, 9409-10, 9414, 9503Employment and treatment of Natives, *supply*, 9393-6, 9398, 9404English, compulsory teaching of, *supply*, 9420, 9490Enforced Native Labour, *supply*, 11375Evidence given before Royal Commission, *address*, 174-8Hut Tax, suggested, *supply*, 11375Mail Service, *supply*, 11358, 11360-1Mail Service, coloured labour in, *supply*, 9413

Motion by Mr. Johnson, for return showing value of British imports and exports between Australia and, 1378

Motion by Mr. McWilliams, for return giving particulars with respect to employment of Native labourers, 9300

Motion by Mr. Bowden, for return of particulars of Civil Service of, 11390
Ordinances ordered to be printed, 9582

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—*continued.*Papua—*continued.*

Questions by—

- Mr. Bamford as to telegraph communication with, 405
 Mr. Bamford as to tenders for mail service to Papua, Solomon Islands, and New Hebrides, 3508-9; Mr. Tudor, 3508
 Mr. Mahon as to object of ordinances with regard to removal of aboriginal natives, 4309, 4412
 Mr. Bowden as to appointment of Committee to report upon ordinances passed by Executive Council of, 4310
 Mr. Bowden as to installation of wireless telegraphic communication with, at places requiring no special defence, 4311
 Mr. Page as to land settlement in, 4646
 Mr. McDonald as to appointments of Government Agent at Rigo, and Commandant of Police, 4958
 Mr. McWilliams as to condition of natives working in mines, 6725
 Mr. Crouch as to taxation of natives, 6813
 Mr. Bamford as to rights of Mr. Wickham with respect to Conflict Group, in view of delay in passing Papua Bill, 7248
 Mr. Bowden as to representations to secure assent to amendment of land regulations to permit of wholesale purchase of native lands, 8816
 Mr. Bowden as to early appointment of Administrator; and whether Judge Murray would be appointed, 9091
 Mr. Mahon as to appointment of Administrator; and as to work of acting Administrator, 9476
 Mr. Wilks as to separation of judicial from administrative power in the appointment of Administrator, 9476
 Mr. Kelly as to suspension of Surveyor-General of, 9763
 Mr. McWilliams as to immediate appointment of Administrator, 9763
 Mr. McWilliams as to steps taken to determine cause of high rate of mortality amongst natives, 9766
 Mr. Mahon as to fortnightly mail service to, 9953
 Mr. J. H. Catts as to land scandals in, 9956; Mr. Page, 10077
 Mr. Willis as to whether Sir William McGregor is in a position to consider an appointment as Administrator, 10077
 Mr. Willis as to whether Mr. Staniforth Smith was aware that an officer sitting with him on the Land Board was interested in an application before the Board, 10131
 Mr. Kelly as to whether, in view of statements by Bishop Stone-Wigg, some person new to the service would be appointed Administrator, 10178
 Mr. Frazer as to appointment of Administrator before prorogation of Parliament, 10178

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—*continued.*Papua—*continued.*

Questions by—

- Mr. Mahon as to suggested appointment of Mr. H. W. Champion as Treasurer of Papua, 10178
 Mr. O'Malley as to limitation of tenure of land leases to ten years, 10575
 Mr. Bowden as to alleged massacre of natives, 10606
 Mr. McWilliams as to terms of leases held by Messrs. Buchanan and Charpentier, 10606, 10652
 Mr. Kelly as to source of statements concerning dissensions in, 10607
 Mr. Johnson as to land transactions in, and Mr. Drummond's suspension, 10878, 11742
 Mr. D. Thomson as to efforts to alter boundary between German New Guinea and, 10965
 Mr. Willis as to steps taken to fill vacancies in Civil Service of, 11054
 Mr. Knox as to taxation of Natives of, 11158
 Mr. Bowden as to reported encounter with natives, 11182; as to action of German officials in connexion with survey of boundary between German New Guinea and, 11223, 11385; as to printing of Ordinances, 11182
 Mr. Thomas Brown as to alleged unsatisfactory state of affairs in; steps taken to place administration on proper basis, and appointment of Administrator, 11324
 Mr. Kelly as to statement of Anglican Bishop of; and appointment of Administrator while Parliament is sitting, 11324
 Mr. Mahon as to whether a memorandum of the Legislative Council of, had not informed the Prime Minister that almost the whole of the white population are in favour of the permanent appointment of the acting Administrator; as to whether the white population had not petitioned to the same effect, 11325
 Mr. Johnson as to whether the recommendation in favour of the permanent appointment of the acting Administrator was not repudiated by certain of the white residents of, 11325
 Mr. McWilliams as to defining boundary between German New Guinea and, 11385
 Mr. Frazer as to whether the acting Administrator had approved of Lands Department Officials holding shares in companies applying for land, 11421-2; Mr. D. Thomson, 11422
 Mr. Kelly as to calling applications for position of Administrator, 11522; Mr. Bowden, 11523
 Mr. Frazer as to association of Mr. Staniforth Smith with land scandals in, 11522; Mr. Willis, 11523
 Mr. Livingston as to issue of instructions that no more land should be sold in, 11523

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—continued.

Papua—continued.

Questions by—

Mr. Kelly as to reasons for acting Administrator's references to lack of administrative experience and capacity on the part of Mr. Stanforth Smith, 11524

Mr. Carr as to whether Mr. Drummond had exhausted his right of appeal, 11524

Mr. McWilliams as to preventing officials being interested in land transactions in, 11524; as to delay in furnishing return of indented labour, 11744

Sir John Forrest as to case of Mr. Drummond, 12199

Mr. Knox as to tabling of papers relating to appointment of, and charges against, Mr. Drummond, 12199

Mr. Carr as to evidence of Mr. Russell at inquiry into charges against Mr. Drummond, 12199

Mr. Wilson as to record of Mr. Ardlie, and his connexion with land scandals, 12199

PEARLING FLEETS.

House of Representatives:

Question by Mr. Mahon as to raids upon, by foreign pirates, 81

PHILIPPINES.

House of Representatives:

Questions by Mr. Wise as to restriction on importations of butter into, 5210; Mr. Maloney, 6726

PORTUGAL.

Senate:

Message of condolence on assassination of King and Crown Prince of, 7791

Questions by—

Senator Stewart as to message of condolence, 7794; Senator de Largie, 7794

Senator Stewart as to whether the Government would send a message of sympathy with the people of, on the outrage of their liberties, 7795

Senator Stewart as to whether the Government would ascertain the truth of the allegation that the late King of, had usurped despotic power, 7841

PREFERENTIAL TRADE. [See TRADE AND CUSTOMS, "TARIFF, GENERAL."]

PREMIERS' CONFERENCE.

Senate:

Anti-Federal attitude of, address, 149, 294, 400

House of Representatives:

Anti-Federal attitude of, address, 161; Budget, 3013, 3217

Proceedings at, supply, 3316-7, 3341-2

Statement by Mr. Deakin at, 11787

Motion by Mr. Johnson for printing of memorandum of, as a Parliamentary Paper, 774

Influence of, supply, 3335

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—continued.

Premiers' Conference—continued.

Questions by—

Mr. Joseph Cook as to report of, 470
Mr. Webster as to bringing position of Border Hospitals under notice of, 9194

Mr. Crouch as to whether the Prime Minister proposed to discuss Commonwealth matters with the, 10785

Mr. Reid as to further Conference of State Premiers with representatives of Commonwealth Government, 11787; as to distribution to Federal members of copies of official report of last, 12040

[See COMMONWEALTH AND STATES.]

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT.

House of Representatives:

Question by Mr. O'Malley as to whether an invitation to visit Australia would be extended to, 10756

[See AMERICAN FLEET, VISIT OF.]

QUEBEC, TERCENTENARY OF.

Senate:

Invitation to Prime Minister to attend, announced, 9421

House of Representatives:

Invitation to Prime Minister announced, 9474

RABBITS, TINNED, FOR IMPERIAL NAVY.

House of Representatives:

Question by Mr. Livingston as to supply of tinned rabbits for the Imperial Navy, 10875

REMOUNTS FOR INDIA. [See INDIA.]

SHIPPING SUBSIDY.

House of Representatives:

Question by Mr. Mahon as to whether the Government would subsidize steamers proposed to be run by Western Australian Government in the North-West Coast Service, 10784

SHIPPING, COASTAL TRADE. [See TREATIES.]

SINGAPORE:

Senate:

Subsidized transport of Victorian produce to, supply, 6317, 6319

Question by—

Senator O'Loughlin as to agreement with Archibald Currie and Co. for carriage of goods from Victoria to, 5746

STATUTES.

House of Representatives:

Question by Sir J. Forrest as to printing and issuing of, 11182

STOCK (State Quarantine). [See TRADE AND CUSTOMS.]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—*continued.*

SUNSHINE RAILWAY ACCIDENT.

House of Representatives:

Obs. on, 10482-3

SYDNEY-MELBOURNE EXPRESS.

Senate:

Question by Senator Colonel Neild as to alteration of time for change of trains at Albury, 11217, 11301

SUEZ CANAL.

House of Representatives:

Question by Mr. Knox as to representations to secure reduction of canal dues, 10181

TAHITI.

House of Representatives:

Questions by Mr. Bowden as to proposed transfer of from France to Germany, 3105; Mr. B. Smith, 3734

TILLET, MR. BEN, STATEMENTS BY. [*See IMMIGRATION.*]

TREATIES.

Senate:

Anglo-Japanese Treaty, *supply*, 5867-73, 5876

Questions by—

Senator Pearce as to correspondence with the late Right Hon. R. J. Seddon on desirability of regarding trade between the Colonies and the United Kingdom as coastal trade in order to avoid clashing with treaties made with foreign countries, 564

Senator Pearce as to treaty between Queensland and Japan, and responsibility of Commonwealth Government in connexion therewith, 5561, 5858

Senator Pearce as to whether the Government will take steps to denounce the protocol under which Queensland is made a party to the Anglo-Japanese Treaty, in view of the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada declaring the British-Columbia Act on the lines of the Commonwealth Immigration Restriction Act to be unconstitutional, 8507

TROPICAL DISEASES.

Senate:

Vote for study of, *supply*, 6348-9

House of Representatives:

Vote for study of, *supply*, 6288, 9724

VICTORIANS IN WESTERN AUSTRALIA.

House of Representatives:

Question by Mr. O'Malley as to accuracy of report that Victorian Government proposed to repatriate families of Victorians said to have been stranded in Western Australia, 9765

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—*continued.*

WESTERN AUSTRALIA.

House of Representatives:

Question by Mr. Mathews as to creation of new State of portion of, 11743
[*See* "MARINE SURVEYS," and "SHIPPING SUBSIDY."]

WHITE AUSTRALIA POLICY.

House of Representatives:

Advantages of, *Budget*, 2457-8, 2969, 2975; *supply*, 4024

Cost of, *Budget*, 2975

Question by Mr. Crouch, as to views of Imperial Authorities concerning Commonwealth legislation preventing the employment of lascars on ocean-going vessels trading with the Commonwealth, 1975

WOMEN'S WORK EXHIBITION.

Senate:

Special adjournment to enable senators to attend opening of, 4893-5

House of Representatives:

Grant in aid of, *supply*, 1787, 1798, 1804, *obs.*, 1866-7; *supply*, 1870-5, 1877, 1879, 1880, 1883, *adj.*, 2345

Motion by Mr. Mahon, for correspondence concerning grant of £1,000 in aid of, 1977

Questions by—

Mr. Mahon as to whether a sum of £1,000 had been granted in aid of, 1750

Mr. Mahon as to whether the Government voluntarily offered a grant of £1,000 to the Women's Work Association in aid of, 2236

Mr. Knox as to adjournment to enable members to attend opening of, 4646; Mr. Salmon, 4955

GOVERNMENT.

AUTHORITY OF.

Senate:

Action of New South Wales Government in defying, *obs.*, 2099

Question—

By Senator Millen, as to maintaining, 2178

House of Representatives:

Action of New South Wales Government in defying, *obs.*, 2120; *Budget*, 2152-3, 2387-8, 2612, 2678, 2726-8, 2829, 2907-11, 3279; *adj.*, 2344-6; *supply*, 3431, 3440-1, 6291

Exercise of, in regard to carriers' licences, *supply*, 2896-9, 2904-5

Questions—

By Mr. Bowden as to difficulty arising out of seizure of wire netting, 2230; by Mr. W. H. Irvine, 2232; by Mr. Livingston, 2233; by Mr. Hutchison, 2563; by Mr. Page, 4309

By Mr. Fisher as to intimation from New South Wales of intention to seize goods, 2231

GOVERNMENT—continued.

Authority of—continued.

Questions—

By Mr. Page as to medical examination of Mr. Carruthers, 2233; as to amicable settlement of difference in view of resignation of Mr. Carruthers, 4309
By Mr. Johnson as to exercise of, in regard to carriers' licences, 2687, 2793; by Mr. B. Smith, 2687

CONSTITUTION OF.

Senate:

Appointment of Mr. J. H. Cook to Cabinet and Executive, *obs.*, 7652
Changes in, *obs.*, 1130
Question by Senator Neild, as to alteration in, 7544, 7569

House of Representatives:

Appointment of Mr. J. H. Cook to Executive and Cabinet, *obs.*, 8818; *supply*, 9482
Changes in, *obs.*, 1085

ELECTION OF.

House of Representatives:

Abolition of party politics in favour of, *Budget*, 2601

ESTIMATES.

House of Representatives:

Loss of control over Estimates by, *supply*, 6280-8, 8830-2, 8835, 12098, 12180-6

MINISTERS.

Senate:

Mr. Mauger, charges by, against Maitland Colliers, *adj.*, 8354-64
Senator Best, responsibility of Government for statements by, *supply*, 3926
Sir John Forrest, resignation of as Treasurer, *obs.*, 1130; *supply*, 3820

Questions by—

Senator Neild as to charges by Mr. Mauger against Maitland colliers, 8103, 8309, 8672; as to address by Mr. Mauger at Sydney, and prohibition of similar speeches, 8507

Senators Stewart, Symon, and Gray, as to speech by Senator Best, 11468

House of Representatives:

Mr. Deakin, absence of, *address*, 159, 206, 227, 345, 408; *obs.*, 193, 693-4; *Budget*, 2124, 2658; attitude of Opposition to during illness, *expl.*, 693; health and return of, *expl.*, 694; *adjt.*, 1083-4, 3230, 3232; *supply*, 3355; congratulations on return, *obs.*, 3735; resumption of leadership by, *ways and means*, 4117; relations to Labour Party and views regarding, *address*, 409-20, 455-6; *supply*, 3348-9

Mr. Mauger, interest of, in Hat Industry, *expl.*, 6812

Official expenses of Ministers, *supply*, 9482-7

Sir William Lyne, reference to Standard Oil Company having the "numbers in its bag," *p.o.*, 10974-5; *obs.*, 10975-60

Sir John Forrest, resignation of as Treasurer, *obs.*, 1084-6; *Budget*, 2366-7

GOVERNMENT—continued.

Ministers—continued.

Questions by—

Mr. Bowden, health of Mr. Deakin, 2563

Mr. J. Cook, date of return of Mr. Deakin, 3621

Mr. Kelly, acceptance of office by Sir Wm. Lyne, 11707

Mr. Liddell, speech by Mr. Ewing, 772
Mr. Liddell and Mr. Watkins, charges by Mr. Mauger against Maitland colliers, 8812

Mr. Reid, illness of Mr. Deakin and Minister acting for, 297; aspersions on parents of children in East Sydney, 8818

Mr. Reid, preventing disclosure of relations of, by, 11706

POSITION OF.

Senate:

In Parliament, *address*, 40, 53, 64, 71-2, 140-1, 292-5, 401; *supply*, 3827, 3843-50
On New Protection, *supply*, 6340-44; *obs.*, 7547-52, 7562-3, 7592-4, 7613, 7619-20

Questions—

By Senator Dobson as to, on New Protection, 7796

By Senator Millen as to whether a statement by the Treasurer about the Tariff represents the views of the Ministry, 11863

House of Representatives:

In Parliament, *address*, 86, 100, 109-11, 124, 206-7, 217-8, 241, 344, 346, 409-20, 460; *expl.*, 693; *Budget*, 2124, 2143, 2145, 2663, 2676, 2717-8, 2923; *supply*, 12187

On findings of Tariff Commission, *Budget*, 2708-13, 2968, 2081

On New Protection, *adj.*, 6356-70

On Land Taxation, *obs.*, 9350

On Mr. Webster's amendment to "Supply" motion, *supply*, 10451-59; *obs.*, 10460-1; *adj.*, 10461-2; *m.*, 10464-82

On Mr. Chanter's amendment to "Supply" motion, *supply*, 11330-57

Question—

By Sir John Forrest as to land taxation being part of policy of Government and three Ministers voting against it, 9389-90

RESPONSIBILITY OF.

Senate:

Lease of site in London, *supply*, 3926-30

Question—

By Senator Stewart as to, for utterances of each Minister, and every other member of Parliament, 8309

House of Representatives:

Abdication of, *supply*, 11344-57

Appointment and Remuneration of public servants, *Budget*, 2350-1, 2460

Declaration of, regarding Tariff, *Budget*, 2469

Restoration of, *supply*, 11271

GOVERNMENT—*continued.*

SUPPORTERS OF.

Senate:

- Criticisms by, and votes of, *supply*, 3827, 3843
 Political attitude of Senator Cameron, *address*, 13

House of Representatives:

- Number of, in House, *Budget*, 2124-5, 2676

Question—

- By Mr. Page as to defeat of Government candidate having been cheered by, 976

GOVERNOR-GENERAL.

ARTICLES FOR USE OF.

House of Representatives:

- Free admission of, *Ways and Means*, 7403-6, 7418-21

CONVEYANCE OF.

House of Representatives:

- Charge by Railway Departments for, *supply*, 3305

DEATH OF FIRST.

Senate:

- Motion proposed by Senator Best for a vote of condolence with widow and family of the Marquis of Linlithgow, 8504; seconded by Senator Millen, 8504; debated and agreed to, 8505; reply reported, 9040

House of Representatives:

- Motion proposed by Mr. Deakin for a vote of condolence with widow and family of the Marquis of Linlithgow, 8818; seconded by Mr. Reid, debated and agreed to, 8819; reply reported, 9088

DESPATCHES FROM.

House of Representatives:

Questions—

- By Mr. Crouch as to sending all communications for the Imperial Government to the King instead of to the Colonial Office, 6406

- By Mr. Crouch as to right to communicate directly with foreign Governments on subjects of mutual interest, 10181

MESSAGE FROM.

House of Representatives:

- Question by Mr. J. Cook as to position of House in regard to message covering Seat of Government Bill, 10074

RECOMMENDATION OF HONOURS BY.

House of Representatives:

- Question by Mr. Crouch as to whether grant of Knighthoods, and Orders to Australians was due to, 1751

GOVERNOR-GENERAL—*continued.*

RESIDENCES OF.

House of Representatives:

- Ereosion for maintenance of, *supply*, 3305, 9882-6

- Question by Mr. Crouch as to tenure or term on which the Federal Government hold Melbourne Government House and lands, 8815

SUCCESSOR TO.

Senate:

- Appointment of Earl of Dudley as, announced by Senator Best, 9352

- Question by Senator Millen, as to date when Earl of Dudley will enter upon his duties, 9352

House of Representatives:

- Appointment of Earl of Dudley as, announced by Mr. Deakin, 9387

- Question by Mr. Crouch, if Ministry were consulted by Colonial Office regarding new appointment, 9388

HOME AFFAIRS.

AGRICULTURE.

Senate:

Questions by—

- Senator Chataway as to reported establishment of Federal Bureau of, and selection of Dr. Maxwell as director, 8365.

- Senator Dobson as to whether steps will be taken to establish a Federal Bureau of before the meeting of the Premiers' Conference, 8482

- Senator Macfarlane as to whether the Government intend to establish a Bureau of with or without the approval of the States Governments, 8505-6

Representatives:

- Decision of Inter-State Conference of Fruit-growers, *address*, 87, 130

- Establishment of Federal Bureau of, *Budget*, 2915

Questions by—

- Mr. Hedges as to circulation of report by Surveyor-General of South Australia on Campbell system of farming in America, 9765

- Mr. Willis, as to when Bill to establish a Commonwealth Bureau of, would be introduced, 11328

- Mr. Salmon as to whether the Government will take action during the recess to assist rural industries by establishing a Federal Bureau of, 12158

HOME AFFAIRS—continued.

ELECTORAL.

Senate:

Administration, *supply*, 1856
 Amendment of Act, *supply*, 6251, 12145
 Compulsory voting, *address*, 147
 Conduct of General Elections, *address*, 17, 78, 146, 151, 206, 384
 Electoral Reform, *supply*, 1856
 Interference with Voters in Corio Election, *adj.*, 2446-9

Motion by Senator Pearce that the time has arrived for the adoption of a machine for voting purposes; that a Departmental inquiry be instituted to test machines with a view to adoption of an effective machine; that the concurrence of the House of Representatives be invited, 1262; debated, 1268-75; agreed to, 1275

Offices, Western Australia, *supply*, 10304-5
 Preferential Vote, *address*, 17, 28, 61, 78, 403

Rolls, compilation of, *supply*, 11617-20
 Voting machines, *address*, 296

Questions by—

Senator Pearce as to trial of voting machines, 131, 3798, 7543, 8698, 11383, 11472-3

Senator Dobson as to introduction of legislation to provide for compulsory voting, 650

Senator Stewart as to State referendum on the Bible in State schools at next Federal elections in Queensland, 2283, 2514

Senator McGregor as to whether telegram read by Senator Neild *re* election of Mr. Dooley for State electorate of Hartley in New South Wales, was not a bogus telegram, 3233

Senator Henderson as to inquiry into alleged interference with voters in Corio election, 3364, 4362

Senator W. Russell as to discovery of ballot papers for Senate election in South Australia, said to have been burnt, 3364

Senator St. Ledger as to delay in declaration of result of Senate election in South Australia, 8423

Senator Sayers as to transmission of election returns by telegraph, 8423

Senator Mulcahy as to what would happen if at an election postal votes were lost or destroyed, 8423

Senator Neild as to senators being declared elected on telegraphic returns, 8423

Senator Millen as to qualifications of mechanical engineer advising Committee appointed to inquire into use of voting machines, 8698

Senator Chataway as to publication of revised rolls, 9632

Senator Needham as to introduction of Bill to amend the Electoral Act, 9633, 9796

Senator Sayers as to purging of Federal and State rolls at the same time, 9633

HOME AFFAIRS—continued.

Electoral—continued.

Questions by—

Senator Givens as to when papers relating to delay of nomination paper at Bowen would be tabled, 9735

Senator Mulcahy as to whether members of Parliament would be given an opportunity to inspect voting machines, 11472

Senator Turley as to objections issued in connexion with compilation of rolls for Queensland electorates, 11983

Senator Findley as to practice in dealing with names objected to, 11984

House of Representatives:

Accommodation for Electoral Officers, *supply*, 8852-4

Administration, *supply*, 9768-73, 9888-9

Allowances to Registrars, *supply*, 9768

Bible reading in State Schools Referendum, *adj.*, 3970

Burning of Ballot Papers, South Australian Senate Election, *supply*, 8859-61

Conduct of General Elections, *address*, 179, 342

Co-operation with States Departments, *supply*, 9768-71

Cost of Elections, *supply*, 1808

Cost of printing and distribution of rolls, regulations, &c., *supply*, 9886, 9888

Delay in declaration of poll for Senate election for South Australia, *supply*, 8855-60

Electoral Reform, *address*, 106, 179, 194, 343; *supply*, 9768-73

Interference by Members of Parliament in State and Federal elections, *Budget*, 2981

Motion by Mr. Thomas for report from Postal officials acting as Returning Officers, 698; debated, 701-718; *amdt.* by Mr. Storrer, substituting "Federal" for "Postal," 713; agreed to, 714; *m.* as amended withdrawn, 718

Message from Senate announced inviting concurrence in motion for the adoption of a machine for voting purposes, 1325

Postal Ballot Papers, Date Stamping of, *supply*, 2891-3, 2901-3

Postal Officials, Employment of, at Elections, *supply*, 2894

Preferential Vote, *address*, 191

Rolls, condition of, *address*, 105, 333

Vacancy in representation of South Australia in Senate, *address*, 179, 214

Questions by—

Mr. Tudor as to action taken in respect of alleged irregularities at Barwon polling booth, 194

Mr. Glynn as to return of candidates at elections declared void, 404; Mr. Tilley Brown, 977; Mr. Poynton, 978

Mr. J. Thomson as to amendment of regulations to enable postal votes to be obtained on application to electoral registrars, 1181

Mr. D. Thomson as to cost of printing rolls, 1596

Mr. McDonald as to date stamping of postal ballot papers in Queensland, 1866

HOME AFFAIRS—continued.

Electoral—continued.

Questions by—

Mr. Crouch as to proposed State referendum on religious instruction in State schools in Queensland during Federal elections, 2688

Mr. Hedges as to tests of voting machines, 2890

Mr. Fairbairn as to amalgamation of Commonwealth and State Electoral Departments, 3300

Mr. Webster as to particulars of numbers added to and removed from rolls in 1906, 9847

Mr. Salmon as to alteration of representation of Victoria in House of Representatives, 10484; by Mr. D. Thomson, 10525

Mr. Mathews as to method of compiling rolls, 11258, 11327

Mr. McDonald as to new rolls, 11258, 11327

Mr. Batchelor as to joint compilation of Commonwealth and State rolls, 11258, 11327, 11330

Mr. O'Malley as to striking of names off Darwin roll, 11259

Mr. Tudor as to practice in striking of names off rolls, 11259; Mr. Hutchison, 11259; Mr. Livingston, 11259

Mr. Mathews as to whether returning officers have been instructed to be prepared for a general election, 11259

Mr. Batchelor as to whether electoral officers will be instructed that the object of expenditure on the compilation of rolls is to insure the enrolment of all entitled to vote, and not for an opposite purpose, 11259

Mr. Willis as to whether in compiling rolls Commonwealth officers relied upon information supplied by States officials, 11327

Mr. Glynn as to assimilation of Commonwealth and State franchise, 11327

["VACANCY IN SENATE," see PARLIAMENT;
"CANDIDATES, EXPENSES OF," see TREASURY.]

FEDERAL CAPITAL.

Senate:

Cost of Establishment of, *supply*, 1835

Expenditure on, *supply*, 3821

Selection of Site of, *address*, 12, 18, 53, 61, 146, 355, 375, 402; *supply*, 6311, 6313, 6325, 6331; *Customs Tariff Bill*, 7547, 7552

Motion by Senator Best for printing of correspondence between Prime Minister and Premier of New South Wales, 7755

Motion by Senator Best for printing of further correspondence in connexion with, 10369

Motion by Senator Keating for return to Home Affairs Department of maps referred to in report on Canberra water supply, 10369

Questions by—

Senator W. Russell as to arrangements made to enable senators to visit Canberra and other proposed sites, 828; by Senator O'Loghlin, 829

HOME AFFAIRS—continued.

Federal Capital—continued.

Questions by—

Senator Neild as to introduction of Bill dealing with, 5979; by Senator W. Russell, 12101

Senator Neild as to effect of speech by Senator Dobson as to intention of Government to deal with question after Christmas adjournment, 6407

Senator Pearce as to steps taken to give effect to Seat of Government Act, 8029

Senator Pearce as to grants of money for further visits to sites, and repeal of Seat of Government Act 1904, 9537

Senator Neild as to visit of inspection to Tooma site, 10003

House of Representatives:

Delay in settlement of question, *Budget*, 2731-2; *supply*, 2895, 2899-900, 8823-5, 8829-31, 8835-8, 8845, 8861

Expenditure upon, *Budget*, 2271, 2465, 3116, 3190; *supply*, 3339

Reports upon sites by Sir John Forrest, *address*, 224

Selection of Site of, *address*, 107, 108, 119, 122, 163, 168, 187, 213, 236; *adj.*, 298-314; *address*, 325, 328, 463; *adj.*, 1469; *supply*, 1869, 1876-8, 1880-2; *Budget*, 2271, 3127-8, 3207-9, 3211-2; *supply*, 8932, 9887-8

Visits of Inspection, cost of, *supply*, 6289, 9886

Questions by—

Mr. Watson as to water supply at Canberra, 193

Mr. Johnson as to resolutions of Premier's Conference, 297

Mr. Webster as to whether an opportunity would be afforded new members to visit Tooma before legislation to decide the question is attempted, 773, 7460

Mr. Liddell as to the readiness of the Government of New South Wales to afford facilities to members to visit Canberra, 773

Mr. Reid, as to postponement of visit of inspection, 1279

Mr. Johnson as to when question will be submitted for consideration, 260-1, 3508, 7111; Mr. Hall, 3508, 3733; Mr. Wilks, 7450; Mr. J. H. Catts, 8814; Mr. Reid, 8814; Mr. H. Willis, 8027; Mr. J. Cook, 9001, 9052; Mr. Kelly, 9842; Mr. Bowden, 9052

Mr. Thomas Brown as to communications with New South Wales Government and additional information as to Canberra site, 5337

Mr. Bowden as to maps appended to report on Canberra water supply, 7111; as to visits of inspection during Christmas adjournment, 7460

Mr. Bamford as to exhibition in Lobby of views of Canberra, 8814

Mr. Webster as to whether facilities would be afforded for exhibition of views of Tooma, 8815

HOME AFFAIRS—continued.

Federal Capital—continued.

Questions by—

- Mr. Willis as to expediting Bill, 3588;
as to whether the Government had promised Mr. Webster not to proceed with the settlement of question until he had made a second visit of inspection of a particular site, 8927
- Mr. J. Cook as to time fixed for visits to suggested sites, 9091
- Mr. D. Thomson as to invitation to New South Wales Government to supply information with respect to Canberra site, 9475
- Mr. Fuller as to communicating with Premier of New South Wales to ascertain whether he would be prepared to deal liberally with the Federal Government in the matter of the area of the Federal territory should the Canberra site be chosen, 9766
- Mr. J. Cook as to visit of inspection to Tooma site, 9842; Mr. Johnson, 9842
- Mr. Tilley Brown as to circulation of plan of Tooma site, 10073
- Mr. J. Cook as to procedure to be adopted in choosing site, 10074; Mr. Kelly, 10074
- Mr. O'Malley as to exhibition of pictures or photographs of Dalgety site, 10074; Mr. Bowden, 10074
- Mr. Mathews as to water supply of Tooma site, 10074
- Mr. Watkins as to fixing date for discussion of question, 10131-2
- Sir John Quick as to circulation of Mr. Chesterman's report on Tooma site, 10135
- Mr. Crouch as to arrangements to convene meetings of representatives of States other than New South Wales, 10179
- Mr. J. H. Catts as to procedure to be followed in discussing Seat of Government Bill, 10179
- Mr. Kelly as to return alienation of areas near Dalgety and Canberra, 10401
- Mr. Liddell as to growth of wonderful citron melon at Cooma, 10401
- Mr. B. Smith as to plans and estimates of the early requirements of, 10463
- Mr. Fuller as to removal of picture of Dalgety from corridor, 10965; Mr. Salmon, 10965
- Mr. Willis as to when Seat of Government Bill will be proceeded with, 11096
- Mr. Johnson as to whether the honorable member for Eden-Monaro had noted the severe weather conditions recently prevailing in Southern Monaro, 11181
- Mr. Chapman as to why the zeal displayed by certain members for settlement of question had disappeared, 11181

[See "SEAT OF GOVERNMENT BILL"]

HOME AFFAIRS—continued.

INFANT MORTALITY.

House of Representatives:

Question by Mr. Salmon as to statement in petition from Child Study Association of Australasia with respect to infant mortality in New South Wales, 2998

INTERIOR, DEPARTMENT OF.

House of Representatives:

Establishment of, proposed, address, 130

IRRIGATION.

House of Representatives:

Advantages of, supply, 8971-2

Locking of Rivers Murray, Murrumbidgee, and Darling, address, 329; supply, 8971-2

Opportunities for, Budget, 3026

Question by Mr. Joseph Cook as to agreement arrived at by three States interested with respect to the distribution of the Murray waters, 503

KALGOORLIE TO PORT AUGUSTA RAILWAY.

Senate:

Expenditure involved in construction of, supply, 3809

Survey of, address, 62, 78, 146, 154, 251, 296, 375, 403, 483

Questions by—

Senator Millen as to fixing of date for division on second reading of Kalgoolie to Port Augusta Railway Survey Bill, 879; Senator Symon, 931

Senator Neild as to whether the decision of the Government to delay consideration of Northern Territory Agreement until confirmed by State Legislatures should not be applied to the question of the construction of, 1232

Senator Lynch as to whether South Australian Parliament had been asked to pass legislation consenting to survey, 3463, 3558

Senator de Largie as to preparations for survey of, 7541, 7927, 8505

Senator Neild as to whether the sum voted by Parliament is insufficient for the survey of more than one route, 8221; Senator Dobson, 8221

Senator Mulcahy as to whether the Government intend to ask for a further vote for the survey of, 8229; Senator Clemons, 8229

Senator Henderson as to whether survey has been commenced, 11217

Senator Sayers as to whether camels to be used in connexion with survey are driven by white or black men, 11217; Senator Neild as to whether camels are not Asiatic imports, 11217

Senator Stewart, cost of conference, 7927

HOME AFFAIRS—*continued.*

Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway—*continued.*

House of Representatives:

Survey of, *address*, 164, 168, 215; *adj.*, 744

Questions by—

Sir John Forrest as to steps taken to obtain consent of Parliament of South Australia to survey of route of, 2121, 2996, 7112; when matter would be dealt with by South Australian Parliament, 4086, 4958

Mr. Henry Willis as to formation of party to survey route of, 5328

Mr. Glynn as to route to be chosen for survey, 7112

Mr. Mahon as to whether the Government would obtain full information as to Mr. Louis Brennan's inventions of the mono-rail and application of gyroscope to rolling stock, in connexion with, 8927

Mr. Poynton as to delay in survey, 9093

Mr. McDonald as to accuracy of report that Experts Committee recommended Tarcoola route for survey, 9093

Mr. Watkins as to sending geological party with survey party, 9191, 9388

Mr. Glynn as to whether geological survey of country between Port Augusta and Western Australian border had not been made by South Australian Government, 9191

Mr. Livingston as to when survey would be begun, 9191; Sir John Forrest, 10756

Mr. Mahon as to progress of survey, 10785

LAND RESUMPTION.

Senate:

Question by—

Senator Croft as to Mr. Spencer's claim for land reserved at Fremantle, 5283

MAPS.

Senate:

Cost of proposed Map of Australasia, *supply*, 6351, 12145

Publication of Map of Australia, *supply*, 10307-8

Question by—

Senator McGregor as to hanging of up-to-date maps of Australia and of the several States in Parliament House, 5466

House of Representatives:

Publication of map of Australia, *supply*, 9880, 9890-1

Questions by—

Mr. Fisher as to delay in compilation of official map of Australia, 648

Mr. McDonald as to when official map would be published, 1056

HOME AFFAIRS—*continued.*Maps—*continued.*

Questions by—

Mr. Johnson as to publication of sheet map of the world, showing true position of Australia in regard to trade routes, 1056

Mr. Bowden as to maps appended to report on Canberra water supply, 7111

MEDICAL OFFICERS.

Senate:

Payment of, *supply*, 10307

METEOROLOGICAL BUREAU.

Senate:

Expenditure on, *supply*, 8988

Tasmanian forecasts, *adj.*, 7652

Transfer of States Services, *supply*, 139, 140

Questions—

By Senator Dobson as to Tasmanian forecasts, 7568; by Senator Macfarlane, 7568

By Senator Macfarlane as to publication of reports, 7843

By Senator Millen as to International Conference of meteorologists, 8422

House of Representatives:

Expenditure on, *Budget*, 1632

Forecasts and Reports, circulation of, *supply*, 9879

Location of Central Office, *address*, 120; *supply*, 1808, 9879

Questions by—

Mr. Batchelor as to inaccurate forecasts, 8926, 9091

Mr. Batchelor as to predicting conditions for ensuing season, 9480

Mr. Kelly as to establishment, 976, 1056

Mr. Sampson as to temperature records, 8928, 9098

PUBLIC SERVICE.

Senate:

Boards of Inquiry, *supply*, 8907

Centralization of administration, *supply*, 1852-3, 1858-9

Civic positions held by, *adj.*, 8418-22

Civil Rights of, *supply*, 10270-80, 10282, 10390

Commissioner, Powers and Duties of, *supply*, 10280

District Allowances, *supply*, 10280, 10391, 12146

Exemptions, *m.*, by Senator Pearce for a return showing, 250

Grievances of, *supply*, 8905-8, 8918, 8921

Inefficiency of, *address*, 383

Leave, *supply*, 10390, 11515

Superannuation scheme for, *supply*, 8921

Sweating, 6308-11

Temporary employes in, *supply*, 8909-11

Motion by Senator Findley for disallowance of Regulation 66 as amended by Statutory Rule 70, regarding Sunday work, 688; debated, 690-2; amended, and agreed to as amended, 693

HOME AFFAIRS—continued.

Public Service—continued.

- Motion by Senator Needham for classification of linotype operators, 3829, debated, 3833-8, 5397-5406, negatived, 5406
- Questions by—
- Senator Findley as to printing of regulations relating to Sunday work and overtime, 1684
- Senator Dobson as to whether it is the intention of the Government to abolish the office of Public Service Commissioner, 3365
- Senator Gray as to increase of salaries and wages in consequence of increased cost of living due to the Tariff, 3464
- Senator Stewart as to error in recording result of examination held in Queensland, 4144
- Senator Findley as to grade transfers and sweating in Post and Telegraph Department, 5176
- Senator St. Ledger as to actions at law by dismissed Public Servants, 6206, 7568
- Senator Chataway as to interpretation of section 71 of Public Service Act providing for furlough after twenty years' service, 7571
- Senator Mulcahy as to production of papers in case of promotion of Mr. E. A. Blakney, 7702, 7796, 8364, 8554, 8867
- Senator St. Ledger as to establishment of Superannuation Fund, 7704
- Senator Clemons as to report from Public Service Commissioner upon promotion of Mr. E. A. Blakney, 7752
- Senator Pearce as to demand made for withdrawal of postal official from membership of Claremont Road Board, 7754, 7926, 7977, 8221, 8554, 9139
- Senator Pearce as to non-payment of overtime for Sunday work in Western Australia, 7791-2
- Senator Chataway as to living allowances in Northern Queensland, 7977, 8483
- Senator Stewart as to publication of list of permanent employés, 8076; as to distribution of copies of report of Public Service Commissioner, 8076
- Senator Dobson as to whether in an appeal against a classification all documents in the case are not laid before the Appeal Court, 8365
- Senator Chataway as to alleged prevention of Divisional Representative from attending Board of Inquiry, 8672, 8700
- Senator Dobson as to classification of public servants in Tasmania, 8698
- Senator Stewart as to delegation of the taking of evidence in connexion with Boards of Inquiry, 8700
- Senator Dobson as to promotion of Mr. Blakney, 9742
- Senator Stewart as to long service furlough, 11384
- Senator Chataway as to increases in salaries of Customs officers, 11581

HOME AFFAIRS—continued.

Public Service—continued.

House of Representatives:

- Administration of, address, 185; *Budget*, 2350, 2460, 2504-8, 2663, 2934-6; *supply*, 3513, 4850-67, 9773-87, 9958-64, 11282-3
- Amendment of Act, *supply*, 9776, 9785, 9787
- Appointments, *Budget*, 2350, 2460; *supply*, 3399
- Blakney, Mr., Promotion of, *supply*, 10154
- Boards of Inquiry, *supply*, 8847, 8906-7; *obj.*, 8935; *supply*, 9774-80, 9783, 9787; expenses in connexion with, 10158
- Boy and Girl Labour in, *Budget*, 3270
- Centralization, *Budget*, 2063; *supply*, 8825-6, 8829-31, 9773, 9783, 11294
- Civil Rights of, *supply*, 10152-3
- Commissioner, powers, duties, and qualifications of, *supply*, 9773-8, 9782-7, 10168, 10224, 10445
- District Allowances, *adj.*, 2684; *supply*, 5791, 9781, 10151-2, 11282, 11367, 11371-4, 11376, 11392, 11395
- Examinations, *Budget*, 2936
- Evasions of Act, 10224-7, 10233-7, 10251
- Grievances of, *Budget*, 3292
- Motion by Mr. Bamford for return of officers compulsorily retired and officers retained after reaching retiring age, 9194
- Motion by Mr. Archer for return of particulars of transfers and promotions of officers in Queensland during past two years, 10136
- Overtime, *Budget*, 2272-82, 2817
- Party politics at Celebrations of, *supply*, 8822
- Promotions, *supply*, 9782, 9786, 10154, 10169-70, 10232
- Retiring Age, *supply*, 10224, 10227-8
- Sunday Work, *supply*, 4859, 11392
- Sweating, *supply*, 4849-52, 4855, 4859, 4866, 6283-4, 8851
- Temporary Hands, *supply*, 4853, 4866, 8838-40, 8844, 10200-1, 11358, 11364-5, 11378-9, 11396-400, 11402
- Transfers, *supply*, 4870, 5791, 5796
- Transferred Rights, *supply*, 4860-4, 5700
- Undermanning of, *Budget*, 3292-3, *supply*, 8831, 9967
- Union Officials, Recognition of, *supply*, 8860
- Vacancies, Notification of, *supply*, 9773
- Questions by—
- Mr. Mahon as to allowances in Western Australia, 405, 504
- Mr. Johnson as to vacancies, promotions, increments, and appeals in Customs Department in New South Wales, 1281
- Mr. Bamford as to officers of Fifth Class doing work entitling them to Fourth Class classification, 1075
- Mr. Webster as to introduction of a Bill to amend the Public Service Act, 3854; Mr. Mathews, 10310
- Mr. Tudor as to recognition of services of printers and telegraph messengers employed in connexion with Parliament during late sittings, 6812

HOME AFFAIRS—*continued.*Public Service—*continued.*

Questions by—

- Mr. Page as to holidays to which temporary employes are entitled, 7109; as to payment of temporary employes for proclaimed holidays, 7250
- Mr. Maloney as to leave for temporary employes at Government Printing Office, 7415, 7538
- Mr. Tudor as to passes gained in examinations by students of colleges, 7459
- Mr. McWilliams as to tabling of papers in connexion with promotion of Mr. Blakney, of Hobart General Post Office, 8818; Mr. Storrer, 9476
- Mr. Hutchison as to recognition of Union Officials by Commissioner in the ventilation of grievances of, 8925, 9953
- Mr. Page as to delegation of work of Boards of Inquiry to Police Magistrates, 8936
- Mr. Bamford as to payment of district allowances in North Queensland, 9009
- Mr. Hutchison as to whether in making application for retention in service after retiring age all officers would be treated alike, 9475
- Mr. McDougall as to pensions payable to transferred officers, 9480
- Mr. McWilliams as to notifications of vacancies, 9684
- Mr. Thomas Brown as to circular concerning leave for recreation and on account of illness, 10130, 10310; as to when scheme for re-grading circulated by the Public Service Commissioner would be brought into operation, 10653
- Mr. J. Thomson as to scheme for re-classification of officers in Postal Department, 10875
- Mr. Thomas Brown as to sick leave in Customs Department, 11704
- Mr. Frazer as to district and living allowances, 11919; Mr. Batchelor, 11919
- Mr. J. H. Catts as to retiring allowances, 12043
- Mr. Hutchison as to character of examination papers set to candidates for positions in, 12151
- Mr. Tudor as to understanding on passing of Act that practical men temporarily employed at the time of the transfer of Departments to the Commonwealth would not be subjected to an educational test, 12152
- Mr. Kelly as to comments by Ministers to members of deputations on work of Public Service Commissioner, 12152
- [See DEFENCE, POSTMASTER-GENERAL, ATTORNEY-GENERAL, TRADE AND CUSTOMS, AND TREASURY.]

PUBLIC SERVICE ACT.

House of Representatives:

- Question by Mr. Webster, as to introduction of Bill to amend, 3854; Mr. Mathews, 10310

HOME AFFAIRS—*continued.*

PUBLIC WORKS.

Senate:

- Additions to Commonwealth Offices in Melbourne, *supply*, 5907
- Estimates for, *supply*, 3901-34, 4037-83
- Method of Construction of, *supply*, 3813-4
- Method of framing Estimates for, *supply*, 3912-3
- Questions by—
- Senator O'Loughlin as to advisability of securing new site for Post Office at Port Pirie, 744
- Senator Needham as to assistance to State Government in building dock at Fremantle for accommodation of war-ships, 6191, 7977, 8700, 10369
- Senator Needham, as to tender for wireless telegraphic stations, 8701, 9796
- Senator McGregor as to steps taken to expedite construction of new Post Office at Port Pirie, 8700
- Senator Clemons as to expenditure of vote for wireless telegraphy, and connexion with King Island, 11383, 11468
- Senator Guthrie as to connexion by wireless telegraphy with Nepean, Althorpe's, or Kangaroo Island, 11383

House of Representatives:

- Construction of Trawler at State Ship-Building Works, Cockatoo Island, *supply*, 5793
- Director-General, Qualifications of, *supply*, 9788-9, 9792-4
- Estimates:
- Defence (New South Wales), 3446-51; (Victoria), 3452-4; (Queensland, South Australia, Western Australia), 3454; (Tasmania), 3454-6; (Special Defence Material), 3598-3615; (New Special Defence Provision), 3677-82, 3735-48
- External Affairs (Commonwealth Offices in London), 3616-9, 3622-76
- Home Affairs, 3423-35
- Post and Telegraph (New South Wales), 3456-61, 3509-27; (Victoria), 3527-30; (Queensland), 3531-3; (South Australia), 3533; (Western Australia), 3533-9; (Tasmania), 3539-40
- Telegraphs and Telephones (New South Wales), 3540-54; (Victoria, Queensland, South Australia, Western Australia, Tasmania), 3554-5
- Trade and Customs, 3435-46
- Treasury, 3589-98
- Wireless Telegraphy, 3554-5
- Additional, 1907-8 (Defence), 11408-18; (Home Affairs), 11403-8; (Post and Telegraph), 11408
- Additional, 1905-6 and 1906-7, 11418
- Government Houses, Sydney and Melbourne, Expenditure on, *supply*, 9882-6
- Method of framing Estimates for, *supply*, 3523-4, 3525
- States' Departments of, Services rendered by, *supply*, 9787, 9881

HOME AFFAIRS—*continued.*

Public Works—*continued.*

Questions by—

- Mr. Livingston as to cost of alteration of Post Office at Port Elliot, 1089
 Mr. B. Smith as to commission paid to Government of New South Wales on payments for, on Commonwealth account, 2997
 Mr. Livingston as to cost of connecting Hog Bay by telephone, 3174
 Mr. Livingston as to cost of improving Penola Post Office, 3175, 6505
 Mr. Liddell as to capital cost of telephone line between West Maitland and Sydney, 4749
 Mr. Willis as to arrangements made for construction of trawler, 5691
 Mr. Wilks as to lease of buildings for Commonwealth Offices in Melbourne, 5801
 Mr. Thomas Brown as to delay in payment of contractors, 6025
 Mr. Knox as to building of new Post Office at Glenferrie, 7296
 Mr. Dugald Thomson as to number of miles of railway of each different gauge constructed, in course of construction, or authorized in each State, 9298
 Sir John Forrest as to delay in construction of Post Office at Northam, 9581, 9765
 Mr. Crouch as to payments for services of States officers, 10078
 Mr. Thomas Brown as to cessation of works for Post and Telegraph Department owing to exhaustion of votes, 11054
 Mr. Atkinson as to construction of trawler, 5238, 11261
 Mr. Willis as to expenditure of vote for wireless telegraph, 12154; Mr. Storrer, Mr. O'Malley, and Mr. Hedges, 12154
 [See "TELEGRAPHY, WIRELESS," POSTMASTER-GENERAL; also TREASURY, "EXPENDITURE," "FINANCE," and 'TREASURER'S ADVANCE ACCOUNT.]

RAILWAY FARES, INTER-STATE.

House of Representatives:

- Question by Mr. Maloney as to cheap fares between Melbourne and Sydney, 1751

RAILWAY RATES, DIFFERENTIAL.

Senate:

- Question by Senator Guthrie as to, 12101

House of Representatives:

- North-west coast, *supply*, 9996-7
 Question by Mr. Glynn as to, 694, 12039

SEAT OF GOVERNMENT, TEMPORARY.

Senate:

- Motion by Senator McGregor for return showing expenditure incurred in Melbourne as temporary seat of Government, 2180
 Question by Senator McGregor as to rent paid for office accommodation in, 5284

HOME AFFAIRS—*continued.*

SNAKE BITE.

Senate:

Questions by—

- Senator Stewart as to Morrissey's alleged antidote for, 3900-1; Senator Neild, 3901

STATISTICS.

Senate:

- Unnecessary publication of, *supply*, 6350-1
Year-Book, Publication of, *adj.*, 9190; *supply*, 10305-6

Questions by—

- Senator Findley as to motive of Government in calling for tenders for printing and publication of a volume of, 1130; whether a Commonwealth Printing Office should not be established to carry out such work, 1131
 Senator Givens whether States Government Printing Offices had been invited to tender for publication of, 1131
 Senator St. Ledger as to compilation of tables showing amount and value of goods imported from each State of origin, 1816
 Senator St. Ledger as to particulars of alienated and unalienated lands in the several States, 4364
 Senator Croft as to printing of *Year-Book*, 4707; Senator Findley, 4707
 Senator de Largie as to latest awards of Arbitration Courts and Wages Boards, 8103, 8154
 Senator Stewart as to issue of *Year-Book*, 9422
 Senator Needham as to why *Year-Book* was not printed at Victorian Government Printing Office, 11218
 Senator St. Ledger as to number of applicants for employment registered by State Labour Bureaux, 11303

House of Representatives:

- Year-Book*, *supply*, 9875
 Progress Reports, *supply*, 9876-79

Questions by—

- Mr. Salmon as to infant mortality in New South Wales, 2998
 Mr. Tudor as to preparation of statistics of school physique and hygiene, 3302
 Mr. Tudor as to correspondence referring to medical inspection of school children, 3585, 3972
 Mr. Liddell as to publication of new volume of, 4309
 Mr. McDonald as to printing of *Year-Book*, 4412
 Mr. Sampson as to establishment of official stations for recording shade temperatures, 8928
 Mr. Salmon as to whether any action would be taken to alter representation of Victoria in House of Representatives in view of altered method of estimating population of States, 10484

HOME AFFAIRS—*continued.*Statistics—*continued.*

Questions by—

Mr. D. Thomson as to whether the Statistician admits that according to new method of estimating population the population of Victoria has been under estimated, 10525

Mr. Bamford as to when the *Commonwealth Year-Book* would be published, 10607, 10652

Mr. J. H. Catts as to distribution to States Members of Parliament of copies of *Year-Book*, 11920

TENDERS.

Senate:

Questions by—

Senator Needham as to when tenders would be called for construction of wireless telegraphic stations and places at which they would be constructed, 8701, 9796

Senator McGregor as to specifying names of firms in, 9041; Senator Croft, 9041

TIMBER, AUSTRALIAN.

Senate:

Question by Senator Clemons, as to tests of value of seasoned Australian timbers, 11382

TRANSFERRED PROPERTIES.

House of Representatives:

Valuation of, *Budget*, 1641, 2359, 2701, 2980; *supply*, 9890-1

Questions by—

Mr. McWilliams as to valuation of, 11703; Mr. Dugald Thomson, 11921

Mr. Wilks as to payment of municipal rates on, 11795

Mr. Willis as to transfer of properties of States Quarantine Departments, 11918

[*See TREASURY.*]

PAPERS.

Advertising: Resources of Australia, Correspondence, 10606

Afric, s.s., affidavits of marine surveyors, 10820

Agriculture, proposed bureau, memorandum, 11328

American Fleet, visit of, 8354, 9952

Army Medical Corps, 10606

Audit Acts, 193, 248, 354, 405, 774, 829, 1089, 1131, 2807, 2844, 3559, 3589, 4893, 4895, 6591, 7544, 8819

Banking Returns, 5558, 5560

Beale, Mr. O. C., report on drugs and medicines, 7508-9, 9893, 9952

Bounties Act, 9734, 9735

Bounties, Conference, 591, 1083

Budget Papers, 1678, 1685

Cable Business: Eastern Extension Company, 11922

Cable, Tasmanian, 12042-3

PAPERS—*continued.*

Cadets, 1565, 1567, 2446, 2511, 5283, 7703, 8939, 10606

Colonial Conference, 591, 1131

Colonial Office: Despatch as to Re-arrangement, 6061, 9422, 9475

Colonial Sugar Refining Company, 2404

Commerce Act, Regulations, 3795, 3797, 5083, 5130, 7571, 8422, 8819

Commercial representation of Commonwealth abroad, letter and circular of Minister of Trade and Customs, 8616

Copyright Act, 9, 23

Customs regulations, 5011, 5012, 8422, 8819, 9193, 9237, 11328, 11383

Debts of States: Memorandum and statistics, 10808, 10829

Defence Acts, 9, 23

Defence: Memorandum on proposed national guard, 7753

Defence: Memorandum on Estimates, 11328

Defence: Regulations, 193, 248, 503, 774, 829,

1565, 1567, 2068, 2121, 2446, 2511, 2743,

2807, 2844, 3621, 4363, 4796, 4893, 5307,

6190, 6231, 7703, 8156, 8232, 8939, 9007,

9039, 10463, 10606, 10829, 11055, 11182,

11221, 11987, 12042

Defence: Transport, 7796

Designs Act, 9, 23

Electoral Rolls, 10401

Estimates, 1685, 10253, 12148, 12201

Excise Act, 9, 23, 4580, 4623, 4796, 7571, 9537,

9582, 10700, 10829

Excise, Agricultural Implements, 1233, 5912,

8819

Excise Procedure Act: Regulations, 10606,

10829

Excise Tariff (Agricultural Machinery) Act, Judgment of Mr. Justice Higgins, 6129, 6591

Expenditure, Commonwealth, 3049, 7977

Federal Capital, 193, 248, 354, 405, 5859,

5912, 7571, 7755, 8104, 9795, 9847, 9893,

10253, 10369, 10401

Financial relations, Commonwealth and States, scheme by Mr. King O'Malley, 10462

Fisheries Conference, 2958, 2993

High Court: Judgment in *Vardon v. O'Leigh*, 1907; in *New South Wales v. Commonwealth*, 12201

High Court Procedure Act, 7544, 10136, 10253

Hobart, Sandy Bay Rifle Range and Mount Nelson Forts, Land Claims, 42-6

Immigrants: Contract, 8820, 8866

Immigration, 9, 23, 2017, 2512, 10606

Immigration Restriction Act: Return, 8820, 8866

Index to Papers, 23

Infantile Mortality, Report, 10463

Judiciary Act, Rules, 3148, 3230, 8819, 10136, 10253

Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta Railway Survey, 820, 897, 8232

Kanakas, Repatriation, 9795, 9796, 9847

Land Acquisition, 9, 23, 591, 680, 774, 829, 1815, 1867, 2067, 2121, 3365, 3421, 4401,

5519, 5647, 5745, 6835, 7544, 8029, 8508,

8820, 10181, 10253

Library Committee, 4623

Literary Fund, 4747

Loan Expenditure by States, 3365

Lone Hand Magazine: Correspondence,

10700

PAPERS—continued.

Mail Contract, Guarantee, 2994, 3049
 Mail Service, European: Orient Company's Contract, 6190
 Mail Service, European: Tenders, 6129, 6190
 Mails, Tasmanian, 829
 Meteorological Bureau, 1131, 1180
 Meteorological Conference, 354, 405
 Military Barracks, Hobart, 3148
 Military Board, Report, 193, 248
 Military Clothing, 763, 774
 Military Forces, 503, 563, 564, 2446, 2511, 3684, 10606, 10829
 Military Forces: Inspector General's report, 9237, 9298
 Native Labour Ordinance, 23
 Naval Director's Report, 193, 248
 Naval Forces, 193, 10606
 Navigation Bill, 9041
 Navigation Commission Report, 2787
 Navigation Conference, 563, 591
 Navigation Laws, Correspondence, 1054
 New Protection, explanatory memorandum, 7509
 Northern Territory, Alienated Lands, 5558
 Northern Territory, Lands, Revenue, Railways, 7110
 Officers, Defence Forces, 4747
 Officers' Quarters, Defence Forces, 10463
 Old-age Pensions, 11987, 12042
 Opium: Report of Comptroller-General, 9190, 9298
 Pacific Cable, Revenue and Expenditure, 4086
 Pacific Island labourers. [See Kanakas.]
 Pacific Islands Trade, 2017
 Papua Copper Mines, 591
 Papua: Lieutenant-Governor, 9041
 Papua: Officials, 9190, 9893
 Papua, Land Officials, 10606, 12102
 Papua, Ordinances, 9, 2690, 2743, 3621, 3684, 4363, 4411, 4747, 6414, 6505, 9041, 9581, 9893, 10606, 10829, 11018, 11055, 11096, 11182, 11221
 Papua Reports, 7701, 7703, 8555, 8820, 10253, 11221
 Papua: Suspension of R. M. Drummond, 9847
 Patents Office, 2650, 2684
 Post and Telegraph Act, Regulations, 193, 248, 1089, 1131, 4155, 4199, 4363, 4411, 7544, 8820, 8866, 10789, 10829
 Post and Telegraph Department, Deputy-Postmaster-General, Victoria, 4704
 Post and Telegraph Department: Prohibition of Correspondence, 7571, 7703, 8285, 12201
 Post and Telegraph Department: Progress report, 11466, 11467; Correspondence as to Assistant Secretary, 7702
 Premiers' Conference, Brisbane, 591, 746
 Premiers' Conference, Melbourne, 9, 23
 Privy Council Judgment, *Webb v. Outtrim*, 829, 897
 Promotions, 132, 159, 194, 248, 2068, 2121, 7653, 7848, 8104, 8555, 8819, 8866, 8939, 10310
 Public Service: Appointment of Mr. H. C. Dannevig, 11096, 11221
 Public Service, 9, 23, 193, 248, 354, 405, 503, 563, 680, 1089, 1131, 1180, 1812, 1815, 2999, 3049, 3269, 3365, 4310, 4363, 5083, 5130, 5647, 5803, 5859, 6068, 7544, 7653, 7703, 7796, 8508, 8819, 8939, 9796, 9847, 11221, 11328
 Public Service: List of officers, 8819

PAPERS—continued.

Public Service: Officers over age limit, 10310
 Public Service: Queensland Officers: Return, 11182
 Public Service, Reports, 7703, 10079, 10653
 Public Service: Retirement of John Brown, 9767
 Rabbit Destruction, Report on Dr. Danysz's experiments, 7418
 Referendum (Constitution Alteration) Act, 3972, 4036
 Revenue and Expenditure of Commonwealth, 10967
 Revenue, Trade and Customs and Excise, 3684
 Royal Commission on Drugs and Foods, report, 1567, 1595
 School Children, Physical Condition, 3972
 Spirits Act, 9, 23
 Stamps, Printing, Correspondence, 8029
 Stamps: Report of Board, 6129, 6190
 Statistics, Conference Report, 2068, 2121
 Statistics of Commonwealth, 2068, 2121, 2301, 2343, 3621, 4310, 4363, 5560, 5647, 5859, 5912, 7116, 7544, 9190, 9193, 9796, 9847, 10463, 10829
 Suez Canal Charges, 11181
 Sugar Bounty Act, 4623, 11328, 11383
 Sugar: Correspondence with South African Governments, 9632
 Sugar, Excise and Bounty, 4623, 4706
 Swiss Military System, 4580, 4623
 Tariff Commission, Reports, 1742, 2891, 2999
 Tariff, Comparative Tables, 2262
 Tariff: Resolution of Parliament of Western Australia, 5011, 5046
 Telegraph Messengers, 9190
 Telegraphic Regulations, 104
 Telephone, West Maitland, Sydney, 4704
 Tobacco, Cigars and Cigarettes taken out of Bond, 3797
 Tobacco Employés, 563
 Tobacco Leaf for Cigars: Registered Growers, 7544
 Trade Marks Act, 9, 23, 3559, 3589
 Treasury Regulations, 103, 248
 Waverley Postal District: Return, 11159
 Wireless Telegraphy Conference, 563, 591
 Women's Work Exhibition, 2404

PARLIAMENT.

CLERK OF.

Senate:

Statement by the President as to grant of leave of absence to, and appointment of Clerk Assistant of the Senate to perform duties of, 7, 7541
 Absence and retirement of, *supply*, 10285

CONVENING OF.

Proclamation for, read, 5, 22

House of Representatives:

Issue of next proclamation for, *supply*, 12097-8; *adj.*, 12201
 Question by Sir John Forrest, as to date of opening of next session, 12201

COST OF.

House of Representatives:

Question by Mr. Knox, as to leading article in Melbourne *Age* on, 502

PARLIAMENT—continued.

HOUSES OF.

Senate:

- Construction of, *supply*, 3821
- Occupation of, *supply*, 3908, 6326
- Remuneration and work of gardeners, *supply*, 5882-4, 12144
- Questions by—
 - Senator McGregor as to hanging maps of Australia and States in, 5466
 - Senator Neild as to insanitary state of building, 9631; Senators Pulsford and Sayers, 9632

House of Representatives:

- Cleaner in Queen's Hall, *supply*, 8964
- Sewering of, *ways and means*, 4847; *supply*, 8964
- Vote for, and admission to, Gardens, *supply*, 8965-6
- Question—
 - By Mr. Hall as to sewerage of, in recess, 12039

LEGISLATION OF.

Senate:

- Form of Supply Bills, *supply*, 12141-4

Questions by—

- Senator Needham as to communication from Western Australian Parliament about Tariff, 4143; Senator Pearce as to reply and publication of correspondence, 4925
- Senators Walker and Pearce as to provision for sale of Acts, 6061
- Senator Clemons as to sessional issue of statutory rules, with index, 11219

House of Representatives:

- Encroachment on State functions by, *Budget*, 3010-4, 3036-7; *supply*, 3427-9

Questions by—

- Mr. Crouch as to approval of, and interference with, by Colonial Office, 1975
- Mr. B. Smith as to inconvenience caused to members by form of amending Bills, 12039

[See CONSTITUTION.]

MEMBERS OF.

Senate:

- Relations of, with State Ministry, *supply*, 11502-19
- State taxation of allowances to, *address*, 12, 16, 61, 75, 284
- Questions by—
 - Senator Neild as to repeal of Commonwealth Salaries Act, 7567
 - Senator Chataway as to paragraph in *Perth Daily News* as to effect of increased allowance upon, 11216

PARLIAMENT—continued.

Members of—continued.

House of Representatives:

- Increase of allowance to, *Budget*, 1644, 2477, 2668; *supply*, 1775; *adj.*, 1813-4
 - Information, supply of, by Public Departments, *obs.*, 2652-3
 - State taxation of allowances to, *address*, 25, 191, 214, 455
 - Treatment of, by State Premiers, *Budget*, 2605
 - Questions by—
 - Mr. Wilson and Mr. J. Cook as to opinion of Mr. Deakin on proposed increase of parliamentary allowances, 1866
 - Mr. Hutchison as to a statement by Mr. Fairbairn relative to parliamentary allowance being increased at instance of Labour Party, 2449
 - Mr. Hutchison as to members distributing extra allowance in their constituencies, 2964
 - Mr. Crouch as to petition to Privy Council on State taxation of parliamentary allowances, 6811
 - Mr. Johnson as to making of statements and asking of questions in Parliament by military officers, 12043
- [See SENATE, also HOUSE.]

POWER OF.

House of Representatives:

- Motion proposed by Mr. Coon, that the States should be asked to surrender to the Commonwealth their power to enact industrial legislation, 2567
- To impose direct taxation, *Budget*, 2676, 2691, 2821

PRAYERS IN.

Senate:

- Statement by Mr. Palmer, M.H.R., concerning, *obs.*, 5745-6; *adj.*, 5781

PRESENTATION TO.

Senate:

- Statement by the President that the Prime Minister had presented to Parliament a gold casket, 8

House of Representatives:

- Statement by Mr. Speaker that the Prime Minister had presented to Parliament a gold casket, 22

PROCEEDINGS, REPORTS OF.

House of Representatives:

- Inadequacy of press reports of, *Budget*, 3198-9, 3213
- Issue of summary of, to the press, *Budget*, 3198-9, 3212-3
- Question by Mr. Webster as to whether in view of inadequate, biased, and unreliable reports of, published by the press, the Government would consider the advisability of establishing a Commonwealth newspaper, 10702

PARLIAMENT—continued.

PROROGATION OF.

Senate:

Issue of proclamation for, *adj.*, 12149

Questions—

By Senator Dobson as to arranging to close session within year, 4035; after disposal of Tariff, 7796

By Senator Millen as to date of, 11579

House of Representatives:

Duration of session, *supply*, 8828, 8830-2, 12180-9; *adj.*, 9630, 11784

Issue of proclamation for, *adj.*, 12201

Questions by Mr. Johnson as to date for closing of session, 10180, 11703; by Mr. Archer, 11053; by Mr. J. Cook, 11260; by Mr. McDonald, 11525; by Mr. aBmford, 11790

SERVICE OF.

Senate:

Motion by Senator Macfarlane for production of correspondence relative to Mr. J. K. Reid's application for position in, agreed to, 354

SESSIONS OF.

House of Representatives:

Curtailment of duration of, *supply*, 5784-7, 5790-1, 5794-5

SPEECH TO.

Absence of reference in, to granting of Supply, *address*, 167
By the Governor-General, 5

SENATE.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

Senate:

Governor-General's Speech reported, 9;
Address-in-Reply moved by Senator Cameron, 10; seconded by Senator Trenwith, 12; debated, 12-21, 40-79, 140-57, 250-96, 354-403, 473-85; and agreed to, 485; presentation of, 485, 1180, 1232

ADJOURNMENTS (Formal).

Coal Combine, *adj.*, 3684-3706
Cypher Telegrams, 1685-7
Debate on matters of urgency, 2616-27
Excise Tariff Act, 5746-74
Maitland Colliers: Mr. Mauger, 8354-64
Northern Territory, 9735-42
Post and Telegraph Department, 9521-36
Tobacco Combine: Tariff, 2032-55

ADJOURNMENTS (Special).

Motion by Senator Best for, agreed to, 9, 1180, 4803-5, 6353-4, 6415-6, 7652, 7786-90, 10072, 10309, 10400, 10874, 10962, 11257, 11321-3, 11384, 11521, 11697, 11909, 12149-51

References to, *address*, 13; *adj.*, 693, 1712-4; *supply*, 1856-62, 1934-44, 5877-9, 6297-9

Questions by—

Senator Pearce as to enabling senators to attend opening of Women's Work Exhibition, 4245

Senator Neild as to adjourning over Easter, 10252, 10369

SENATE—continued.

BAKER, SIR R. C.

Motion proposed by Senator Neild for recognition of services rendered to the Parliament by, as first President of the Senate, 3365; seconded by Senator Best, 3366; debated, 3366; and agreed to, 3370; reply reported, 3684

BILLS.

Motion by Senator Neild for report by Standing Orders Committee as to amendment of standing order regulating reference of Bill to select committee, agreed to, 30.

Circulation of Supply Bill prior to first reading, *supply*, 1836

Initiation of, in Senate, *supply*, 1856

Question by Senator Neild as to amendment of standing order so as to permit of a Bill being referred to a Select Committee prior to its second reading, 2512

BUSINESS OF.

Motion proposed by Senator Best to regulate order of, 31; amendment proposed by Senator Stewart to give precedence to private business on Thursday, 31; debated, 32-4, and withdrawn, 34; amendment proposed by Senator Pearce to devote Thursday evening to private business, 35, and agreed to, 35; motion, as amended, agreed to, 35

Conduct of, *adj.*, 485-7, 585-7, 7563-4; *supply*, 1862, 1932, 5878-9, 11321-3; *obs.*, 5395, 6415-6, 7895-6, 8555, 9189-90

Order of, *adj.*, 157, 650, 693, 2888, 3730, 4199, 4618-21, 8284, 11697, 11909, 12038; *obs.*, 650-51, 3365

Programme for rest of session, *adj.*, 9191

State of, *adj.*, 1712-4; *obs.*, 10399

Visit to Agricultural Show, *adj.*, 2962-3

Questions by—

Senator Dobson as to business to be submitted to Parliament after Tariff is disposed of, 7796

Senators Symon, Pearce, and Gray, as to business to be taken after message concerning Tariff requests has been disposed of, 10919

Senator Millen as to business to be introduced, 11579

Senator Symon as to order of business, 11579

Senator Guthrie as to paragraph in *Age* concerning business of next session, 12101

CAMERON, SENATOR.

Political attitude of, *address*, 13

SENATE—continued.

CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES.

- Appreciation of services of, *obs.*, 6415-6, 12149-51
 Congratulations to, *address*, 14
 President's warrant nominating panel of temporary chairmen, tabled, 132
 Withdrawal of ruling by, 1472
 Dissent from ruling of, by Senator Dobson, 1513-6; by Senator Neild, 3150-3; by Senator Best, 3479-83; by Senator Symon, 7896-7906; by Senator Millen, 8644-52; by Senator Clemons, 8712-8, 10020-5

CHAIRMAN, TEMPORARY.

- Dissent from ruling of, by Senator Pearce, 4162-7; by Senator Neild, 9248-53

CHAMBER.

- Coldness of, *address*, 140

DAYS OF MEETING.

- Motion by Senator Best to suspend sitting for refreshment, agreed to, 30
 Motion proposed by Senator Best to fix, 30; amendment by Senator Millen to alter hour of meeting on Wednesday, agreed to, 31; motion, as amended, agreed to, 31
 Sitting on Friday, *adj.*, 693, 2962
 Suspension of Sitting, *obs.*, 6414; *adj.*, 9088, 9473
 Motion proposed by Senator Best to fix, 7572; amended and agreed to, 7574
 Motion proposed by Senator Best to alter hours of meeting on certain days, 8076; debated, 8077; and agreed to, 8080
 Motion by Senator Best to fix the duration of the luncheon adjournment, agreed to, 8156
 Question by Senator Gray, as to notice of intended alteration of sittings, 11579-80

DISPUTED RETURNS COMMITTEE

- President's warrant nominating, tabled, 132
 Motion by Senator Best to refer Mr. J. Vardon's petition to, agreed to, 2311
 Motions by Senator Symon to enable Committee to send for persons and papers, and if necessary to sit while Senate is sitting, agreed to, 2512
 Article in *Argus* as to draft report of, *obs.*, 3556-8; *expl.*, 3706
 Report from, presented and read, 4393
 Question by Senator W. Russell as to whether members of, had resigned, 4893

See "VACANCY IN."

DIVISIONS.

- Correction of list, *obs.*, 9646
 Errors in list, *adj.*, 827
 Non-ringing of bells, *supply*, 5881; *obs.*, 7947, 7974; *adj.*, 7972-3
 Placing of gong in Queen's Hall, *obs.*, 6190
 Transfer of vote, *obs.*, 8165-6
 Question by Senator Stewart as to inspection of bells, and recording of votes when bells have failed to ring, 7973

SENATE—continued.

HANSARD.

- Alteration of proofs, *supply*, 3804-5
 Appreciation of work of staff, *adj.*, 12149-50
 Circulation of speech before publication in, *obs.*, 6092; *adj.*, 6093, 7564
 Discrepancy between wording of item 222 of Tariff and *Hansard*, *obs.*, 9183
 Misprint in speech of Senator Neild, *expl.*, 7703
 Question by Senator Stewart as to daily issue of, 5177, 5284

HOUSE COMMITTEE.

- Motion by Senator Best to appoint, agreed to, 30

LABOUR PARTY.

- Motto for, *supply*, 3845
 References to, *address*, 144, 156, 251, 254-6, 292-5, 403; *adj.*, 2227; *supply*, 3827, 3843-5, 3848-50, 3902, 3915, 3921, 6333; *obs.*, 7599
 Senator St. Ledger's relations with, *obs.*, 11250; *expl.*, 11467; *adj.*, 11910-2

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

- Motion for, by Senator Millen, 1330, 4896, 9139, 10921; by Senator McColl, 5370; by Senator Stewart, 5493; by Senator Neild, 10921
 Motion proposed by Senator Millen, that, "To meet the requirements of section 20 of the Constitution, leave of absence be granted to every member of the Senate" for a certain period, 6297; debated, 6297-8; amendment by Senator Givens to omit the words "to meet the requirements of section 20 of the Constitution," proposed and agreed to, 6299; motion, as amended, agreed to, 6299

LIBRARY COMMITTEE.

- Motion by Senator Best to appoint, agreed to, 30

MATTERS OF URGENCY.

- Motion for adjournment proposed by Senator Neild to discuss the necessity of amending standing orders relating to, 2616; debated, 2619; and withdrawn, 2627

NEWSPAPER MISREPRESENTATION.

- Report of speech by Senator de Largie in *Argus*, *expl.*, 7843
 Article in *Age* reflecting on Senator Neild, *expl.*, 8026-8
 Article in *Daily News* reflecting on Senator Pearce, *expl.*, 8028
 Report in *Herald* attributing remarks to Senator Chataway, *expl.*, 8867
 Report in *Age* ascribing remarks to Senator Sayers, 8979

[See "PRIVILEGE"; also PROCEEDINGS OF, UNDER PARLIAMENT.]

SENATE—continued.

OFFICERS OF.

Appreciation of services of, *obs.*, 6415-6, 12149-51
Housekeeper's duty in connexion with press-room, *supply*, 6319
Office of Usher of Black Rod, *supply*, 10285-90

OPPOSITION.

Leader of, *obs.*, 6293, 6298; *supply*, 6327
Meeting of, *supply*, 4081-3, 6322-8; *expl.*, 4085
Room for leader of, *supply*, 8981-3
Question by Senator Findley as to report that Senator Macfarlane was deputy leader of, 5176

PAIR BOOK.

Alteration of entry in, *expl.*, 3145-8
Breaking of pair, *expl.*, 7790, 8240, 9245
Pairing of Senators, *expl.*, 1704
Motion proposed by Senator Neild that any unauthorized entry or alteration in pair book is an interference with privileges of Senate, 3501; debated, 3501; and withdrawn, 3507

PAPERS.

Accommodation for, of senators, *supply*, 8979-87
Files of Statutory Rules and Orders, *supply*, 4154; *obs.*, 4155
Insufficiency of accommodation for, *supply*, 5881-2
List of papers not recommended to be printed, *obs.*, 935-6, 1566
Printing of, *supply*, 4051-9; *adj.*, 6093; *obs.*, 7843-8, 8221-9, 8866
Rescission of order for printing of a paper, *obs.*, 157; motion by Senator Henderson to rescind order, agreed to, 564
Re-setting of matter for, *obs.*, 1566-7
Withholding of, by Government, *supply*, 3824
Motion proposed by Senator Henderson to adopt report from Printing Committee concerning printing of papers, 680; debated, 680; and agreed to, 681

Questions by—

Senator Pearce as to laying papers on Library Table, 932-3; by Senator Neild, 933
Senator Walker as to provision for sale of, 6061; by Senator Pearce, 6061
Senator Guthrie as to why a despatch had been made known to the public before it had been communicated to Parliament, 8863
Senator Dobson as to whether it was policy of Ministers to acquaint press with contents of important documents before they were laid before Parliament, 8864
Senator Neild as to why printing of report of judgment of High Court in *Vardon v. O'Loughlin* had not been recommended, 9353
Senator Stewart as to accommodation for correspondence and papers of senators, 9631

[See PRINTING COMMITTEE]

SENATE—continued.

PARTIES IN.

Rooms for, *supply*, 8982-3
Formation of, *supply*, 6322-4

PHOTOGRAPH OF.

Question by Senator Neild as to reproduction of flashlight photograph of, in *Victorian School Paper*, 11383

POSITION AND RIGHTS OF.

Under the Constitution, *supply*, 11517-9
Motion proposed by Senator Best, that action of other House in receiving and dealing with reiterated requests on Customs Tariff Bill is in compliance with undoubted constitutional position and rights of Senate, 11581; amendment proposed by Senator Millen that such affirmation be embodied in message to other House, 11583; debated, 11585; and withdrawn, 11588; motion agreed to, 11588

PRAYERS IN.

Question by Senator McGregor as to demeanour of senators during reading of, 5745

PRESIDENT.

Absence of, reported, 7652
Appreciation of services of, *obs.*, 6415-6, 12149-50
Congratulatory to, *address*, 14
Report of Standing Orders Committee formulating and tabulating decisions from the Chair during 1906, tabled, 8
Right of, to debate non-party questions, *obs.*, 665-8

PRINTING COMMITTEE.

Motion proposed by Senator Best to appoint, 38, debated, 38-9, and agreed to, 39
Printing of papers without a reference to, *obs.*, 132-7, 248, 746
Report from, 680-1, 934-6, 1566-7, 2179, 2283, 3148-9, 3464, 3706-7, 4462-70, 5083, 5647, 6293, 7843-8, 8221-9, 8616, 8673, 9297, 9353, 10003, 10255
Adoption of reports from, without notice, *obs.*, 8221-9
[See "PAPERS."]

PRIVILEGES OF.

Curtailment of, by grant of supply for three months, *supply*, 1833-64, 1930-48
Disregard of, by the Government, *supply*, 3824, 3904, 3914, 3925, 10269, 10282-3

SENATE—continued.

Privileges of—continued.

Message, asking for appointment of Select Committee on procedure in cases of privilege, reported from House of Representatives, 9951; motion proposed by Senator Best to appoint Select Committee, 10004, debated, 10004, and agreed to on division, 10013; message, desiring Select Committee to investigate any recent allegations reflecting on Parliament or any of its members, reported from House of Representatives, 10255; motion proposed by Senator Best to empower Select Committee accordingly, 10255, debated 10256, and agreed to on division, 10260; motion by Senator Neild to enable Select Committee on Privilege Procedure to sit during sittings of Senate, agreed to, 11304; progress report presented by Senator Neild, and read, 11676; second progress report presented by Senator Chataway, and read, 11983; motion proposed by Senator Chataway to adopt progress reports, 11987; debated 11990; and agreed to, 11995

Question by Senator Chataway as to paragraph in *Perth Daily News*, that the Parliament is not in a position to freely criticise a "nefarious proposal," 11216

PROTEST TO.

Production of correspondence on, *obs.*, 5011
Question by Senator Needham as to joint resolution of Western Australian Parliament concerning Tariff, 4143; by Senator Pearce, 4925

QUESTIONS.

Character of answers to, *supply*, 1851
Form and revision of questions, *obs.*, 5368-70, 8154-6, 9734, 9892-3
Notice of, at morning sittings, *obs.*, 8076, 8156
Questions by—
Senator de Largie as to whether a certain statement in a question had been revised, 5370
Senator McGregor as to whether a senator had to vouch for the truth of any statements in a newspaper extract which had been quoted in a question, 5370
Senator de Largie as to whether a series of questions had been reviewed; and, if so, why argumentative matter had been passed, 8154-6

SENATORS.

Administration of oath to, 563, 9040
Luggage of, *supply*, 8985-7
Personal explanations by, 974, 1054, 1704, 2068, 2227, 2941, 3145, 3796, 4085, 4143, 4795-6, 4801, 5466, 7703, 7790, 7843, 8026-8, 8867, 8979, 9245, 11467
Relations of, to State Ministry, *supply*, 11502-19

SENATE—continued.

STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE.

Motion proposed by Senator Best to appoint, 35; amendment proposed by Senator Stewart to substitute Senator Givens for Senator Dobson, 35, and withdrawn, 38; motion amended by leave and agreed to, 38
Question by Senator Neild as to action of, on a reference from the Senate, 2512

ST. LEDGER, SENATOR.

Alleged betrayal of principles by, *p.o.*, 11250; *expl.*, 11467; *adj.*, 11910-2

STRANGERS.

Entertainment of, at Parliament House, *adj.*, 6092-4
Presence of, *p.o.*, 8778
Seat on dais for Governor of Tasmania, *obs.*, 5561
Questions by Senator McColl as to entertainment of, at Parliament House, 6058; by Senators Trenwith, Story, McGregor, and de Largie, 6059; by Senator Henderson, 6060

SUSPENSION OF RULES.

Appropriation Bill, 10260, 11623
Coast Defence Appropriation Bill, 12106
Customs Tariff Bill, 10041-2, 10830-41, 11581
Customs Tariff Amendment Bill, 12102
Disputed Elections and Qualifications Bill, 5986
Election Expenses Reimbursement Bill, 12148
Excise Tariff (Starch) Bill, 12105
Invalid and Old-age Pensions Bill, 11995
Motion without notice, 2512, 3049-55
Officers Compensation Bill, 10071
Old-age Pensions Appropriation Bill, 12126
Parliamentary Papers Bill, 11866
Procedure for, *adj.*, 10072-3
Quarantine Bill, 6227
Supply Bills, 39, 1953, 5774, 6300, 12137
Surplus Revenue Bill, 11866
Works and Buildings Bill, 11621-2, 11623
Questions by—
Senator Neild as to a suspension of Standing Orders, including a suspension of Sessional Orders, 6409
Senator Pulsford as to a contingent notice of motion for, being made part of machinery of Senate, 12100

VACANCY IN.

Statement by the President that the return of Mr. J. Vardon for South Australia had been declared void by the High Court, and that he had notified its Governor of the happening of the vacancy, 7; finding of the High Court read, 8
Absence of reference to, in Governor-General's Speech, *address*, 63
Opinion of Attorney-General on, *address*, 146
Notification of election of Mr. O'Loghlin by Parliament of South Australia to fill, reported, 563

SENATE—continued.

Vacancy in—continued.

Discharge of order of day relating to, *obs.*, 974

Petition from Mr. J. Vardon against choice of Senator O'Loughlin reported by the President, 2311

Motion by Senator Neild, to discuss vacancy in representation of South Australia, *dis.*, 974

Motion by Senator Best to refer petition to Disputed Returns and Qualifications Committee, agreed to, 2311; report presented and read, 4393

Motion proposed by Senator Symon to adopt Committee's report, 4708; debated, 4723; amendment proposed by Senator Best that Senator O'Loughlin has been validly chosen by the State Parliament, and that the petition of Mr. Vardon be disallowed, 4731; debated, 4732-47, 4797-4834; amendment of amendment proposed by Senator Turley that the point of constitutional law involved in the petition be referred by legislation to the High Court, 4834; and agreed to, 4836; amendment, as amended, agreed to, 4836; decision of High Court reported and read, and notification of a vacancy to Governor of South Australia announced, 7541; election of Mr. J. Vardon announced, 9040

Motion by Senator Best to return the petitioner's deposit, agreed to, 4836

Notice of motion by Senator Neild, 9

Questions by—

Senator Neild as to opinion of Attorney-General concerning method of filling, 28; as to printing judgment of Court of Disputed Returns, 9353

Senator St. Ledger as to referring question of vacancy to Committee of Disputed Returns and Qualifications, 2068

Senator W. Russell as to discovery of ballot papers sworn to have been burned, 2364

Senator O'Loughlin as to position of petition of Mr. Vardon, 4893

Senator Symon as to Bill to refer Mr. Vardon's petition to High Court, 5011, 5082

Senator Guthrie as to press comments on report of Committee of Disputed Returns, 3556; as to tabling copy of judgment of High Court on petition, 7753

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

House of Representatives:

Abolition of, *address*, 24, 86, 170, 178, 225, 343, 350, 458

Completion of Debate on, *expl.*, 468

Governor-General's Speech reported, 23;

Address-in-Reply brought up by Committee, and read, 24; moved by Mr. Wise, 24; seconded by Mr. Coon, 27; debated, 85-131, 159-92, 194-243, 317-52, 408-69, and agreed to, 469; presentation of, 1230, 1289

Postponement of Debate on, to get Supply, *obs.*, 81

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—continued.

ADJOURNMENTS (Formal).

Alleged Customs frauds, 9093-8

Excise Tariff Act, 6356-70

Federal Capital, 298-314

Mail Contract Tenders, 591-606

New Protection: Wages award, 12158-68

Patent and Proprietary Medicines, 883-897

Postal Administration, 6231-2

Publication of report, 3091-3105

Shipping Combine, 3936-69

Surplus Revenue, 11744-5

Telephone Anomalies, 979-987

ADJOURNMENTS (Special).

Motions agreed to, by Sir William Lyne, 470,

741-3, 2025-9, 3360, 3622, 4580, 5283, 5745,

5977, 6292, 6503-4, 6591, 6673, 6725, 6810,

6834, 6967, 7024, 7110, 7169, 7413, 7456,

9136, 12201; by Mr. Deakin, 4958, 5497,

7491, 9521, 10461, 10482, 11734, 11784

Christmas adjournment, *supply*, 6279-87; *adj.*, 7536-40

Questions by—

Mr. J. T. Brown as to adjourning over Thursday in Show week, 2688

Mr. O'Malley as to adjourning over afternoon of Melbourne Cup Day, 5416

Mr. Page as to Christmas adjournment, 5519; by Sir John Forrest, 6728; by

Mr. McDonald, 6729; by Mr. Liddell, 6834; by Mr. J. Cook, 7169, 7459; by

Mr. Johnson, 7299, 7416; by Mr. Fraser, 7300

Mr. Hughes as to adjourning until Senate had disposed of Tariff, 11053

BILLS.

Determination of constitutionality of, by High Court, *ways and means*, 3996, 4092

BUSINESS OF.

Motion proposed by Sir W. Lyne to regulate precedence of Government business and general business, 469; debated, 469; and agreed to, 469

Motion by Sir W. Lyne to regulate order of general business, agreed to, 469

Conduct of, *adj.*, 3682, 4461-2, 4704, 11466; *supply*, 5784-7, 5793-5, 6279-88

Introduction of new business after 11 p.m., *supply*, 6281-2

Order of business, *adj.*, 472, 563, 744, 1083-4, 1678, 2282, 2343-6, 3047-8, 3619, 6186-8,

6521-3, 6834, 7456-7, 9794, 11082, 12100, *obs.*, 1977, 2124, 7416, 12054; *Budget*,

3036, 3128, 3294; *Ways and Means*, 3294-8

Precedence to Government business, *obs.*, 2690; motion proposed by Sir William

Lyne to give precedence to Government business daily, unless otherwise ordered,

2795; debated, 2795; and agreed to, 2807

Precedence to items in Tariff, *ways and means*, 4120-30, 4125-61

Programme for remainder of session, *supply*, 8821; *obs.*, 8030-5

Progress of, *adj.*, 4035, 5236, 9630, 10177; *obs.*, 5131

Suspension of private business, *obs.*, 2612; *adj.*, 2612, 2684-6

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*continued.*Business of—*continued.*

Work of session, *adj.*, 12201-3

Motion by Mr. Deakin to resume consideration of Tariff at point reached prior to count-out, agreed to, 7251

Motion proposed by Mr. Deakin to postpone remaining business until after consideration of Mr. Chanter's motion relative to Messrs. Freeman and Wallace, 10126, debated 10126, and withdrawn 10127

Questions by—

Mr. Fraser as to transferring an order of the day from the 5th to the 12th September, 2566

Mr. J. Cook as to business for the week, 3622; for the period prior to Christmas, 6417, 7169; for rest of session, 11260

Mr. Reid as to taking out of order certain items in Tariff, 4280; as to course of public business, 8930

Mr. Watson as to business for sitting, 7461

Mr. Willis as to resuming consideration of private business, 8926

Mr. Batchelor as to order of business during next few days, 10078

Mr. Chanter as to motion for appointing Select Committee on case of Messrs. Freeman and Wallace, 10079, 10129, 10132, 10134; by Mr. Fraser, 10133-4

CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES.

Motion by Mr. Batchelor to appoint Mr. McDonald, ruled to be irregular, 82; *obs.* as to delaying appointment of, 82, 83

Motion proposed by Sir J. Forrest to appoint Mr. Mahon for the day only, 83; debated, 83; and agreed to, 84

Motion proposed by Sir W. Lyne to adopt new Standing Order regulating tenure of office of, 315; debated, 315; and agreed to, 316

Appeal to Speaker from rulings of, *p.o.*, 10738-40

Appreciation of services of, *adj.*, 7536-40

Calling of members by, *adj.*, 2685; *obs.*, 4954, 5231

Casting vote of, 5730, 7124, 10667, 10725, 11214-5

Clerical alterations in Tariff by, *obs.*, 7340, 7440

Dissent from ruling of, by Mr. Groom, 1312-6; by Sir W. Lyne, 3297-8; by Mr. Page, 7040; by Mr. Crouch, 7092-4; by Mr. Chanter, 10211-3; by Mr. J. Cook, 11546

Motion proposed by Mr. Batchelor to appoint Mr. McDonald, 316; amendment proposed by Mr. Storrer to appoint Mr. Salmon, 316; amendment negatived on division, and motion agreed to, 317

Speaker's warrant appointing panel of Temporary Chairmen, tabled, 404

Question by Mr. Watson as to avoiding sessional contest for position of, 80

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*continued.*

CHAMBER.

Ventilation of, *adj.*, 3683; *Ways and Means*, 4857; *supply*, 6289

Questions by—

Mr. Liddell as to ventilation of, 4412

Mr. Johnson as to lighting of, 7249

DAYS OF MEETING.

Motion proposed by Mr. Deakin to fix, agreed to, 28

Motion proposed by Mr. Deakin for the House to sit on Monday, 6506; debated, 6506, and agreed to, 6519; motion by Mr. Deakin to discontinue Monday sittings unless otherwise ordered, agreed to, 8863; motion by Mr. Deakin for Monday sitting agreed to, 11734

Hour of meeting, *adj.*, 3230, 3362, 4704, 4955, 5236, 6186-8; *m.*, 6967

Duration of recess for dinner, *obs.* 113; *adj.* 3230, 3232

Days of sitting, *adj.*, 6186-8, 6504, 6521-3, 6810; *obs.*, 6417, 6503-4; *expl.*, 6524

Saturday sitting, *adj.*, 6521-3, 6810

Suspension of sitting, *p.o.*, 6631; *obs.*, 7355

Stress of long sittings, *obs.*, 6967

Questions by—

Mr. Chanter as to sitting on Friday, 976

Mr. Chanter as to dinner adjournment, 3854

Mr. Page as to meeting on six days a week, 5131; by Mr. McDonald, 5520; by Mr. Thomas, 6024; by Mr. J. T. Brown, 6186; by Mr. Batchelor, 6416; by Mr. Watson and Mr. J. Cook, 6417, 6676; by Mr. Bamford, 6729; by Mr. McWilliams, 11703

Mr. Maloney as to recording names of members in attendance during all-night sittings, 6024

Mr. Bowden as to alteration of days or hours of sitting, 6111

Mr. J. Cook as to protracted sittings, 6811

Mr. McDonald as to sitting on Saturday or other day to dispose of Tariff, 11052; late on Friday and on following Monday to close the session, 11525

Mr. Hutchison as to morning and late sittings, 11790

DIVISIONS.

Correction of list, *obs.*, 6548

Inadvertent vote, *expl.*, 7183

Number of calls for, *p.o.*, 6567-8

Position of member calling for, *p.o.*, 7247

Vote of member in gangway, *obs.*, 6965

Withdrawal of calls for, *obs.*, 6908-9, 6976, 7091-2

EXHIBITS.

Mineral specimens in corridor, *adj.*, 1412

Playing of exhibited pianos, *obs.*, 7213

Questions by—

Mr. Johnson as to erection of a machine in north lobby and extension of like privilege to importers of machinery, 6591

Mr. Glynn, Mr. Poynton, and Mr. Batchelor, as to exhibit of piano in ante-room, 7114; Mr. Johnson, 7115

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—continued.

Exhibits—continued.

Questions by—

- Mr. Willis as to use of corridors by strangers in connexion with exhibited wares, 7115
Mr. Livingston as to removal of pianos, 7300
Mr. Fuller and Mr. Salmon as to a picture of Dalgety, 10965
Mr. Fuller as to permission to exhibit pictures in corridor, 10965

FORREST, Sir J.

- Performances and professions of, *Budget*, 3220-8; *adj.*, 3231-2; *expl.*, 3300; *supply*, 3344-50
Withdrawal from Chamber, *expl.*, 192
Reduction of Estimates by, *expl.*, 11625
Votes of, *expl.*, 10876

GRAND COMMITTEES.

- Appointment of, *supply*, 5786

HANSARD.

- Correction of figures in speech by Mr. Mahon, *expl.*, 3419-20
Inaccuracy in a "proof" report, *obs.*, 3852
Insertion of unread document in, *obs.*, 7315, 9847

KINGSTON, Right Hon. C. C.

- Motion proposed by Mr. Deakin that the House record its deep appreciation of the great public services rendered by Mr. Kingston, and its profound regret at his untimely decease, 11046; debated, 11047, and agreed to, 11049; motion by Mr. Deakin that Mr. Speaker be requested to convey the resolution to Mrs. Kingston, agreed to, 11049; reply reported, 12038

LABOUR PARTY.

- Issue of circular by Mr. Catts, *Ways and Means*, 4026-8; *expl.*, 4361-2
References to, *address*, 109-10, 124, 160, 183-5, 206-7, 218, 241-2, 317-24, 338-43, 344, 347-50, 409-56, 460-7; *Budget*, 2124, 2145, 2477-82, 2609-12, 2656-9, 2716-7, 2821, 2840, 2923-4, 2991-3, 3141-5; *supply*, 3346-50, 3429, 9303-51, 12187; *Ways and Means*, 3991-3, 4005-6, 4018-23, 4110, 4118
Resignation by Mr. Watson of, and election of Mr. Fisher to, leadership of, *obs.*, 5326-7
Votes of members of, *expl.*, 10876
Question by Mr. Hall asking Mr. Fairbairn to cite one instance of a member of Labour Party being compelled to vote against his conscience, 10876, 10967

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

- Motions for, by Sir William Lyne, 2121; by Mr. Deakin, 5803, 10652; by Mr. Reid, 5803
Motion by Mr. Groom to grant leave of absence to every member until first sitting in 1908, agreed to, 7491

LIBRARY.

- Vote for, *supply*, 11300
F.6950.—a

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—continued.

LOBBYING.

[See EXHIBITS, also STRANGERS.]

MEMBERS.

- Absence of Mr. Maloney, *p.o.*, 7252
Administration of Oath to, 22, 500, 769, 1412
Mr. H. Mahon, *supply*, 3344-9
Naming of Mr. Poynton, *Ways and Means*, 7368-9
Order of High Court voiding the return of Mr. Palmer for Echuca, read by the Clerk, 22
Personal Explanations by, 192, 468, 500-1, 693, 897, 1180, 1279, 1866-7, 2312-3, 2561-3, 2651-4, 2683, 3231, 3296-9, 3300, 3410, 3419, 3438, 3439, 3440, 3589, 3852, 3970-1, 4243, 4361-2, 4843-7, 4867, 5210, 5782, 5910, 6506, 6524, 6548, 6767, 6768, 6793-5, 6812, 7183, 7185, 7253, 9347, 9348, 9350, 9351, 10471, 10480-2, 10605, 10703-6, 10732, 10876, 10966-7, 10975-8, 10998, 11017, 11018, 11046, 11177-9, 11578, 11625, 11704-7, 11787, 11913-5, 11918, 12190, 12198
Supply of information to, *expl.*, 2651-3
Writ, issue of, 22, 11095; return of, 500
Questions by—
Mr. Storrer as to late delivery of letter to, 6673
Mr. J. Cook as to sweating of members and payment for overtime, 6813
Mr. Palmer as to whether a statement by Mr. Hughes was a breach of his oath of allegiance, 9093

NEWSPAPER MISREPRESENTATIONS.

- Statement in *Age* reflecting on the Opposition, *expl.*, 693-4; on the Opposition Corner, *expl.*, 1279-80; *obs.*, 10985-6; on Sir J. Forrest, *expl.*, 3300; on Mr. J. Cook and Mr. Page, *expl.*, 5210; on Mr. Page, *expl.*, 11017
[See PRIVILEGE.]

NOTICES OF MOTION.

- Removal of motion from notice-paper, *supply*, 9310, 9317, 9337; *p.o.*, 9352
Question—
By Mr. Wilson as to disappearance of Mr. Fisher's motion about Old-age pensions from notice-paper, 9298

OFFICERS.

- Appreciation of work of, *adj.*, 12201-3

OPPOSITION, THE.

- Attitude of, during illness of Prime Minister, *expl.*, 693-4
Betrayal of free-trade by, *Ways and Means*, 4106-7, 4112-3
Condition of, *address*, 456
Disciplining of, *Budget*, 2667
Leader of, *address*, 85, 147, 207, 217, 457; *Budget*, 2477-80, 2608-12, 2656-9, 2840-2; *Ways and Means*, 4014-7, 4026, 4106-7, 4112-7
Policy of Opposition Corner party, *Budget*, 3044-5
Thanks to leader of, *adj.*, 11863
Question by Mr. Page as to intrigue by Opposition Corner Party to oust Ministry, 11054

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*continued.*

PAIRS.

- Breaking of pair, *expl.*, 10732
- Changing of pairs, *Ways and Means*, 6793-5
- Erroneous entries in book, *expl.*, 6506, 11579
- Failure to obtain a pair, *expl.*, 11578
- Pairing member twice, *adj.*, 10699; *expl.*, 10703-6, 11579
- Pair on piano duties, *obs.*, 11214
- Refusal of pairs, *obs.*, 10544-6, 11214

PALMER, Mr. A. C.

- Allowance to, *supply*, 11216

[See PRAYERS.]

PAPERS.

- Motion proposed by Mr. Hutchison to adopt report from Printing Committee concerning printing of papers, 769; debated, 769, and agreed to, 771
- Printing of Bills and Papers, *obs.*, 2229-30; *supply*, 3589-98
- Publication of Mr. Beale's report, *adj.*, 2612-4, 3091-3105; *obs.*, 2995; *supply*, 9975-83
- Setting of tabular matter for, *supply*, 3501

PETITIONS.

- Erasure of reception of petition, *obs.*, 7294
- Genuineness of signatures to petition from Wagga, *obs.*, 3408-10
- Motion proposed by Sir W. Lyne that the petition be received, 3409; debated, 3409-10; and agreed to, on division, 3410

[See PRIVILEGE.]

PRAYERS IN.

- Demeanour of members during reading of, *expl.*, 5782
- Question by Mr. Thomas, as to a statement by Mr. Palmer to a public meeting on, 5782

PRINTING COMMITTEE.

- Motion by Sir J. Quick for leave to, to confer with Printing Committee of the Senate, agreed to, 404
- Motion by Mr. Hutchison to place a petition in custody of, agreed to, 3852
- Report from, read, and adopted, 404, 769-771, 974, 1595, 2228-30, 3171-2, 3851, 4517, 5130, 5690, 6354, 9298, 10078
- Powers of, *supply*, 3593

PRIVILEGE.

- Motion proposed by Mr. Hutchison to refer petition to Attorney-General for immediate investigation as to its accuracy and alleged forgery, 3412; debated 3413; amendment proposed by Mr. Salmon to substitute Printing Committee for Attorney-General, 3412; debated, 3412-9; and agreed to, 3419; motion, as amended, agreed to, 3419; report presented and read, 6004; and adopted, 6095; report by Crown Solicitor tabled and read, 7457-8
- Charges and innuendoes of corruption against members of Parliament, *adj.*, 9794; *obs.*, 11100-13
- Statement by the Treasurer that Standard Oil Company had "the numbers in its bag," *p.o.*, 10974-5; *obs.*, 10975-96

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*continued.*

Privilege—*continued.*

- Rules of procedure in cases of, *adj.*, 9794
- Motion proposed by Mr. Deakin to appoint a Select Committee to report as to best procedure for trial and punishment of persons charged with interference with or breach of powers, privileges, or immunities of either House or member of committees of each House, 9953, debated 9953, and agreed to 9954; message from Senate reported, 10076; motion proposed by Mr. Deakin to empower Privilege Procedure Committee to investigate any recent allegations reflecting on Parliament or any of its members, 10127, debated 10128, and agreed to 10129; message from Senate reported, 10368; report requesting leave to report minutes of evidence presented by Sir J. Quick, read and adopted, 10400; motion by Sir J. Quick to enable Committee to sit during sitting of House, 11328; progress report presented by Sir J. Quick, and recommendations read, 11701; motion proposed by Mr. Deakin that the report be printed, 11701; debated, and agreed to, 11702; second progress report presented by Sir J. Quick, read, and ordered to be printed, 12044; motion proposed by Sir J. Quick to adopt reports, 12044; debated, 12048; and agreed to, 12053

Questions by—

- Mr. Johnson as to insinuations against integrity of Parliament by Mr. O. C. Beale, 8925; by Mr. Kelly, 10075
- Mr. Liddell as to paragraph in Sydney *Bulletin* ascribing corruption to members of Parliament, 8928; by Mr. Kelly, 10075, 10400
- Mr. Wilks as to investigation of charges placed by Mr. Johnson and Mr. Liddell before House, 9844; by Mr. O'Malley, Mr. J. Cook, Mr. Kelly, and Mr. H. Willis, 10075; by Mr. Kelly, Mr. Knox and Mr. Wilks, 10076; by Mr. J. Cook, 10077
- Mr. Kelly as to letter on subject from Mr. Beale and Sydney Chamber of Manufactures, 10401
- Mr. Reid as to investigation into truth of allegations of bribery and corruption of members by the Standard Oil Company, 11017
- Mr. Foster as to article in *Review of Reviews* reflecting on motives of members, 11521

PROCEEDINGS IN COMMITTEE.

- References to, *adj.*, 3299, 3361-2, 4243, 4461-2, 4646, 5237, 6144, 6181, 10699

PROTEST TO.

Questions by—

- Mr. Fowler as to tabling joint resolution of W.A. Parliament concerning Tariff, 4955
- Mr. Crouch as to whether the correspondence on the subject was transmitted to both Houses by the Governor-General with the knowledge and approval of the Ministry, 15690

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—continued.

QUESTIONS.

Answering of, when orders of day called on first, *obs.*, 315, 606
 Character of answers to, *supply*, 2894, 2806, 2901, 2904
 Method of asking, and continuity of, questions, *obs.*, 10076
 Number of questions without notice, *obs.*, 2233
 To private members, *p.o.*, 10965, 10968-9
 Questions by—
 Mr. Maloney as to requiring notice of all questions, 10079; Mr. McDonald, 11744, 12041; Mr. Storrer, 11793
 Mr. Catts as to allotting certain time to questions without notice, 11707

QUORUM.

Absence of, reported, 7447
 Position of Mr. Palmer, *expl.*, 7253
 Withdrawal of members during ringing of bells, *p.o.*, 6800-1

REPRESENTATION OF VICTORIA:

Questions—

By Mr. Salmon as to method of estimating population, 10484; by Mr. D. Thomson, 10525

RIGHTS OF.

Motion proposed by Mr. Deakin that the House refrains from determination of its constitutional rights in respect to the Senate returning Customs Tariff Bill with requests a second time, 11424; debated, 11425; and agreed to on division, 11437; resolution ordered to be incorporated in message returning Bill, 11438

ROYAL COMMISSIONS.

Treatment of reports of, by Government and House, *Budget*, 2708-15, 2825, 2835-7

SENATE.

Allowance to Messrs. O'Loghlin and Vardon, *supply*, 11216
 Delay in return of writ to elect a senator for South Australia, *supply*, 8855-9
 Opinion of Attorney-General on vacancy in, *address*, 179, 214
 Scrutiny of ballot-papers for Angus Division, *supply*, 8859, 8861
 Right of, to request increases of duties, *p.o.*, 10484-7; *obs.*, 10569-70; to request additions to items, *p.o.*, 10674-5; to return a Bill with requests a second time, *p.o.*, 11380-1; *obs.*, 11424-37; *p.o.*, 11432-7; to request a modification of a suggested amendment agreed to by the House with a modification, *p.o.*, 11539-46; *obs.*, 11579

SPEAKER.

Absence of, reported by the Clerk, 6505, 6523, 1769
 Appreciation of services of, *adj.*, 7536-40
 Death of Mr. C. C. Kingston, *obs.*, 11049
 62

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—continued.

STANDING ORDERS.

Suggestion by Mr. W. G. Higgs that Government should apply, to silence debate on Tariff proposals, *Budget*, 2666
 Limitation of debate on Tariff items, *Budget*, 2989-90
 Suspension of, *obs.*, 8863; *m.*, 9481; *p.o.*, 9482; *expl.*, 9521
 Questions by—
 Mr. Johnson as to adopting a revised set of, 6421; Mr. Bowden, 6834
 Mr. B. Smith as to applying closure to Opposition, 6593
 Mr. Catts as to regulating questions without notice, 11707

STRANGERS.

Dispute with Mr. J. McDougall, *expl.*, 7185-6
 Entertainment of, *supply*, 6292-3
 Lobbying by, on Tariff, *Ways and Means*, 6585-8, 7185-7, 7193-5, 7310-1, 7326; *p.o.*, 10974-5; *obs.*, 10975-96
 Presence of, *obs.*, 3095
 Question to exclude, negatived, 3095
 Questions by—
 Mr. Johnson as to erection of machine by strangers in a private room, and lobbying in corridors, 6591
 Mr. Maloney as to lobbying by representative of Standard Oil Trust, 6592
 Mr. Kelly as to circular on lobbying in interest of manufacturers, 11051

SUSPENSION OF RULES.

Appointment of Committees, 82
 Appropriation Bill, 3749, 10251, 11418
 Australian Industries Preservation Bill, 9481
 Bounties Bill, 1392
 Coast Defence Appropriation Bill, 12094
 Commonwealth Salaries Bill, 3897
 Customs Tariff Bill, 7456
 Customs Tariff Amendment Bill, 12054-5
 Disputed Elections and Qualifications Bill, 6389
 Election Expenses Reimbursement Bill, 12196
 Excise Tariff (Starch) Bill, 12056
 Invalid and Old-age Pensions Bill, 11982
 Ministerial statement, 11628-37
 Officers Compensation Bill, 7502
 Old-age Pensions Appropriation Bill, 12095
 Parliamentary Allowances Bill, 2017
 Parliamentary Papers Bill, 11780
 Supply Bill, 82, 1809, 5800, 6286, 8863, 12098, 12190
 Works and Buildings Bill, 11418

PETITIONS.

Senate:

Australian Industries Preservation Bill, praying Senate to lay Bill aside (Senator Symon), 5081
 Kerosene Flash Point, praying for reduction of standard to 73 degrees Fahrenheit (Senator Vardon), 10251
 Military Training, compulsory, against (Senator Mulcahy), 5745
 Senate Election, South Australia, against return of Senator O'Loghlin, 2311

PETITIONS—continued.

Tariff: for the free admission of magazines (Senator Dobson), 5175; against high duties (Senator Neild), 5465; *re* duties on harvesters, strippers, and metal parts (Senator W. Russell), 7565; for reduction of duties on watches and clocks (Senator Millen), 7791; for substantial reduction of duties on medicines (Senator Neild), 7925; *re* duties on photographic papers (Senator Guthrie), 8075; (Senator Neild), 9352; for placing wire netting on free list (Senator Millen), 8153; for alterations in the duties on leather (Senator Trenwith), 11216

House of Representatives:

Australian Industries Preservation Act, for amendment of (Mr. Dugald Thomson), 6811
 Australian Industries Preservation Bill, for laying aside of (Mr. Glynn), 6896; (Mr. Hedges), 9089
 Elections, praying House to provide for regulation of (Mr. Maloney), 12038
 Kerosene Flash Point, praying for reduction of standard to 73 degrees Fahrenheit (Mr. Batchelor), 10482; (Mr. Mathews), 10574
 Legal Tender, for appointment of committee of inquiry (Mr. Hume Cook), 1412
 Mail Service, European, for making provision for cool storage, and making Brisbane a port of call (Colonel Foxton), 588, 769; (Mr. Groom), 769; (Mr. Archer), 1056; (Mr. Edwards), 1086
 Military Training, Compulsory, against (Mr. Storrer), 4747
 Monetary system, for appointment of a Committee of inquiry (Mr. Mauger), 11385
 Public Service: from members of Public Service, Western Australia, praying for preservation of rights (Mr. Mahon), 9842
 Rebate of duty on a portable engine, asking for (Mr. Tilley Brown), 6591
 Secret Drugs, against circulation of report on, 4308
 Tariff, for increased duties on arrowroot and cornflour, 1180; for removing duties from food and clothing (Mr. Joseph Cook), 2789; against the Tariff and the duty on wire-netting (Sir William Lyne), 3408, (Mr. Spence), 3732; against the Tariff (Mr. Hall), 3508; against duties on pianos, &c. (Mr. Sinclair), 3610; against the Tariff (Mr. Johnson), 3619, (Mr. Mahon), 3620; against increasing duties on necessities of poorer classes (Mr. Joseph Cook), 3971, 4517, (Sir William Lyne), 3971; for duties on timber (Mr. McWilliams), 4085; against the Tariff (Mr. Foster), 4085; against duties on pianos (Colonel Foxton), 4278, 4411, (Mr. Edwards), 4278, (Mr. Page), 4517, (Mr. Hughes and Mr. Watkins), 4406, (Mr. Poynton), 5600, (Mr. Knox), 6725; against a higher duty on pianos than that levied under the old Tariff, (Mr. Maloney), 6811; against the Tariff

PETITIONS—continued.

(Mr. Dugald Thomson and Mr. McDonald), 4308, (Mr. Reid), 5208; as to duties on confectionery (Mr. Fairbairn), 4410, (Mr. Joseph Cook, Sir Philip Fysh, and Colonel Foxton), 4411; for relief from duties pressing on primary industries (Mr. Webster), 4517; suggesting a maximum duty on confectionery (Mr. Mahon), 4646, (Mr. O'Malley and Mr. Coon), 4842; to reduce duties on agricultural implements and mining machinery (Mr. Glynn), 4646; for a duty of 35 per cent. on boots and shoes (Mr. Coon), 4842; for reduction of duties on agricultural and mining machinery (Mr. Poynton), 4955, 5129, 6523, 6673 (Mr. Livingston), 4955; for retaining duties on confectionery (Mr. Coon), 4955; against taxation of magazines (Sir Philip Fysh), 5208; against high duties (Mr. Henry Willis), 5415; against the duty on fishing nets and cork floats (Mr. John Thomson), 5519, 6023, 6129, 6227, (Mr. Liddell, Mr. Watson, Mr. Fuller, and Mr. Joseph Cook), 5782, (Mr. Ewing), 5801; against increased duties on phonographs, gramophones, records, &c. (Mr. Mahon), 5801; for increase of duties on parasols and umbrellas (Mr. Coon and Mr. Carr), 6023; for reduction of duties on farm requisites (Mr. Poynton and Mr. Hutchinson), 6129; for reduction of duty on chairs (Mr. Maloney), 7025; for removal of duty on cinematograph films, 7248; for an increased duty on harvesters (Mr. Chapman), 9387; for retaining the duty on electrical appliances (Mr. Tudor), 10700; for the re-imposition of duties on wire netting (Mr. Coon), 10874; against the amendment requested by the Senate in item 353B, kid and patent and enamelled leather (Mr. Watson), 11050

POSTMASTER-GENERAL.

ACTIONS AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT.

Senate:

Question by Senator St. Ledger as to actions by dismissed officers, 7568

ADMINISTRATION.

Senate:

Balance Sheet, *supply*, 10270
 Centralization, *supply*, 6310, 8917
 Efficiency of Administration, *supply*, 8900-1, 8904, 8918, 8919, 9001-6, 11482-9, 11609-11
 Facilities, country, *supply*, 8901, 9002; *adj.*, 9521-36; *obs.*, 11637-70
 Mauger, Mr., Postmaster-General, speech regarding Maitland coal miners, *adj.*, 8354-64
 Questions by—
 Senator Chataway as to reduction of Estimates, 7976
 Senator Millen as to speech made by Postmaster-General, and refusal of funds to Postmaster-General by Treasurer, 7795

POSTMASTER-GENERAL—continued.

Administration—continued.

Questions by—

- Senator Needham as to charging for stores destroyed in Melbourne fire, 8423
- Senator Neild as to disagreement between Postmaster-General and Treasurer, 7925
- Senator Neild as to speech by Postmaster-General regarding Maitland miners, 8103, 8229, 8309, 8507, 8672

House of Representatives:

- Assistant Secretary, *supply*, 10225, 10233-4-5-6, 10251
- Balance Sheet, *supply*, 10139-40, 10186
- Centralization, *address*, 167; *Budget*, 2663; *supply*, 10143, 10146, 10149, 10154, 10226, 10239
- Commissioners, Departmental management by, *m.s.o.*, 11649-52
- Correspondence, delay in answering, *adj.*, 3360; *supply*, 10247
- Deputy Postmaster-General, Victoria, *supply*, 4847, 4849, 4850, 4853, 4854, 4858, 4865, 5791, 11299
- Deputy Postmasters-General, *supply*, 10143-5, 10238, 10420
- Efficiency of Administration, *address*, 458; *supply*, 3456-61, 3509-55, 8820-61, 10136-77, 10181-10250, 10406-61, 11267-11300, 11391-11403; *adj.*, 11466
- Facilities for inland centres, *supply*, 8840, 8852-3, 9967, 10162
- Inspectors, New South Wales, *supply*, 5792
- Inspectors' Districts, *supply*, 10243, 10245, 10249
- Newspaper attacks, *supply*, 10161
- Political Influence, *supply*, 10137-8, 10169
- Postmasters-General, *address*, 458; *Budget*, 2817; *supply*, 3323; *expl.*, 6812
- Report, Annual, *supply*, 4869, 5792
- Secretary Central Administration, *Budget*, 2818; *supply*, 10176, 10224, 10236, 10240, 10250
- Sydney Head Office, *supply*, 10241-2

Questions by—

- Mr. J. T. Brown as to Wangaratta train service, 11154
- Mr. Foster as to comments in *Review of Reviews*, 11522
- Mr. Kelly as to administration of Mr. Chapman, 1516
- Mr. Liddell as to speech by Mr. Mauger *re* Maitland coal miners, 8812; by Mr. Watkins, 8812
- Mr. Liddell as to Secretary of Department, 10609
- Mr. Livingston as to centralizing telephone administration, 7296
- Mr. Page as to administration by Commissioners, 11385; by Mr. Henry Willis, 11524
- Mr. Palmer as to curtailment of country facilities, 9100
- Mr. Reid as to speech by Mr. Mauger *re* children of East Sydney, 8818
- Mr. B. Smith as to provision of adequate funds, 12154-5
- Mr. O'Malley as to whether Acting Prime Minister had lectured the Postmaster-General, 1056

POSTMASTER-GENERAL—continued.

Administration—continued.

Questions by—

- Mr. D. Thomson as to opinions on policy by Secretary of Department, 9092
- Mr. Thomas as to whether Mr. Chapman intended to resign portfolio of, in favour of Mr. Mauger, 158
- Mr. Webster as to reports on Sydney administration, 988
- Mr. Webster as to complaints *re* administration, 8936
- Mr. Webster as to lack of funds, 8936, 8938
- Mr. H. Willis as to delay in answering letters to Department, 7300

[See COMMITTEE OR COMMISSION OF INQUIRY.]

ADVERTISEMENTS, NEWSPAPER.

House of Representatives:

Question by—

- Mr. Salmon as to objectionable, 3269

CABLES.

Senate:

- Eastern Extension Company, *supply*, 1952, 1954, 70389
- Tasmanian Cable, *supply*, 1840, 1951, 1952, 3804, 4049, 6321; *q.*, 4470
- Questions by Senator Pearce as to Tasmanian Cable, 1565, 1815; Senator Dobson, 2179, 2406, 5559, 7623; Senator Macfarlane, 11467

House of Representatives:

- Eastern Extension Company, *supply*, 12181-6
- Tasmanian line, *Budget*, 1635, 2604; *supply*, 12180-6, 12188, 12190

Questions by—

- Mr. Batchelor as to messages sent "*via* Eastern," 12153
- Mr. Carr as to Eastern Extension Company, 10788, 10967, 11921
- Mr. Fairbairn as to use of cable codes, 9842
- Mr. Knox as to press messages, 12153
- Mr. Knox as to cable code, 12154
- Mr. Mahon as to Pacific Cable, 4086; Mr. Joseph Cook, 12153
- Mr. O'Malley as to Tasmanian Cable, 6811, 8929; Mr. Storrer, 11526; Mr. Batchelor, 11707; Sir John Forrest, 11707, 12153
- Mr. O'Malley as to cable route, *id* King Island, 10963

[See TELEGRAPHY, WIRELESS.]

CLOCKS, POST OFFICE:

House of Representatives:

- Provision for, *supply*, 3527

POSTMASTER-GENERAL—*continued.*

COMMITTEE OR COMMISSION OF INQUIRY.

Senate:

Appointment of, *supply*, 8901, 8905, 8918, 8920, 9001-6; *adj.*, 9521-36
Cabinet Committee, *supply*, 10267

Questions by—

Senator Chataway as to request of Post and Telegraph Associations for appointment of a Parliamentary Committee of Inquiry, 7704

Senator Sayers as to appointment of Royal Commission, 9136, 9632; Senator Millen, 9137, 9632, 9735; Senator Vardon, 11580

Senator Sayers as to inquiries of Cabinet Committee in Queensland, 11220

House of Representatives:

Appointment of, *adj.*, 7457; *m.* and *p.o.*, 8817; *supply*, 8861, 10401-10461, 10464-82, 11286, 11298

Cabinet Committee, *supply*, 10146, 10150, 10155-6, 10181-4, 10199, 10203, 10240, 10244, 10245, 10247, 10401-61, 10464-82, 11297; *adj.*, 11466

Cabinet Committee's Report, *m.s.o.*, 11637-670

Questions by—

Mr. Johnson as to notice of motion, 8817; Mr. Willis, 8817

Mr. Webster as to appointment of Select Committee, 7458, 7459; as to Cabinet Committee, 9477, 9764; as to need of more searching inquiry, 10879; Sir John Quick, 9477; Mr. Joseph Cook, 9843; Mr. Crouch, 9844; Mr. Henry Willis, 10078, 11096; Mr. Reid, 10177

Sir John Forrest as to Cabinet Committee's Report, 11524; by Mr. Hutchison, 11525

Mr. J. H. Catts as to Royal Commission, 12042; Mr. Joseph Cook, 12152

COMPENSATION.

Senate:

Question by Senator Neild as to payment of, 10919

House of Representatives:

Fireman Swanwick, compensation to relatives of, *supply*, 11401

Loss *re* undelivered telegram, *supply*, 10157

Payment of, *supply*, 4852, 10153

Questions by—

Mr. Webster as to compensation to Mrs. Clarke, 3423, 7463, 8938

Mr. Webster as to Mrs. M. H. J. McDonnell, 3623

[*See OFFICERS COMPENSATION BILL*, under "BILLS."]

POSTMASTER-GENERAL—*continued.*

CONTRACTS.

Senate:

Tenders for material "duty paid," *supply*, 9006

Tenders for supply of cables, *supply*, 8924

Questions by—

Senator Mulcahy as to contract for supply of wire, 8868

Senator Pearce as to clothing contract, 7542, 7571

House of Representatives:

"Sweating," *supply*, 4852

Tenders for services, *supply*, 10175-6, 11391, 11399

Questions by—

Mr. Thomas Brown as to payment to contractors, 6025

Mr. Livingston as to Tender Board, South Australia, 6728

Mr. Sinclair as to tenders for insulators, 11181

ELECTIONS.

Senate:

Nomination Paper, delayed, *supply*, 10392, 10398

Question by Senator Givens as to delayed nomination paper at Bowen, 9735

House of Representatives:

Motion for a report from postal officers acting as returning officers, proposed, amended, and withdrawn, 698-718

Stamping of postal votes, *supply*, 2898, 2901, 2902, 2903

Questions by—

Mr. Bamford as to non-delivery of a nomination paper by officials at Bowen, 9193

Mr. McDonald as to stamping postal votes, 1866

EXPENDITURE.

Senate:

Allocation of, *supply*, 1953

Balance-sheet, need for, *supply*, 8902

Details of, *supply*, 3803, 3814

Estimates of, *supply*, 3799, 3912

Increase of, *supply*, 8900, 10264-6

Questions by—

Senator Millen as to reduction of Estimates, 7795; Senator Chataway, 7976

House of Representatives:

Estimates, reduction of, *expl.*, 11625, 11704-7

Increase of, *Budget*, 1634-6, 2460, 2503, 2695, 2973, 3118; *supply*, 9963, 9985, 10141, 10184-8, 10190-1, 11266, 11270, 11274, 11288, 11397

Revenue producing character of, *m.*, 7504

South Australian expenditure, *supply*, 11393

Treasurer's advance expenditure from, *supply*, 8821

Works, New, Expenditure on, *obs.*, 7502-3

POSTMASTER-GENERAL—continued.

EXPENDITURE—continued.

Questions by—

Sir John Forrest as to reduction of Estimates, 11524-5, 11625; by Mr. Glynn, 11626

Mr. Irvine as to increase of, 12151

HOURS OF WORK AND HOLIDAYS.

Senate:

Closing time of offices, *supply*, 6326
Complaints of officers, *supply*, 1845
Letter carriers and clearers, hours of, *supply*, 1845, 1855
Night work, *supply*, 1855
Telegraphists, hours of work, *supply*, 1845, 10391

Questions by—

Senator Chataway as to office hours, Toowoomba, 5082
Senator Findley as to Sunday work of telegraphists, 8864
Senator Neild as to night staff, Sydney, 3798; as to early closing of offices, 5979, 6409; Senator Walker, 6409
Senator Pearce as to overtime of telegraphists, 7754, 7791; Senator Guthrie, 7792; Senator Symon, 7792; Senator Stewart, 9536
Senator Pearce as to hours of duty of country postmasters, 11219
Senator W. Russell as to office hours at Gawler, 5082, 7569

House of Representatives:

Accumulation of overtime, *Budget*, 2271, 2817, 3292; *supply*, 4864; *m.*, 7504
Closing time of offices, *supply*, 5703, 5705, 5706
Holiday concessions to inland officers, *supply*, 10153, 10175
Hours worked, *supply*, 10166
Overtime, Payment for, *supply*, 10411
Saint Patrick's Day holiday, *supply*, 10158
Sunday work, *supply*, 4859, 5792, 10248, 11392
Sweating in Cairns office, *supply*, 5694
Sweating in Sydney General Post Office, *Budget*, 2663; *adj.*, 6231; *supply*, 6283, 6324; *m.*, 7504, 7506

Questions by—

Mr. Bowden as to hours worked, by linemen of Mount Victoria district, 9299, 9479
Mr. Johnson as to broken shifts, Sydney office, 6896
Mr. Johnson as to payment for Sunday work, 10134, 11016; Mr. Thomas Brown, 11708, 12155
Mr. Maloney as to Saturday afternoon work at General Post Office, Melbourne, 8925
Mr. O'Malley as to sweating at Zeehan office, 7025
Mr. Page as to Deniliquin office, 2704; Mr. Chanter, 2795, 3733
Mr. Page as to hours of Queensland telegraphists, 9300, 9474

POSTMASTER-GENERAL—continued.

Hours of Work and Holidays—continued.

Questions by—

Mr. Storrer as to hours, &c., Launceston, 5328
Mr. Tudor as to overtime in Victoria, 2313; Mr. Maloney, 2688
Mr. Willis as to overtime in Sydney office, 2651; Mr. Johnson, 5416, 5692; Mr. Thomas Brown, 6421, 7117; Mr. J. H. Catts, 6814; Mr. Chanter, 10310
Mr. Wilks as to holidays on St. Patrick's Day, 9092
Mr. Webster as to overtime in New South Wales, 3853, 3854, 3973, 4640, 7417, 8937; Mr. Johnson, 7171
Mr. Webster as to extension of statutory day's work, 8937
[See POST AND TELEGRAPH OFFICES; LETTER CARRIERS AND CLEARERS; and MESSENGERS, TELEGRAPH.]

INCREMENTS:

House of Representatives:

Questions by—

Mr. J. H. Catts as to payment of before Christmas, 7464
Mr. Johnson as to increments of electrical and mechanical branch officers, 2794
Mr. O'Malley as to increments to telephone attendants, 10177

INSURANCE.

House of Representatives:

Question by Mr. Fowler as to insurance of property, 6824

LETTER AND PILLAR BOXES.

Senate:

Clearance times on, *supply*, 8912
Mitcham, *supply*, 3914
Sydney Railway Station, *supply*, 4046; *expl.*, 4143

House of Representatives:

Wanstead, *supply*, 10247
Question by Mr. Fuller as to letter-box at Wollongong, 12041-2

LETTER CARRIERS AND CLEARERS

Senate:

Boys, employment of, *supply*, 1844, 1846
Hours of Work, *supply*, 1845, 1855
Letter Carrier, Geraldton, *supply*, 7540
"Sweating," *supply*, 4852, 7549

Questions by—

Senator Findley as to employment of boys, 1470; Senator Stewart, 1232, 3233
Senator Stewart as to staff in Queensland, 1233, 1470; as to letter carriers acting as sorters, 10369, 11384

House of Representatives:

Boys, employment of, *supply*, 8834
Salaries, *supply*, 8851
Motion by Mr. Kelly for return as to letter carriers in Waverley Postal District, agreed to, 10757

POSTMASTER-GENERAL—*continued.*Letter Carriers and Clearers—*continued.*

Questions by—

- Mr. Batchelor as to South Australian letter carriers and drivers, 9846
 Mr. Fowler as to temporary letter carriers, Western Australia, 6676
 Mr. Hughes as to sweating, 3972
 Mr. Tudor as to employment of boys, 504, 1181, 1412; Mr. Webster, 3854

LETTERS, &c., COLLECTION AND DELIVERY.

Senate:

- Delays in delivery, *adj.*, 1055; *supply*, 7546; *m.*, 8156; *supply*, 8900, 8912, 10173
 Facilities at Moora, Western Australia, *adj.*, 4924
 Letter Boxes, *supply*, 4046
 Non-delivery of, *supply*, 11489

Questions by—

- Senator Neild as to delay in delivering Sydney letters, 10252
 Senator Stewart as to delay in delivery of newspapers, 7895, 7926

House of Representatives:

- Delays in delivery, 3360, 3362

Questions by—

- Mr. Batchelor as to clearance of letter-boxes by motor car, 9477, 10752;
 Mr. Hutchison, 9477, 9842
 Mr. Bowden as to late fee box, Sydney Central Railway Station, 10653, 10752
 Mr. Liddell as to delays, 2793; Sir John Forrest, 9843
 Sir John Quick as to loss of letters containing cheques and postal notes, 9475, 9766
 Mr. Storrer as to delivery of Tasmanian letters at Parliament House, 6673

[See "ELECTIONS," "MAILS," and "PROHIBITION OF CORRESPONDENCE."]

MAIL BAGS.

House of Representatives:

- Question by Mr. Mathews as to prison-made bags, 3509

MAIL CONTRACT, EUROPEAN.

Senate:

- Brisbane a port of call, *address*, 387
 Cancellation of contract, *address*, 12, 14, 41, 53, 61, 282, 373, 387, 394, 400, 480; *m.*, 3171
 Contract with Orient Company, *obs.*, 5978; *m.*, 6191-6217; *m.*, 6089-92; *adj.*, 6093; *supply*, 11489
 Cool storage, *address*, 480
 Guarantee, Forfeiture of, *supply*, 1951, 8923
 Tenders, *address*, 481
 Union labour, employment of, *m.*, 4497

Questions by—

- Senator Chataway as to making Brisbane a port of call, 5560, 5978; Senator Stewart, 5746, 6060
 Senator Clemons as to names of tenderers, 6294

POSTMASTER-GENERAL—*continued.*Mail Contract, European—*continued.*

Questions by—

- Senator Millen as to new contract, 5560, 5746, 6060; Senator Dobson, 5746; Senator Colonel Neild, 5858, 7542; Senator Needham, 7652
 Senator Neild as to tenders, 4363, 4462; Senator Guthrie, 4363, 4462; Sir Josiah Symon, 4363
 Senator Turley as to Orient Company's 1906 tender, 6294, 6410
 Senator Turley as to late deliveries by Orient Company, 6297, 6408
 Senator Walker as to forfeiture of guarantee, 249, 649, 3558; Senator Millen, 249; Senator Neild, 249, 1131, 4462, 4706, 4895, 7542, 8230, 8672; Senator Guthrie, 249, 4462; Senator Macfarlane, 931, 2513, 2743, 7926; Senator Symon, 4363; Senator Mulcahy, 8672, 8868; Senator St. Ledger, 11220

House of Representatives:

- "All Red" Route, *address*, 93
 Brisbane, Port of Call, *address*, 238, 348; *adj.*, 245, 246; *adj.*, 6504; *supply*, 10249
 Guarantee, Forfeiture of, *supply*, 1785, 1869; *Budget*, 2662; *supply*, 2894, 2900, 2903
 Cancellation of Contract, *address*, 26, 88, 118, 196, 211, 225, 322, 346, 348; *Budget*, 1634, 2818
 Cool Storage on Steamers, *adj.*, 243, 245, 246; *address*, 349; *adj.*, 591-606; *Budget*, 1634
 Contract with Orient Company, *m.*, 6118-28, 6389-6401, 6422-6438, 6440-6503; *amdt.*, *re* Commonwealth ownership of fleet, 6389, 6422-6438, 6440-6498; *re* reduction of period from ten years to seven, 6499; *re* inclusion of provisions as to freight for frozen meat and fruit, 6501; *re* docking of ships in Australia, 6502; *re* omission of proviso as to vessels calling at Hobart, 6502; *re* payment of extra subsidy by Queensland, 6502; that the motion be agreed to, 6503
 Poundage system, *supply*, 8841
 Tenders, *adj.*, 192; *address*, 226, 238, 346; *adj.*, 243, 245; *m.*, 2572
 Union labour, employment of, *m.*, 2572
 Questions by—
 Mr. Bowden as to new contract, 4415, 5690, 6096; Mr. Reid, 5908; Colonel Foxton, 6023; Mr. Hedges, 8817
 Mr. Edwards as to making Brisbane a port of call, 5416, 5521, 5690
 Mr. Frazer as to forfeiture of deposit, 79, 404, 881; Mr. Edwards, 193; Mr. Johnson, 352, 1517, 9388; Mr. Glynn, 352, 404; Mr. Bruce Smith, 404, 4623; Mr. O'Malley, 404; Mr. Joseph Cook, 404, 2651, 7027; Mr. Wilson, 881, 987; Mr. Frazer, 502, 1087, 2313; Mr. Wilks, 2890, 2964; Mr. Knox, 4086; Mr. Reid, 4279, 5783, 5908, 6098; Mr. Thomas, 7027, 10701, 10786; Mr. Fairbairn, 8816; Mr. Bamford, 9766; Mr. Bowden, 9842; Mr. Sampson, 12154

POSTMASTER-GENERAL—continued.

Mail Contract, European—continued.

Questions by—

- Mr. Hughes as to labour conditions, 4623
 Mr. Hughes as to speed of vessels, 5497
 Mr. Johnson as to penalties under new contract, 80
 Mr. Johnson as to white labour condition in tenders, 297
 Mr. Knox as to speed of vessels, 6354
 Mr. Knox as to interim service, 6728
 Mr. Mahon as to contract between Imperial Government and P. and O. Company, 3973
 Mr. Mahon as to day and port of departure, 6129
 Mr. Mahon as to revenue from service, 6229
 Mr. O'Malley as to shipping ring and mail contract, 10785
 Mr. Poynton as to freights, 6132;
 Sir John Forrest, 6728
 Sir John Quick as to coal storage on steamers, 297, 408, 588; Mr. Wynne, 589; Mr. Page, 590; Mr. Knox, 590
 Mr. Reid as to tenders received, 4309, 4519, 4957; Colonel Foxton, 5237
 Mr. Sinclair as to payment of contractors, 5520
 Mr. Thomas as to States imports and Federal steamers, 988
 Mr. Thomas as to calling for tenders, 80; Mr. Joseph Cook, 589; Mr. Wynne, 589
 Mr. Thomas as to Commonwealth line of steamers, 5801; as to visit of Attorney-General to England in connexion with action for recovery of guarantee on cancelled mail contract, 10786
 Mr. D. Thomson as to tenders and deposits, 4623
 Mr. D. Thomson as to contract time, 6229
 Mr. Wilks as to docking of steamers, 193, 5520
 [See MAIL STEAMERS.]

MAILS.

Senate:

- Expenditure on, *supply*, 1954
 North West Coast, *supply*, 10396, 10398
 Railway Departments, payments to, *supply*, 8902
 Special trains, payment for, *adj.*, 766, 768
 Vancouver service, *supply*, 1858

Questions by—

- Senator Clemons as to Tasmanian mail contract, 745, 2845, 2941
 Senator Macfarlane as to delay of Tasmanian mails, 131, 157, 745, 2031, 11301, 11473; Senator Clemons, 745, 1815, 1929, 11301, 11473; Senator Findley, 745
 Senator Needham as to use of motor cars, 4471, 8423
 Senator Sayers as to Queensland mails, 2031, 11987

POSTMASTER-GENERAL—continued.

Mails—continued.

Questions by—

- Senator Stewart as to carting at Brisbane, 1688
 Senator Vardon as to mails on west coast of South Australia, 9632

House of Representatives:

- "All Red" route, *address*, 93
 Carriage of, Molong, *supply*, 9966
 Contract, *supply*, 11391, 11399
 Country services, extension of, *m.*, 7507-8;
supply, 8852-3, 10228, 11398
 Cost of services, *supply*, 10198, 11397
 Deakin shire services, *supply*, 11398
 Delivery after 6 p.m., *supply*, 5704, 5706
 Magnet service, *supply*, 11299
 Spencer's Gulf service, *supply*, 8854, 10229
 Tasmanian Mails: Coal Strike, *adj.*, 6504, 6523

Questions by—

- Mr. Archer as to mail steamer *Bingera*, 10463
 Mr. Bamford as to risk of destruction of mails by fire on railway trains, 11158
 Mr. Batchelor as to use of motor cars, 4086, 10752, 11526, 11791
 Mr. Thomas Brown as to Trundle service, 4411
 Mr. Chanter as to railway charges, 4200
 Mr. Mahon as to Casino-Grafton service, 407
 Mr. Mahon as to North-West Coast service, 2690, 10784
 Mr. Mahon as to Pilbarra and Port Hedland service, 2123
 Mr. Mahon as to employment of Asiatics, 9844
 Mr. McWilliams as to delay of Tasmanian mails, 1973
 Mr. O'Malley as to Tasmanian mails, 2998, 7249, 10134, 10463; Mr. McWilliams, 11419; Sir Philip Fysh, 11791; Mr. Atkinson, 11917
 Mr. Sinclair as to payment of contractors, 2313
 Mr. Storrer as to Tasmanian winter service, 10874
 Mr. John Thomson as to short country services, 1595

[See MAIL CONTRACT, EUROPEAN; also "PACIFIC ISLANDS," "NEW HEBRIDES," and "PAPUA," under EXTERNAL AFFAIRS.]

MAIL STEAMERS.

Senate:

- Commonwealth Ownership, *address*, 283, 395; *m.*, 681, 2211, 3838
 Contract time, fines, *supply*, 11621

Questions by—

- Senator de Largie as to vessels suitable for mail and defence purposes, 2179
 Senator Macfarlane as to winter running of Tasmanian mail steamers, 11301, 11473; Senator Clemons, 11301, 11473

POSTMASTER-GENERAL—*continued.*Mail Steamers—*continued.**House of Representatives:*Docking of, *adj.*, 192

Questions by—

Mr. Crouch as to reduced services to

Tasmania and New Zealand, 6131

Mr. Storrer, 6131; Mr. O'Malley, 6131

Mr. Crouch as to payments to Japanese

mail steamer, 9585

Mr. Thomas as to Commonwealth

ownership of, 773, 1181, 5801; Mr.

O'Malley, 1089, 11916

Mr. Wilks as to docking of, 5520

[See MAIL CONTRACT, EUROPEAN.]

MESSENGERS, TELEGRAPH.

*Senate:*Examinations and appointments, *mw.*,
8555Question by Senator Stewart as to mes-
senger at Cairns, 4363*House of Representatives:*Shortage of, *supply*, 5697Terms of Employment, *Budget*, 2604

Questions by—

Mr. Thomas Brown as to retiring age,
883Mr. Tudor as to delivery of letters by,
504, 1181, 1412Mr. Tudor as to late hours at Parlia-
ment House, 6812

[See HOURS OF WORK AND HOLIDAYS.]

METEOROLOGICAL OBSERVATIONS.

*Senate:*Question by Senator Chataway as to
posting of weather reports in Parlia-
ment House, 247*House of Representatives:*Warning light, Sydney General Post
Office, in connexion with, *supply*, 2895,
2904, 9880Question by Mr. Wilks, as to warning light
at Sydney General Post Office, 2890[See HOME AFFAIRS, "METEOROLOGICAL
BUREAU."]

MONEY ORDERS, ETC.

*Senate:*Interest on advance, *supply*, 11620Telegraphic, *supply*, 4154Question by Senator Guthrie as to tele-
graphic orders, 5979*House of Representatives:*Sydney office, *supply*, 10414Interest on advance, *supply*, 11391

Questions by—

Sir John Forrest as to postal orders
and postal notes, 11917

Mr. O'Malley as to Linda office, 6416

Mr. Storrer as to telegraphic money
orders, Mangana, 3173POSTMASTER-GENERAL—*continued.*

OFFICERS.

*Senate:*Associations, *supply*, 8905Civic Positions, occupancy of, by officers,
adj., 8418; *supply*, 10390Defalcations, *supply*, 11620Furlough, *supply*, 10390Increase of officers, *supply*, 8905, 8909Inquiries addressed to Senators, *supply*,
1851, 1860, 1864Grievances of, *supply*, 8906Living allowances, *supply*, 10391Offences committed by, *supply*, 10389Promotions, *obs.*, 7848Sorters, Queensland, *supply*, 1848, 1861

"Sweating" in Sydney General Post

Office, *supply*, 6308, 6324Telegraphists, appointments and pro-
motions, *supply*, 8908-9

Questions by—

Senator Chataway as to sustenance
allowances, 8483Senator Chataway as to Committee of
Inquiry into grievances, 7704Senator Clemons as to Mrs. Murray,
postmistress, Springfield, 6407Senator Dobson as to classification of
officers in Tasmanian Postal Service,
8698Senator Findley as to Sunday work of
telegraphists, 8864, 8865; Senator
Pearce, 8865Senator Gray as to charges against
officers, 6296Senator Henderson as to Cue post-
master, 6296Senator Lynch as to supply of medicine
chests to isolated officers, 9536Senator Mulcahy as to promotion of
Mr. E. A. Blakney, 8364, 8867;
Senator Dobson, 8365, 9742Senator Pearce as to overtime of tele-
graphists, 7754, 7791; Senator Guthrie,
7792; Senator Symon, 7792Senator Pearce as to compulsory retire-
ment of officer from local governing
body, 7926, 7977, 8554, 9139Senator Pearce as to return *re* num-
ber of telegraphists, 8422, 8864Senator Pearce as to salaries of assis-
tant telegraphists, 8979Senator St. Ledger as to inquiry *re*
suspension of an officer, 6296Senator St. Ledger as to actions brought
by officers, 6296Senator Stewart as to shortage of tele-
graph officers and overtime, 9891Senator Stewart as to employment of
lads as sorters, 11471Senator Stewart as to letter carriers
acting as sorters, 10369, 11384*House of Representatives:*Appointments, *supply*, 9567, 10148Associations, *supply*, 4864, 8860Blakney, Mr. E. A., promotion of, *sup-*
ply, 10154Civic Positions, occupancy of, by officers,
supply, 10152, 10174Classification of telegraphists, *supply*,
11394Daysdale Postmistress, *obs.*, 2348

POSTMASTER-GENERAL—continued.

Officials—continued.

Employment of additional hands, *supply*, 5703; *expl.*, 5910; *supply*, 9967
Fidelity guarantees, *supply*, 10412-5
Furlough, *supply*, 10413
Grievances of, *Budget*, 3292; *supply*, 8822
Horse allowance, *supply*, 11284
Increase of, *supply*, 8821, 8831, 8834; *supply*, 10142, 10192, 10200, 10236, 11295
Living Allowances, *supply*, 9781, 10151-2, 10228, 11282, 11392
Military Training, leave for, *supply*, 10158
Number and remuneration of, *m.*, 9954
Postmasters, overwork, *supply*, 5607
Postmasters, salaries, *supply*, 5700, 11394
Promotions, *supply*, 10165, 10170, 10232, 10236, 11271
Quarters, Postmasters, *supply*, 3518
Relieving Staff, *supply*, 10415
Retiring Age, *supply*, 10176, 10224, 10227, 10241, 10246, 10248, 11299
Retiring Allowance, *supply*, 4860, 4863, 4864, 10163
Rewards for suggestions, *Budget*, 3293
Salaries, *supply*, 5700, 8822, 8838, 8851, 10165, 11394; *obs.*, 8934
Sorters, *supply*, 4864
"Sweating," *supply*, 7549, 7552, 9967
Telephone attendants, examination of, *Budget*, 2936; *supply*, 3549
Temporary employes, *Budget*, 2817; *supply*, 4866; *m.*, 7504, 9954; *supply*, 8834, 8838-40, 9968, 10142, 10160, 10193, 10201, 10409, 10417, 11391, 11396, 11400, 11402
Transfers, *supply*, 4870, 5791, 5796

Questions by—

Mr. Archer as to retirement of an officer, 8813
Mr. Bamford as to promotions, 5240; Mr. Thomas Brown, 4684, 5804
Mr. Bamford as to living allowance, North Queensland, 9009
Mr. Batchelor as to classification of South Australian postmasters, 2566, 2890
Mr. Bamford as to non-delivery of electoral nomination paper by officers at Bowen, 9193
Mr. Bowden as to rewarding officials regarding fire at Murwillumbah, 3420
Mr. Bowden as to appointment of sixth inspector for New South Wales, 9193
Mr. Bowden as to postmasters at semi-official offices, 9193
Mr. T. Brown as to suspension of Mr. Bruce Hart, 2793; as to promotions of telegraphists, 5804
Mr. J. H. Catts as to examination of sorters, 11526, 11708
Mr. J. Cook as to leave for officials who are military officers, 9481, 10079, 10131; Mr. Page, 10079
Mr. Coon as to instrument fitters, 11158, 11182
Mr. Crouch as to furlough, 9479
Mr. Fairbairn as to dismissed line repairers, 12152; Mr. Kelly, 12152

POSTMASTER-GENERAL—continued.

Officials—continued.

Questions by—

Colonel Foxton as to allowances to Railway Station-masters, Queensland, 9954, 10136
Mr. Hutchison as to recognition of officials of associations, 8925, 9953
Mr. Hutchison as to examinations, 12151; Mr. Tudor, 12152
Mr. Johnson as to type-writing machines for telegraphists, 5520, 5911
Mr. Liddell as to employment of additional hands, 5803
Mr. Mahon as to postmaster, Cue, 6406
Mr. Maloney as to advertisement for telegraphist at country contract office, 9192; as to register of applicants for employment, 10081
Mr. McDougall as to number and ages of officers, 5130, 5692
Mr. McWilliams as to promotion of Mr. Blakney, Post Office, Hobart, 8818; Mr. Storrer, 9476
Mr. O'Malley as to staff, hours, and climatic allowance, Zeehan office, 7025
Mr. O'Malley as to promotions, Tasmania, 7028
Mr. O'Malley as to telephone attendants, 10177
Mr. Page as to working hours, grade, and duties of Queensland telegraphists, 9300, 9474
Mr. Poynton as to position of transferred officers, 10653, 11919
Mr. Storrer as to hours and wages of officers at Launceston, 5328
Mr. D. Thomson as to views of Secretary of Department on new appointments, 9092
Mr. J. Thomson as to classification of officers, 10875; Mr. Henry Willis, 11260; Mr. Palmer, 11708
Mr. Tudor as to promotions, 4842
Mr. Webster as to amendment of Public Service Act, 3854
Mr. Webster as to additional officers in New South Wales, 4649, 8937; Mr. Johnson, 4842; Mr. J. H. Catts, 6968, 7117, 10080, 10135
Mr. Webster as to temporary employes, 6814, 8936, 8937, 9474; Mr. J. H. Catts, 6968, 7117, 11181
Mr. Webster as to "sweating," 8936
Mr. Willis as charwoman, Melbourne General Post Office, 2235
[See LETTER CARRIERS AND MESSENGERS, TELEGRAPH; also PUBLIC SERVICE under "HOME AFFAIRS."]

PARCELS, POST.

House of Representatives:

Sydney Mails and Parcels Branch, *supply*, 8843, 10413-4

Questions by—

Mr. Storrer as to Melbourne and Sydney parcels offices, 7027
Mr. Tudor as to delivery of parcels by contractors, 11424, 11628, 11794

POSTMASTER-GENERAL—*continued.*

POSTAGE, PENNY.

Senate:

Proposals of Government, *address*, 290
Question by Senator St. Ledger as to
effect on revenue, 1233

House of Representatives:

Proposals of Government, *address*, 224;
Budget, 2270, 2973; *obs.*, 8934; *supply*,
10173
Revenue estimate, *Budget*, 1633
Question by Mr. W. H. Irvine as to pro-
vision for, 12151

POSTAL RATES.

Senate:

Newspaper rates, *supply*, 8913
Questions by—
Senator Findley as to postage of
Economist newspaper, 1688
Senator Stewart as to Postal Rates
Bill, 4036

House of Representatives:

Packet Rates, *supply*, 5695, 5704
Radius for Penny Rates, New South
Wales, *supply*, 10247, 10249
Surcharges, *supply*, 10174
Questions by—
Mr. Batchelor as to South Australian
Rates, 882; Mr. Hutchison, 882
Mr. Crouch as to Victorian Inland
Rates, 882
Mr. Hutchison as to newspaper postage,
Elder's Weekly Review, 7026
Mr. Sinclair as to Postal Rates Bill,
10524

POST AND TELEGRAPH OFFICES.

Senate:

Brisbane, *supply*, 4048
Closing time of offices, *supply*, 6326
Contract Offices, *supply*, 8912
Extension of, *supply*, 3914
Port Pirie, *supply*, 4048
Sites for, *supply*, 4047-8
Sydney office, Insufficiency of staff, *sup-
ply*, 6308, 6324
Undermanning of, *supply*, 139, 1844, 1847,
1853, 1861, 6336, 7547, 7552, 8904

Questions by—

Senator Clemons as to Launceston
office, 7848, 8029, 9735, 10003
Senator Findley as to boy labour at
Shepparton, 1470
Senator Findley as to East Brighton
office, 8616, 8697
Senator Guthrie as to facilities at
Port Pirie, 29, 132, 5176; Senator
O'Loughlin, 744; Senator McGregor,
8700
Senator Henderson as to Cue office,
6296
Senator McGregor as to extension at
outer Harbor, Port Adelaide, 7976
Senator McGregor as to semi-official
office, at Moonta Mines, 8154, 8286
Senator Needham as to Moora office,
5178

POSTMASTER-GENERAL—*continued.*Post and Telegraph Offices—*continued.*

Questions by—

Senator Neild as to early closing of
offices, 5979, 6409; Senator Walker,
6409
Senator Story as to Stockwell office,
10252
Senator W. Russell as to office hours
at Gawler, 5082, 7569
Senator Stewart as to re-organization of
Brisbane office, 4705

House of Representatives:

Allowance offices, *supply*, 4866, 8851,
10163, 10175, 10230, 11393
Alstonville office, *supply*, 3522
Balmain office, *supply*, 3525
Bellingen office, *supply*, 3517, 3522, 3524
Bondi office, *supply*, 3514, 3522
Brisbane office, *supply*, 3531
Broken Hill office, *supply*, 5792
Brunswick office, *adj.*, 3230, *supply*, 3529
Bungallow office, *supply*, 3522
Cairns office, "sweating," *supply*, 5693,
5704
Canbelego office, *supply*, 3522
City Road, Melbourne, office, *supply*,
3528
Cloncurry office, *supply*, 3424, 3532
Closing time of, *supply*, 5703, 5705, 5706
Cobar office, *adj.*, 4645-6
Coff's Harbor office, *supply*, 3517, 3522,
3524
Contract offices, *supply*, 3529, 4859, 10167,
10171, 10413, 11393, 11396
Culcairn office, *supply*, 3522
Dalby office, *supply*, 3531
East Melbourne office, *supply*, 3528
Expenditure on, *supply*, 3331, 3336, 3514,
3517, 3522, 3523, 3524
Gatton office, *supply*, 3532
Gunning office, 3523
Hawthorn office, *supply*, 3527, 3529
Katoomba office, *supply*, 3514, 3522, 3525
Kurri-Kurri office, *supply*, 3520, 3524
Launceston office, *adj.*, 2345, 2346; *Bud-
get*, 2603; *supply*, 3539, 3540
Lithgow office, *address*, 168; *supply*,
3514, 3523, 3524
Melbourne office, extensions, *supply*, 3527-
3528, 3530; *m.*, 7503
Northam office, *supply*, 3533, 3534, 3535,
3536, 3537
Revenue and expenditure of offices,
supply, 10243, 10248
Rock, The, office, *supply*, 3522
Roma office, *supply*, 3532
South Melbourne office, *supply*, 10231
Staff offices, *supply*, 4867
St. Peter's, Sydney, office, *supply*, 3517
Sydney office, management of, *supply*,
11283
Sydney office, Building extensions, *sup-
ply*, 3513, 3516, 3519, 3521, 3522
Sydney office, Insufficiency of Staff, 2271,
3292; *supply*, 4855, 4856
Toowoomba office, *supply*, 3532
Undermanning of, *Budget*, 3292; *adj.*,
3162, 3363; *supply*, 4849, 4855, 4859,
4869, 5792, 10160
West Maitland office, *supply*, 10244
Wrightville, *supply*, 4860

POSTMASTER-GENERAL—continued.

Post and Telegraph Offices—continued.

Questions by—

- Mr. Chanter as to returns from offices, 12153
- Mr. Fuller as to "sweating" in country offices in New South Wales, 5329
- Mr. Livingston as to Port Elliott office, 1089; Mr. Tudor as to Shepparton office, 1412; Mr. Frazer as to new Western Australian offices, 1595; Mr. McDonald as to Queensland offices, 1595; Mr. McDougall as to Hamilton office, 3423, 3974; Mr. Liddell as to Brunswick office, 2996; Mr. Storrer as to Mangana office, 3173; Mr. Livingston as to Penola office, 3175, 6505; Mr. Chanter as to Deniliquin office, 3733; Mr. Batchelor as to Unley office, 5497; Mr. Crouch as to Bacchus Marsh office, 5601, 5911; Mr. Bowden as to Lithgow office, 6099, 12153; Mr. Chanter as to Narrandara office, 6405; Mr. Mahon as to Cue office, 6406; Mr. Chanter as to Junee office, 6406; Mr. Knox as to Glenferrie office, 7296; Mr. Webster as to staff of Morree office, 8936; Mr. Poynton as to Port Pirie office, 8938, 9299, 10574; Mr. Livingston, 11791, 11917, 12042; Sir John Forrest as to Northam office, 9581, 9765; Mr. Hutchison as to Goodwood office, 11260; Mr. Bowden as to Katoomba office, 12153
- Mr. Maloney as to advertisement for telegraphists at country contract office, 9192
- Mr. Palmer as to classification of offices, 10178
- Mr. Storrer as to parcels post offices, Melbourne and Sydney, 7027
- Mr. Tudor as to undermanning of offices, 4519, 4843; Mr. Webster, 4640; Mr. Johnson, 4842; Mr. Chanter, 5692
- Mr. Webster as to "sweating" at Sydney office, 3422; Mr. Johnson, 5416

PROHIBITION OF CORRESPONDENCE

Senate:

Questions by—

- Senator McGregor as to case of Messrs. Freeman and Wallace, 7567, 8076, 8221, 8286
- Senator Mulcahy *re* "Tattersalls," 8364

House of Representatives:

- Freeman and Wallace, case of, *m.*, 10126-7; *adj.*, 10129, 10204-23, 10235; *supply*, *m.*, 11330-11357; *exp.*, 11913; *m.*, 12044; *supply*, 12190
- Medical correspondence prohibited, *adj.*, 2613
- Questions by—
- Mr. Thomas Brown as to correspondence *re* the "Electricon," 10787
- Mr. Chanter as to case of Messrs. Freeman and Wallace, 10079, 10132, 10134, 11626, 11704, 12043; Mr. Frazer, 10133

POSTMASTER-GENERAL—continued.

Prohibition of Correspondence—continued.

Questions by—

- Mr. Chanter as to correspondence prohibited, 12043
- Mr. Glynn as to prohibition of correspondence, 4958; Mr. Johnson, 17511
- Mr. Crouch, 5691; Mr. Thomas Brown, 5782, 6025, 6422
- Mr. Liddell as to lottery circulars, 10785

REVENUE.

House of Representatives:

- Balances, *supply*, 3548
- Estimate of, *Budget*, 1629, 1633, 2694-5
- Increase of, *Budget*, 2461, 2503, 2964; *supply*, 10141, 10191, 10195-7
- Returns from services, *m.*, 9954; *supply*, 10197
- Questions by—
- Mr. Mahon as to details, 297
- Mr. Mahon as to revenue from European mail service, 6229
- Mr. McDougall as to amount earned in Melbourne and suburbs, 4649
- Mr. Henry Willis as to decrease of revenue on Melbourne-Sydney telephone line, 6675

House of Representatives:

- Question by Mr. Bamford, as to establishment of Commonwealth Savings Banks, 407

SAVINGS BANKS.

House of Representatives:

- Question by Mr. Bamford as to establishment of Commonwealth Savings Banks, 407

STAMPS.

Senate:

- Purchase of, at Melbourne, *supply*, 4047
- Report, Board of Experts, *m.*, 5859; *supply*, 5874, 5877, 6353
- Questions by—
- Senator Neild as to printing of, 7565
- Senator W. Russell as to sale of, at Gawler, 5082, 7569
- Senator Stewart as to design for, 5083; Senator Needham, 5648

House of Representatives:

- Printing of, *supply*, 8860, 9970-74, 11395
- Sale of books of stamps, *supply*, 11403
- Uniform issue, *address*, 167; *supply*, 10243, 10249, 11400
- Questions by—
- Mr. Batchelor as to printing machine, 298, 314, 406; Mr. Poynton, 503
- Mr. Fowler as to International Reply Coupons, *supply*, 5908
- Mr. Frazer as to design, 4957; Mr. Crouch, 5908
- Mr. Hutchison as to designs for Commonwealth stamp, 8818
- Mr. Webster as to printing of, 6008
- Mr. Henry Willis as to uniform stamps, 6677

POSTMASTER-GENERAL—*continued.*

SUPERANNUATION FUND.

*House of Representatives:*Establishment of, *supply*, 10414

TELEGRAPH POLE DRESSERS, LINESMEN, ETC.

*Senate:*Pole dressers' wages, *adj.*, 3230-31; *supply*, 10393

Questions by—

Senator E. J. Russell as to wages of workmen on underground telegraph wires, 7927; of pole dressers, 8482, 8506, 8868

Senator Story as to wages of painters, 5647, 5857, 7703, 7795, 7842

*House of Representatives:*Pole dressers' wages, *adj.*, 3230, 3231; *supply*, 10250, 11398

TELEGRAPHS.

*Senate:*Cost of Telegrams, *supply*, 10266-7Cypher messages, *adj.*, 1685; *supply*, 1851, 1863Delayed message, *supply*, 8905, 8911Increase of facilities, *supply*, 9002Receipts for messages, *supply*, 1858

Questions by—

Senator Chataway as to telegraphic communication with Queensland, 9041, 9136

Senator Clemons as to charges, 2615, 2845

Senator Dobson as to adoption of, system of "delayed" telegrams, 7623, 7703; Senator Stewart, 7751, 7796; Senator Millen, 7752

Senator Guthrie as to Pinnaroo line, 1929

Senator Guthrie as to delayed messages, 11218, 11985, 11987

Senator Lynch as to Black Range extension, 2743

Senator Macfarlane as to marine station at Port Davey, 5178

Senator Millen as to cost of poles, 3363

Senator Pearce as to supply of copper wire, 11986

Senator Sayers as to cypher messages, 1330, 1927, 2029

Senator Stewart as to obsolete transmitters, 9536, 9892

Senator Stewart as to Sydney-Brisbane service, 4895, 9796

Senator Stewart as to delivery of a telegram, Brisbane, 10370

Senator Stewart as to telegraph message forms, 11471

Senator Sir Josiah Symon as to breakdown of service between Victoria and South Australia, 8555

POSTMASTER-GENERAL—*continued.*Telegraphs—*continued.**House of Representatives:*Delay in transmission of messages, *supply*, 8834, 8860, 9001, 10172-3Western Australia, coastal line, frequent breakdown of, *m.*, 7507-8

Questions by—

Mr. Archer as to delay in transmission of messages to Queensland, 8813, 8925

Mr. Batchelor as to messages abroad being telegraphed to mail steamers, 9389

Mr. Fisher as to restoration of communication with Queensland, 9089

Colonel Foxton as to cypher messages, 1868

Mr. Johnson as to delayed messages, 4748; Mr. Edwards, 4647; Mr. John Thomson, 5328; Mr. Thomas Brown, 6024; Mr. Fuller, 10874; Mr. Webster, 11625

Mr. Mahon as to North-west coast-line, 2121, 4412

Mr. McDougall as to importation of insulators, 2890

Mr. McDougall as to painting of poles, 9479, 11628

Mr. McDougall as to use of galvanized iron wire, 6025

Mr. O'Malley as to Waratah-Zeehan route, 5209

Mr. O'Malley as to errors in telegraph messages, 10874

Sir John Quick as to manufacture of insulators, 3853, 5911

Mr. Salmon as to telegraph forms, 11704

Mr. Sinclair as to congestion of work on Sydney-Brisbane line, 6677

Mr. Wilks as to frequent breakdown of Inter-State communication, 5209; Mr. Thomas Brown, 7117, 7250

Mr. Willis as to condemned telegraph wire, 10701

TELEGRAPHY, WIRELESS.

*Senate:*Althorpe Islands, *supply*, 4049Coastal Installations, *supply*, 6312, 6321Expenditure for, *supply*, 3804, 4049King Island, *supply*, 4050, 12137-40Papua, *supply*, 4049

Questions by—

Senator Needham as to coastal installations, 6189, 8701, 9537, 9796

Senator Pearce as to use of, for Tasmanian service, 1565, 1815, 11986-7;

Senator Clemons, 2031, 11383, 11468;

Senator Macfarlane, 11863, 11987;

Senator Mulcahy, 11864

*House of Representatives:*Cape York—Port Moresby installations, *supply*, 3554Flinders Island, *supply*, 3555Systems, competing, *supply*, 3555

POSTMASTER-GENERAL—continued.

Telegraphy, Wireless—continued.

Questions by—

- Mr. Bamford as to communication with Papua, 405, 11327; Mr. Bowden, 4311
- Mr. Fowler as to installation at Rottneest Island, 6505; Mr. Hedges, 12154
- Mr. O'Malley as to installation at King Island, 6505, 12154
- Mr. Knox as to stations in the Pacific, 12154
- Mr. Storrer as to costal stations, 3301
- Mr. Storrer as to Flinders Island installation, 11917, 12154
- Mr. Henry Willis as to New Zealand service, 11918

TELEPHONES.

Senate:

- Delays in construction, *supply*, 1857
- Delays in securing connexions, *supply*, 9003
- Extension of in Queensland, *supply*, 139
- Subscribers' names, lists of, *supply*, 11482
- Toll System, *supply*, 8901
- Questions by—
- Senator Chataway as to applications for, 650, 1470, 1566
- Senator Chataway as to Nanango Exchange, 11864
- Senator Givens as to Sydney-Melbourne line, 10829, 11219
- Senator Gray as to telephone connexion, Riverina, 9742, 9892
- Senator Guthrie as to "party" system, 29, 131, 247
- Senator Guthrie as to rates, 472
- Senator Neild on delays in securing connexions, 8506
- Senator Neild as to erection of wires on telegraph posts, 3900
- Senator O'Loughlin as to Millicent Exchange, 6296
- Senator Pearce as to supplementary telephone directories, 11865; Senator Mulcahy and Senator Findley, 11865

House of Representatives:

- Adelaide suburban exchange, *supply*, 11394
- Balmain Exchange, *supply*, 3530
- Bellingen, *supply*, 11393
- Black Range line, *supply* 10163
- Broken Hill Exchange, *supply*, 5792
- Burrowa service, *supply*, 11293
- Cabinets, *supply*, 4858
- Charges, *adj.*, 979-87; *supply*, 3456, 3458, 3459, 3460, 3461, 3510, 3511, 3515, 3516, 3540-42, 3549, 3553, 11396, 11402
- Coolgardie-Norseman line, *supply*, 11281
- Cost of construction, *supply*, 3544
- Country districts telephones, *supply*, 8852, 10161, 10163, 10244, 11285, 11396
- Dorrigo district telephone, *supply*, 11393
- Efficiency of service, *supply*, 3514, 8843
- Exchanges, *supply*, 3460, 3509, 3516, 3518, 3525, 3542, 3545
- Extension, *supply*, 3518, 3520; *m.*, 7502, 11204, 11402
- Guarantees, *supply*, 8853, 10150, 10161, 10230

POSTMASTER-GENERAL—continued.

Telephones—continued.

- Gunbower, *supply*, 10172
- Hawthorn exchange, *supply*, 3543
- Hotel telephones, *supply*, 3520
- Instruments, obsolete, *supply*, 11285
- Insulation, defective, *supply*, 11285
- Katoomba trunk line, *supply*, 6290, 11402
- Lithgow extension, *supply*, 6291
- Lostock, *supply*, 12187
- Maitland-Sydney line, *m.*, 2964; *supply*, 3551, 5798, 10245
- Melbourne-Geelong line, *supply*, 3554
- Metallic circuit, *supply*, 3551
- Miranda service, *supply*, 3519
- Molong service, *supply*, 9960, 11280
- Pinnacle, *supply*, 10244
- Plane Creek Central Mill telephone, *supply*, 12147
- Press, use of trunk lines, *supply*, 3541, 3545
- Receivers, disinfection of, *supply*, 3549
- Revenue from, *Budget*, 2604
- Rifle range telephones, *supply*, 3449
- Rockdale exchange, *supply*, 3518
- South Yarra exchange, *supply*, 3509
- Strathfieldsaye, Kamarooka, and Raywood extensions, *supply*, 8852
- Sydney-Melbourne line, *supply*, 3540, 3542, 3544, 3546, 3549, 3550, 3552, 3554, 8841, 8852, 10162, 11375-8
- Sydney-Orange line, *supply*, 3527
- Toll system, *supply*, 10142, 10162, 10242, 10249
- Trunk lines from Sydney, *m.*, 7503
- Underbank District, *supply*, 12187
- Underground wires, *m.*, 7503
- Uralla-Armidale service, *supply*, 10159
- Questions by—
- Mr. Batchelor as to Exchanges at Norwood and Unley, 1090, 5520
- Mr. Bowden as to ventilation of cabinets, 4309
- Mr. Bowden as to seating accommodation in cabinets, 7460
- Mr. Carr as to Bathurst Exchange, 1089
- Mr. J. H. Catts as to public bureaux, 11708
- Mr. J. Cook as to notice of discontinuance, 9954
- Mr. Crouch as to subscribers' numbers, 2234
- Mr. Crouch as to construction and relation between Department and Treasury, 9844
- Mr. Crouch as to Essendon-Keilor telephone line, 9954, 10135
- Mr. Crouch as to Barwon Heads exchange, 11626
- Sir John Forrest as to Directories, 4411; Mr. Bowden, 9299
- Mr. Fowler as to underground wires, 158, 978; Mr. Salmon, 10131, 10609
- Mr. Frazer as to extensions in Western Australia, 1595
- Mr. Frazer as to supplementary lists of subscribers, 11743; Mr. Kelly, Mr. Tudor, and Mr. McDonald, 11743-4
- Mr. Fuller as to Sydney-Wollongong trunk line, 7249, 8929
- Mr. Glynn as to guarantees, 4749

POSTMASTER-GENERAL—*continued.*

Telephones—*continued.*

Questions by—

- Mr. Hall as to Telephone Exchange at Young, 80
 Mr. Hall as to use of, for ascertaining election results, 1866
 Mr. Johnson as to bureaux, 10178
 Mr. Knox as to administrative branch, 5130
 Mr. Liddell, as to charges, 298, 2690;
 Mr. Tudor, 501, 590, 975, 2348, 6726;
 Mr. Bowden, 880; Mr. Batchelor, 880,
 978; Mr. Carr, 1089; Mr. J. Cook, 6726
 Mr. Liddell as to West Maitland-Sydney line, 2793, 4749, 5802
 Mr. Livingston as to connexions at Hog Bay, Mount Gambier, Narracoorte, Lucindale, Kangaroo Island, and Kingston, 1976, 3174, 6421
 Mr. Livingston as to management of telephone service, 7296
 Mr. Livingston as to supply of instruments, 7466
 Mr. McDonald as to Queensland facilities, 1595
 Mr. McDonald as to manufacture of wire and instruments, 3586
 Mr. McDougall as to Brimpaen-Horsham line, 10526
 Mr. McDougall as to Goroke-Minimay telephone, 11794
 Mr. Maloney as to subscribers' inquiries regarding mail steamers, 773, 928
 Mr. Maloney as to advertising in directories, 5911
 Mr. Maloney as to numerical directory, 1516, 3586; Mr. Liddell, 3586
 Mr. McWilliams as to service at Port Davey, 6505
 Mr. Poynton as to guarantees for country lines, 3588; Mr. Sinclair, 12042
 Mr. Salmon as to undergrounding of wires, 10131, 10609
 Mr. Sampson as to Kerang service, 10963
 Mr. Sinclair as to telephones in country towns, 10464
 Mr. D. Thomson as to metallic circuit, 6725
 Mr. Watkins as to improvement of service, 6726, 7169
 Mr. Watkins as to new switchboard in Newcastle district, 6726, 11521
 Mr. Webster as to country exchanges, 9300
 Mr. Willis as to new switchboard, Sydney, 5209
 Mr. Willis as to Sydney-Melbourne line, 6675, 6726; Mr. McDougall, 6896, 7417, 11794; Mr. Frazer, 11179
 Mr. Willis as to Sydney bureau, 11917
 Mr. Webster as to delay in answering call *re* fire. Melbourne, 6834
 [See WORKS AND BUILDINGS.]

POSTMASTER-GENERAL—*continued.*

UNIFORMS :

Senate :

Question by Senator Pearce as to contract for, 7542, 7571

House of Representatives :

Question by Mr. Batchelor as to use of Chinese helmets, 6593, 6675, Mr. Chanter, 6675

WORKS AND BUILDINGS.

Senate :

Repair of telegraph and telephone lines, *supply*, 11392

Store, Darling Island, *supply*, 3930

Store, South Melbourne, *supply*, 4047

Question by Senator Pearce as to land purchased at Eucla, 6296

House of Representatives :

Expenditure on, *Budget*, 2461, 2503; *supply*, 10186-8, 10194, 10199, 10202, 11404-8, 12192-5

Payment of contractors, *supply*, 5704

Question by Mr. Thomas Brown as to New South Wales works, 11054

RULINGS—

Senate :

President, The

Adjournment of Debate need not be moved after a senator has got leave to continue his speech on a subsequent day, 974

Adjournment of Senate cannot be moved under standing order to refute any statements made on a similar motion, but can be moved to bring forward any new facts or circumstances in connexion with the question raised by that motion, 2069-70, 2624

A motion for adjournment under Standing Order 60, or at the end of a sitting, cannot be regarded as a means of a tacking a senator for not having made use of his opportunities to deal with a matter, 2620.

Amendments.—Until it is determined whether or not certain words shall be left out of the original question with a view to insert other words, no other amendment can be submitted, 2446, 4732

A senator who has exhausted his right of speech cannot move an amendment subsequently, 2446, 4732, 7848, 11584

While an amendment to leave out certain words and insert other words in lieu thereof is pending, an amendment to the words proposed to be inserted cannot be moved until the question to leave out the words has been determined, 4732

An amendment which is irrelevant to the question cannot be moved, 3058

An amendment cannot be put unless it is seconded by a senator who has not spoken to the main question, 6214

A message already sent by the Government to the Colonial Office and which is not a motion before the Senate is not open to amendment by the Senate, 7795

TENDERS. [See CONTRACTS.]

RULINGS—THE PRESIDENT—continued.

A senator may move that an amendment to a motion be amended by the addition of words; but if such proposal partakes of the character of an amendment to the motion, it should not be put to the Senate until it has dealt with the first amendment, 7845-6

An amendment before the Senate can only be amended by the mover with consent, 8228

After a substantive motion has been put to the Senate and agreed to no amendment to modify or extend its operation can be entertained; but in Committee a request to modify an accepted request is in order, 8651-2

On a proposal to empower a Select Committee on procedure in cases of privilege a senator cannot move that the Committee have power to call persons who are alleged to have made charges against members of Parliament, 10013

Anticipating Discussion.—Standing Order 118 should not be construed so as to apply to a Bill from the other House, and the fact of a notice in general terms being on the business paper should not prevent discussion of a Bill dealing with a specific subject, 1032-3

Even on the first reading of a Supply Bill a senator cannot anticipate the discussion on a motion, 1848; or a committed Bill, 8924

It is irregular to anticipate the debate on a Bill, 4181

On a motion to print a Bill, its merits cannot be discussed, 4841.

Bills.—A Bill to authorize the survey of a route for a railway in a State which has not given its consent thereto does not infringe paragraph 34 of section 51 of the Constitution, and may be proceeded with, 1030

An amendment to a Bill must be relevant to the subject-matter of the Bill or consistent with its text, 1516

A motion to report that until a certain event has happened the Committee considers it inexpedient to consider the Bill referred to it is out of order, 3153

The Bounties Bill can be dealt with by amendment in certain respects and by request in others, 3481-3, 4166

A request to increase the amount of a bounty is in order, 3481-3; but a proposition to alter the destination of a bounty or to include a new tax cannot be received, either as an amendment or as a request, 4165-7

A proposition to recommit a Bill, in whole or in part, is a substantive motion, and not an amendment to the question of third reading, 4836; or to the question of adopting the report, 10041-4

On a motion to recommit one clause of a Bill it is competent for senators to propose the inclusion of other clauses or of items in the schedule, and each amendment will be put separately, 10044-5

The Standing Orders do not permit a Bill to be amended except in a Committee of the Whole; and such rules do not conflict with section 49 of the Constitution, 4583-5

RULINGS—THE PRESIDENT—continued.

A Bill need not be recommitted to substitute the words "appointed by him in writing" for the word "named," as it may be regarded as a consequential amendment, which the Clerk will be justified in making, 5183

A request for the insertion of words modifying an accepted request is not out of order, 8651-2, 9252

After the body of a paragraph of an item has been agreed to, a senator should be allowed to move a request for the insertion of a paragraph to admit free, "as prescribed by departmental by-laws," certain articles mentioned in the paragraph, 8716-8, 9251

When a request to make an article in an item the subject of a new paragraph and dutiable at a lower rate has been carried, and the duty under the item has been dealt with, the Committee cannot entertain a request concerning the new paragraph, 9251. But prior to dealing with the duty under the item it was open to any senator to move a request for the grant of a preference to British imports under the new paragraph, 9253

Where the schedule to an Excise Tariff Bill includes glucose but not paraffine wax and plaster of Paris, a senator may submit a request for the insertion of an item dealing with confectionery containing glucose, but not for confectionery containing paraffine wax or plaster of Paris, 10024

An Excise Tariff Bill cannot be amended in any respect, 10025

Where a Bill is reported with a request, the adoption of the report cannot be moved if an objection be taken, 10040

Constitution Act.—It is the duty of the Chair to give an opinion on the application of the Constitution to a question under consideration, but not to give an opinion which would involve the interpretation of it, 1029

Strictly speaking, a provision in the Constitution on a subject must govern rather than a standing order, and it is sufficient for a senator to comply with the former, 6200

When a matter can be clearly and definitely settled, a provision in the Constitution should not be ignored, 10024

Debate.—The remarks of a senator must be relevant to the question, 8, 135-7, 1024-9, 1145, 1147, 1156, 1258-9, 1375, 1515-6, 1600-1, 2035-53, 2080, 2182, 2430, 2618-22, 2645, 2647, 2749, 2759, 2761, 3050-3, 3058, 3506, 3688-3700, 3818-9, 3906, 4580, 4598, 4604-5, 4610, 4841, 5114, 5375, 5379, 5568, 5753, 5759, 5766, 6212, 7899-7900, 7903, 8079, 8154, 8226-7, 9250, 10251, 10837, 10840, 11899, 12117, 12123

By leave, a senator, when moving the second reading of one Bill, may discuss another Bill of a cognate character on the notice-paper, and other senators may exercise the same privilege, 487

To a certain extent a senator may explain his position in taking a point of order, 1024; but another senator is not entitled to ask him to explain his conduct on a previous occasion, 1028

RULINGS—THE PRESIDENT—*continued.*

On the motion for second reading of a Bill a senator may allude, incidentally, to what has taken place elsewhere under similar conditions, 1259; he should confine himself as closely as he can to its subject-matter, 5682
It is permissible to criticise the attitude of a Minister in regard to the Bill before the Senate, but not in regard to other matters, 1690. When the Minister is replying to the attack he is entitled to point out that his support of the Bill is consistent with the opinions he has held on cognate questions, 1696

The statement of a senator must be accepted, 1691, 5374, 5385

On the third reading of a Railway Survey Bill a senator may point out the difficulties which will probably occur should the railway be built, 1702

A debate is closed by the speech of the mover of the question, 1952, 3925

With concurrence, a debate may be interrupted to permit a Minister to make an important announcement to the Senate, 2008

When a senator is moving for a suspension of the Standing Orders to enable him to move for the appointment of a select committee, he is entitled to state, but not to discuss, the objects of the proposed inquiry, 3053

On a motion to appoint a Select Committee to inquire into certain charges, a senator may show that he had reasons for making certain statements, but he may not discuss their accuracy or otherwise, 3058

On a motion for adjournment under standing order 60, the debate is limited by the terms of the motion, and, except incidentally, other cases or matters cannot be alluded to, 3692-3700. A senator can allude to another matter incidentally, but it cannot be debated, 5759, 5766, 9739

On the first reading of a Works and Buildings Bill there can be no discussion of its details, 11622; the motion cannot be debated, 11624

On the second reading of a Works and Buildings Bill, the debate should be relevant, but an incidental reference to any matter, so long as it is pertinent, is not objected to, 3819-23, 3907-23, 11689. The text of the Bill and its schedules are the matters upon which the question of relevancy must be considered, 3825. There cannot be a discussion on a financial policy which may or may not be evolved by the Government, 3907; or on the policy of the Labour Party, 3915; or on the whole financial policy of the Commonwealth, or the policy of establishing cadet forces, 3917

On a motion to print a paper there can be no debate except such as is relevant, 6092

When a senator is speaking, he should address the Chair, 4805, 7901; and take no notice of interjections, 10397

It is very irregular to discuss the recommittal of a Bill on a motion to fix a day to adopt the report, 5114

The passing of charges across the chamber is most disorderly, 5568

RULINGS—THE PRESIDENT—*continued.*

On the second reading of a Supply Bill, a senator who missed the opportunity to speak on the first reading should make his remarks on irrelevant matters as brief as possible, 5880; but other senators must observe the rule of relevancy, 5880

On the first reading of an Appropriation Bill a senator may discuss any question, but on the second reading the discussion should be relevant to the Bill, 10260-75-6. In a second-reading speech a senator may discuss the administration of, and expenditure on, the Departments, but not the protectionist policy of the Government, or the question of the sugar bonus, 10276-84. The rule of relevancy applies to the motion for the third reading, 10396-7

A Minister has no more right than any other Senator to digress from the subject-matter of an objection to a Chairman's ruling; but with concurrence he may explain his intentions in making a Ministerial statement to the Committee, 7900

Except by leave a Minister cannot digress from the question before the Committee on a Bill in order to make a Ministerial statement, 7904-6

The action of the Printing Committee should not be defended or debated at length on a motion to adopt its report, 8226-7

On the second reading of the Surplus Revenue Bill a senator should not dwell at length on the question of transferred properties, 11882, 11896; or on the merits of old-age pensions and defence, 11902

Divisions.—A division on a question cannot be taken unless the decision of the Chair has been challenged by at least two senators, 5285

The fact that a senator was out of the chamber or did not hear the bells does not entitle him to have his vote recorded in any divisions; nor does it render the divisions invalid, 7973

Hansard.—There cannot be embodied in *Hansard* reports of the Senate anything that does not take place in the Senate, 7974

Interruptions.—It is irregular for senators to converse across the chamber, 26, 1697, 3922; to converse with the speaker, 287, 1140, 1363, 4183; to join in conversations, 4805; to converse in loud tones, 5371

It is out of order for a senator to interrupt a speaker with questions, 289, 2515, 5374, or an irrelevant question, 1701, 4194-5; to reply to questions asked by a speaker, 1338; to make an irrelevant interjection, 5371-3; to cross-examine a speaker as to a document he is quoting, 5373; to interject, 6322-3, or reply to an interjection, 6322

A cross-fire of interjections is disorderly, 390, 11899; and ought not to be replied to, 390

Frequent interruptions ought not to be made, 1178, 1331, 1338, 1365, 1704, 2182, 2185, 2617, 3235, 3495, 4179, 4711, 4805, 5192, 5373, 5376, 5385, 5568, 5753, 6012, 6323, 12013, 12026

RULINGS—THE PRESIDENT—continued.

A senator ought not to allow himself to be side-tracked, 1145, 2647, 4194-5, 5373; or drawn into a dialogue, 8079; or to reply to interjections, especially when he has been asked to proceed with his speech, 10397

It is very disorderly to interrupt a senator, especially when he is limited to time, 2038, or discussing a point of order, 3151

A senator has a perfect right to ask to be allowed to speak free from interruption, 2515

There is no necessity for a senator to reply to a question, 2759, 4183

If a question is pertinent to the matter under discussion, and the speaker is willing to consider it, there can be no objection to its being asked. But if he desires not to be interrupted it is the duty of the Chair to enforce his wish, 3249

When an appeal is made to a senator by the speaker, he may ask a question, 3929

Senators ought not to interrupt the speaker in the middle of a quotation, and when they do interject, they should make their interjections as pertinent as possible to the subject, but not too frequently, 4179

The attention of the Chair should be directed by the speaker to an interjection to which exception can be taken, 4805, 8079

A senator ought not to interject after the speaker has objected to being interrupted, 5576, 11518, 12011

Interjections are disorderly, 7703, 8227, 11899

The senator in possession of the Chair, whoever he may be, is entitled to be heard without interruption, 12011

Language, Parliamentary.—It is permissible to use the word "nefarious," except in relation to a Bill or senator, 1232

to allude to the conduct of a person who is not a senator, 5381

If a senator interjects that the subject being discussed by the speaker has nothing to do with the Bill the remark is not one which he can be called upon to withdraw, 10398

Language, Unparliamentary.—Not in order—to impute motives, 134, 2079; "nefarious" dealing, 1137; dishonesty, 2747; hypocrisy, 10049

to say that a senator has made misrepresentations, 259; is trying to "ram" a Bill down the throats of any senators, 1025; is a "drawing-room colonel," 1261; is stating what he absolutely knows to be untrue, 1693; is here to say what he can on behalf of monopoly, 2038; has cast a "little mud," 4798; ought to be ashamed of himself, 5377; is a "shoddy politician," or a "shoddy protectionist," 5762; or "a pig," 6323

to state that a senator's statement is incorrect and that he knows it, 1331; or is an insult to the intelligence of the Senate, 1515; or is contemptible, 2079; or is untrue, 2537, 8079

to enter into a discussion with the Chair, 1370

RULINGS—THE PRESIDENT—continued.

Language, Unparliamentary—continued.

to reflect upon the Chair, 1370, 3056; a Sessional Committee, either individually or collectively, 4732-4, 4798, 4807; the understanding of a senator, 4805; a judge except on a specific motion, 4814; the way in which a senator chooses to make a speech, 6323

to assert that any senators are actuated by feelings in favour of monopoly, 2038; had tried to amend a Bill so as to leave loop-holes for criminals to escape, 5178

to ascribe to a senator improper conduct, or neglect of his public duty, 2079; indecency, 3056; insincerity, 4841; vulgarity, 5571

to accuse the Chairman of Committees of partisan feeling in relation to his office, 4740

to question the action of a senator in calling attention to the state of the Senate, 4909

to express an intention to persist in an unparliamentary course, 4909

to describe an interjection as impertinent, 5571

to interject to a senator not to obey the Chair, 5762

to speak of a Sovereign as a monster, or mighty tyrant, 7795

to liken a senator to Judas Iscariot, 12004

to apply the epithet "obnoxious" to the Naval Agreement, 12125

An unparliamentary term should be withdrawn without comment, 1331, 5762; or qualification, 4798

If a senator has any exception to take to a remark he should call the attention of the Chair to it, 2185, 4806

For a senator to say that he withdraws a statement because he is not on his oath is practically to repeat it, 4798

So long as a statement is withdrawn in ordinary terms the manner of its withdrawal cannot be interfered with, 4806

It is usual to accept the withdrawal of a statement unless it is accompanied by a remark which is considered offensive, 4806

If a senator regards a statement as offensive it should not be made, 5378

Reflections on a deceased Sovereign are disorderly, and cannot be embodied in a question to a Minister, 7794

It is just as disorderly to make an unworthy accusation by implication as it is to do so by a direct charge, 12004

It is irregular to apply an offensive epithet to anything done by Parliament, unless on a motion for its rescission or repeal, 12125

Ministerial Statements.—A Ministerial statement may be made in Committee by the courtesy of the Chair, and the unanimous consent of senators. It should not contain terms of censure on any senators, and when such terms are used, they should be taken exception to at once with a view to their withdrawal. A senator is entitled to object at any time to a Minister digressing from the subject-matter under consideration. By the courtesy of the Committee a senator may be permitted to reply to the Minister; but under the standing order no senator has that right, 7904-6

RULINGS—THE PRESIDENT—*continued.*

Motions.—A complicated motion may be put in parts, 692, 4839, 10013

A motion may only be withdrawn with concurrence, 693

When a motion is objected to, it cannot be put as formal, 1233

A motion for the preparation of a return, even if the required information should have to be sought from a State Government, is in order, 1276

By leave, a senator may amend his motion before it is moved, 2227, or after it is moved, 3059, 3501

A motion to suspend the Standing Orders to enable a motion to be moved, ought not to be moved until the routine business has been dealt with, 3040

A motion which the Chair thinks, if carried, cannot be made operative except by legislation, is not out of order, 3506

By leave, a motion may be moved without notice, 3797, 4463

A motion affecting the seat of a senator takes precedence of private business, 4825

A motion for leave of absence is required by standing order 47, but not by the Constitution, to contain a statement of the cause and period of absence and, strictly speaking, the Constitution must govern, 6299

A motion which has been made an order of the day cannot be changed to a notice of motion, 5467

A motion for an instruction to the Committee on a Bill can only be moved immediately after its second reading, and, by leave, it may be moved without one day's notice, 5595-6

A motion to suspend the Standing Orders may be moved without notice, but requires the support of an absolute majority of the Senate, 10041. It is customary, but not obligatory upon the Chair to ascertain that an absolute majority is present: if no challenge be made the presumption is that the standing order has been complied with, 10073; before putting the motion to the vote the Chair will cause the bells to be rung, 10841

Notices.—Notice of a motion may be given in general terms by a senator; but he is required to hand in a copy of his motion at least one day prior to that for which he has given notice, 9

After the regular time a notice of motion can only be given by leave, 2180

Notice of a question must be given before the business of the day is called on, 10830

Pairs cannot be taken cognizance of by the Senate; a pair book is provided, and pairing is arranged for the convenience of senators, 3146, 3504

Papers.—If the Senate decide that a paper be not printed, then, unless the resolution be rescinded, the paper will have to remain on the table, and cannot be printed, 135. If the paper be allowed to go automatically to the Printing Committee, the Senate may deal as it thinks fit with a recommendation from that body; 136

RULINGS—THE PRESIDENT—*continued.*

On a motion to adopt the report of the Printing Committee a senator may submit an amendment for the printing of a Senate document not recommended to be printed, but not for the printing of petitions or other papers presented to the House of Representatives, 4463-6

It is open to the Senate to order the printing of a paper in respect of which the Printing Committee has made no recommendation, 7844

By leave, a motion to print may include several papers, 248

No standing order warrants or forbids the laying of papers on the table of the Library; it is entirely a matter within the discretion of the Senate, 933. The Senate has no control over, and recognise no responsibility in respect of, papers tabled in the Library, 933

It is not competent for the President to lay upon the table, as a paper, a joint resolution from the Houses of a State Parliament; it can only be presented in the form of a petition, 4143, 4925

Documents may be printed and added to the report of a Sessional Committee, 4396

Personal Explanations.—In making an explanation on a motion for adjournment, a senator is not in order in making an attack on another senator, 1055, 5494-5, or debating an explanation by another senator, 5494-5; he may only refute a statement concerning himself or show how he has been misrepresented, or explain his own position in regard to the matter, 5494-6

An explanation can only be given after the speaker has finished his speech, unless he is prepared to give way, 2080; and no argument may be used, 4801

A personal explanation may be made on the motion to adjourn the Senate, 3146

If a senator wishes to make a personal explanation the leave of the Senate must be obtained, and, if granted, he must not reflect upon or attack any senator, 3147

If a senator considers that he has been misrepresented he may make an explanation, 3147, but he cannot comment on or discuss a letter he has received, 5466, or correct the report of another person's remarks, 5746, or proceed to argue the question or reflect on a newspaper, 8028

By the indulgence of the Senate a senator may make a personal explanation concerning a matter which did not arise out of any business in connexion with the Senate, 8026-7

Petitions.—A senator cannot move that a petition be printed unless he informs the Senate that he intends to take action thereon, 7925, 10251

Points of Order.—The construction of a standing order by a senator does not involve a question of order, 2621

A point of order cannot be discussed after a ruling has been given, 8026-7

RULINGS—THE PRESIDENT—continued.

There is no question of order involved in the fact that a circulated Bill differs from the Bill received from other House and read a first time, 11622, or in the fact that a Bill has not been circulated prior to motion for first reading, 11624

President.—In the absence of a standing order the Chair is entitled to rule on any question which may arise, 3146

Privilege.—An entry, or a non-entry, or a change in the disposition of a pair does not involve a question of the privileges of the Senate, or of a senator, 3146, 3504, 4583

The privileges of the Senate are defined by the Constitution, and cannot be extended except by legislation, 3504-7, 4583

A statement in a newspaper that a Sessional Committee has met and determined to delay the submission of its report to the Senate until after a certain event has taken place is not a breach of privilege, 3557-8

Protest against Bill.—If either House of a State Parliament wishes to protest against the enactment of a Tariff Bill or other measure the protest should be presented in the form of a petition and addressed to the President and Members of the Senate, 4143, 4925

Questions and Answers.—No argument may be used by a senator in asking a question, 29, 746, 934, 1927-9, 2030-1, 7792, 8155-6, 11984; or by a Minister in replying thereto, 932

A senator may not ask a question not arising directly out of the reply to a question upon notice, 745, 1232, 1928, 3798, 5367-8, 5980, 10830, 11221, 11865; he should give notice of the question at the proper time, 5368, 9633, but, if he desires, he may make a personal explanation, 5370

The correctness of a Minister's reply cannot be debated by the quotation of a newspaper paragraph; but any statement in the paragraph may be elucidated by means of a question upon notice, 1929.

A Minister is not obliged to answer a question, 2031, and may give reasons why it should not be answered, 8156. He cannot be called upon to answer a hypothetical question, 8243.

A question inviting an expression of opinion is irregular, 2615, 4705, 8155-6, 8232, 12100

The proper time to ask a question without notice is before questions upon notice are called on, 2846, 5980

A senator may reply to a question in which a doubt is cast upon his word, 3233

A senator may only be questioned about a Bill or matter of which he has charge, 4893

The subject-matter of a question cannot be debated when it is answered, 5284

The Chair has the right to have questions on notice revised and put in such a form as it may consider proper and pertinent, 5168, 8155-6, 9734, 9893

Any extracts from newspapers or documents should not be unduly long, and should be pertinent to the subject-matter of the questions, 5369. A senator is responsible for the correctness of a quotation from a newspaper but not for the accuracy of its statements, 5370

RULINGS—THE PRESIDENT—continued.

It is out of order to debate the answer to a question, but a further question may be asked, 7792, 7842

It is not permissible to ask a question embodying disorderly allegations against a deceased Sovereign, 7794, or to embody in a question statements which may or may not be correct, 7794-5

A question arising out of an answer must be relevant to the original question, 7850; or designed to make clearer the reply, 8700

A question about the conduct of proceedings may be put to the Chair at any time except during the discussion of a point of order on another matter, 8154-5

Questions to Ministers should deal with matters of fact, and not with matters of policy, and matters of opinion, 8155

A senator may give notice of a question which he has asked without notice, even though not so desired by the Minister; but if the question be fully replied to then, it cannot be put on the notice-paper a second time, 8229

When questions on notice have been answered only such further questions may be asked as tend to elucidate the replies; questions asking for other information should be placed on the notice-paper, 8231-2

A question may be asked about a motion which may be taken as formal business, 9353

A senator may not ask without notice a question by which it is sought to bring about a feeling of ridicule and contempt with regard to the administration of a Department; it should be given notice of with a view to revision in accordance with the rule on the subject, 9734, 9893

Quotations and References.—A senator may refer to anything that has been said during a debate, 1156, or to an irrelevant matter to illustrate an argument with regard to the merits or demerits of a Bill, 1691

It is out of order to refer to a debate of the same session, 1690, unless in discussing the same matter, 12022; or to a question which is being considered in another Bill, 8924; or to a Bill which was dealt with at previous sitting, 12018, 12026

On a motion for adjournment under standing order 60, a senator cannot reply to statements made on a similar motion during the session, 2619

If, in answering a question, a senator quotes a passage from a telegram, he is not obliged, nor can he be compelled, to lay the telegram upon the table, 3233

A senator may refer to any document mentioned in a report of the Printing Committee, 4465

On the second reading of a Bill a senator may not discuss the value of the tenure of an officer, but he can allude to facts, 4615

On the second reading of the Customs Tariff Bill a senator may, by leave, make full reference to the Excise Tariff Bill, 7563

RULINGS—THE PRESIDENT—continued.

On the motion to adopt the report of the Disputed Returns Committee it is out of order to comment upon its individual members, or to criticise its report as a report of a partisan nature, 4732-4; or to impute unfairness to anybody who presided at or took part in its meetings, 4798; but a member of the Committee may give reasons why no doubt should be thrown upon his individual honour in that capacity, 4740

It is irregular to allude to what took place at meetings of a Sessional Committee to which the public were not admitted, 4798

A personal explanation, when made at a previous stage of the sitting, cannot be debated on the motion for adjournment, 5404-5

It is out of order to comment upon the course of procedure in other House, 10837; or to allude to a Bill before another place, 11503, to a debate in other House on the Bill before the Senate, 11890, to the debates in another place, or the reasons that actuated its members in giving their votes, 12009

Right of Speech.—In the absence of a question before the Senate a senator is not entitled to speak, 8, 651, 7791, 7795, 11688; except by leave, 5746

No senator may speak to a motion after its mover has begun to exercise his right of reply, 134-5; or after that right has been exercised, 1952; or to a motion to adjourn a debate, 861

A senator is not entitled to speak to a motion for adjournment under standing order 60, after the time allowed for its discussion has expired, but the mover may ask leave to withdraw it, 5774

By leave, a senator may be permitted to continue his speech on another occasion, 974

A senator is not allowed to make a statement for the purpose of enabling a Minister to answer his question on another occasion; such information should be supplied privately, 1689

It is not open to a senator to discuss the subject-matter of a personal explanation by another senator, 2069, 5494

There can be no debate on a motion to print a report, and fix a day for its consideration, 4396

With concurrence a Minister may speak to a motion which he had moved without making a speech thereon, 4472

A statement by the Chair on a point of parliamentary practice is not open to debate, 5369

If a senator has been misrepresented after he has spoken to the question, he can make a personal explanation, 5496

Where a Ministerial statement has not been concluded with a motion, there can be no discussion, 7791

Except by leave, no senator can reply to a Ministerial statement made in Committee, 7905-6

The mover of a motion to which an amendment has been proposed, should speak to the amendment, and reserve his reply until other amendments, if any, have been dealt with, 8227

RULINGS—THE PRESIDENT—continued.

After proposals to recommit clauses of a Bill have been disposed of a senator may speak to the question of adopting the report, 10044

Where no objection is taken the Chair does not interfere to prevent a Minister from offering congratulatory remarks on the passage of any measures; but there can be no debate on his statement, 11688

Rulings.—A question dealt with in a ruling by a former President can always be raised again on another matter, or when a fitting occasion presents itself, 1030

When a decision has been given from the Chair, it must not be debated, or alluded to, but obeyed, 1137, 1259, 7794, 10397-8

It is the duty of the Chair to insist on compliance with a ruling unless the Senate see fit to dissent therefrom, 1259; to maintain order and enforce its rulings, 4909

A senator should comply with a ruling unless he is prepared to take another step, 1691, 4909, 7795

A request from the Chair is expected to be complied with, 5568, 10397

A ruling is not given on a hypothetical case, 4616, 10025

Same Question cannot be discussed on a second motion for adjournment under standing order 60, but it may be raised when debating the first reading of a Supply Bill, 2069-70

It is not permissible, on a motion for adjournment under standing order 60, to debate a matter which has been debated on a similar motion during the session, but for purposes of illustration a senator is at liberty to mention any case he sees fit to show the necessity for amending the Standing Orders relating to such motions, 2617, 2621

Standing Orders.—The suspension of the Standing Orders to expedite the passage of a Bill involves the suspension of the sessional orders relating to private business, 6327, 6408

Strangers.—A person in the gallery is not permitted to read a newspaper, 2043

Suspension of Sitting need not depend upon a sessional order; it can be regulated by an understanding, 8077.

[See GOULD, Senator (Speeches).]

Chairman of Committees.

Bills.—While an amendment to a clause is pending another amendment cannot be moved, 670

An amendment relating to the construction of a railway is irrelevant to the subject-matter of a Railway Survey Bill, 1513

An amendment to prohibit the landing of certain persons is within the scope of an Immigration Bill, but not a Quarantine Bill, 5991-3

After an amendment to a later portion of a clause has been dealt with, the earlier portion is not open to amendment, 1066, 5396

An amendment which is not the same, in substance or purport, as an amendment disposed of, is in order, 2118

An amendment must be relevant to the clause, 2119, or within the scope of the Bill, 5991-3

RULINGS—CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES—*continued.*

- Where it has been agreed to separate the parts of a clause, and each part has been dealt with, the clause has been disposed of, and is not open to amendment, 1973
- The sub-clauses of a clause may be put separately, if desired, 2856, 5012
- A sub-clause may be dealt with separately, but it cannot be postponed, 2872
- Schedules to Bills cannot be considered until after postponed clauses have been dealt with, 759
- An item in a schedule cannot be postponed, but the schedule can be postponed, 2872
- After postponed clauses have been dealt with it is not competent to move the insertion of a new clause, except it be decided to reconsider the Bill for that purpose, 2283
- When the body of a schedule to a Bill has been amended, the heading of the schedule will be altered accordingly, without an amendment being moved, 2284
- A motion that the Chairman report that until a certain event has happened the Committee considers it inexpedient to consider a Bill conflicts with standing orders, 251, 267, 268, and 269, and cannot be received, 3150
- A request to the House of Representatives to increase the amount of an item may be proposed in connexion with a Bill which the Senate may amend in certain respects, 3476-7, 3479
- When notice of dissent from a ruling is given, the proceedings on the Bill are suspended, 3480
- Where the omission of certain words has been moved with a view to substitute other words the debate is limited to the question of creating a blank, 3574
- An amendment to omit the second word of an item must be withdrawn to enable a senator to move the omission of the first word, 3585
- A decision to retain the first word of an item precludes another amendment for the omission of that word, 3722
- A proposition to omit an item from the Works and Buildings Bill may be submitted as an amendment, 4064
- An amendment to reduce two items is not in order: each item must be the subject of a separate amendment, 11692
- The question on an amendment should be put in such a way that, if rejected, it will not prevent a certain amendment from being moved, 5397
- Where a subsequent amendment has been made in a clause a prior amendment cannot be moved, but a senator can test the question by moving the omission of the same words where second occurring, 5482
- If a senator desires to move for an increase of a gratuity he must submit a request, but he may move for a reduction of the amount by way of amendment, 10061
- An amendment to bring one provision of a Bill into operation at a later date than that of the assent to the Bill is in order, 11909
- Customs Tariff Bill.*—All motions to secure alterations must be moved as requests, 7623-4

RULINGS—CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES—*continued.*

- Where an item is subject to two rates of duty, the rate in the general Tariff must be dealt with before the rate in the preferential Tariff can be considered, 7624, 7685, 7755, 8296
- It is permissible for a senator to move a request for an increase of the duty on any item, or for one or more articles in an item to be made free, or for an article covered by but not mentioned in an item to be included therein or made free, 7624
- It is not permissible for a senator to move a request for the insertion of a new item, 7624; or for the omission of a duty, 7710, 7946, or an item, 8116, or a paragraph of an item, 8503, 8811, or an article not mentioned in an item, 8280, or any words which have been agreed to, 8622
- A senator cannot move an amendment relative to the rate of duty in a request; he should vote against the request, and if negatived submit a request, 7625
- A request should have no relation to the date in a column, 7710
- Where the Committee has decided in favour of a lower duty on liquorice, a senator cannot move a request for a higher duty, but he may move a request to insert a new paragraph dealing with high-grade liquorice, 7758
- Before another request can be moved, the request in possession of the Committee must be withdrawn, 7646, 7658, 8115, 8134, 8298, 8622, 9555; or disposed of, 8111, 8221, 8298
- An item, if postponed generally, cannot be dealt with until the schedule has been gone through, 7826
- An amendment to postpone a Tariff item until a pending election has been completed is irrelevant, and therefore cannot be accepted, 7826
- If a request to make an item free be negatived, a senator may move a request to alter its wording, 8103; but the latter cannot be moved until the former has been dealt with, 8111
- After a request to make an item free and a request to alter its wording have been dealt with, a senator cannot move a request respecting the duty, 8116; but where, owing to a ruling, some confusion has arisen, it may be done by unanimous consent, 8116
- The proper course is for the Committee to deal first with the wording of an item and then with the duty, 8116, 8117, 8326
- A footnote is merely for the information of the Committee, and is not part of the Bill, 8120
- A request to fix a duty "on an *ad valorem* basis" is open to amendment by substituting for those words "at 30 per cent. or 16s. per dozen, whichever rate returns the higher duty," or similar words, 8318
- If a request to fix a duty "on an *ad valorem* basis" be defeated, it will still be open to a senator to move a request for a duty of so much per dozen on the article, or a certain percentage, whichever rate returns the higher duty, 8319
- After the Committee has dealt with a request for an *ad valorem* duty on an article, it is still competent for a request for a composite duty, or a request for a fixed duty to be moved, 8319

RULINGS—CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES—*continued.*

On a request to raise the duty on an item in the general Tariff to a certain amount, a senator cannot move an amendment to raise the duty in each column to a lesser amount, to be collected on the issue of a proclamation; it can be moved as a sub-paragraph of the item after the request has been disposed of, 8410

If a senator desires a higher duty than that proposed in a request, he may move an amendment to substitute a higher figure, 8441; but the practice has been to take first a proposal for a higher duty, and it will be continued, 8444

After a request to raise a duty has been carried, a senator cannot move a request for the insertion of a paragraph to bring the increased duty into force on the issue of a proclamation, 8444

A request to exempt from duty certain articles in an item takes priority of a request to make the item free, 8588

Where a request to insert "n.e.i." after "weighbridges" has been agreed to, a senator cannot move a request for the omission of that word; but he may move a request for the insertion of a paragraph making "Weighbridges, n.e.i.," dutiable at same rate, 8622

A request to insert words qualifying an accepted request is not contradictory of a previous decision, and is in order, 8646, 8711

A request to add a paragraph modifying or qualifying a paragraph which has been disposed of is not in order, 8695

A request to deal in a separate paragraph with an article already included in the item must be submitted before the duties under the last paragraph of such item are considered; but, after those duties have been settled, a senator is entitled to move a request for the addition of a paragraph referring to some article included in a subsequent item, 8695

When the last paragraph of an item has been disposed of the whole item has been dealt with finally, unless a senator desires to move a request to add a paragraph referring to an article in a subsequent item, 8695

After the body of a paragraph of an item has been agreed to, and before the duties have been considered, a senator may move a request for the insertion of a paragraph to admit free, "as prescribed by departmental by-laws," certain articles mentioned in the paragraph. But after a paragraph of an item, or an item, has been disposed of, the Committee cannot go back upon its decision thereon, 8710-2, 8718

The body of an item must be dealt with first, and a senator may submit a request to omit words therefrom, or to add words thereto, or to provide in a new paragraph an alternative course in regard to articles specified in such item, 8712

If a senator wishes to secure the free admission of an article mentioned in a paragraph of an item he should move first a request to omit the article therefrom and then a request to provide in a new paragraph for its free admission. After the body of the paragraph has been agreed to it is too late to submit such requests; but it is still competent

RULINGS—CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES—*continued.*

to propose a request to provide in a new paragraph for the free admission of the article subject to departmental by-laws, 8718

When the rate of duty on a paragraph of an item is under consideration a senator cannot move a request for certain articles included in the paragraph to be admitted free under a new paragraph, subject to departmental by-laws, 8746

A request for the reduction of a duty by 1 per cent. cannot be received because the amount is not of a substantial character; $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. is the smallest reduction, as compared with the previous request, which can be proposed, 9047-8

It is not necessary for a senator to ask for the withdrawal of a request in respect of which no question was stated from the Chair, 9087, or, in such circumstances, to ask leave to amend a request, 9672

Where a request to omit an article from an item, and to make it free under a separate paragraph has been defeated, it is competent to submit a request to omit the article for the purpose of fixing a lower duty under a separate paragraph, 9242

The body of a request for a new paragraph may be put first and the rate of duty afterwards, 9264-6

A request to deal separately with certain articles in an item does not, if carried, prevent a senator from moving a request to insert some words in a later part of the item, 9291

Where a request to reduce a duty from 15 to 10 per cent. has been negatived, a senator cannot move a request to free the article; he can only move for a duty between 15 and 10 per cent., 9294

After the rates of duty on an item have been settled, a senator may move a request to take out any articles not specifically mentioned in the item, and to embody them in a new paragraph, 9374

A request which is a modification of, and does not go so far as a rejected request can be received, 9645

A paragraph of an item must be disposed of before a senator can move a request to deal separately with articles not specifically mentioned therein, 9797, 9919

A request which has not yet been stated from the Chair may be moved in any form that the proposer wishes, 9835

To negative a motion that a request be not pressed is tantamount to affirming that the request is persisted in, 10844

When it is moved that a request be not pressed a modification, if desired, should be submitted in the form of an amendment, which, if carried, will become the request of the Senate, 10847. Where the request covered two articles a modification may be proposed in respect of each article, 10853-4

When merely the inclusion of an article in an item was requested, and it is proposed not to press the request, a senator cannot move an amendment in favour of making the whole item free; but he may submit a modification asking the other House to make the article free in a separate paragraph or to impose a higher or lower duty on the article, 10953

RULINGS—CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES—continued.

An amendment as to the rate of duty on an article cannot be proposed after an amendment embodying the principle of no duty has been added to a motion not to press a request, except in that regard, 11226-7

Debate.—On an amendment to a clause a senator cannot discuss the whole Bill, 1044, 1051

It is not regular to discuss on a clause the principle of the Bill, 10059, 10063, 12103

The discussion must be relevant to the question, 1051, 1485, 1496, 1501, 1505, 1506, 1508, 1943, 1952, 2766, 2858, 2863, 2865, 2961, 3084, 3157, 3401, 3405, 3470, 4046-7, 4073-4, 4076, 4922-3, 5124, 5662-5, 5669-71, 5885, 5902, 5904, 5986, 7824, 8645, 8982, 9000, 10294-6, 10390, 11904, 12148, except when a senator is making a personal explanation, 5045

On a Supply Bill, a senator cannot discuss the merits of the Tariff Commission, 1042, or the necessity for the revision of the Tariff, 1046; or the utterances of the Minister on the subject of unification, 8995; or the defence scheme as it affects the cadets, 8998

A senator cannot anticipate the discussion of a proposal which has been foreshadowed, 3574; or of an item in the schedule of a Bill, 8142, 8870

A senator is guilty of tedious repetition if he repeats a statement he has made several times, 4923, or a number of times, 12035

The debate on an item in the Tariff should be relevant, 7624, 7629, 7669, 7671, 7688-9, 7693-4, 7728, 7738-9, 7769-70, 7779, 7833, 7862, 7867, 7896, 7906, 7913, 7921, 7955, 8117-8, 8146, 8203, 8216, 8254, 8317, 8323, 8330, 8342, 8440, 8407, 8415, 8442, 8456, 8460, 8465, 8467, 8468, 8674, 8683, 8704, 8754, 8758-9, 8803, 9084, 9207, 9362-3, 9376, 9378, 9382, 9386, 9541, 9928, 10850, 10869, 10931, 10940, 10955-6, 11229, 12103

It is not out of order to make an incidental reference to another item in so far as it affects the item under consideration, 7921

A senator may state his reasons for moving the postponement of the consideration of a Tariff item, 7810; on a motion to postpone an item or a number of items he cannot discuss a whole division, or wander all over the Tariff, 8118

The question whether a Minister can, within the Standing Orders, answer questions cannot be raised in Committee on a Bill, 7827

When a Ministerial statement has been made on a Tariff item it may only be discussed by the leaders of the respective parties, unless the Committee decide to allow a general discussion, 7896

After perfect quiet has been restored, a senator should either proceed with his speech or resume his seat; if he does not continue his speech the question will be put, 8213

When reasonable order is being maintained a senator should proceed with his speech, 8744

A senator, if called by the Chair, has the right to discuss an item without moving any request; it is merely a matter of courtesy if a senator gives way to another who wishes to propose a lower rate of duty, 8233-4

RULINGS—CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES—continued.

On a Tariff item a senator may discuss the tactics of a company in other countries as well as in Australia, 8431; but the lack of administration on the part of the U.S. Government has no relevancy to the item, 8431

Tedious repetition is not allowed, 8746, 9915, 12035

Decorum.—It is a breach of decorum for a senator to bring into the chamber a pillow for the purpose of sleeping thereon; it should be removed by him, 8747

Divisions.—Until the second teller is appointed a senator is entitled to cross the floor, and his vote cannot be challenged on that ground, 2962

It is not competent for the Chair to order the insertion of a senator's name in a division list, 7947; except where his presence was overlooked by the teller, 9646

A senator who is crossing the floor when the tellers are appointed may vote as he desires; but a senator who crosses the floor after that event cannot; his vote must be transferred, 8165

Any senator has the right to ask that a question shall be divided, and its parts put separately, 8803, 9563

If a senator passes the centre of the table before the Chair has finished naming him as a teller for the noes, he may vote with the ayes, 8810

A senator who gave his voice with the noes may vote with the ayes, 9296

When a division is called for, senators should leave the table or writing desks and take their places on one side of the chamber or the other, 9646

Excise Tariff Bill.—It is not competent for the Chair to receive a request for the imposition of a duty on an article containing a substance which is not included in the schedule, 10014-20

Interruptions.—All interjections are disorderly, 1486, 5780, 8260, 8459, 9289, 9755

Senators should not interject after the speaker has objected to being interrupted, 8213, 10955; or converse in loud tones, 8399

Senators should extend to the speaker that courtesy which all have the right to claim, 9363

Language, Parliamentary.—A senator is entitled to criticise the remarks of a senator relative to a proposal which he intends to submit when the opportunity arises, and also the views which he thinks Ministers take of that proposal, 671

A senator is not out of order in characterising as a lie a statement which the speaker had denounced as a lie to a public meeting, 5045; or in describing as "detestable" the methods which have marked proceedings on the Tariff, 9296; or in accusing the representatives of Victoria of doing all they can to block justice from being meted out to other States, 10954

The application of the term "rubbish" to a senator's remarks is not out of order, 8459

An interjection that a speech is delaying the passage of the Bill is not a reflection on the speaker, since every speech causes delay, 5780

RULINGS—CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES—continued.

Language, Unparliamentary.—Not in order—to accuse a senator of doing an improper thing, 670; telling a lie, 5044; making false and misleading statements, 5891; misrepresentation, 8214

to allude to a senator as an ass, 8458; a fool, 8464; a consummate ass, 9363; a phonograph, 10955

to ascribe to a senator "crawlsomeness," 9368

to reflect upon the President, 5124; the Committee, 9290; the Chair, 9296; the Chamber, 9807

to refer to any proposal before the Committee as a job, 1483; immoral, 7951; degrading, 9807

to shout remarks at the Chair, 5044

to state that senators are playing a political game, 8696; or wish to damn the farmer, 9167

to interject when a ruling is being given, 5671

to remark that the statement of a senator is untrue, 7856; blather, 8459; inane trash, 9761

to speak of "the brutal force of the majority of numbers," 9386

to use concerning another place the term "trick," 10950, or "despicable proceeding," or "nefarious proceeding," 10951

If a remark is offensive to a senator it must be withdrawn, 3470, 8214, 8464, 8696

The use of an objectionable expression should be taken exception to at once, and not afterwards, 8458-9

Points of Order.—If a point of order is not taken when the Chairman intimates to the mover of a proposition that in his opinion it is admissible, that does not prevent a senator from raising at a later stage the question of its inadmissibility, 3479

When a senator moves the omission of certain words with a view to substitute other words, no point of order as to the latter words can be taken until the question of their insertion is before the Committee, 3574

A point of order cannot be raised on an interjection, 7827; or received after an objection to a decision has been taken, 7897

The question of whether it is necessary to record a senator's remarks in *Hansard* is not a point of order, 8283

Quotations and References.—A senator may make a statement of the facts contained in a document referring to a debate of the current session, 7978

It is out of order to refer to a later item, 8142, 8870, 9814, or a previous item, 8659, 9813; to comment on an incident that is closed, 8459; to discuss past votes, 9057

It is out of order to read extracts from a newspaper or other document, except *Hansard*, referring to a debate in the Senate during the same session, 10847-8, 10868

It is not permissible to allude to a debate or proceeding in another place, 8732, 8879, 11237; to any debate of the current session in the other House, or to any measure impending therein, 10847-8; to the debates of another place on the subject before the Chair, 11228

RULINGS—CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES—continued.

A senator may refer to the sources from which he thinks the Ministry receives his information, 8778; or reply to an explanation made by a Minister, 9278

If a Minister says that the Government had made a vigorous fight for an item, without stating where it was made, he is not out of order, 11228

Right of Speech.—Only leaders of parties are entitled to refer to a Ministerial statement, 7896

The Chairman is bound to call upon the first senator who, in rising, catches his eye; the fact that a senator has given notice of, or intimated an intention to move, a request gives him no right of priority, 8097

Rulings.—If a senator disputes a ruling, he should state at once his objection in writing, 5045, 5669; otherwise it should be obeyed, 8318, 8415, 8458, 9294, 9297

Strangers.—The presence of persons within the precincts of the chamber is not a matter within the jurisdiction of the Chairman; his authority is limited to what takes place in Committee, 8778

A senator is not entitled to rise to speak unless the speaker chooses to give way to him, 9289

Suspension of Sitting.—Where a sessional order fixes a time for the resumption of a sitting, it must be observed, 8092

At the wish of the Committee a sitting may be suspended, 8092, 8748

[See PEARCE, Senator (Speeches).]

Chairman, Temporary.

Senator DOBSON.

Debate.—The remarks of a senator must be relevant to the question, 8741, 9385

Documents.—A document quoted from by a private senator may be ordered to be laid upon the table, 7995

Quorum.—No senator ought to leave the chamber after attention has been called to the absence of a quorum, 8743

Quotations and References.—A senator has no right to allude to a debate in another place, 8742

Senator MCCOLL.

Bills.—A request to take an article out of an item of the Tariff, and to subject it to a lower rate of duty in a separate paragraph is put to the Committee as a whole, and not in parts, 9246-8

After the Committee has carried a request to take an article out of an item imposing a duty of 15 per cent., and to make it dutiable at 5 per cent. in a separate paragraph, and then negatived a request for a duty of 10 per cent. on British imports under the original item, it is competent for a senator to submit a request for a duty of 15 per cent. on British imports under the new paragraph, 9248

A request to insert a definition of "superficial foot" should be moved at the end of the item, and not at the end of the first paragraph thereof, 9453

RULINGS—CHAIRMAN, TEMPORARY—continued.

Where a senator desires an article in a paragraph of an item to be admitted at a lower duty he should submit a request for a separate paragraph for that purpose, 9831

Debate.—In discussing an item in the Tariff, a senator may show, at a reasonable length, that a local company are able to carry out what they profess, 8395

On an item dealing with the manufactures of metals a senator may refer to tins, but not to their contents, 8749

The discussion should be relevant to the question, 8749, 8753

Decorum.—A senator is not guilty of objectionable conduct in resuming a sleeping posture on a bench immediately after he has raised a point of order, 8749

Divisions.—Voting is optional in the case of the occupant of the Chair, 8757

Point of order as to the admissibility of a request should not be raised until the question has been stated, 9247

Senator NEILD.

Bills.—A senator will be out of order in submitting a proposition in a jocular spirit, 8663

An amendment, extending a bounty to articles not provided for in the schedule and therefore extending the destination of the bounty is not in order, 4161

Where three requests have been submitted in one motion they will be put separately, 8668

Before another request can be submitted the request before the Committee must be dealt with, 9185

When a request to omit certain articles from an item in order to put them in a new paragraph has been carried it is not imperative to deal at once with a request for the insertion of the new paragraph: the matter is one for the convenience of the Committee, 9935

When the rates of duty on an item are before the Chair a senator may submit a request for the imposition of lower rates until a certain proclamation is issued, 9936

Debate.—The temporary occupant of the chair is unable to take part in the discussion of a question, 8449

The discussion on a question must be relevant, 9082, 9084, 9189, 11243, 11250

Divisions.—It is not possible to remove from a division list the name of a senator who has broken a pair, 8240

If when a question is put, any senators call Aye, and no senator calls No, the Chair has no option but to declare the question carried; but if the Committee so desire the question may be put again, 9549-53

Language, parliamentary.—It is not out of order to make a statement of so utterly indefinite a character as "on every occasion we find the members of the socialistic party banded together against the farmer," 8613

Language, Unparliamentary.—Not in order— to say that the statement of a senator is not true, 11249-50

RULINGS—CHAIRMAN, TEMPORARY—continued.

The statement that a senator had betrayed every political principle is highly objectionable, and, if taken exception to, must be withdrawn, 11250

Personal Explanation can be made in the course of a speech only by the consent of the mover, 824

Quotations and References.—A senator may not discuss a point which has been decided, 8614

House of Representatives:

Speaker, Mr.

Adjournment of Debate.—A member desiring the adjournment of a debate loses his opportunity to move to that effect if he continues to speak for a few minutes before doing so, 467, 468, 10455

Before concluding his speech a member may ask leave to continue his remarks, which leave must be given unanimously, 468

If there be dissent from a request for leave to continue his remarks, and the member making the request continues and resumes his seat he cannot speak again in the debate, 468

A motion for the adjournment of a debate must be put without debate, 10427

Adjournment (Formal).—The Speaker must judge of the urgency of the matter, to discuss when a formal motion of adjournment is moved, by the remarks of the member moving the motion, 12159

The violation of the wages award in the agricultural implement industry is, in view of the early close of the session, a matter of urgent public importance, 12159

Adjournment of House.—The Minister having replied to the debate on his motion for the adjournment of the House, the debate is closed, 10462

Amendments.—On the motion "That the House do now adjourn," it is not competent to move as an amendment the addition of words requiring the carriage of perishable products in Government steamers, 600

Questions affecting amendments should be raised in Committee on the Bill to which they refer, 1056, 1379

No amendment can be made in a schedule to a Bounties Bill which would enable any bounty to be payable in respect of any item not already provided for in the schedule to the Bill as presented, 1315

It is not forbidden by the Standing Orders, but it has not been the practice, to make amendments in a schedule to a Bill altering the appropriation provided for if before the Bill as amended is reported a message is received covering the appropriation required by the amended schedule, 1316

A Bill may be amended so as to determine that a certain amount shall be paid under it in any year—either earlier or later—provided that there is no increase in the total appropriation, or any new destination of any vote, 1380

An amendment—that the money for the bounties be raised by means of direct taxation—cannot be moved on the third reading of a Bill making provision for the payment of bounties, 1409

RULINGS—MR. SPEAKER—*continued.*

An amendment moved on the second reading of the Manufactures Encouragement Bill that, to the question, "That this Bill be now read a second time," the following words be added—"and the Committee on the Bill be instructed to incorporate in the Bill provision for the nationalization of the iron industry," is in order since it is not an "instruction" within the meaning of standing orders Nos. 218, 249, and 251, but a "resolution strictly relevant to the Bill" within the meaning of standing order No. 152, 6233-5

An amendment to a Bill cannot be moved on the second reading, 6279

No more than two amendments to a motion can be before the House at the same time, 9350

On the motion "That this (Surplus Revenue) Bill be now read a second time," an amendment moved to omit the words after "That" with a view to insert "the Bill be read a second time this day six months" must be temporarily withdrawn, to enable an amendment to be put for the omission of the words after "That" with a view to insert "the consideration of this Bill be postponed until the financial relations of the Commonwealth and States can be dealt with as a whole," because the latter amendment would anticipate the issue raised by the former, 9875

An amendment can be withdrawn only by leave of the House, 10406

An amendment proposing an increase of any tax, rate, or duty cannot be moved by a non-official member in any committee on any Bill; but on the initiation of a Bill when the House is dealing with the preliminary resolutions relating to the imposition of duties any member may move such an amendment, 10486

No amendment can be moved upon a motion on the business-paper until the motion is called on, 11050

It is the practice to state reasons why amendments made by the Senate are not agreed to; but it would be unwise to adopt a similar practice in dealing with requests, 11579

Bills.—If after a Bill received from the Senate has been read a first time, it should be discovered that there is anything in it to which objection can be taken on the ground that it infringes the privileges of the House of Representatives, it is the duty of Mr. Speaker to call attention to the fact, 1926

The Commonwealth Salaries Bill not being a Bill to appropriate revenue or moneys, or to levy taxation does not contravene section 53 of the Constitution, and was not improperly originated in the Senate, 3862

If a Bill transmitted from the Senate is found to have been originated in contravention of section 53 of the Constitution, it is the duty of the Speaker when he becomes aware of the circumstances to direct attention to the infringement of the rights of the House of Representatives, 3862

RULINGS—MR. SPEAKER—*continued.*

Business, Order of.—It is the practice for the Leader of the House to submit motions affecting the order of business, 10126; but members who have motions on the paper may object, 10126

The absence of members who have motions on the paper does not preclude the House from going on with other business, 10126

Chairman of Committees.—A motion for the suspension of the Standing Orders, and motions for the appointment of Committees of Supply and Ways and Means having been agreed to, Mr. Speaker remains in the chair until provision is made for the appointment of either a temporary or a permanent Chairman of Committees, 82

Orders of the Day having been postponed for a definite purpose, it is competent for a motion in furtherance of that purpose to be moved, 83; but a motion for the appointment of a permanent Chairman of Committees would require a further postponement of the Orders of the Day before it could be moved, 82

The ruling of the Chairman should be asked on questions as to the order in which the items of a Tariff shall be taken, after the Tariff has been referred to the Committee of Ways and Means, 3587

Committees.—When the House has referred a measure to a Committee in the way in which the Tariff is referred to the Committee of Ways and Means it will refuse, by specific motion, to direct the Committee as to the conduct of its business in any matter within the power of the Committee, 3587

Conduct, Disorderly.—It is not in order for members to make remarks, or to move about the chamber while Mr. Speaker is addressing the House, 184, 3765, 3856, 6026, 10455

Conversations should not take place within the chamber while a member is speaking, 26, 184, 1679, 1749, 1877, 2237, 2680, 2702, 3936, 3965, 4279, 6026, 6135, 6138, 6146, 6356, 6369, 6434, 6438, 7450, 10757, 11711, 11823

Debate.—Must be relevant to the question, 82, 796, 818, 1304, 1402, 1409, 1924-5, 1084, 2240, 2801, 3418, 3760-74, 3856, 3860, 3946, 3968, 6163, 6186, 6233, 6258, 6439, 7453, 7506, 9038-9, 9120-1, 9589, 9592, 9875, 10442, 10454, 10460-1, 11632, 11750-1, 11796, 11826-7, 11858, 11941-2

A member in speaking must address the Chair and not other members, 204, 3766, 11853

In a debate on the Address-in-Reply, a member may refer to the remarks of previous speakers, 468

A member is not at liberty to speak more than once on a motion for a special adjournment of the House, 741

It is not in order to refer to what has occurred in the Senate, 1402, 3851, 4278; or to a Bill before that Chamber, 11940, 12039

The relative merits of direct and indirect taxation should not be debated on the third reading of a Bill making provision for the payment of bounties, 1409

RULINGS—MR. SPEAKER—continued.

- The Minister having replied to a debate the debate is closed, 1869, 3299, 10480
- It is very undesirable that the names of the household of His Excellency the Governor-General should be introduced into a discussion, 1870
- It is not in order to make a statement as to the provisions contained in a Bill on the motion fixing a date for the second reading thereof, 1924-5
- It is not in order to anticipate a debate which may take place during the consideration of an Order of the Day already on the business paper, 2895, 2900, 4794-5, 4843, 4845, 4847, 4868, 4956, 5695, 6026, 6141-2, 6231-2, 6676, 8933, 10180, 11670; unless the Order be rescinded, 11629; or the Standing Order dealing with the matter be suspended, 11635
- No discussion should take place on proceedings in Committee until the Committee has reported, 3299, 3361, 4243, 4461, 4646, 6144, 6181, 10699
- Debates begun in Committee cannot be continued in the House, 3361
- A member, so long as he does not transgress the Standing Orders, has a right to say what he pleases, and in his own way; and no attempt should be made to limit or confine him to a statement of what others may desire him to say, 3413
- A member having resumed his seat is not entitled to rise again and resume his speech; whenever a member resumes his seat it is an intimation to the Presiding Officer that he has concluded his speech, 3414, 10455
- Except on a specific motion it is improper to criticise the action of Judges, and it is undesirable that their names should be mentioned, 3860
- Remarks made upon an irrelevant matter introduced in a debate may be replied to in the same debate, 3948, 9589, 10456; but there should not be a general discussion of the irrelevant matter, 10458
- The House having without dissent agreed to the continuance of a debate upon a formal motion for the adjournment, the advisability of its continuance cannot be subsequently discussed, 3959
- The repetition of a statement the accuracy of which is questioned does not involve a point of order, 3965
- It is in order on the second reading of the Manufactures Encouragement Bill to discuss the nationalization of the iron industry, 6135
- A comparison of the results of the working of State as against private railways is in order in debating a proposal for the nationalization of the iron industry, 6240
- Remarks calculated to stir up feeling are undignified, and should not be made, 6288
- A member should not broadly discuss a particular policy on a measure which deals only with the procedure proposed to give effect to that policy, 7474
- On a motion dealing with the broad principles of the establishment of old-age pensions, it is not in order to discuss details of particular schemes to give effect to the principle, 9324-5

RULINGS—MR. SPEAKER—continued.

- On the question proposing the imposition of taxation on unimproved land values to provide an old-age pension fund it is not in order to discuss exemptions from such taxation, 9346
- It is usual for one member to accept the assurance of another, 9346
- A comparison of the revenue from the tariff of 1902 with that from the tariff of 1907 is not in order on the motion for the second reading of the Surplus Revenue Bill, 9850
- References to the personal appearance of members are very undesirable, 10787
- It is not in order to canvass a decision of the House, 10817
- A member is entitled to deny an inaccurate statement, but should not do so by way of interjection during a personal explanation, 11178
- It is not in order to refer to a previous debate of the same session, 11344
- A member may speak only once to a question unless by way of personal explanation, 11636
- The terms of a Bill should not be discussed on the preliminary motion for the appropriation to give effect to its provisions, 11670
- It was not in order on the second reading of the Surplus Revenue Bill to discuss the division of surplus revenue, 11750-1; means for the settlement of the financial relations between the Commonwealth and the States, 11823, 11826; members speaking to the main question were confined to the discussion of the advisableness of passing or not passing the Bill, and on the amendment to the advisability of deferring the passing of the Bill until some agreement had been come to between the Commonwealth and the States, 11827
- It is not in order on the second reading of a Supply Bill to debate a matter that is not dealt with in the Bill, 12182
- The only course open to members on the third reading of a Supply Bill is to accept or reject the Bill: it cannot be amended, 12196
- Divisions.*—Leave to withdraw a call for a division cannot be granted on the request of a member against whom the decision was not given, 9481
- Documents* must be read at length to secure publication in *Hansard*, 9847
- Explanations.*—Remarks which can properly be made in Committee should not be made in the course of a personal explanation to which there can be no reply, 2652-3
- No debate is permissible on a personal explanation, 2652, 3589
- It is not in order in the course of a personal explanation to anticipate the subject of a subsequent debate, 2652-4
- A member may make a personal explanation in order to put himself right with the House in a matter in regard to which he has been misunderstood; but in doing so he is not entitled to bring further argument to bear on the question, or to repeat arguments which have already been used, 3419
- A member may not interrupt the speech of another member in order to make a personal explanation, 9347, 10479, 11660

RULINGS—MR. SPEAKER—*continued.*

A member should not under cover of a personal explanation continue a debate that is closed, 10481

A member who has been misunderstood or misrepresented is entitled to make a personal explanation, 10482, 11705, 11913

Explanations as to misrepresentations of remarks by persons who are not members of Parliament are not in order, 11018

Personal explanations should be kept within reasonable bounds, 11705

The right to make a personal explanation does not carry with it the right to comment on the statements of others, 11913

A personal explanation should not be used to speak in terms of contempt, or to impugn the honour of persons who are not members of the House, 11914

A member in making a personal explanation is not entitled to debate the question involved, 11915

"*Grievance Day.*"—On the formal motion for the ventilation of grievances a member can discuss any matter he pleases, 9352, 10402

Any member may speak to the formal motion "That the Speaker do now leave the chair," and any amendment may be moved on that motion, 10402

No amendment upon an amendment on the formal motion can be received until the question "That all the words after the word 'that' be left out" has been decided, 10402, 10451, 11333

An amendment to insert the words "the consideration of the order of the day be postponed until to-morrow," in lieu of the words after "That," would if carried postpone "*Grievance Day*" for three weeks; and when the order of the day was reached on the morrow the Speaker would leave the chair without any motion being put, 10405

House Committee.—All matters relating to the House and the convenience of Members are in the hands, not of Ministers, but of the House Committee, 4412

Interruptions and Interjections.—Are disorderly, 26, 184, 301, 309, 310, 320, 412, 982, 3048, 3856, 3946, 4280, 6135, 6288, 6356, 6369, 6438, 9121, 9327, 9346, 9348, 9349, 9584, 9850, 10406, 10455, 10876, 11665, 11702, 11711, 11721, 11787, 11810, 11852, 12181

It is very unusual to interrupt a new member, 26

Interruptions are very unfair if made during a debate in which members' speeches are limited, 301, 309, 310, 982, 12163

Ministerial Statements.—In order that a ministerial statement may be made, only so much of the Standing Orders should be suspended as might be necessary to enable the Minister making the statement to have free scope in doing so, and to give other members equal freedom in speaking upon it, 11628

In the absence of rules governing the discussion of a ministerial statement the practice of the House of Commons applies, and that practice permits of a reply by the leader of the Opposition, but not of a general debate, 11629

No motion can be moved upon a Ministerial statement, 11635

RULINGS—MR. SPEAKER—*continued.*

Does not rule that it is not competent for a ministerial statement to be made at the commencement of the business of the House without the suspension of the Standing Orders, 11635

Motions.—If leave be asked to submit a motion without notice, to be granted the leave must be unanimous, 3410, 6389

A member having spoken to a motion cannot afterwards move an amendment upon it, 3412

A member moving a motion of privilege has no right of reply to the debate upon it, 3418-9

A motion for the suspension of the Standing Orders must be decided by an absolute majority, 6389, 9482

If the moving of a motion without notice be objected to, it may be moved on the suspension of the Standing Orders, 7492

A motion cannot be dealt with as unopposed business if any amendment is moved or any comment made upon it; if opposed it must stand over till a later date, 10880

A motion cannot be moved without notice unless by consent of the House, 11050, 11425

Before any motion, involving a discussion proper to an Order of the Day on the paper, can be proposed the motion fixing the Order of the Day must be rescinded, 11629

Motions dealing with questions of privilege are given precedence, 11702

A motion for adjournment involving the anticipation of a discussion of a matter on the business-paper cannot be received, 11744-5

A motion for the adjournment of a debate is not open to discussion, 11757

A motion proposing "1. That the report of a Select Committee be now taken into consideration. 2. That the report be adopted" is open to the objection that it might be taken in future to limit the rights of members. The notice which must be given of a motion is all that is necessary to secure the right to have it considered, 12048

Notices of Motions.—A notice of motion for the appointment of a Committee or of a Royal Commission to inquire into the administration of the Post and Telegraph Department does not preclude a general discussion of the administration of the Department in Committee of Supply, but it would preclude a general discussion as to the advisableness of appointing such a Committee or Royal Commission, 8817

It is not desirable that two notices of motion to the same effect should appear on the business-paper, 8817

A member having given notice of a motion is not bound to move the motion, and it is therefore unnecessary for him to withdraw the notice; but should the motion be submitted from the chair it can only be withdrawn by consent, 9352

Language, Unparliamentary.—It is not in order to say that a member's statement is untrue, 203, 204, 320, 606, 725, 3769, 6967, 10442, 10466, 10478, 11660

To charge members with having "played a contemptible trick," 3760

RULINGS—MR. SPEAKER—continued.

A Minister is entitled to complain that certain action has been taken in order to delay business, but if the remark is regarded as offensive by members it should be withdrawn, 3761

It is not in order to charge members with a desire "to burk legislation," and if made such a charge should be withdrawn, 3762

To charge members with making deliberate misstatements, 5699

Remarks regarded as offensive must be withdrawn, 5699, 5700, 5703, 11054, 11346, 11722

A member called upon to withdraw offensive remarks should rise in his place to do so, 5700, 10442

It is very unbecoming to refer to a member as a "chap," 7507

To insinuate that a member has been removed from the magistrates bench, 9349

To say that a member is trying to "fool" persons inside or outside the House, 9586

That a member has made a "scandalous statement," 10479

That members are intriguing, 11054

To describe a section of the members as "a push," 11054

To say that a member has been false to his oath, 11722

To use insulting language towards a member, 10876

New Business.—A motion contingent on business entered upon before 11 p.m. is not "new" business, 1809

Cannot be taken after 11 p.m., 10127

Objections.—The Speaker does not take notice of a call of objection made at an improper time by a member who remains seated, 10481-2

Orders of the Day.—The Orders of the Day must be called on two hours after the meeting of the House, 606

An error made in fixing an Order of the Day for a particular date may be corrected by leave when it is discovered, but the proper course is to correct it when the Order of the Day is called, 2566

Papers.—A paper having been tabled and ordered to be printed is in the custody, not of the Ministry but of the House, and may be dealt with as members think fit, 3001-2

A Minister desiring to make a statement in laying papers on the table should conclude with a motion for their printing in order that the statement may be replied to, 6124, 6676-7

Papers, Printing of.—The adoption of a report from the Printing Committee recommending that, except in cases of urgency and importance, no order be made for the printing of a document until the same has been referred to the Committee for consideration and report, neither increases nor diminishes the powers of the House in regard to the printing of papers as defined in the Standing Orders, 770-1, 9298

Petitions.—It is not the practice to have the names of signatories to a petition read, but it may be done if the House so desires, 2790

RULINGS—MR. SPEAKER—continued.

The certificate of a member to a petition which he presents is merely as to the number of signatures appended, its respectful wording, and the fact that it contains a request. It does not touch the accuracy of the statements contained in the petition, 2999

The House accepts no responsibility for the accuracy of any statement contained in a petition, 2999

A member desiring that the record of a petition be erased must give notice of a motion to that effect, and obtain the support of the prescribed number of members for such motion, 2999

A member is entitled to indicate the nature of the signatures to a petition he presents, 3408
If there are attached to a petition, signatures which are forgeries, it may be presented, and it is for the House to receive it or not as it pleases, 3408-9

On a motion that a petition be read, it is competent to move an amendment requiring the signatures also to be read, 3410

The only motions which can be received on the presentation of a petition are: that the petition be received, and: that the petition be read, 3410

A petition having, on motion, been read and received, a motion to inquire into its genuineness cannot be submitted without notice; and if leave be asked to submit such a motion, to be granted it must be unanimous, 3410

Unless a petition contains a request it is not in order, 3619, 3620

There is no such thing as the "usual prayer" in petitions, 3620

The words which usually conclude a petition—"and your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray"—are unnecessary, and are not the prayer of the petition, 3620

A document which does not ask for something is not a petition, and cannot be received as such, 3620

It is not usual to order the reading of two petitions similar in character, 6023

It is not competent for a member who presents a petition to move that it be printed, unless he proposes to take action upon it by submitting a specific motion, 6725

A petition addressed "To the Speaker, and Members of the Legislative Assembly of Victoria" cannot be received, 7294

Political Parties.—It is not a function of the Speaker to appoint a leader to any political party, 11628

Protests.—The House has no power to receive a protest at the hands of any one, 3620

Questions.—A question cannot be put after a motion, which could only be called on after question time has elapsed, has been dealt with, 315

It is the practice of the House, when there is time to spare, to permit the putting of questions, on the paper, after the Orders of the Day have been called on, 315, 606

A member who asks a question may not express an opinion in doing so; nor can the Minister who answers it do so, 589, 6677, 11155

RULINGS—MR. SPEAKER—*continued.*

In putting or answering a question the matter to which it refers cannot be debated, 590, 975, 977, 2688, 2790, 2891, 3935, 4518, 6227, 6420, 7461, 8931, 8934, 9764, 11154-6, 11179, 11387, 11705, 11738, 11788, 12153

It is not in order to put a question to Ministers during the debate on a motion for a special adjournment of the House, 741

A question concerning amendments in a Bill should be raised in Committee on the Bill, 1056

It is not in order for a member to ask a question without notice on a matter dealt with in a question of which notice has been given, 2450, 2794, 11050, 11328

There is no obligation on a member to answer a question put by another, 3299

A question concerning the order in which items in a Tariff shall be considered should be raised in the Committee of Ways and Means to which the Tariff has been referred, 3587

Questions are asked for the information not merely of the members who ask them but of the whole House, 4279

A question, the reply to which would involve the anticipation of a debate proper to a matter on the paper, should not be put, and when put should not be answered, 4956

It is contrary to the Standing Orders for members to obtain, by way of interjection, two or three consecutive answers to a question, 6068, 12157

It is entirely a matter for the Minister concerned to determine the answer he will give to a question; and for the member asking the question to take any step he may please in respect to the answer, 9009

A member in asking a question should rise and address the chair, 10076

A member is not entitled to ask two or more questions in succession, to the exclusion of other members, 10076, 11737

When questions are asked, members should be silent in order that the questions and the answers to them may be heard, 10754, 11154, 11387, 11787

It is contrary to the Standing Orders to make a question a means of making a statement rather than a means to obtain information, 10064

Questions asked of private members must relate to a Bill, motion, or other public matter, connected with business on the notice-paper, in charge of the member of whom the question is asked, 10965, 10969

In putting questions only such quotations should be made as are necessary for the purposes of the questions, 11050, 11521, 11626; where it is desired to read long extracts from newspapers, the question should be stated first that Mr. Speaker may be able to judge the relevance of the extracts, 11626

The answer to a question should not assume the character of a speech in a debate, 11387; nor should it include a reference to a matter which does not arise out of the question, 11388

The only justification for reading quotations in asking questions is that they explain the questions, 11738

Questions must avoid references which would open up a discussion of a matter on the business paper, 1140

RULINGS—MR. SPEAKER—*continued.*

A question relating to a Bill before the Senate is not in order, 12039

Quotations.—Reports of debates of the current session on the subject under discussion, and reports of debates of previous sessions on any question may be quoted, but reports of debates of the current session on questions other than that before the House may not be quoted, 6238

Reports of debates of the current session on questions other than that before the House may be summarized, 6238

Quotations made in putting questions should be only such as are necessary for the purposes of the questions, 11050, 11521, 11626

Recommitals.—A motion to recommit a Bill for the purpose of considering certain specified amendments would if carried restrict the Committee to the consideration of those amendments, 1379

Rulings.—It is not the duty of the Speaker to give rulings on supposititious cases, 9236

A ruling by the Speaker should not be debated, 3361

Senate.—In accordance with precedents already laid down, it is becoming for the Senate to make a request to the House of Representatives to increase or decrease duties, or otherwise to modify any item in a Tariff, 7450

The Senate, in requesting the House of Representatives to amend the schedule of a Tariff Bill, does not amend the Tariff, and its action is not followed by action on the part of the Customs Department until the requested amendments have been made by the House of Representatives, 10487

The Senate may not amend a Bill so as to involve an increased burden upon the people, but it may request the House of Representatives to make such an amendment, 10485-7

There being no limitation under section 53 of the Constitution precluding the consideration of a request by the Senate for an increase of taxation, the House of Representatives has no right to refuse to consider such a request, 10487

A message from the Senate covering requests for amendments in the schedule to a Tariff Bill is within the power of the Senate to send, and following precedents already laid down might well be considered and dealt with on its merits by the House of Representatives, 10487

There being no joint Standing Orders governing the procedure in respect of messages from the Senate returning a second time with requests for amendments a proposed law imposing taxation, the House must itself decide to deal with the message as it thinks fit, or to refuse to consider it, 11381

It would not be wise, in dealing with Senate's requests, to adopt the practice followed in connexion with amendments made by the Senate of stating reasons why they are not agreed to, 11579

Speaker, Mr.—Should be heard in silence, 184, 3300, 3765, 3856, 10455, 11823

The reply about to be made to a member by Mr. Speaker should not be anticipated, 3413

RULINGS—MR. SPEAKER—continued.

Ruling should be obeyed, 3361, 4280, 10459
Is not cognisant of promises made by leaders of parties, 10460

Not in order to reflect on, 10461

Does not interpret the Constitution, 10486

Does not appoint leaders to political parties, 11628

Does not argue questions of order with members, 11827

Standing Orders.—It is the duty of Mr. Speaker to see that the Standing Orders are not transgressed, 580, 3361

The motion ordinarily moved in accordance with the practice of the House to suspend the Standing Orders to enable a Supply Bill to be passed without delay, suspends only so much of the Standing Orders as might be necessary for that purpose, 8863

A motion for the suspension of the Standing Orders cannot be debated, 9481-2, 9521

The suspension of the Standing Orders is necessary to enable the report of a resolution of Committee of Supply to be carried and the passing of a Bill founded upon it through all its stages, on the same day as that on which the resolution is reported, 12095

Strangers include representatives of the Press, 3095

Suspension of Sitting.—An unusual suspension of a sitting can only take place by the practically unanimous desire of the House, 113

Taxation.—It is not competent for a non-official member to submit any proposal or amendment for the increase of any tax, rate, or duty in any Committee on any Bill; but on the initiation of a Bill, or when the House is dealing with the preliminary resolutions relating to the imposition of duties it is competent for any member to move for any increase, 10486

MR. SPEAKER.—General observations—

Absence of Mr. Speaker, 6505, 7169

Chairman of Committees—Practice followed on appointment of, 82-3

Chairman of Committees, temporary—Warrant nominating, 404

Divisions—Correction of errors in, 827

Explanations, Personal—*Obs.* as to, 2652-4

Kingston, Right Hon. C. C.—

Obs. on announcement of death of, 11049

Reply to motion of sympathy, 12038

Linlithgow, Marquis of—Reply to message of sympathy on death of, 9088

Mails—Delivery of at Parliament House, 6673

Ministerial Statements—Practice in connexion with, 11628-9, 11635

Murwillumbah, fire at—Reply to message of sympathy, 3850

New Zealand, Dominion of—Reply to message of congratulation, 4085

Officers of the House—Acknowledgment of services of, 7540

Papers, Parliamentary—

Distribution of copies of, 1748, 3091-2

Printing of, practice adopted in connexion with, 770-1, 2229

When tabled are the property of the House, 3091

Parliament—Presentation to, by the Prime Minister, 22

F.6950.—11

RULINGS—MR. SPEAKER—continued.

Mr. Speaker—General observations—*continued*
Parliament House—

Entertainment of strangers at, 6292

Exhibition of views of Capital Sites, 8815, 10965

Exhibits in, 1412, 6592, 7114-5, 7300

Joint Committee, leave to sit, 11328

Lighting of House of Representatives' chamber, 7249

Lobbying in, 6592

Sewering of, 4847, 12039

Ventilation of House of Representatives' chamber, 3683, 4413

Petitions—Opinion of Attorney-General as to action in connexion with alleged forged signatures to a petition, 7457

Prayers—Demeanour of members at, 5781

Quotations—Use of, in asking questions, 1126

Questions—Practice in putting, after "Question time," 315

Resolutions of Western Australian Parliament concerning The Tariff, 4956

Senate—

Messages from, raising questions as to constitutional rights of House of Representatives, 11381, 11437

Messages to, where requests have not been agreed to, 11579

Standing Orders—Permanent character of, 10968

Suspension of Sittings—Practice in connexion with, 113

Writs—

Issue of writ for electoral division of Echuca, 22; return of writ, 500

Issue of writ for electoral division of Adelaide, 11095

DEPUTY SPEAKER, MR. McDONALD.

Amendments.—On a motion for the ratification of a contract, it is in order to move that certain words should be inserted in the contract, if ratified, before it is finally completed, 6502

Debate.—No discussion can take place on proceedings in Committee until the Committee has reported, 5237, 6511, 6522

It is in order to reply to irrelevant matter introduced into a debate, 6453-4

The discussion must be relevant to the question, 6454, 6470, 6520

It is not in order to anticipate a debate which may take place during the consideration of an Order of the Day already on the business-paper, 7170

Explanations.—A personal explanation must be confined to the specific matter in connexion with which it is made, 6512
May be made at any time, 6518
Should not be debated, 6518

Interjections and Interruptions are disorderly, 6492, 6509

Should not be replied to, 6511

Language Unparliamentary.—It is not in order to say that a member "is telling a deliberate untruth," 6490

Offensive remarks must be withdrawn unreservedly, 6490

RULINGS—DEPUTY SPEAKER—*continued.*

Motions.—Where the questions raised by a motion and by the amendments moved upon it are interwoven, the procedure has been to regard speeches made upon the amendments as having been addressed to the original question also, and consequently to regard the speech in reply of the mover of the motion as closing the debate, 6499-6501

A motion—That the House, at its rising, adjourn to a later hour of the same day, may supersede a sessional order fixing the days of sitting, 6503

A motion for the resumption of the Committee of Supply on a future date having been agreed to, a subsequent motion that the Committee have leave to sit forthwith can only be submitted by leave, 11418

Pairs.—The House does not recognise pairs in any way, 6506

Rulings.—A ruling from the Chair cannot be discussed except upon a motion to dissent from it, 6501

Chairman of Committees.

Amendments.—An amendment may be moved upon any item in a schedule, 1072

The ordinary rule is to submit a schedule as a whole; but where by desire the items of a schedule are put separately, the most convenient course for a member desiring the omission of an item to follow is to move that the first word of the item be left out, 1106

A schedule to a Bounties Bill may be amended by the insertion of an item not included in the Bill as presented if the amendment would not involve an increase of the appropriation provided for, 1312, 1314. (Withdrawn in deference to Mr. Speaker's ruling, 1316, 1317)

The insertion of an item not included in the schedule to a Bounties Bill, as presented, does not alter the destination of the vote where provision is made in the Bill for varying the maximum amount of bounty payable in respect of any goods, 1312, 1314. (Withdrawn in deference to Mr. Speaker's ruling, 1316, 1317)

An amendment to the same effect as one previously rejected may be moved if expressed in different form, 1562

No more than two amendments to a motion can be before the Committee at the same time, 4341, 4573

An amendment that is in order must be accepted by the Chair in the form in which it is moved, 4577

After a clause has been amended no amendment affecting an earlier part of it can be received, 5159, 9194-5, 11973

An amendment having been moved upon an amendment, it must be disposed of before the original amendment can be withdrawn, and neither can be withdrawn except by leave, 5442

A member objecting to the withdrawal of an amendment should rise in his place to do so, 5725

An amendment is recognised as proposed only by the member who moves it, 5975

RULINGS—CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES—*continued.*

A new clause involving an appropriation of money must be preceded by a message from the Crown, 6388

An amendment to leave out a proposed new section in a clause would, if negatived, prevent an amendment being received to amend the proposed section, 9135-6

An amendment proposing an addition to a motion already passed cannot be received, 10504

An amendment involving a direct negative cannot be received, 10735, 10741

An amendment moved upon a motion must be disposed of before the original motion can be withdrawn, 11004, 11009

Bills.—It is not customary to put the clauses of a Bill in sections, 9132, 9135

Business.—It is not the duty of the Chairman of Committees to decide whether business submitted to the Committee is "Government" business or "Private" business, 1886

The Chairman is not charged with the conduct of business, but when a discussion ceases it is his duty to put the question, 3297

Casting Vote.—The Chairman's casting vote is usually given in such a way as to permit of the further consideration of the question, 5730, 6656, 6680

It should not be questioned, 10725, 11214

Conduct, Disorderly.—Members should not stand in any of the passages or gangways, 4311

Conversations are disorderly, 2729, 4359, 6804, 6885, 7084, 7302, 10554, 10732

Debate.—The discussion must be relevant to the question, 631, 638, 1020, 1077, 1120, 1002, 2002, 3323, 3454-5, 3595-7, 3602-4, 3648, 4022, 4121, 4120-3, 5049-50, 5067, 5152, 5243, 5600, 5629-30, 5826-7, 5950, 6389, 6487, 6597, 6611, 6698, 6714, 6788, 6791, 6792, 6866, 6875, 6909, 6956, 7001, 7079, 7099, 7127, 7255, 7315, 8975, 9209, 9483, 9887, 9909-70, 9977-81, 9983, 9989, 10125, 10190-1, 10612, 10616, 10664, 10668, 10728-9, 10730, 10982, 10992, 11104, 11107-9, 11210, 11265, 11270, 11277-8, 11284, 11298, 11359-66, 11375, 11378, 11411, 11438, 11966, 12078, 12081-4, 12086-8, 12090

Incidental references only may be made to matters not directly bearing on the question, 631, 3597, 6905, 6925, 7128, 9485, 10824, 11107

The general principles of a Bill should not be discussed in Committee, 1057, 1542, 11966, 12072

Members may speak as often as they please to the question in Committee, 1070

When, by desire, the items of a schedule are put separately, the schedule as a whole is subsequently put, and is open to discussion, 1072

A member's denial of a statement attributed to him should be accepted 1081, 3034, 4287, 5743, 6588, 6599, 10215, 10583, 11174

A member addressing the Chair should not be interrupted in order that another member may make a personal explanation, 1082, 2729

RULINGS—CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES—continued.

- A speech interrupted by the reporting of progress may be treated as having been concluded, 2655
- On the resumption of a debate it is not necessary that the Chairman of Committees should restate the question, 2655
- Progress is usually reported on the motion of the Minister in charge of the Bill under consideration, 2741
- A member suggesting the adjournment of a debate is as a matter of practice and by courtesy called upon to resume it, but there is no rule under which he can claim to do so as a right, 2741
- The general discussion on the Budget and Tariff having been concluded, and the first item of the Tariff submitted, members should not resume the general discussion, but should confine themselves entirely to the Tariff, 3294-7
- It is not in order in Committee of Supply to refer in detail to matters connected with the Tariff; that should be done in Committee of Ways and Means, 3319-20
- The discussion of grievances before Supply is limited by the Standing Order dealing with the subject, 3320
- Members when speaking must address the Chair and not other members, 3439-40, 11085
- When an amendment has been disposed of the original motion is again open to debate, 4358
- A statement regarded as offensive by the member to whom it is addressed should, as a matter of courtesy, be withdrawn, 3658, 5924-6, 5958, 5960, 6681, 6791, 6882, 7369
- Irrelevant matter introduced into a debate may be replied to, 4568, 5152
- It is not in order to question the impartiality of the Chair, 4355, 5132, 5441-2, 5970, 7355, 9975, 10728
- It is not in order to impute unworthy motives, 5625, 7193, 10649
- Members should not indulge in personalities, 5629-30, 7367, 11211
- The details of a Supply Bill cannot be discussed in Committee of Supply, but only in the Committee on the Bill, 6286
- A member cannot be compelled to withdraw a statement merely because another member regards it as offensive, 6885
- It is not in order for a member to reflect upon the votes given by another, 6929-30, 10728, 11446
- The absence of a member from the Chamber does not involve a point of order, 7252
- It is not in order to refer to debates in the Senate, 10566, 10568, 10695, 10698-9, 10783
- A member may in the course of his speech put direct questions to other members; but they should not reply to such questions by interjection, 10607
- It is not in order to question a decision of the Committee, 10726, 10728
- Reflections upon the impartiality of the Chair must be withdrawn unconditionally, 10728
- Not in order to make detailed reference to a debate of the same session, 11085, 11088; or to discuss what takes place in Senate, 11147

RULINGS—CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES—continued.

- It is not in order on the preliminary motion preceding the introduction of the Coast Defences Appropriation Bill to discuss in detail the methods of naval defence, 12078; the proceedings of the Imperial Conference, 12081; or the general question of defence, 12088
- Divisions.*—The question "That the item proposed to be left out stand part of the schedule" having on division been resolved in the affirmative, the item is passed, 1105
- Members should not leave the Chamber after the tellers are appointed, 5956
- Members sitting in the seats at the end of the Chamber are regarded as outside the Chamber, if the cords which surround those seats are up, 5956
- Members are at liberty to cross the chamber before, but not after the tellers have been appointed, 6548, 7092
- A member standing in the gangway after the tellers have been appointed, cannot be counted on either side, 6965
- If there be no tellers for the noes, the question is resolved in the affirmative, 6976
- The Chairman has no power to prevent a member who calls for a division leaving the chamber before the division is taken, 7247
- A member may vote in a division against his own motion, 11010
- Estimates.*—It is not in order on the Estimates for Additions New Works and Buildings to discuss the qualifications of or need for officers; this should be done on the Estimates-in-chief for the Department concerned, 3454-5
- Votes included in the Estimates-in-chief cannot be discussed on the Works and Buildings Estimates, 3595-7
- A general discussion is not in order on a particular vote in the Estimates, 9786
- A particular item in the Estimates need not be moved; this would not prevent the reporting of other resolutions or the founding of a Bill on the resolutions reported, 3741
- The practice of the Committee in considering Estimates has been to permit a general discussion on the first division of each Department, and then to confine debate to the particular vote before the Committee, 8966, 9396, 9959, 9985, 10185-6, 11404-5, 11411
- Details connected with the votes should be discussed on the separate votes and not during the general discussion permitted on the first division for each Department, 8973
- On a vote for the Government Printer the cost of printing, that is not specifically provided for elsewhere in the Estimates, may be discussed, 9976-7
- A matter of policy should not be discussed on a division of the Estimates, 9986-8
- It is not in order in dealing with the Estimates for one Department to refer to matters covered by the Estimates for another Department, 9489, 10190-1
- It is in order to discuss the application of a Ministerial policy to a particular case, but not to such an extent as to substitute for a discussion of the vote, a discussion of the merits or demerits of the particular case. 10205, 10211, 10212, 10217

RULINGS—CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES—*continued.*

It is not in order in discussing "Additional Estimates" to refer to matters covered by votes in the Estimates in Chief, 11359-66, 11379

Explanations.—A personal explanation should not be interposed so as to interrupt the speech of a member, 1082; or by way of interjection, 2729

A member who has been misrepresented is entitled to make a personal explanation, 3439

A personal explanation cannot be made on a motion to report progress, 4243

Explanations should be confined strictly to the points that have been raised, 10706

Interruptions and Interjections.—Are disorderly, 611, 737, 2275, 2376, 2473-4, 2488, 2729, 3034, 3178, 3317, 3459, 4022, 4566, 5050, 5965, 6680, 6988, 7078, 7194, 7309, 7321, 7368, 9980, 10697, 10725-6, 10777, 10976, 11085, 11441

A misrepresentation of a member's statement should not be corrected by way of interjection, 2474

Interjections being disorderly should not be replied to, 4002, 5050, 6788, 10207

Under standing order No. 48, it is not in order for a private member to interject from the Treasury Bench, 7040

Language, Parliamentary.—No exception can be taken to the remark "Does not the honorable member know that his statement is untrue," 3520

The statement that "The Standard Oil Trust had honorable members in its bag" is not unparliamentary, but it would be better if such statements were not made, 10975

Language, Unparliamentary.—It is not in order to describe any measure brought before the House as "a scandal," 1806

To accuse a member of deliberate misrepresentation, 2015, 2474

To say that a member's statement is untrue, 2473-4, 3439, 3520, 6686, 6792, 7368, 9081, 10120, 12175

That a member is a "slanderer," 2475

That the statement of a member is a "misstatement," 2729

Unparliamentary expressions must be withdrawn unreservedly, 2729, 3439, 5969-70, 6792, 6928, 7357, 7368, 7397

It is not in order to express a hope that a member "will adhere to the truth," 2729

To say that a member is an "absolute liar," 3357

To reflect upon the Chair, 3357, 10504, 10580

A member reflecting upon the Chair should apologize to the Committee, 3357, 10504

To accuse members of "making disgraceful charges," 3669

To say that a Minister is "a factotum and general bully," 4117

To refer to speeches as "stone-walling," 4344

To say that a member "had better keep his dirty remarks in his own dirty duck-house," 4355

To suggest "sharp practice," 5132

To say that a member "ought to be ashamed of himself," 5458

RULINGS—CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES—*continued.*

To charge members with "political inconsistency to a disgraceful sort," 5626

To call a member an "insulting brute," 5628

To speak of members as "automata," 5628

To refer to a member as a "turncoat in politics," 5727

To say that a member "is grossly misrepresenting the position, and knows it," 5798

To refer to a member as "a mule," 5968

To say that "the proceedings of the Committee are being reduced to a farce," 5969

To say of a member, "Let him be a man and not a monkey," 6584

To say that a member is "an old fraud," 6928

To suggest that members would be guilty of "tricks," 7077

To say that a member's attitude is "most contemptible," 7211

That the opportunity to discuss Supply is used for mischievous purposes, 9979

That a Minister has deceived members, 9981

To charge a Minister with deliberately breaking his word, 10091

To say that a member is "stone-walling," 10554

To accuse a member of trickery, 10565

To say that a member "has probably served his time in Pentridge," 10581

That a member "is wilfully misrepresenting the facts," 10583

To describe any action taken by the Committee as "damnable," 10594

To say that a Minister "is fooling the Committee and playing a despicable trick," 10687

That members are "turncoats," 10730

That a member is "a disgrace to the House," 7357

A member in asking that offensive words should be withdrawn should not use words that are equally offensive, 7357

It is not in order to say that a member "is absolutely ridiculous," 7397

That a member has proposed something which is "traitorous to the Commonwealth," 7402

That "the galleries were filled with men who were imploring the Treasurer to give them an opportunity to dip their hands in the public purse in order that they might enrich themselves," 10981

That votes were taken under circumstances which were not creditable, 11214

Remarks of an insulting character should be withdrawn, 11211

Motions.—A motion "That the Chairman report progress" is not open to debate, 2741, 4580; may be moved although an amendment before the Committee has not been disposed of, 12076

A motion dissenting from a ruling of the Chairman must be submitted in writing, 3298

Pairs.—Are not officially recognised, 6793-4

Papers.—A Minister reading from a State document or any paper likely to be published may be asked to lay it on the table, 5222

RULINGS—CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES—continued.

If a quotation is made from a private letter the member making it may give or withhold the name of the writer at his discretion, 5222

Procedure in Committee.—The Committee has full power to decide its own procedure, 1312, 6388

Though a ruling of the Chairman of Committees is occasionally referred to Mr. Speaker, it is much better that the Committee should arrange its own business, 1312

The Committee may order complicated questions to be divided, 4359, 10663, 10724

Where there is doubt as to how a question should be put the Chairman is prepared to listen to suggestions, 5441

The Committee is not supposed to know what takes place in the House, 10570

The Committee should decide its own procedure, and there should be no appeal to the Speaker from a decision of the Chairman of Committees, 10739

The Chairman is not called upon to interpret the effect of any proposal, 10729, 10812

Quorum.—When a quorum has been called for, until those present have been counted no member should leave the Chamber, 6800

Quotations.—A member may quote from an unfinished debate of the current session, 7139

The Chairman cannot control the reading of any document relevant to the question, 7321

Rulings.—If a ruling of the Chairman is disputed a motion dissenting from it must be moved at once, 3297

A motion dissenting from a ruling of the Chairman must be submitted in writing, 3298

It is not the duty of the Chairman to give rulings on technical questions, 10884; or on hypothetical cases, 4764, 5640, 10678, 11010

The Chairman's ruling should not be discussed except on a specific motion dissenting from it, 5640, 6388, 6705, 7006, 9987-8, 10738, 10742, 11546

It is customary for the Chairman to uphold the ruling of a Temporary Chairman, 9977

A member should not attempt to evade a ruling of the Chairman, 11379

Senate.—The terms of messages to the Senate are determined not by a Committee but by the House, 11544

Speaker, Mr.—A ruling by Mr. Speaker should not be discussed in Committee, 1310

Suspension of Sitting.—There is no time definitely fixed for the suspension of a sitting and should the Committee continue to sit after the hour at which the business is ordinarily suspended, the proceedings are in no way invalidated, 7355

Tariff.—A motion for the consideration of a number of items *en bloc* may be moved when the general question is being discussed, but not after the first item has been put from the Chair, 4006

Each item of a Tariff is in itself a separate enactment, 4006

It is in order to move the postponement of an item or items until a subsequent item or items have been dealt with, 4007, 4120, 4122, 4331, 4626

RULINGS—CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES—continued.

The covering clauses of a Tariff are merely explanatory, and are put to the Committee when the items have been dealt with, when amendments may be moved upon them, 4007

An amendment of general application exempting packages from duty is not in order; but an amendment to exempt from duty all packages in connexion with a specific item may be moved, 4088

An amendment to increase a duty can be proposed only by a Minister; but an amendment which would reduce or would not increase a duty may be moved by a private member, 4305, 4674, 4764, 5264, 5555-6, 5640, 6115, 6911, 7103, 7107

On a motion to postpone the consideration of certain items the merits of the duties proposed in respect of them cannot be debated, 4329, 4341

It is in order to move the postponement of items up to and inclusive of a certain item with the exception of other intervening items, 4331, 4334-5, 4626

If on an amendment to except certain items from those proposed to be postponed a further amendment to except other items is negatived, no further amendment proposing the exception of fresh items can be received, 4358

If a question involving a number of items is considered a complicated question, by leave of the Committee, each item may be put separately, 4359, 7073, 7076, 7080

An amendment to make an article duty free under the General Tariff and also from the United Kingdom having been rejected, it is in order to move that it be dutiable under the General Tariff and free from the United Kingdom, 4574-5

An amendment to make an article dutiable at 5 per cent. under the General Tariff and also from the United Kingdom having been rejected it is in order to move that it be dutiable at 10 per cent. under the General Tariff and 5 per cent. from the United Kingdom; but should the latter proposal be agreed to it would not be in order to move that the duty should be 10 per cent. under the General Tariff and also from the United Kingdom, 4579

A motion to postpone a particular item involves the postponement of that item only, 4625

An amendment adding horses to the list of animals proposed to be made dutiable and fixing the duty at 10s. per head having been agreed to, no subsequent amendment to the item can be received which would alter the duty on horses agreed to, 4772-3

An item having been amended, the question: That the item, as amended, be agreed to—is put and, if carried, no further amendment to the item can be moved, 4773

In submitting amendments to Tariff items that proposing the lowest duty is put first, 4954, 5850

An amendment fixing a duty at a certain rate having been agreed to, no further amendment by way of reduction can be received, 4968

RULINGS—CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES—continued.

- An amendment in the form "and on and after" a certain date, duty at a certain rate, may be amended by the omission of the words "and on and after," 4970
- One part of an item having been amended no amendment to an earlier part can be received, 5159, 5743, 7141, 7222
- No amendment inconsistent with a previous decision of the Committee can be received, 4778, 5442, 5464, 7021, 7092, 7184-5, 7212, 7255, 10725, 10815, 11010-11, 11205
- An amendment to prohibit the importation of an article is not in order, 5465
- An amendment imposing an Excise duty on non-compliance with certain wages conditions cannot be received, 5556-7
- It is not in order in dealing with Tariff resolutions to attempt to include conditions which ought properly to be included in a Bill, 5556-7
- The Committee cannot go back to an item previously dealt with, but it may be again considered when the resolutions are reported, 5712, 6557, 6632, 6704
- On a motion for the recommittal of an item the merits of the proposal cannot be discussed, 5733
- The Committee having decided that certain words in an item shall stand, no amendment to alter them can be received, 5848, 6772, 6889, 7080-1, 7083-4
- After a duty has been agreed to the Chairman will not receive amendments altering the duty after certain dates since by the adoption of such a course there would be no finality, 5847-8
- An amendment to make the duties applicable to a certain item 20 per cent. and 5 per cent. having been negatived, it is in order to move for duties of 10 per cent. and 5 per cent., 5850
- An amendment to admit free of duty the whole of the articles included in a certain item may be moved after an amendment dealing with certain articles in the item has been dealt with, 5914
- An amendment proposing a fixed duty may be received although it would impose duty at about the same rate as an *ad valorem* duty previously rejected, 5969
- The letters "n.e.i." refer only to articles similar to those included in the particular item to which they are attached, 6705
- An asterisk attached to an item brings the articles which preceded under the operation of the corresponding footnote to the Tariff, and should the asterisk be omitted, the footnote would cease to have any application to these articles, 6745, 6832
- It is in order in discussing Tariff items to debate the right of Departmental officers to advise as to matters of policy, 6895
- The reading of business testimonials cannot be permitted, since if the practice became general there would be no finality to Tariff discussions, 6929
- An amendment of an amendment may be received though it might have the effect of re-affirming, wholly or in part, the original proposal, 6988, 7281

RULINGS—CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES—continued.

- On a motion to make Timber, undressed, n.e.i., in sizes 12 in. by 6 in., dutiable, it is in order to move as an amendment the insertion of the words "other than New Zealand white pine cut to sizes for butter boxes, in bond," 7086
- An amendment omitting "New Zealand pine" from an item in which it would have been dutiable having been negatived, it is competent to move the insertion of a new paragraph to the item providing that it shall be admitted free, 7095
- An amendment having been moved, a prior amendment cannot be received until the first is withdrawn, 7196
- An amendment upon which an amendment has been moved cannot be withdrawn unless the amendment moved upon it is also withdrawn, 7212
- The Committee having decided that printing paper used exclusively for newspapers shall be admitted free of duty, it is in order to propose the insertion, as a new paragraph to the item, of "Printing, n.e.i., free," 7213
- A motion for the recommittal of an item cannot be moved until the resolutions have been reported, 7255, 7449
- To permit the discussion of actual business transactions of particular firms in the debate upon an item might lead to endless debate, 7315-6
- It is not the duty of the Chairman to decide what duties can be collected, 7345
- With the consent of the Committee the Chairman will make such alterations in the form of an amendment which has been agreed to as will carry out the expressed will of the Committee, 7346
- An incidental reference to an item not immediately before the Committee is in order, 7348
- It is not customary to postpone an item which has been amended, but in exceptional circumstances that course may be adopted, by leave of the Committee, 7405-6
- With the consent of the Committee, the Chairman will correct clerical errors in a Tariff schedule, 7441
- It is in order to produce for the inspection of members samples of any article, on which a duty is proposed, 10625
- Tariff.—Senate's Requests.**—In dealing with amendments requested by the Senate, a motion fixing the date on which the amendment is made as the date of its operation is in order, 10503-4; but the Committee may at the same time deal with any item in a special way, 10527
- If a motion for a modification of a requested amendment is not carried it is still open to the Committee to accept or reject the amendment, 10564
- A proposed modification of a requested amendment should be relevant to the amendment, 10574, 10579
- A proposed modification of a requested amendment should not involve the introduction of a new item, 10574, 10579, 10885-89, 11027
- Any relevant modification of a requested amendment may be proposed, 10580, 10682, 10801, 10910, 11027, 11170, 11449, 11563

RULINGS—CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES—continued.

The Senate, having requested the amendment of an item by the omission of the words "including women's and children's dress goods," the insertion of the words "including women's and children's dress flannels" after the words "dress goods" may be proposed as a modification, although the requested amendment be not made, 10627-8

The Committee may accept, reject, or modify a requested amendment, 10628

The Committee can deal only with the part of an item which is affected by a requested amendment, 10668, 10678, 10747-8, 10804, 10806

It is not the duty of the Chairman, but of the House, to determine whether it is competent for the Senate to make a certain request, 10675

It is not in order to discuss what the Senate might do in the event of the adoption of a certain course in dealing with a requested amendment, 10729

Should the Senate request that an item be made "free," a member desiring a lower duty than that previously agreed to by the Committee should move by way of amendment of the motion "That the requested amendment be not made," when the lowest duty proposed would be put first, 10732-8, 10741

An amendment to add to the motion "That the requested amendment be not made," the words "in the form in which it appears in this column" involves a direct negative, and therefore cannot be received, 10735

A member desiring the imposition of duties lower than those proposed by a requested amendment should move a modification of the requested amendment, 10792

A modification of a requested amendment is put from the Chair before the amendment itself, 10886, 11027; and that proposing the lowest duty is put first, 11027

It is not the duty of the Chairman to discover how any proposal will affect other items in the Tariff, 10889

One modification of a requested amendment must be disposed of before another is moved, 11117

When a modification has been agreed to, the item, as modified, is put from the Chair, 11190

A member desiring the imposition of a higher duty than those provided for in a proposed modification of a requested amendment may move to amend the proposed modification, 11191

The Committee, in dealing with requested amendments, has the whole Bill before it, and may, if necessary, revert from the schedule to the body of the Bill, 11213

A motion proposing the omission of an item on which the two Houses disagree, may be moved, 11528

A motion "That the requested amendment be made," cannot be received if it involves the insertion of a new item, 11543; but such a motion is in order if the requested amendment involves merely the modification of an item, 11546

RULINGS—continued.

CHAIRMEN OF COMMITTEES, TEMPORARY :

Mr. BATCHELOR :

Amendments.—Following the practice previously adopted by the Chairman of Committees, an amendment equivalent to a direct negative may be submitted, 1219

There can only be one amendment before the Committee at the one time, 6629-30

Conversations and Interruptions are disorderly, 6659, 10493

Debate.—The discussion must be relevant to the question, 3348-9, 4132, 5614, 6895, 6917, 7265, 7325, 9968-9, 10403, 11371

The ventilation of grievances before Supply has been by Standing Order limited to a formal supply motion once a month, 3348-9

It is not in order to reflect upon the impartiality of the Chair, 4455

It is not the invariable rule to call on members from each side alternately, 4455

It is distinctly disorderly for a member to interject while the Chairman is speaking, 4455

Estimates.—A matter covered by a vote in the Estimates for another Department cannot be discussed on the Treasurer's Estimates merely because the money is paid by the Treasurer, 9969

Tariff.—An amendment to increase a duty cannot be moved by a private member, 6809-10, 7108

No amendment inconsistent with a previous decision of the Committee can be received, 7265

Tariff—Senate's Requests.—The Committee can deal only with the part of an item that is affected by a requested amendment, 11553

Mr. FOWLER :

Conversations are disorderly, 6528

Debate.—A member's denial of a statement attributed to him must be accepted, 5218

The discussion must be relevant to the question, 6692

A difference of opinion as to the inference to be drawn from a vote does not involve a point of order, 6694

Mr. WILKS :

Amendments.—When an amendment is before the Committee, it must be withdrawn before a prior amendment can be received, 6579

Conversations are disorderly, 4433

Debate.—It is not in order to anticipate a debate which may take place during the consideration of an Order of the Day already on the business-paper, 10774

TRADE AND CUSTOMS.**ADMINISTRATION.***Senate:*

Want of power on part of administrative head, *supply*, 6310

Question by Senator Guthrie, reported Customs leakages, 6293, 6409

House of Representatives:

Border stations, *supply*, 9984-5-90

Contingencies and increased expenditure, *supply*, 9993-4-6; Over-sea ships, change of policy in regard to collection of duties, *supply*, 9992-3

Questions by—

Mr. Glynn, Customs administration, Adelaide, increased staff and delays, 10703

Mr. Hutchison, reported Customs leakages, 6354

Mr. Salmon, seizure and sale of Japanese goods, 6024; Mr. Wise, 6132

AGRICULTURAL BUREAU. [See HOME AFFAIRS.]**AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENT MAKERS—HARVESTERS—EXCISE TARIFF (AGRICULTURAL MACHINERY) ACT.***Senate:*

Administration of Excise Tariff (Agricultural Machinery) Act and defects in the Act, *adj.*, 5746-74; *supply*, 6303-6, 6314-7, 6319, 6328-32-45

Agricultural Implement Makers' Union and Mr. Woolf, *expl.*, 5466; *adj.*, 5493-6

Failure to enforce provisions of Excise Tariff (Agricultural Machinery) Act, *adj.*, 4277-8

Motion by Senator Needham, for return showing exemptions under Excise Tariff Act and wages paid, 650

Price of Stripper-Harvesters, Tariff, 7595; statutory reduction of prices, inquiries as to, *supply*, 8902

Refusal of Exemption Certificate to Mr. McKay, and collection of Excise; *adj.*, 5781-2

Sunshine Harvester employes, cost of application to Court, *supply*, 8993-95

Questions by—

Senator Chataway, Excise collected and exemptions under Act, 1927

Senator Clemons, conditions under which harvesters are manufactured, 1927

Senator Dobson, inquiries as to enforcing provisions of Excise Tariff Act, 2055; as to date of hearing arguments in Excise Harvester case, 7796

Senator Findley, cost of application to Court, 5177

Senator Findley, posting schedules of wages in factories, 6189, 6205; in post offices, Senator Stewart, 6295

Senator McGregor, presentation of report by Chief Inspector of Excise, South Australia, 7568

Senator Millen, power to postpone collection of Excise, 6189

Senator Mulcahy, police inquiries in Tasmania and intentions of Government, 5560

TRADE AND CUSTOMS—continued.**Agricultural Implement Makers, &c.—continued.***Questions by—*

Senator Neild, application by employes for assistance of accountant, and scope of amending Bill, 4362

Senator Pearce, power to enter factories in connexion with collection of Excise, 6295

Senator E. J. Russell, strike of implement makers at Horsham, 3049; exemption of Messrs. May and Millar, 3149; amendment of Constitution if Act held unconstitutional, 7543; enforcement of Mr. Justice Higgins' award, 7567

Senator W. Russell, harvesters, statutory reduction of prices, 9796, 11221

Senator Sayers, harvester case, delivery of judgment, 11381

Senator Stewart, amendment of Act, 5175, 5284

Senator St. Ledger, regulation of wages, 5980

Senator Vardon, Mr. McKay's price for harvesters, 10919, 11220; Senator Symon and Senator W. Russell, 10920; Senator St. Ledger, 11220; Senator Pulsford, evasion of Act by selling on terms, 11221

Senator Millen, reported collection of Excise, 5857

House of Representatives:

Administration of Act, *supply*, 6282

Applicants for exemptions inconvenienced, *supply*, 5705

Award of Court, violation of, *adj.*, 12158-68

Credit prices of harvesters, *obs.* on 32. of Australian Industries Preservation Bill, 9585-90

Exemptions under Excise Tariff (Agricultural Machinery Act), *address*, 334, *obs.*, 2842-4, *Budget*, 2924-31, 2985, 3045-6

Failure of Minister to act on information supplied, and amendment of Act, *adj.*, 5558-9

Increased charges resulting from Excise duties, *supply*, 1795-7

Injustice of enforcing payment of Excise, where manufacturers have paid what were considered reasonable wages, *adj.*, 6356-70

Motion by Mr. Hutchison for return showing exemptions under Excise Tariff Act and wages paid in South Australia, 1090

Nationalization of industry, *address*, 349; *expl.*, 501

Printing and distribution of judgment of Court in Harvester Excise cases, *adj.*, 5800

Rates of wages under Excise Tariff Act, *supply*, 1795-7; *Budget*, 3107

Unsatisfactory administration of Act, *supply*, 5693-5-9, 5705-12

TRADE AND CUSTOMS—continued.

Agricultural Implement Makers, &c.—continued.

Questions by—

- Mr. Thomas Brown, imports of stripper-harvesters, 7028, 7297, 7418
- Mr. J. Cook, position of employés if Excise collected be paid into Consolidated Revenue, 5909; amending Excise legislation and retrospective aspect of Act, 6130
- Mr. J. Cook, judgment in Excise case to be made a State paper, 5909; and also schedule of wages, Mr. Fisher, 5909; Mr. McWilliams, extension of award to country blacksmiths, 7296
- Mr. Crouch, removal of anomalies regarding standard wages, 6230
- Mr. Fairbairn, payment of Excise and right of appeal, 6130
- Mr. Fisher, steps to be taken to enforce Excise Tariff Act, 5801; judicial comment on Government inaction, 7294
- Sir J. Forrest, application of schedules of wages fixed by Minister and Mr. Justice Higgins, and guide to West Australian manufacturers, 6230
- Colonel Foxton, value of goods upon which Excise was payable under Excise Tariff Act, and inquiries regarding exemptions, 2236
- Mr. Frazer, uniform rates of wages in industry, 7205
- Mr. Glynn, reasons for abandoning method of protecting labour under Excise Tariff Act 1906, 3268, 3302, 3421; collection of import duty on harvesters and constitutionality of Excise, 5909; effect of Mr. Justice Higgins' award, 6230; standard of uniformity, 7295; rule as to uniformity laid down by Act, 7296
- Mr. Hutchison, complaints against Hawke and Co., 5520; reported cessation of collection of Excise and guarantee of conformity with Act, 6130; presentation of notices issued under the Act, 6354; names of manufacturers who have furnished security, 6811; and action to be taken against those who have not, 7026
- Mr. Hutchison, supply of promised return and collection of Excise, 1750, 2347, 2688, 2790-1, 5691; cause of delay in collecting Excise, 3268, 7296
- Mr. Hutchison, regulation of prices of harvesters, 9584; and fair profits for manufacturer, Mr. Fairbairn, 9584
- Mr. W. H. Irvine, retrospective operation of Act, 6130
- Mr. W. H. Irvine, enforcement of Act in respect of arrears, 5908-9, 6097; Mr. Palmer, 7296
- Mr. Johnson, statement by *Labour Call* as to average wages at Sunshine Harvester Works, 4927
- Mr. Mathews, reduction of duties if Excise held to be unconstitutional, 5909
- Mr. McDougall, repeal of Act by new Tariff 12155

TRADE AND CUSTOMS—continued.

Agricultural Implement Makers, &c.—continued.

Questions by—

- Mr. O'Malley, intention of Government, 7171; Mr. Sampson, effect of signing guarantee, 7296
- Mr. O'Malley, supply by manufacturers of names of employés and wages paid, 6354; representation of Government in Excise proceedings, 7417
- Mr. McDougall, dismissal of employé at Sunshine Harvester Works, 7463; cash and credit prices of harvesters, 9767
- Mr. Poynton, harvesters, reduction in prices under Customs Tariff Act 1906, 8817, 9582-3; Mr. J. Cook and Mr. Fisher, 9583; Mr. Webster, Mr. Thomas Brown, and Mr. J. Cook, cash and credit prices, 9584
- Mr. Poynton, amending legislation to limit credit price of stripper-harvesters, 9583
- Mr. Reid, conformity to new standard and redress of hardships, 6097
- Mr. Reid and Mr. Fairbairn, guarantee bond for payment of Excise, 6229
- Mr. Sampson, discrimination between manufacturers throughout States, 6098; amount of security demanded, 6131
- Mr. D. Thomson, standard of wages under Excise Tariff Acts, 6096
- Mr. Tudor, omission of Excise duty from revised proposals, 1748; reported employment of cheap labour by Massey-Harris Coy., 7115
- Mr. Tudor, procedure in event of Court ordering higher wages to be paid, 4748; preparation of statutory rules, 4926-7
- Mr. Watson, exemptions conditional on payment of arrears, 6098

BANANAS.

Senate:

- Questions by Senator St. Ledger, value of imports from Queensland into New South Wales and Victoria, and inspection fees charged, 4472, 4706

BOARD OF TRADE.

House of Representatives:

Questions by—

- Mr. Coon, Mr. Hirsch, as Victorian correspondent of, 405; Mr. Kelly, 406
- Mr. Crouch, statement by Mr. Lloyd George as to appointment of Australian correspondent, 4957
- Mr. D. Thomson, claim by Commonwealth Government to be consulted regarding appointment of correspondents, 4957

TRADE AND CUSTOMS—*continued.*

BOUNTIES.

Senate:

Cons. amds. in Bill relating to, 6353-4
For white labour in pearling industry, *address*, 478

Granting of, *address*, 59, 294, 385, 477

Questions by—

Senator Chataway, preparation of regulations under Act, 7653

Senator Dobson, Bounties Act, minimum quantities of products and expert advice, 9138

Senator Pearce, application by Western Australia to grant bounties, 5175, 5284

House of Representatives:

Attitude of Opposition corner to Bounties Bill, *Age* comments, *obs.*, 1279-80

Conference of Experts, distribution of Report, *obs.*, by Mr. Fuller, 648

Estimated payments under Bounties Bill, *Budget*, 1632

Granting of, *address*, 109, 117-8, 130, 164-5, 330

To encourage iron industry, *supply*, 1645; *Budget*, 2382-3, 2660-74

To encourage ship building, *Budget*, 2660-74

Questions by—

Mr. Bamford, Senate's *amds.*, Bounties Bill, 5415

Mr. Thomas Brown, iron bounties and report by New South Wales Government on material supplied by Messrs Sandford and Co., 6229; Mr. Palmer, State subsidies to, 7027

Mr. Crouch, applications under Act, 11390

Mr. Johnson, agreement between State Government and Mr. Sandford as to iron bounty, 7416-7

Mr. Knox, reported move of Opposition corner regarding Bill relating to, 881

[*See SUGAR INDUSTRY.*]

BREWERIES.

House of Representatives:

Question by Mr. Sampson, excise fees, 9480

BUTTER.

House of Representatives:

Grading regulations, 334-6

Effect of shipping combine on butter freights, *adj.*, 3936-69

Questions by—

Mr. O'Malley, action of Victorian Butter Freights Committee, 1089

Mr. Sinclair, altering system of grade marking, 4649

Mr. Thomas, contemplated increase of freights, 3934-5

Mr. Wise, importation of butter into Philippines, 5210; Mr. Maloney, 6726

Mr. J. Thomson, proposals of Conference on grading, 1413; making butter-boxes in bond, 6591

[*See EXTERNAL AFFAIRS, "PHILIPPINES."*]

TRADE AND CUSTOMS—*continued.*

CELLULOID.

House of Representatives:

Question by Mr. T. Brown, prohibition of manufactures of, 10702

COAL.

House of Representatives:

Question by Mr. J. Cook, Victorian coal mines and State assistance, 7028

[*See "INDUSTRIAL," and "MONOPOLIES, TRUSTS, AND COMBINES."*]

COMMERCE ACT.

Senate:

Appointment of Commonwealth officer to administer Act, *supply*, 6352

Vote to States for cost of administering, *supply*, 6352-3

Questions by—

Senator Clemons, return showing proceedings under, 11303

Senator Macfarlane, expenses under, 132; issue of notice to fruit-growers, 7701, 7754; and resolutions passed by Tasmanian Fruit-growers Union, 7849

House of Representatives:

Operation of, *address*, 336

Reimbursing States, cost of administering, *Budget*, 1633

Vote to States for cost of administering, *supply*, 6290

[*See BUTTER.*]

COMMERCIAL AGENTS.

Senate:

Circular to Chambers of Commerce on appointment of, *supply*, 8919

Question by—

Senator Chataway, circular regarding Commonwealth agents, 8554

Commonwealth agents abroad, issue of circular, *supply*, 8919-20

COMMERCIAL CONGRESS. [*See EXTERNAL AFFAIRS.*]

COPYRIGHT.

House of Representatives:

Question by Mr. Crouch, promised legislation regarding newspaper copyright, 5130

CORN AND POTATO SACKS.

*Senate:**Questions by—*

Senator Chataway, application of regulation to sugar bags, 7565

Senator Guthrie, legislation restricting size, 1567; Senator Clemons, 1568

Senator McGregor, what is being done to regulate size, 7565

TRADE AND CUSTOMS—continued.

Corn and Potato Sacks—continued.

House of Representatives:

Herald statements as to weight of grain bags, *adj.*, 9734

Questions by—

Mr. Atkinson, postponement of proclamation, 11051

Mr. Bamford, intention of Minister to vary determination, 7415; agreement with States and extension to sugar bags, 11051

Mr. Tilley Brown, legal size of corn-sacks, 6227; Mr. Hutchison, 6228

Mr. Tilley Brown, deputation to Premier of Victoria and letter to Minister, 7461; Sir J. Quick, repudiation by deputation of desire to use heavy bags, 7462, Mr. Sampson, decision of Mr. Bent and attitude of Minister, 7462

Mr. Glynn, proclamation, under what section of Commerce Act issued, 10752; Mr. Sinclair, on whose advice issued, 10753

Mr. Glynn, supply for next harvest, 10610

Mr. Hughes, bags in Queen's Hall, weight carrying by Premiers, 10787; Mr. Palmer, personal remarks by Minister, 10787

Mr. Livingston, Premiers' Conference resolution and withholding of proclamation, 10700

Mr. Mathews, size and weight of wheat bags at Rainbow station, 9767

Mr. Page, capacity of Java bags, 7461

Mr. Palmer, opportunity to discuss proposed alteration, 6355; conference with the States representatives, 10970

Mr. Poynton, display of proposed standard grain bag, 9845, and of a 475 lb. grain bag, Mr. Tudor, 9845

Mr. Storrer, nature of instructions issued by Department, and Sir J. Forrest, authority for their issue, 6355

Mr. J. Thomson, postpone reduction of standard size, 7414; Mr. Glynn 10610

COTTON, ABSORBENT:

House of Representatives:

Question by Mr. Liddell, free admission of, for surgical purposes, 10751

COTTON INDUSTRY.

Senate:

Cotton ginning machinery, exemption from duty, *address*, 382-3

Question by Senator Sayers, free admission ginning machinery, 820

[See EXTERNAL AFFAIRS, "COTTON PRODUCTION."]

CUSTOMS ADJUSTMENTS. [See TREASURY, "FINANCE, RELATIONS WITH STATES."]

CUSTOMS BONDS.

House of Representatives:

Question by Mr. Hedges, tonnage capacity of and denial of privileges to Western Australia, 2348, 2689-90

TRADE AND CUSTOMS—continued.

CUSTOMS CERTIFICATES.

Senate:

Motion by Senator Macfarlane, that Customs Department be instructed to accept from Chamber of Commerce of Great Britain certificates of value of British goods at place of export, 1955; debated, 1957; withdrawn, 1965

Question by Senator Macfarlane, certificates of values by British Chambers of Commerce, 7927

CUSTOMS CONFERENCE.

Senate:

Question by Senator Chataway, Customs conference, Pretoria, 10921

[See SUGAR INDUSTRY.]

CUSTOMS DECISIONS.

Senate:

Difficulties of centralization, *supply*, 1858-9

CUSTOMS ENTRIES.

House of Representatives:

Questions by—

Mr. Glynn, checking of entries, 4085; Port Adelaide system unsatisfactory, 9580

Mr. J. H. Catts, delay in passing entries at Melbourne, 4622

CUSTOMS HOUSES.

House of Representatives:

At Broken Hill and Fremantle, *supply* 3436

CUSTOMS OFFENCES.

Senate:

Question by Senator Guthrie, reimbursements, 249

House of Representatives:

Alleged Customs fraud by Harris, Scarfe and Co., *adj. m.*, 9093; *m.* negatived, 9098

Questions by—

Mr. Johnson, Auditor-General's report on Adelaide Customs frauds, 694

Mr. Hutchison, fines imposed on Harris, Scarfe, and Co., 10180, 10310

[See CUSTOMS PROSECUTION.]

CUSTOMS OFFICERS.

Senate:

Gratuities, Western Australia, *supply*, 11620

Promotions, return as to, *m.*, 132, 157, 564

Undermanning of department in Queensland and South Australia, *supply*, 138-9

Want of more temporary hands, *supply*, 6324

TRADE AND CUSTOMS—*continued.*Customs Officers—*continued.*

Questions by—

Senator Guthrie, report on charges, Port Adelaide officers, 1131

Senator Chataway, salaries, higher rates in Queensland, 11581

House of Representatives:

Appointment of Mr. Lockyer as Assistant Comptroller-General, *supply*, 9983

Audit staff and inspectors, South Australia, *supply*, 9990-1

Boarding inspectors and assistants, *supply*, 9989; examining officers, *supply*, 9985-6, 9991

Lack of accommodation for, at G.P.O., Sydney, *supply*, 8844

Temporary assistance, *supply*, 11377-80

Questions by—

Mr. T. Brown, Comptroller-General's circular, No. 88, 10081; annual leave, officers deprived of, 10310; sick leave, 11704

Mr. Fisher, appointment of Inspector-General, 6354; Mr. Hutchison, 8817

Mr. Glynn, Customs staff, Port Adelaide, 10703

Mr. Hutchison, annual leave, officers in landing branch, Port Adelaide, 2235; overtime in Melbourne, 3969, 5238

Mr. Wilks, undermining of Department, complaint by President of Associated Chambers of Commerce, 11257; Mr. Liddell, 11258; Mr. J. Thomson, 11624

Mr. H. Willis, promotions in Customs Department, Sydney, 4279

CUSTOMS PROSECUTIONS.

House of Representatives:

Law costs in connexion with, *supply*, 9991-2

Questions by Mr. Hutchison, delay in instituting, 23, 590; proceedings against Harris, Scarfe and Co., 8815; reason for case before High Court not being proceeded with, 9089; Mr. Batchelor, publication of terms of settlement, 9089

CUSTOMS TARIFF (AGRICULTURAL MACHINERY) ACT. [*See AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENT MAKERS.*]

DRAWBACKS.

House of Representatives:

Interpretation of regulations, *supply*, 11379

Question by Mr. Kelly, drawback on re-exported material, 11329

EXCISE PROCEDURE BILL.

House of Representatives:

Urgency of dealing with, *supply*, 6280; *obs.*, 7169, 7416

Question by Mr. W. H. Irvine, date of dealing with, 6812

TRADE AND CUSTOMS—*continued.*EXCISE TARIFF (AGRICULTURAL MACHINERY) ACT. [*See AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENT MAKERS.*]

EXCISE TARIFF (SPIRITS) ACT.

Senate:

Observance of fair labour conditions, *adj.*, 4616-21

Questions by—

Senator Findley, collection of Excise, 5857; posting of schedule of wages in factories, 6189; observance of schedule, 7566

Senator Macfarlane, extent to which Victorian manufacturers have availed themselves of the Act, 8364

House of Representatives:

Delay in obtaining information as to observance of fair labour conditions, *supply*, 5698-9, 5707

Observance of fair labour conditions, *obs.*, 4142

Questions by—

Mr. Batchelor, supply of promised information as to wages paid in industries under the Act, 4647-8, 4748, 5238, 5691; steps taken to apply the Act, 4748, 5238; number of firms supplying information, 5328; collection of Excise where conditions unsatisfactory and replies to notices, 7027; intentions of Government, 7113, 7297; result of delays, 7298

Mr. Hutchison, observance of fair labour conditions under Act, 4647; Mr. Glynn, 4648

Mr. Hutchison, steps taken to ascertain if Act is being observed, 4749

Mr. D. Thomson, standard of wages under, 6096

EXPORTS.

Senate:

Question by Senator St. Ledger, statistical tables showing quantity and value of goods exported from each State of origin, 1816

House of Representatives:

Questions by—

Mr. Crouch, export entries, Geelong and Melbourne, 10756

Mr. Hutchison, subsidies on State exports, 1181

FISHERIES.

Senate:

Purchase of trawler, *supply*, 3931-3

Questions by—

Senator Dobson, presentation of report of Fisheries Conference, 2844; construction and cost of trawler and appointment of Commissioner of Fisheries, 8230

Senator Needham, payment of standard wages by successful tenderer for trawler, 1928; statement by Melbourne *Herald* regarding, 2029, 2070

TRADE AND CUSTOMS—continued.

Fisheries—continued.

House of Representatives:

Construction of trawler in Government dockyards, *supply*, 5793

Purchase of trawler, *supply*, 3437-46

Questions by—

Mr. Atkinson, construction of trawler at Fitzroy Dock, 5238; progress of work, 11261

Mr. Kelly, canning factories and Scottish fishermen, 10965

Mr. Mathews, payment of standard wage on construction of trawler, 1751

Mr. Tudor, delay in accepting tender for trawler, 3301; Mr. Wilks, names and prices of tenders, 3301

Mr. Willis, successful tenderer and cost of constructing trawler, 5691

FRUIT.

Senate:

Question by Senator St. Ledger, States collection of inspection fees, 5178

House of Representatives:

Question by Mr. McDougall, imports of loathsome dates, 11390

[See also "COMMERCE ACT."]

GLUCOSE.

Senate:

Question by Senator Clemons, rotten potatoes for manufacture of, 8285

GUNS.

House of Representatives:

Question by Mr. H. Willis, reported importation of imitations of well-known brands, 11016; inferior guns from Belgium, 11054

IMPORTS.

Senate:

Question by Senator Chataway as to imports of vanilla, 1023

House of Representatives:

Identity of classification, *supply*, 9995-6

Remission of duty on State imports, test case, *supply*, 6291

Question by Mr. McDougall re importation of wheat, 5600, 6099; importation foreign-made goods at British preference rates, 11056

["WIRE NETTING," see TARIFF, GENERAL.]

INDUSTRIAL.

Senate:

Child labour in biscuit trade, *obs.*, 7790

Mildura dried fruit industry, strike of workers, *Tariff*, 7550-2

Miners for Broken Hill, *adj.*, 3298

Unemployed in Western Australia, *adj.*, 8697

TRADE AND CUSTOMS—continued.

Industrial—continued.

Wages in Australian States, *address*, 79, 256-9, 261, 361-8, 378-9, 395, 398

Wages and conditions of labour in Great Britain and Ireland, *address*, 359-60; in the United States, 482

Wages Board System, *supply*, 6329-32-8

Questions by—

Senator Croft, waterside workers' strike, Government intervention, 9041

Senator de Largie, statement showing latest industrial awards, 8103; and rates of wages in manufacturing trades, 8154

Senator Neild, industrial dispute, Mildura, and duty on dried fruits, 7843

Senator E. J. Russell, dismissal of unionist coal miners by Victorian companies, 7926, 8104

Senator St. Ledger, registrations, State Labour Bureaux, wages and cost of living, 11303

House of Representatives:

Obs. as to advertisement regarding attack on starch industry, 928-9

Motion by Mr. Coon as to uniform industrial legislation, moved, 2567

Motion by Mr. Hughes, differentiation against unionists by over-sea mail contractors, moved, 2572

Questions by—

Mr. Catts, referendum on nationalization of coal mines, 5910; Federal trade union legislation, 11704

Mr. Hutchison, statement by President, Victorian Chamber of Manufactures, as to contract labour, 5046

Mr. Johnson, U. S. Tariff, effect on employment, 10608

Mr. McDonald, uniform industrial legislation, amendment of Constitution, 6096

Mr. O'Malley, State use of plants of corporations during strikes, 6094

Mr. Palmer, speech by Mr. Hughes on obligation to obey award of Arbitration Court, 9093

Mr. D. Thomson, standard of wages under Excise Tariff Acts, 6096

Mr. Tudor, piano industry, arrivals under contract, 11261

Mr. Watkins, dismissal of coal miners for applying for registration under Conciliation and Arbitration Act, 2233; extension of coal miners' strike, 6024

Mr. Webster, woollen trade Wages Board, 3622

[See "AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENT MAKERS," "EXCISE TARIFF (SPIRITS) ACT," and "SUGAR INDUSTRY"; also "IMMIGRATION," under EXTERNAL AFFAIRS.]

TRADE AND CUSTOMS—*continued.*

IRON.

House of Representatives:

Bounties for iron industry, *supply*, 1645;
Budget, 2382-3, 2660-74

Crisis at iron works, Lithgow, and settlement of bounty question, *adj.*, 7414

Questions by—

Mr. Brown, report from New South Wales Government as to quality of material supplied by Sandford and Co., 6229

Mr. Johnson, agreement between Mr. Sandford and New South Wales Government as to bounties, 7416-7

Mr. McDougall, reported export of Australian ore, 6407; Japanese-Australian iron and steel industry, 6593

Mr. Palmer, State subsidies to Lithgow iron works, 7027

Mr. J. Thomson, statement by Mr. Hoskins, and encouragement of industry, 11420; immediate passing of Manufactures Encouragement Bill or imposition of duties under division VI.A of Tariff, 11742; Mr. Carr, assistance by bounty or protective duty, 11789; Mr. Bowden, opportunity to deal with Manufactures Encouragement Bill, 11789; Mr. Chanter, statement by Premier of New South Wales, 11790

KEROSENE.

House of Representatives:

Question by Mr. Bamford, flash point, new regulation, 11180

LABORATORY.

Senate:

Laboratory at Melbourne, *supply*, 3931

House of Representatives:

Laboratory at Melbourne, *supply*, 3442-4

LIGHTHOUSES. [See NAVIGATION AND SHIPPING.]

MANUFACTURES ENCOURAGEMENT BILL.

House of Representatives:

Consideration of, before dealing with Tariff, *obs.*, 6522-3; before Christmas recess, *obs.*, 7414, 7416, 7456-7

Questions by—

Mr. Bowden and Mr. Watson, date of dealing with, 5690; Mr. D. Thomson 5691; Mr. J. Cook, 5910

Mr. Palmer, socialistic tendency of clauses, 6594

MARBLE.

House of Representatives:

Question by Mr. Kelly, search for deposits, 11624

MARINE SURVEYS. [See EXTERNAL AFFAIRS.]

TRADE AND CUSTOMS—*continued.*

MATCHES.

Senate:

Question by Senator McGregor, contracts for supply of and protection of people, 8309

[See "MATCHES," under TARIFF.]

MEATS.

House of Representatives:

Questions by—

Mr. Livingston, supply of tinned rabbits for Imperial Navy, 10875

Mr. Page, alleged shortage of canned meats in America, 9952

MONOPOLIES, TRUSTS, AND COMBINES.

Senate:

Alleged bicycle trade combine, *supply*, 6345-7

Alleged combine in confectionery trade, *obs.*, 3406-8

Alleged Coal Combine, *adj.*, 3684-706; constitutionality of amended anti-trust legislation, *obs.*, 4278

Ineffectiveness of Australian Industries Preservation Act, *address*, 483-4

Standard Oil Trust, *obs.*, 278-9

Tobacco trust, *address*, 483

Questions by—

Senator Clemons, return as to proceedings under anti-trust legislation, 11303

Senator Findley, boot machinery trusts, 472, 828, 934

Senator McGregor, shipping ring, statement by representative of British Chamber of Manufactures, 10828

Senator Millen, manufacturers' agreement to increase price of starch, 2513, 3556, 3683

Senator Millen, statements as to alleged coal combine, 3899; proceedings against coal vend, 4035; result of official inquiries as to alleged combines, 7566, 7653; reported legal proceedings against trusts, 8507; under principal Act, 8555

Senator Millen and Senator Symon, amended anti-trust legislation, 4935

Senator Story, alleged combine increasing price of bicycle sets, 5978, 6294, 7569

House of Representatives:

Existence of shipping combine and its detrimental effect on the community, *adj.*, 3936-69

Nationalization of monopolies, *address*, 126, 349, 460

Nationalization of implement industry, *address*, 349; *expl.*, 501

Questions by—

Mr. Atkinson, British shipping ring, 10784; and relation of Orient Coy. to, Mr. O'Malley, 10785

Mr. Bamford, protection of public against shipping combine, 3585

TRADE AND CUSTOMS—continued.

Monopolies, Trusts, and Combines—continued.

Questions by—

- Mr. J. H. Catta, referendum on nationalization of coal mines, 5910; alleged barristers' combine, 10087
- Mr. J. Cook, amended anti-trust legislation, 3971; action under, 10524
- Mr. Crouch, Millers' Association and price of bran, 11795
- Mr. McDougall, Victorian jam manufacturers, alleged combine, 9956, 10576, 10970; manure combine, 7417, 11055; fruit and fruit buckets, and combine in respect of, 11329; Standard Oil Trust, 12044
- Mr. O'Malley, alleged coal and shipping combine, 3585, 3621, 3935; appointment of Royal Commission, 3971; confiscation of property of monopolistic combinations, 7414; reported photographic materials trust, 11050
- Mr. Salmon, tobacco trust and riots in Kentucky, 9101; Mr. O'Malley, relation of American and Australian tobacco monopolies, 9192
- Mr. H. Willis, *Argus* criticism of amended anti-trust legislation, 4278
[See also TOBACCO INDUSTRY.]

MORPHIA.

House of Representatives:

- Question by Mr. Liddell, price increased by duty on opium constituents, 10750

NAVIGATION AND SHIPPING.

Senate:

- Bill relating to, *address*, 155; date of induction of, *obs.*, 2787-9; facilitating passage next session, *supply*, 5878-9; consideration this session, *adj.*, 6354; consideration next session, *obs.*, 12101
- Board of Trade Memorandum on Navigation Bill, *adj.*, 9007
- Customs Launch, Sydney, *supply*, 3931
- Navigation Conference, *address*, 10, 16, 59, 293, 393, 473
- Seamen's Compensation Bill, *obs.*, 12101
- Submarine bells and lighting, *supply*, 12146
- Questions by—**
- Senator Dobson, British Attorney-General's criticism of Navigation Bill, 8154-6; exemption of Tasmania from coastal clauses, 8285
- Senator Givens, introduction of Navigation Bill, 472; Senator Symon, 2405
- Senator Guthrie, report of Navigation Conference, 8; Senator Macfarlane, 563, 3145
- Senator Guthrie, date of proceeding with Navigation Bill, 7623; memorandum from Board of Trade regarding provisions of, 8863-4, 8978; Senator Dobson, 8864
- Senator Guthrie, compensation for injuries to seamen, 3462, 3559; introduction of Bill, 10918; Senator Symon, 3463
- Senator Guthrie, damage to steamer *Afric*, and affidavits thereon, 8865-6, 8979

TRADE AND CUSTOMS—continued.

Navigation and Shipping—continued.

Questions by—

- Senator Macfarlane, rebates to shipping companies, 11985
- Senator Macfarlane, reply to Board of Trade's memorandum on Navigation Bill, 9422, 10253, 10918; Senator Millen, 10919
- Senator Millen and Senator Guthrie, differential treatment of shipping in Victoria, 11983; Senator Millen, 12100
- Senator Needham, preferential charges by shipping companies, North-Western Australia, 649, 3798, 8029; Senator de Largie, 650
- Senator Needham, construction of graving dock, Fremantle, 7977, 8700, 10369

House of Representatives:

- Beacons and ocean lights, *address*, 121, 334; *obs.* as to introduction of Bill for transference of, 1469-70
- Customs Steam Launch, *supply*, 3436
- Navigation conference, *address*, 15, 24-5, 7, 59, 91, 103-4, 114, 170, 179, 293, 444-7, 464, 473; *supply*, 1873
- Orion*, s.s., loss of, *adj.*, 11177
- Remission of Bill to Royal Commission on, *address*, 345
- Safety of Inter-State shipping, *address*, 114
- Shipping rates and differentiation between ports on North-West Coast, *supply*, 9996-7
- Warning light, Sydney General Post Office, *supply*, 2894, 2903
- Questions by—**
- Mr. Catts, Government ship-building yards, Saltwater River, 10483
- Mr. Chanter, increased passenger rates on mail steamers, 1975
- Sir J. Forrest, presentation of report of Commission, 3173; freight charges by mail steamers between London and Fremantle, 3422
- Mr. Glynn, improvement of London port and docks, 6726, 9684
- Mr. Hughes, Cairns Harbor Trust, differential treatment of oversea ships, 11916
- Mr. Johnson, distribution of reports of conference, 404; transfer of control of ocean lights, 405
- Mr. Knox, Board of Trade objections to Navigation Bill, 9089; Mr. D. Thomson, comparison of Commission's recommendation with Bill, when considering objections, 9192
- Mr. Maloney, supply of shipping information by telephone, 928
- Mr. O'Malley, erecting lighthouse at Port Davy, 4955; shelter sheds at, and telephonic communication with, 6129; missing steamer *Orion*, search for, 11177; rumoured overloading, 11260
- Mr. O'Malley, Chinese sailors on British ships, 11179
- Mr. Thomas, New Zealand State imports, preference to subsidized steamers, 5802
- Mr. Thomas, preference to Federal line of steamers in regard to State imports, 988

TRADE AND CUSTOMS—*continued.*Navigation and Shipping—*continued.*

Questions by—

Mr. D. Thomson, differential exemptions and pilotage rates, Victoria, 11790, 11921

Mr. Wilks, warning light, Sydney General Post Office, 2890

[See "MONOPOLIES, TRUSTS AND COMBINES," also "MAIL CONTRACT, EUROPEAN," POSTMASTER-GENERAL.]

OILS.

House of Representatives:

Question by Mr. Hedges, statement in Colonial conference paper as to exports of olive oil, 1716

OPIUM.

Senate:

Smuggling in Western Australia, *adj.*, 9007-8

Questions by—

Senator Croft, inadequate fine for smuggling at Palmerston, 5011

Senator Findley, prevention of importation of, 745; opium smuggling at Port Darwin, and sufficiency of staff, 4895

Senator Henderson, opium smoking in Western Australia, 9236

Senator Millen, cause of increased smuggling, 8699

House of Representatives:

Smuggling, *supply*, 9989-91

Questions by—

Mr. Bowden and Mr. Reid, protest against restricting supply of, for medicinal purposes, 2234

Mr. Bamford, influencing magistrates in dealing with smugglers, 2565

Mr. Crouch, reward to Constable Dunn for discovery of smuggling, 10135

Mr. Johnson, newspaper allegations of laxity in suppressing smuggling, 9099

Mr. Liddell, punishment of smugglers in Straits Settlements, 2565; effect of opium duty on price of morphia, 10750

Mr. Maloney, Chinese smugglers, deportation of, 11525

Mr. Poynton, punishment of smugglers, 2234

Mr. D. Thomson, regulation of sales, 3970

Mr. Wilson, seizure of treacle as opium, 6675

PATENT MEDICINES AND FOODS.

Senate:

Delay in making analyses of, *supply*, 139

Question by Senator Mulcahy, Government action on Mr. Beale's report, 8286

House of Representatives:

California syrup of figs, *expl.*, Mr. Salmon, 2313

Importation of, without formulae on labels, *obs.* on *adj.*, 883-97

Statement in Mr. Beale's report as to Hearn's Bronchitis Cure, *obs.*, 3899

TRADE AND CUSTOMS—*continued.*Patent Medicines and Foods—*continued.*

Questions by—

Mr. Maloney, sale of impure foods, 9764

Mr. Thomas, regulations relating to importations of, 80, 647; introduction of Bill relating to, 772, 879-80, 4842, 6023, 11521; Mr. Wilson and Mr. Glynn, 879

Mr. Thomas, presentation of departmental papers, 1749, 5129; intimation to importers that nature of contents must be shown on bottles or packages, 4519, 4649; action in England, and reason for delay in introducing Bill relating to, 4926; protests in England, 5497; passing of Bill before Christmas, 1907, 6355; before close of session, 10309; provision in Bill to permit formula of proprietary article to remain undisclosed, 8815

Mr. Tudor, alleged combine controlling infants' foods and proprietary articles, 4622

Mr. Wilson, production of correspondence regarding regulations, 1087

[See EXTERNAL AFFAIRS, "BEALE, MR. O. C."]

PATENT OFFICE.

Senate:

Ability of office to cope with work, *supply*, 6353

Questions by—

Senator Croft, presentation of papers and report on charges against Commissioner, 1689

Senator Pulsford, access to files, 11301; procedure in contentious cases, 11985

House of Representatives:

Motion by Mr. Fuller for return of all applications received since establishment, number of, and salaries paid to examiners of patents, 12200

Questions by—

Mr. Wilks, alleged irregularities in, 501

Mr. Hutchison, alleged delays, 882

PATENTS.

Senate:

Questions by—

Senator McGregor, amendment of Patents Act, to deal with harsh restrictions, 9139

Senator de Largie, goods patented in Great Britain to be made there, 9139

House of Representatives:

Question by Mr. Mathews, introduction of Bill on lines of new British Act, 9297; Mr. Maloney, 11157

TRADE AND CUSTOMS—continued.

PEARL SHELLING.

Senate:

Bounty for white labour, *address*, 478

House of Representatives:

Bounty for white labour, *address*, 165

Question, by Mr. Johnson, Japanese at Thursday Island, 9582

PREFERENTIAL RATES. [See NAVIGATION AND SHIPPING; also "RAILWAY RATES, DIFFERENTIAL," HOME AFFAIRS, and "SINGAPORE," EXTERNAL AFFAIRS.]

PRINTING PAPER.

House of Representatives:

Cost of telephone message by Treasurer, *expl.*, 11177-9; *supply*, 11375-6

Questions by—

Mr. Kelly, duty on super-calandered paper and Ministerial decision, 10878, 11019, 11055; notification of decision to Treasurer and *Bulletin*, 11095; telephone message by Treasurer, 11179; Mr. Johnson, 11179

QUARANTINE.

Senate:

Questions by—

Senator Dobson, uniformity of administration, 5367

Senator Lynch, prohibition on stock from Western Australia, 8482, 8508

Senator Neild, objections to Bill by New South Wales, 829, 934

Senator St. Ledger, cost of State Quarantine and Boards of Health, 1816, 2405, 4243, 5011

House of Representatives:

Consideration of Senate's *amds.*, *obs.*, 7416, 7461

Federal system of, *address*, 174

Provision for, Federal system, *Budget*, 1632

Quarantine buildings, acquisition of, *supply*, 9984

Questions by—

Mr. Liddell, objections by States to Bill, 1412

Mr. Mahon, stock quarantine and boycotting of Western Australian stock, 3732

Mr. Willis, quarantine building, acquisition and valuation of, 11918

RABBIT DESTRUCTION.

House of Representatives:

Dr. Danysz's experiments, cost of, *supply*, 11376-7

Dr. Tidswell's report, presentation of, and *obs.* on *m.* that it be printed, 6520-1

Rabbit extermination, need for, *supply*, 11380

TRADE AND CUSTOMS—continued.

Rabbit Destruction—continued.

Questions by—

Mr. Bowden, experiments on mainland, 10081

Mr. T. Brown, report on Dr. Danysz's experiments, 5520, 6356; distribution of information, 6674; experiments on mainland, 7300

Mr. Chanter, reported introduction of disease, 3969, 4519, 5328, 5417, 6406, 6674

Mr. Glynn, final report of South Australian Commissioners, 503

Mr. Hutchison, publication of report of South Australian Commissioners, 6674

Mr. Liddell, supply of Dr. Tidswell's report to press, 6505

Mr. Maloney, use of Danysz virus, 407

RAT DESTRUCTION.

House of Representatives:

Question by Mr. Maloney, virus used in New Hebrides, 6675

REVENUE: CUSTOMS AND EXCISE.

Senate:

Questions by—

Senator Pearce, receipts for June, 1903-4-5-6-7, and deductions from same, 11986

Senator Pulsford, deductions from, for administering Department and payments to States, 12101

Senator St. Ledger, collections since 1901 and collection in each State in 1907-8, 11581

Senator Pulsford, from spirits, tobacco, cigars, and cigarettes, 10370; Customs revenue from ships' stores, 10251

House of Representatives:

Collections in each State and salaries paid to officers employed, *m.*, by Mr. Johnson for return, 11709

SACKS. [See CORN AND POTATO SACKS.]

SECRET DRUGS. [See "PATENT MEDICINES."]

STOCK.

Senate:

Question by Senator Lynch, regulations governing transfer of from Western Australia, 8508

House of Representatives:

Export of from Northern Territory, *supply*, 9995

Question by Mr. Frazer, horses from Western Australia, exclusion from eastern States, 11916

[See EXTERNAL AFFAIRS, "ARGENTINE REPUBLIC."] ed by Google

TRADE AND CUSTOMS—*continued.*

SUGAR INDUSTRY.

Senate:

Bounty, abolition of, *supply*, 10284
Surtax on Australian sugar in South Africa, *supply*, 10394-99
Effect of bounty, *address*, 381, 483
Sweating Customs officers in sugar districts, *supply*, 139
White labour on cane-fields, 261-75, 278-81, 367

Questions by—

Senator Chataway, delay in paying bounty, 2178, 2614, 3364; receipts from Excise and payments of rebates on bounty, 4796; scarcity and character of labour, 5367; Senator de Largie, revision of statements regarding same, 5370

Senator Chataway, payment of standard wages, 6190; regulation as to size of sugar bags, 7565; deduction of pay for wet weather, 10920; request for reduced wages, 11472

Senator Chataway, surtax on sugar, by Natal, 10253; date of cablegram to Natal Government, 10309; surtax by Cape Colony on Australian white-grown sugar, 9138, 9357; Conference at Pretoria, 10921; Senator Millen, reason for same, 9138

Senator de Largie, vilification of white labour, 5367-8; complaints against white cane-cutters and Colonial Sugar Refining Company, 5560

Senator Findley, production of paper pulp from megass, 9631; application of new protection to sugar industry, 11382

Senator Givens, will Senator St. Ledger fight for higher wages, 11382; request to lower standard, 11471

Senator Lynch, opinion of Captain Douglas on immigrant labour for, 1680, 1816

Senator McGregor, reported lawlessness of labour, 5467

Senator Pearce, rejection of Wages Board system and abolition of duties, 5190

Senator Turley, reported statements, at Women's National League Conference regarding labour on cane-fields, 5175, 5284; Senator Macfarlane, 5176

House of Representatives:

Bounty paid and sugar produced, *Budget*, 1628

Bounty, payment of, *supply*, 9988-7

Bounty, Government intentions, *supply*, 8841

Cost of duty to consumers, *Budget*, 2352-3, 2982-3, 3213

Desire for coloured labour and "black-birding," *Budget*, 3187-8-91-2

Effect of bounty, *address*, 330; *Budget*, 2457

Effect of bounty on Federal expenditure, *supply*, 1770, 3308-10; *Budget*, 2130, 2349-51-71, 2509, 3213-4-29

Effect of bounty on States revenue, *Budget*, 2397

TRADE AND CUSTOMS—*continued.*

Sugar Industry—*continued.*

Estimated yield and bounty payable, *Budget*, 3024

Excise, cost of collecting, *supply*, 9988-9

Hands employed, *Budget*, 2982

Increased consumption of sugar, *Budget*, 1628

Price of Australian sugar in South Africa, *Budget*, 2397, 2982

Protective duty to assist, *address*, 330

Repeal of Sugar Bounty Act, *Budget*, 2353, 2983, 3020

Revenue from sugar duties, *Budget*, 1628, 2607

Sugar cane left standing for want of labour, *Budget*, 3021

Sugar, imports of, *Budget*, 1629

Sugar Bounty Bill and State rights, *Budget*, 3011, 3036-7; *supply*, 3426-9

Wages ordinance, *address*, 129

White labour, cane-fields, *address*, 163, 236-7, 338; *Budget*, 3020, 3182; *supply*, 3425-6

Questions by—

Mr. Archer, wages of casual labourers, Ministerial decision, 10878

Mr. Bamford, legal size of sugar bags, 6228, 11051

Mr. Edwards, delay in paying bounty, 3299

Mr. Mahon, sugar rebates, 5240, 5417; and drawback on Excise sugar exported, 10463, 10525, 10575, 10701, 10789; request for reduced wages, 11325

Mr. Tudor, repeal of Sugar Excise Act, 3173

[See "IMMIGRATION," EXTERNAL AFFAIRS.]

TARIFF (CUSTOMS TARIFF BILL)—Schedule :

Senate:

Acetic acid or essence of vinegar, 9237

Adding and computing machines, 8625; *cons. mes.*, 10937

Adze, axe, bentwood handles, 9639

Agricultural, horticultural and viticultural machinery, 8574, 8587

Ale, 7623

Aluminium, bronze, &c., 9173; *cons. mes.*, 10940

Ammonia, 9239 (*p.o.*, 9247-53); *cons. mes.*, 11237

Ammonia condenser coils, 9169

Ammunition, 8555

Animal foods, *n.e.i.*, 7920

Animals, 7653

Anodes and hooks, 9173

Antimony and lead compounds, 9171

Any dutiable machinery or machine tool not made in Commonwealth, 8720

Apparel and attire, woollen or silk, 8117, 8194

Apparel and attire, *n.e.i.*, 8211

Arms, 8556; *cons. mes.*, 10934

Arrowroot, 7949

Articles, *n.e.i.*, 8216

Artificial plants, flowers, 8349

Bags and sacks, 8217, 8218

Bananas, 7835, 7850

Baskets, 9899

TRADE AND CUSTOMS—continued.

Tariff (Customs Tariff Bill), Schedule—continued.

Basketware, n.e.i., 9571
 Bayonets and swords, 8349
 Bent poles, rough, 9643; dressed, 9643
 Bicycles, tricycles, &c., 9815; *cons. mes.*, 11315
 Biscuits, 7666
 Blacking, dresses, pastes, 8365
 Blacks and litharge, 8473
 Blankets, 8232; *cons. mes.*, 10924
 Blankets, rubber or wool, 9946
 Blue, laundry, 7685; *cons. mes.*, 10844
 Boats, launches, yachts, 9901
 Boots, rubber, 9665
 Boots, shoes, and footwear, n.e.i., 9661
 Bottles, n.e.i., 8496
 Bottle stoppers, 8496
 Brass, 9173
 Brasswork and gunmetal work, 8764
 Bronzing and metal powders, 8374
 Broom, corn, millet, and rice straw, 7697
 Brushes, 9903
 Buckets and tubs, wooden, 9648
 Buggy shafts, 9641
 Butter and cheese, 7698
 Cameras, magic or optical lanterns, 9936
 Candles, tapers, &c., 7704
 Carbide of calcium, 9256
 Carbonic acid gas, 9253
 Carpets, floorcloths, &c., 8260; *cons. mes.*, 10925, 11592
 Casks, barrels, vats, n.e.i., 9644
 Ceramic transfers for pottery, 9806
 Chaffcutters, and horse gears, 8579
 Chemical compounds, 9293
 Children's tricycles, 9821
 Churns, incubators, 8581
 Coffee and chicory, 7761
 Coir mats and matting, 8275
 Combined cornsheller, &c., 8581
 Combs, toilet, 9653
 Confectionery, cocoa, chocolate, 7720; *cons. mes.*, 10855
 Copper, 9173
 Corks, 9926
 Cosies and cushions, 8277, 8286
 Cotton, asbestos and other packings, 9939
 Cresylic acid, 9273
 Crust or rough tanned goat, &c., skins, 9678
 Curled hair and fibre, 9890
 Curtains and blinds, n.e.i., 8287; *cons. mes.*, 10926, 11589
 Cutlery, manicure sets, 8598; *cons. mes.*, 10936
 Cycle parts, 9824; n.e.i., 9825
 Doors of wood, 9639
 Drugs and chemicals, 9270
 Earth and rockcutting, ore dressing, and smelting machinery, 8782
 Electrical and gas appliances, 8888, 9042; *cons. mes.*, 10947-50, 11506, 11688
 Electrical machines, appliances, parts, 8797, 8869; *cons. mes.*, 10942-7, 11589-90
 Electrotypes and stereotypes, 9168
 Engines, pulley blocks, turbo blowers, 8665; *cons. mes.*, 10938-40, 11596
 Explosives, 9926
 Fancy goods, 9650
 Feathers, dressed, 8217
 Filters, n.e.i., 9899

TRADE AND CUSTOMS—continued.

Tariff (Customs Tariff Bill), Schedule—continued.

Fire and glazed bricks, 8479; *cons. mes.*, 11235
 Fire brigade appliances, n.e.i., 9940
 Fire extinguishers, hand, 8773
 Fish, 7783, 7797; *cons. mes.*, 10856
 Fishing and rabbit nets, 9917
 Fringes of textile materials, 8334
 Fruits and vegetables, 7808, 9948
 Fruits, citrus, 7829
 Fumigators, atomizers, &c., 9924; *cons. mes.*, 11316
 Furniture, 9353; *cons. mes.*, 11241-2
 Furs and other skins, 8289
 Ginger, green, 7831
 Glass, 8483, 8494; *cons. mes.*, 11235
 Glassware, n.e.i., 8488
 Globes, geographical, &c., 9813
 Gloves, 8293; *cons. mes.*, 10927, 11592
 Glue, 8502, 8508; *cons. mes.*, 11235-6
 Goods sent out for repairs, 9944
 Goods brought back to Australia, 9946
 Grain and pulse, not prepared, 7888
 Grain and pulse, prepared, 7893, 7895, 7906
 Graphite or plumbago, 8368
 Hats, caps, bonnets, 8297, 8309
 Hay and chaff, 7922, 7928; *cons. mes.*, 10856
 Hogsheds, second-hand, 9646
 Honey, jams, jellies, 7945
 Hops, 7947
 Horsehair cloth, 8333
 Infants' food, 8063
 Insecticides, sheepwashes, disinfectants, 9280; *cons. mes.*, 11238, 11599
 Iron and steel, 9188
 Iron and steel tubes, or pipes, 9086
 Iron pipes, cast and wrought, n.e.i., 9073
 Iron, plate and sheet, 8560
 Isinglass, 8064
 Jewellery, unfinished, 9654; rolled gold, 9655; machine made chain, 9655; n.e.i., 9655
 Kinematographs, &c., 9657
 Kindergarten materials, 9806
 Lamps and lampware, 8568
 Lantern slides, 9930; *cons. mes.*, 11316
 Lard and lard oil, 7720
 Leather and belting, 9674; *cons. mes.*, 11309-10
 Licht-pausrohpapier, 9814
 Linseed, 7949
 Linseed meal, 7949
 Liquid removers, 8472
 Liquorice, 7755; *cons. mes.*, 10855
 Locks, knobs, keys, 9173; *cons. mes.*, 10958
 Locomotives, road rollers, 8661
 Lounges and settees, 9383
 Macaroni and vermicelli, 7955
 Machinery and parts, 8697
 Machinery, machines, machine tools, n.e.i., 8701
 Machinery or machine tools not made in Commonwealth, 8720
 Machines and machinery, n.e.i., 8665, 8673
 Machine tools, 8720
 Malt, 7956

TRADE AND CUSTOMS—*continued.*Tariff (Customs Tariff Bill), Schedule—*continued.*

Malt extract, 7956
 Mangles, washing machines, 8573
 Manufactures of paper, n.e.i., 9801
 Manufactures of metal, n.e.i., 8724; *cons. mes.*, 10940
 Manures, 9903
 Matches and vestas, 7960, 7977, *cons. mes.*, 10867
 Meats, poultry, game, 8011
 Medicines, 9293
 Metals and machinery, Division VIA., 9187
 Military band and orchestral instruments, 9899
 Milk, including cream, 8019
 Mining machinery, coal-cutting and rock-boring machines, *cons. mes.*, 10941, 11596
 Mixed metalware, plated ware, 8723
 Motive-power machinery, except electric, 8626 (*p.o.*, 8644-52), 8652; *cons. mes.*, 10938
 Motor cycles, tricycles, &c., 9822
 Musical instruments, 9833
 Mustard seed, 8029
 Mustard, 8030, *cons. mes.*, 10868
 Nails, 8599
 Naphthaline, n.e.i., 9275
 Nuts, edible, 8032
 Oars and sculls, 9902
 Oilmen's stores, 8040; *cons. mes.*, 10870
 Oils, 8386, 8424; *cons. mes.*, 11222-7-30, 11598
 Onions in natural state, 7883
 Outside packages, n.e.i., 9948
 Paint boxes, 9654
 Paints and colours, 8449
 Paper, 9679, 9743, 9797; *cons. mes.*, 11311-14
 Paper patterns, 9806
 Parasols, sunshades, umbrellas, 8325
 Passengers' personal effects, &c., 9941
 Peel, preserved in liquid, 7833
 Pens, n.e.i., inkstands, academy boards, 9810; *cons. mes.*, 11315
 Perambulators, go-carts, 9822
 Perambulator or go-cart body and under-gear, 9824
 Perfumery, 9295
 Photograph frames and stands, 9641
 Pianos, 9834, 9893
 Pickles, sauces, &c., 8065; *cons. mes.*, 10871
 Piece goods, 8119, 8157; *cons. mes.*, 10923-4, 11594
 Pins, 9178
 Plates, sheets, pipes, tubes, 9170
 Platinum, 9178
 Potatoes, in natural state, 7888
 Printing ink, 9803
 Printing roller composition, 8519; *cons. mes.*, 11236
 Rails, fishplates, &c., 9063; *cons. mes.*, 10951
 Rennet, 8065
 Rice, 8067, 8080; *cons. mes.*, 10871
 Rice root, 7698
 Roasting dishes, 8482; *cons. mes.*, 11235, 11599

TRADE AND CUSTOMS—*continued.*Tariff (Customs Tariff Bill), Schedule—*continued.*

Roofing and other tiles, 8478; *cons. mes.*, 11234
 Rubber and other hose, 9665
 Rubber manufactures, n.e.i., 9670
 Sago and tapioca, 7658
 Salt, 8088
 Sausage casings, 8018
 Saws, n.e.i., 8763
 Schedule B, 9950; *cons. mes.*, 11320
 Scientific apparatus (glass), 8495
 Scientific instruments for public institutions, 9942
 Scientific instruments or apparatus, 9947
 Screws, with nuts, &c., 8777; *cons. mes.*, 10941, 11589
 Seed cotton, 8095
 Sewing silks and twists, 9923
 Shaft bars, 9643
 Shafts in the rough, n.e.i., 9642
 Sheet lead and piping, 8571; *cons. mes.*, 10935, 11588
 Slate slabs, 8527-8
 Slipper forms, 9663; *cons. mes.*, 11309
 Soap, 8095
 Socks and stockings, 8334
 Solid spirit heaters, 7712
 Sparklets, 8100
 Spectacles and frames, 9658
 Spectacle cases, 9657
 Spices, 8098; *cons. mes.*, 10873
 Standards, steel fencing, 9178; *cons. mes.*, 10959, 11598
 Starch flours, 8100
 Stationery, manufactured, 9801
 Stearine, paraffine, &c., 7712; *cons. mes.*, 10845
 Steel, and steel rimmed wheels, 9183; *cons. mes.*, 10960
 Stone and marble, 8532; *cons. mes.*, 11237, 11589
 Straw, 7944
 Stripper harvesters, 8582
 Surgical appliances, 9939; *cons. mes.*, 11320
 Surgical, dental, veterinary instruments, 9942; *cons. mes.*, 11320
 Talking machines, 9657
 Tallow and greases, 8376
 Tanks, 8612, 8617
 Tartaric acid, 9293; *cons. mes.*, 11241
 Tea, 8102, 8105; *cons. mes.*, 10921
 Tents, sails, flags, 8346
 Timber, 9387, 9422, 9537; *cons. mes.*, 11242-53-4-5-7, 11304, 11599-600, 11688
 Tool handles, unattached, 9634
 Tobacco, manufactured, n.e.i., 7631
 Tobacco, unmanufactured, 7645, 7649; *cons. mes.*, 10841-43
 Trimmings for bonnets, &c., 8348
 Type, printers', 8764
 Unrefined glycerine, 9297
 Vegetables, dried, 7873
 Vegetables, n.e.i., 7872
 Vehicles, 9825; *cons. mes.*, 11315
 Voltoids of sal-ammoniac, 9275
 Waddings, cotton wool, 8326
 Watch and clock springs, barometers, &c., 9656; *cons. mes.*, 11309
 Watches, clocks, n.e.i., 9656
 Waxes, mixed or compound, 7720

TRADE AND CUSTOMS—continued.

Tariff (Customs Tariff Bill), Schedule—continued.

Weighing machines, 8619
 Wicker, bamboo, and cane, 9564
 Wigs, hair nets, 8353
 Wine, sparkling, 7624
 Wire, n.e.i., 9187; *cons. mes.*, 11221
 Wire netting, 9139
 Wood, articles made of, n.e.i., 9572
 Works of art for public institutions, 9936;
cons. mes., 11317, 11607
 Yarns, 9919

TARIFF (WAYS AND MEANS RESOLUTIONS).

House of Representatives:

Formal *amds.* in Tariff: authority to Chairman, *obs.*, 7440
 Motion by Mr. Frazer, to give precedence to items relating to tea, mining engines and machinery, electrical machinery, oils (kerosene), chairs, and magazines, moved, 4624; negatived, 4628; by Mr. H. Willis, to give precedence to item relating to oils (kerosene), moved and negatived, 4628
 Motion by Sir W. Lyne, that duties of Customs and duties of Excise be imposed according to Tariff submitted, to come into operation from 8 Aug., 1907, 1648; debated, 1678, 2124, 2262, 2314, 2348, 2451, 2579, 2655, 2691, 2807, 2905, 2965, 2999, 3105, 3175, 3269, 3974, 4087, 4200, 4281, 4311, 4413, 4519, 4623, 4650, 4749, 4870, 4928, 4959, 5046, 5131, 5210, 5240, 5329, 5417, 5497, 5601, 5712, 5804, 5914, 6033, 6099, 6524, 6596, 6678, 6730, 6814, 6835, 6896, 6968, 7028, 7118, 7171, 7251, 7301, 7418
 Motion by Mr. Willis, to give precedence to item 187, Wire Netting, moved and debated, 4120; withdrawn, 4130
 Motion by Sir William Lyne, that certain items be postponed to give precedence to item 187, Wire Netting, moved and debated, 4327; amendment by Mr. Hughes, "except items 105, 106, 148, 177, and 178," 4331; amendment of the amendment by Mr. Wilks, "add the following figures, '34, 42, 54A, 94, 107, 124,'" 4334; amendments negatived, and original motion agreed to, 4361
 Motion by Sir William Lyne, that resolution on item 114 (Bags) be reported, moved and debated, 5730; agreed to, and item *recom.*, 5736
 Motion by Sir W. Lyne to postpone remaining items until consideration of schedule "Rebate for Home Consumption," 6753; to postpone Division VI. (Metals and Machinery), 6842; to postpone items 299 to 302, moved and debated, 6999; withdrawn, 7001; to postpone item 425, moved and debated, 7405; agreed to, 7406
 Motion that report be taken into consideration forthwith, moved and debated, 7449; agreed to and *ad. rep.*, 7456

TRADE AND CUSTOMS—continued.

Tariff (Ways and Means Resolutions)—continued.

Recommittal of items, 353C and 355, moved, 7450; items 170 and 114, 7451; 84, 7453; statement by Treasurer as to intention regarding recommitments and motions negatived, 7455
 Requests by Senate, *m.* by Sir William Lyne, that date of any *amdt.* be the date of its being made by Committee, moved, debated, and agreed to, 10503
 Requests, *m.* by Sir William Lyne that Chairman report to House all requests dealt with to date and *amdt.* that request in regard to Item 15, Hay and Chaff, be *recom.*, moved, 10815; *amdt.* negatived, *m.* agreed to, and *m.* that progress report be adopted and message sent to Senate moved and debated, 10816; agreed to, 10817.
 Resolutions of Committee of Ways and Means adopted, 7449
 Schedule as amended agreed to, 7449

TARIFF—CUSTOMS SCHEDULE:

House of Representatives:

Academy boards, 7266
 Acetic acid, extract of vinegar, 6068
 Adding and computing scales, 6632
 Adze and bent wood handles, 7124
 Agricultural, horticultural, and viticultural machinery, 6053, 6549, 6575, *cons. req.*, 10660, 10662
 Ale, porter, and other beer, 3294, 3974, 4087, 4135
 Ammonia, *cons. req.*, 11001
 Ammonia condenser coils, 6113
 Ammunition, 6033
 Amylic alcohol and fusel oil, 4137
 Animals, living, 4768
 Antimony, 6830
 Any dutiable machine or machine tool, 6112
 Apparel and attire, of any material, n.e.i., 5628; *cons. req.*, 10564
 Apparel and attire (woollen or silk), 5601; *cons. req.*, 10562
 Arms, 6033; *cons. req.*, 10656
 Arrowroot, 5445
 Articles n.e.i., 5631
 Articles for State Governors, 7404, 7418
 Articles for Governor-General, 7403, 7418
 Articles imported by Commonwealth, 7400, 7422
 Articles, n.e.i., of celluloid, &c., 7399
 Articles, n.e.i. for advertising, 7359
 Asbestos pipe and boiler covering, 7399
 Asphalt, mastic, 6909
 Bacteriological products, 6993
 Bags, baskets, boxes, 7359
 Bags and sacks, 5641, 5642; *cons. req.*, 10571
 Bananas, 5336
 Barbed wire, 6829
 Basketware, 7109
 Bayonets, badges, braids, lace, 5938
 Bent poles, 7131; *cons. req.*, 11057
 Bicycles and tricycles, 7270; *cons. req.*, 11174
 Biscuits, 4774

TRADE AND CUSTOMS—continued.

Tariff—Customs Schedule—continued.

Blackening and polishes, 6845
 Blankets for printing machines, 7497
 Blankets, 5712; *cons. req.*, 10576, 11534
 Blue, 4780; *cons. req.*, 10501
 Boats, launches, yachts, 7359
 Bolts, carriage, 6113, 6831
 Bolts, nuts, rivets, washers, 6829
 Books, n.e.i., 7269
 Boots, rubber, *cons. req.*, 11068
 Boots, shoes, slippers, 7154
 Bottles, n.e.i., 6936, 6948
 Bottle stoppers, 6935
 Brasswork and gun metal, 6112
 Brushmakers' woodware, 7118
 Bronzing and metal powders, 6860
 Buckets and Tubs, wooden, 7138
 Buggy shafts, not dressed, 7127
 Buggy shafts, dressed, 7131
 Bullion and coin, 7150
 Cameras, magic lanterns, 7393, 7395
 Candles, 4870, 4928, 4959, 5046, 5131
 Canvas and Duck, 5930
 Carbide of calcium, 6971
 Carbon bisulphide, 7392
 Carbonate of ammonia, 6969
 Carpets, 5737; *cons. req.*, 10576, 11459
 Casks, barrels, vats, 7131
 Catalogues, show cards, pictures, 7174
 Chaffcutters and horse gears, 6564
 Chain, n.e.i., 6113
 Chairs, 7021
 Chemical compounds, *cons. req.*, 11010
 Children's cycles, 7281
 China, parian, porcelain, 6897
 Churns, 6567
 Cigarettes, 4304
 Cigars, 4304
 Clay smoking pipes, 7396
 Coffee and chicory, 5260
 Coir mats and matting, 5739
 Combined cornsheller, &c., 6566
 Combs, and shaving sets, 7142
 Confectionery, cocoa, chocolate, 5159, 5210, 5240; *cons. req.*, 10514
 Copying apparatus, 7378
 Cork mats, bungs, floats, 7379
 Corks, 7379; *cons. req.*, 11175
 Cosies and cushions, 5739
 Cotton, asbestos, other packings, 7399
 Cresylic acid, tar oil, &c., 6976
 Crude naphthaline, 6977
 Crust or rough tanned goat skins, 7168
 Curled hair and fibre, 7359
 Curtains and blinds, n.e.i., *cons. req.*, 10577, 11438
 Cutlery, 6056; *cons. req.*, 10672, 11443
 Cyanide of potassium, 6978
 Cycle parts, 7283
 Cycle parts, n.e.i., 7284
 Cycle tubing and fork sides, 7282
 Cylinders, 6113
 Diving dresses, 639
 Dolls, undressed, 7142
 Droppers, patent steel, 6114, 6831
 Drugs and chemicals, 6971
 Dry gums, shellac, &c., 6957
 Earthenware, brownware, 6902
 Egg contents, 5265
 Eggs, 5265
 Electrical and gas appliances, 6808; *cons. req.*, 10743-8, 11545

TRADE AND CUSTOMS—continued.

Tariff—Customs Schedule—continued.

Electrical machinery, 6800; *cons. req.*, 10734-8-42-3, 11444-8-52-59
 Electrical materials, 6810
 Engines, &c., 6703
 Explosives, 7381
 Essential oils and fat, 6999
 Eyelets and eyelet studs, 6114
 Fancy goods, 7140; *cons. req.*, 10579, 11057
 Feathers, undressed, 5634; dressed, 5638
 Filters, 7359
 Fire extinguishers, 6112
 Fire and glazed bricks, 6909
 Fishing nets and netting, 7374; *cons. req.*, 11175
 Fish, 5265; *cons. req.*, 10519
 Fly papers, 6993
 Fringes and textile materials, 5931
 Fruits and vegetables, 5278, 5329
 Fruits, citrus, 5333
 Furniture, 7001; *cons. req.*, 11011-15
 Fumigators and the like, 7379
 Glass, 6911, 6921, 6927; *cons. req.*, 10926
 Glassware, 6922
 Glassware, n.e.i., 6923; *cons. req.*, 10904-6
 Gloves, 5939; *cons. req.*, 10577, 11460
 Glucose, 4623
 Glue, gelatine, 6948
 Grain and pulse, 5346
 Grain and pulse, prepared, 5348
 Graphite or plumbago, 6858
 Hats, caps, and bonnets, 5941; *cons. req.*, 10579-93-7, 10610
 Hay and chaff, 5358, 5417; *cons. req.*, 10521, 10526
 Hessians and brattice cloth, 5931
 Hogsheads, 7135
 Honey, jams, jellies, 5444
 Hops, 5444
 Imitation jewellery, n.e.i., 7150
 Incandescent mantles, 5977
 Inks and stains for leather, 7399
 Inkstands, fountain pens, 7266
 Insecticides, sheepwashes, disinfectants, n.e.i., 6978; *cons. req.*, 11001, 11562
 Invert sugar and syrup, 4764
 Iron and steel tubes, 6112, 6829
 Iron and steel, 6833, 6835
 Iron pipes, cast and wrought, 6829; *cons. req.*, 10750
 Iron, plate and sheet, 6118, 6524
 Isinglass, 5462
 Jewellery, unfinished, 7143; rolled gold, 7146; machine made chain, 7148
 Jewellery and imitation jewellery, n.e.i., 7148
 Kerosene. (See "Oils.")
 Kindergarten materials, 7266
 Kinematographs, 7152; *cons. req.*, 11064
 Lamps and lampware, 6038
 Lamps, Miners' safety, 6049
 Lantern slides, &c., *cons. req.*, 11176
 Lasts and trees, 7126
 Lead, sheet and piping, 6049; *cons. req.*, 10660
 Leaf and foil of any metal, 6114
 Leather manufactures, n.e.i., 7163; *cons. req.*, 11069, 11070, 11574
 Leather and other belting and leather, n.e.i., 7164

TRADE AND CUSTOMS—continued.

Tariff—Customs Schedule—continued.

Leather, 7168
 Licht-pausroh papier, 7268; *cons. req.* 11170
 Liquid removers of paint and varnish, 6893
 Liquorice, 5260; *cons. req.*, 10517-8
 Locks, 6114; *cons. req.*, 10776, 10789
 Lounges and settees, 7021
 Machine tools, 6112
 Machinery, 6111
 Machinery and machines, and machine tools, 6721, 6730
 Machinery, and parts thereof, 6099
 Malt, 5445
 Mangles, 6549
 Manufactures of metal, n.e.i., 6746; *cons. req.*, 10686, 10703-7, 11167, 11544
 Manures, 7361
 Maps, 7266
 Marine engines, boilers and machinery, 6633
 Matches and vestas, 5446; *cons. req.*, 10546, 10552
 Medicines, 6993
 Medicinal preparations, 6997
 Metal cordage, 7378
 Metal parts of stripper-harvesters and harvesters, 7449
 Metals and machinery (Heading), 6837
 Meats, poultry, game, 5454
 Milk, 5497
 Military band instruments, 7358
 Milling silk, 5929
 Mining engines and machinery, 6772; *cons. req.* (rock drills), 10710; (coal cutting machines), 10731, 11544; (rock boring machines), 10731
 Mixed metalware, 6112
 Molasses, 4765
 Motive power machinery, except electric, *cons. req.*, 10674, 11534
 Motor cycles, 7281
 Mustard, 5462; *cons. req.*, 10555
 Musical instruments, parts, 7357
 Nails, 6596
 Naphthaline, 6977
 News printing inks, 7264
 Nuts, edible, 5462; *cons. req.*, 10557
 Oilmen's stores, 5521; *cons. req.*, 10558
 Oils, 6860; *cons. req.*, 10817, 10880-1-4-7, 10909, 10970 (*p.o.* as to *obs.* by Sir W. Lyne *re* Standard Oil Trust, 10974; *m.*, to postpone further consideration of request, 10976; request postponed, 10996), 11098; (*m.*, to postpone consideration pending Ministerial statement as to investigation of charges of corruption, 11101, *m.*, withdrawn, 11113), 11550
 Oils in bulk or otherwise, 6876
 Opium, 6993
 Outside packages, n.e.i., 7411
 Paints and colours, 6876; *cons. req.*, 10895-8-9
 Paper, 7171; *cons. req.*, 11071-6-80-9-90-1, 11452
 Parasols, &c., *cons. req.*, 10619
 Parchment, cut and uncut, 7267
 Peel, 5333
 Pencils and penholders, wooden, 7143; *cons. req.*, 11058

TRADE AND CUSTOMS—continued.

Tariff—Customs Schedule—continued.

Pens, *cons. req.*, 11167
 Perfumery, 6997
 Perfumed spirits, 4139
 Perambulators and go-carts, 7282
 Perambulator or go-cart body and under-gear, 7283
 Photographs, 7267
 Photographic accessories, 7395
 Photographic dry plates, 7395
 Photograph frames, 7125; *cons. req.*, 11057
 Pianos, 7301; *cons. req.*, 11213-4
 Pictures, 7398
 Pictorial illustrations and casts, 7406
 Pickles, sauces, 5463
 Piece goods, cotton, 5914
 Piece goods, woollen or containing wool, n.e.i., 5804; *cons. req.*, 10623-4-8-9, 11443, 11461, 11526
 Plates, sheets, of any metal, 6830
 Portland cement, 6896
 Potatoes, 5341
 Potato flour, 5344
 Prepared plates, engravers and lithographers, 7396
 Printing and stencilling inks, n.e.i., 7243, 7251; *cons. req.*, 11092
 Printers' material, 6115
 Printing roller composition, 6956; *cons. req.*, 10996
 Pulley blocks, steam turbo blowers, &c., *cons. req.*, 10685-6, 11539
 Rabbit traps, 6115
 Rails, fish plates, 6814; *cons. req.*, 10749
 Reaper and binder twine and yarn, 7377
 Regalia, 5639
 Rennet, 5462
 Rice, 5525; *cons. req.*, 10559
 Rice root, 4793; *cons. req.*, 10502-4
 Rivets, bifurcated, 6832
 Roasting dishes, 6910; *cons. req.*, 10903, 11556
 Roofing and flooring tiles, 6906; *cons. req.*, 10900
 Roofing slates, 6957
 Rope, cordage, twines, 7374
 Rubber and rubber manufactures, 7163
 Rubber and other hose, 7159
 Rubber manufactures, n.e.i., 7159; *cons. req.*, 11069
 Saddlers' and harness makers' material, 6115
 Saddlers' and Upholsterers' Webs, 5929
 Sago and tapioca, 4774; *cons. req.*, 10496
 Salt, 5536; *cons. req.*, 10559
 Salt, and table preparations thereof, 5534
 Sausage casings, 5459
 Saws, 6748
 Schedule A, Rebates for home consumption, 6753, 7412
 Schedule B, *cons. req.*, 11194, 11213
 School pen and pencil sets, 7143
 School and drawing slates, 7267
 Scientific instruments and apparatus, 7406, 7408
 Scientific apparatus, glass, 6935; *cons. req.*, 10906
 Scientific apparatus, porcelain, 6900
 Scrap iron and steel, 6832
 Screws, 6768; *cons. req.*, 10709, 11444
 Sewing silks, twists, 7378

TRADE AND CUSTOMS—continued.

Tariff—Customs Schedule—continued.

Shafts, 7131
 Shaft bars, 7131
 Shooks, 7136
 Slate slabs, 6957; *cons. reg.*, 10998
 Slipper forms, *cons. reg.*, 11067
 Smoking pipes, n.e.i., 7396
 Soap, 5543
 Socks and stockings, 5931; *cons. reg.*, 10642, 10653
 Spectacles frames, 7153; *cons. reg.*, 11067
 Spirits, 4135
 Standards, steel fencing, 6116; *cons. reg.*, 10798, 11548
 Starch, 5547
 Starch flours, 5548
 Stationery, manufactured, 7242
 Stay paper and cloth, 7267
 Steam road rollers, 6678
 Stearine, paraffine wax, &c., 5134; *cons. reg.*, 10505
 Steel, band or ribbon, 6116
 Steel and steel rimmed wheels, 6832, *cons. reg.*, 10804
 Stone and marble, 6957; *cons. reg.*, 10998, 11452
 Stripper harvesters, 6570, 7441
 Strippers, 7449
 Sugar, n.e.i., 4765
 Sugar, the produce of cane, 4635, 4644, 4650, 4749
 Sulphuric and other ethers, 4139
 Sulphuric ether, 6999
 Surgical appliances, n.e.i., 7400; *cons. reg.*, 11191
 Surgical, dental, veterinary instruments, 7406; *cons. reg.*, 11192
 Table waters, 4142
 Talking machines, 7153; *cons. reg.*, 11066
 Tanks, 6621
 Tartaric acid, 6993; *cons. reg.*, 11011
 Tea, 5464; *cons. reg.*, 10559
 Tents and tarpaulins, 5937
 Thio sulphides, 6993
 Timber, 7021, 7028; *cons. reg.*, 11019, 11056, 11121, 11144-7-9-50-51, 11159, 11452, 11567-71
 Tin plates, 6116, 6833
 Tobacco cut, n.e.i., 4302
 Tobacco, destroyed for sheepwash, 4304
 Tobacco manufactured, n.e.i., 4202, 4281
 Tobacco unmanufactured, 4302
 Tobacco unmanufactured, entered to be locally manufactured, 4303; *cons. reg.*, 10496
 Tool handles, unattached, 7119
 Trimmings, ornaments, n.e.i., 5938
 Trophies, decorations, medallions, 7407
 Type, printers', 6753; *cons. reg.*, 10709
 Undertakers' requisites, 7399
 Unrefined glycerine, 6998
 Unserviceable cordage, 7378
 Varnishes, 6892
 Vegetables, dried, 5341; *cons. reg.*, 10519
 Vehicles, 7284
 Waddings and cotton wool, 5927; *cons. reg.*, 10630
 Wall and ceiling parts, 7399
 Watches, clocks, &c., n.e.i., 7150
 Watch and clock springs, compasses, thermometers, &c., 7152; *cons. reg.*, 11059

TRADE AND CUSTOMS—continued.

Tariff—Customs Schedule—continued.

Weighing machines, scales, n.e.i., 6626
 Whiffle tree bars, 7131
 Wicker, bamboo, cane, 7108; *cons. reg.*, 11056
 Wigs, hair-nets, 5939; *cons. reg.*, 10655
 Wine, n.e.i., 4139, 4200
 Wire cloth and gauze, 6833
 Wire, n.e.i., 6118; *cons. reg.*, 10806, 10811
 Wire netting, 4361, 4413, 4519; *cons. reg.*, 10757, 11205
 Wood, articles of, n.e.i., 7110
 Wood naphtha, 4138
 Works of art, 7397-8; *cons. reg.*, 11183, 11575
 Yarns, 7375

TARIFF—EXCISE SCHEDULE—

House of Representatives:

Amylic alcohol, *cons. reg.*, 11215
 Cigars, machine and hand-made, 4306
 Cigarettes, 4306, 4311
 Glucose, 4636
 Golden syrup, 4767
 Invert sugar and syrup, 4766
 Saccharin, 4766, 5557, 7412
 Snuff, 4325
 Starch, 5548
 Tobacco, manufactured, n.e.i., 4304

TARIFF (EXCISE TARIFF BILL) SCHEDULE—

Senate:

Amylic, alcoholic, and fusel oil, 10025
 Confectionery, containing glucose, &c., 10020
 Glucose, 10026
 Tobacco, unmanufactured, n.e.i., 10014

TARIFF (GENERAL).

Senate:

Action of Mr. Carruthers in seizing wire netting, *obs.*, 2099
 Average rate of dutiable goods, *tariff*, 7555-6, 7589
 Basis of Tariff, *tariff*, 7555
 Collection of duties on goods in transit, *supply*, 1838
 Duties on bicycles and alleged combine, *supply*, 6345-7
 Effect of new Tariff on revenue, *supply*, 3810-13, 3902; *tariff*, 7576-7, 7594, 7601, 7608
 Government view regarding introduction of Tariff in Senate, *supply*, 5878
 Increase in price of kerosene, *adj.*, 2787-9
 Increase in price of tobacco following new duties, *adj.*, 2032-55
 Morning sitting to expedite Tariff, *m.*, 8076-80
 Operation of existing Tariff, *address*, 483
 Pencils and school sets, *m.* to postpone items, 9654
 Postponement of divisions, *obs.*, 8284
 Proceedings against New South Wales Government in respect of seizure of wire netting, *supply*, 5860, 5875, 5880-1
 Reply to resolution of Western Australian Parliament, *obs.*, 4924-5, 5011

TRADE AND CUSTOMS—continued.

Tariff (General)—continued.

Revision of, *address*, 10, 49, 53, 59, 62-5, 69, 70, 141, 148, 150-1, 253, 260, 275-6, 291, 293, 372-3, 379, 381, 393, 397, 401-2, 476-7; *supply*, 3915
 Stripper harvesters, *m.* to postpone item, 8582; negated, 8587
 Tariff anomalies, *tariff*, 7575, 7581, 7610
 Urgency of dealing with, *supply*, 1935-47, 3818; *obs.*, 7563-4, 7786-90
 Questions by—
 Senator Dobson, disposing of Tariff before Christmas, 3364; arrangements to dispose of Tariff by end of year, 4035, 4580
 Senator Dobson, refund of duty on agricultural machinery, 5980
 Senator Findley, duty on paper, 9631
 Senator Gray, increased pay to public servants to meet Tariff increases, 3464
 Senator Macfarlane, notice of new duties in Tasmania, 1814
 Senator McColl, supply of comparative tables, 1684; Senator Stewart, 7542, 7570, 7794; Senator Dobson, 7570
 Senator Millen, action of Government regarding seizure of wire netting by New South Wales Government, 2178
 Senator Millen, preparation of return showing effect of on revenue, 7791, 7926
 Senator Millen, reported dissatisfaction of Sir William Lyne with Tariff as passed, 11863; Senator Pulsford, introduction of amending Bills, 11863
 Senator Needham, failure to take proceedings in Court of summary jurisdiction for seizure of wire netting in New South Wales, 3463
 Senator Needham, resolution of West Australian Parliament, 4143
 Senator Neild and Senator Symon, decision of Full Court of New South Wales concerning State imports, 2406
 Senator Pearce, textile machinery, duty on, 10920
 Senator St. Ledger, date of submitting revision proposals, 1023
 Senator Story, duties on bicycles and increased price of bicycle sets, 5978, 6294
 Senator Symon, presentation of Tariff to Senate, 4036, 4143; return showing value of imports from United Kingdom, 7542
 Senator W. Russell and Senator Sir J. Symon, duty on wire netting, 1814; Senator Millen, hands employed in making wire-netting, 1926, 2405; Senator W. Russell, statement by South Australian *Advertiser*, and number of manufacturers, 1926; Senator St. Ledger, duty on State imports of wire-netting, 1926

House of Representatives:

Abolition of Excise and bounty on Sugar, *Budget*, 2983
 Collection of duties on goods in transit, *supply*, 1875-79-82-3
 Collection of new duties, *supply*, 9983

TRADE AND CUSTOMS—continued.

Tariff (General)—continued.

Date of proceeding with, *supply*, 1775; expediting consideration of, *obs.*, 3362
 Effect of new Tariff on revenue, *Budget*, 1628; on States, 1638
 Estimate of normal revenue from new duties, *supply*, 1783-4
 Exemption of hat leathers, *adj.*, 4794-5
 Exemption of woollen machinery, *adj.*, 4795
Expl. by Sir John Forrest, 1180, 3231; Mr. Mahon, 3231-2; Mr. Liddell and Mr. H. Cook, 3298, Sir W. Lyne, 3299, Mr. Johnson, 4243; Mr. Catts, 4361; Mr. J. Cook, 5210; Mr. Mauger, 6812; Mr. Maloney, 12198; *obs.* by Mr. Coon, 12203
 Immediate removal of anomalies, *obs.*, 3047-8
 Joint consideration of Tariff and Budget, *obs.*, 1743-4
 Kerosene duty and refund of excess prices paid, *obs.*, 7414; charges of corruption in regard to, *adj.*, 9794-5
 Late sittings, to deal with, *obs.*, 742, 3682-3; extra sittings, *obs.*, 3362, 6186-8, 6416-8, 6521-2; *m.*, 6506-19
 Lack of information concerning schedule, *supply*, 1776
 List of items to be taken after tobacco duties, *adj.*, 4243
 Making terms with Opposition to secure early passing of, 6187-8
 New Tariff and effect of, *supply*, 3314-5, 3322-55; *obs.*, 3974-4035, 4087-4135
Obs., as to date of submitting revision proposals, 1469-70
Obs. as to duty on wire netting, 4646
Obs., urgency of Tariff revision, 469; delay in dealing with Tariff, 11466
 Piano duties and alleged leakage of information supplied by Mr. G. Allan to Customs Department, *adj.*, 7536; charges of corruption in regard to, *adj.*, 9794-5
 Precedence of Government business to expedite consideration of Tariff, *m.*, 2795-2807
 Percentages of Customs, duty collected to values of goods imported in Commonwealth, and other countries, *obs.*, 3981, 4307
 Printing and circulating revised tobacco proposals, *adj.*, 4243
 Rebates on woollen and hat machinery duties, *supply*, 4843-7
 Recommitments and corrections, *adj.*, 7413-4
 Refunds of duties, *obs.*, 1743-4; *supply*, 1782-97, 1800-1
 Revision of, *address*, 26-8, 100, 115-7, 125-6, 159, 165, 178, 188-9, 195, 205-9, 217-19, 233, 322, 324, 327, 330, 333-4, 336, 346, 349-50, 458, 465
 Schedule of machinery exemptions under Tariff of 1902, *adj.*, 4461
 Seizure of wire netting by New South Wales Government, *obs.*, 2120-1, 2344-6; *Budget*, 2152-3, 2387-9
 Senate's requests and compacts between Government and House of Representatives, *obs.*, 8932

TRADE AND CUSTOMS—*continued.*Tariff (General)—*continued.*

Supply of kerosene and duty collected, *obs.*, 3047-8

Tariff average, *supply*, 3313-18, 3333

Uninterrupted consideration of Tariff, *supply*, 1775-83-5-7-99, 1882; *adj.*, 2025-9

Western Australia's special Tariff, effect of cessation of, *Budget*, 1627

Work of Treasurer as Minister in charge of Tariff, *obs.*, 7536

Questions by—

Mr. Atkinson, congratulatory messages, 2996

Mr. Bowden, seizure of wire netting by New South Wales Government, 2230; Mr. Fisher, 2231; Mr. Irvine, 2232; decision of Supreme Court of New South Wales as affecting same, Mr. Watkins and Mr. J. Cook, 2231; Mr. Glynn, 2232; mental condition of Mr. Carruthers, Mr. Page, 2233; Mr. Livingston, distribution of netting seized, 2233; Mr. T. Brown, 3422; Mr. Hutchison, statement in *Argus*, 2563; Mr. Johnson and Mr. B. Smith, cancellation of carriers' licences, 2687; Mr. Johnson, 2793; Mr. Page, amicable settlement of dispute regarding seizure, 4309

Mr. Bowden, duties on curios, 5329

Mr. J. T. Brown, Government intentions regarding anomalies, 2996

Mr. Thomas Brown, combine of confecturers, Sydney, 5239; duties on shearing machines, 5329

Mr. Catts, Tariff referendum, 11326

Mr. J. Cook, comparative urgency of Tariff with other measures, 3588; consideration of non-contentious items, 6523

Mr. J. Cook, Customs Tariff Bill in Senate and Ministerial obligations, 9100

Mr. Crouch, increased price of kerosene, 2563; collection of duty on, Mr. Poynton, 2687; Mr. Page and Mr. Thomas, refunds of excess prices, 7298; Mr. D. Thomson, reason for increase, 7299; Mr. Tudor, refunds by Colonial Oil Company, 7299; Mr. Salmon, collection of duties on stocks and donation of excess profits to charities, 7299; Mr. D. Thomson, letter from Colonial Oil Company, 7458; Mr. Page, collection of duty of 6d per gallon, 6685

Mr. Crouch, collection of duties on goods in transit, 1745; Mr. Mathews and Mr. Wilks, 1746; Mr. Glynn, 1747; Mr. Johnson, 1976

Mr. Crouch, effect of Tariff on South African preference, 1919-20

Mr. Fairbairn, consumption and manufacture of goods in Australia, 1752; duties on bottles and cases, 5496

Mr. Fisher, free admission of log timber, 1715

Sir John Forrest, recommittal of item, "Hay and Chaff," 6132

Sir J. Forrest, manufacture of gloves, 2566, 2689

TRADE AND CUSTOMS—*continued.*Tariff (General)—*continued.*

Questions by—

Sir J. Forrest, preparation of explanatory list, 3733, 3972; Mr. D. Thomson, printing and distribution of proposed amendments, 6834

Mr. Fowler, correspondence regarding resolution of Western Australian Parliament, 4955; Mr. Crouch, letter transmitting correspondence from Governor-General to Parliament, 5690; Mr. Fowler, telegram to Premier of Western Australia, regretting effect of Tariff on the State, 6677

Mr. Frazer, order of dealing with items, 2791

Mr. Glynn, duty on printing paper, 2791; Mr. Mahon, duties collected on paper under new Tariff, 6675; Mr. Kelly, instructions to collectors, 10878

Mr. Glynn, selection of items for immediate consideration, 3587; Mr. J. Cook, direction by motion to committee to give precedence to certain items, 3587

Mr. Glynn, alteration in rule as to clearance of imports, 1868; duplication of duties on sardines, 6674; circulation of divisions as dealt with, 6812

Mr. Hedges, duty on railway wheels and axles, 2312, 2687

Mr. Hedges, alphabetically indexed copies of Tariff, 2687

Mr. Hughes and Mr. McDonald, Senate's requests, prompt dealing with, 11052-3; Mr. Archer, 11053; Mr. Johnson, cause of delay, 11052; Mr. Kelly, postponement of items, 11053

Mr. Hutchison, increase of prices by retailers, 1865; by wholesale firms, Mr. Johnson, 1867

Mr. Johnson, duty on potato flour, 5415

Mr. Johnson, complaints in England against new Tariff, 2235, 2311

Mr. Johnson, effect of Tariff on prices, 2564; and on industries, 9090; effect of U.S. Tariff on employment, 10608; claim by Harbor Trust employes, Mr. B. Smith, 3173; effect on New South Wales and telegram to Premier of that State, Mr. Chanter, 6677

Mr. Johnson, anomalies in dressed timber duties, 3300, 3420; duties on lining boards, 4199; duty on photographic plates, 3854; duties on pianos, and statement by Mr. Beale regarding subscription of funds to influence Parliament, 8925

Mr. Johnson, preparation of schedule of Senate's requests, 9390

Mr. Kelly, Tariff changes, circulation in England, 9476

Mr. Kelly, reported dissatisfaction of Treasurer with Tariff as passed, and attitude of Prime Minister, 11789

Mr. Knox, basis of determination under Division VI.A, 3734; circulation of schedule of Senate's requests, 10079; Mr. D. Thomson, 10079

TRADE AND CUSTOMS—continued.

Tariff (General)—continued.

Questions by—

- Mr. Liddell, revision of hat duties, 880-1; effect of new duties on Denton Hat Mills, 1747; kerosene duty, and alleged corruption, 8928
- Mr. Mahon, discontent with Tariff in Western Australia, 2691
- Mr. Mahon, increased price of condensed milk, 2564
- Mr. Mahon, duty on cases, 2233; Mr. Crouch, 2347; Mr. Fairbairn, 5496
- Mr. Mahon, supply of incorrect information regarding piano imports, 7113, 7251; Mr. Glynn, Mr. Poynton, and Mr. Batchelor, exhibit of pianos in Parliament House, 7114; Mr. Livingston, 7300; Mr. Willis and Mr. Johnson, 7115; Mr. Johnson, erroneous statistics as to piano imports, 7170; Mr. Wilks, inquiry as to alleged Customs leakage of information supplied by Mr. Allan, 7415, 7462
- Mr. Maloney, excessive charges for drinks on steamers, 2564
- Mr. Mathews, increased prices by Sydney firms, 2792
- Mr. Mathews, abolition of duty on bicycles, 3588
- Mr. McDonald, discussion of Tariff, 1715-6; Mr. Poynton, 3420
- Mr. McWilliams, notice of new duties in Tasmania, 1747
- Mr. McWilliams, duties on British goods, 1747, 1868
- Mr. O'Malley, appointment of sub-committee to select non-debatable items, 5131, 5210, 5240
- Mr. O'Malley, duty on packet tea, 1517
- Mr. Page, date of submitting revision proposals, 406-7; Mr. Frazer, 975; Mr. Knox, 1180
- Mr. Page, duties on necessities of life, 3173
- Mr. Page, differentiation in Tariff between woollen mill and wool-scouring machinery, 4926
- Mr. Page, extra sitting days to expedite Tariff consideration, 5131; Mr. McDonald, 5520; procedure if Tariff not dealt with before Christmas, 6729
- Mr. Palmer, accumulations in bond owing to delay in dealing with Tariff, 5131
- Mr. Poynton, statement by Secretary, Federal Council of Chambers of Manufactures as to Sir William Lyne, and duties on stearine and wax, 5131
- Mr. Poynton, suspension of duty on magazines, 1865; Mr. Glynn, 2312, 2565, 3421; Mr. McDonald, 2312; removal of advertisements from, Mr. Liddell, 2312
- Sir John Quick, newspaper information concerning, 976
- Sir J. Quick, rebate on duty on paints for ships, 2232
- Mr. Reid, order of consideration of items 4280

TRADE AND CUSTOMS—continued.

Tariff (General)—continued.

Questions by—

- Mr. Sampson, resuming consideration of Tariff, 3733; Mr. Fowler, expediting consideration, 5519
- Mr. Sinclair, duty on antimony, 11157; Mr. O'Malley, 11157-8
- Mr. B. Smith, action by New South Wales tweed factory, 2792
- Mr. B. Smith, collections under amended rates, 3734
- Mr. B. Smith, duty on wire netting and effect of, 1974; Mr. Page and Mr. Willis, early consideration of item, 3586; Mr. Hutchison, sale of wire netting by Commonwealth Government, 1974; Mr. Foster, 2314; Mr. Willis, refund if duty on wire netting be struck out, 2792; or reduced, 4199; Mr. Glynn, 2997; Mr. Johnson, refund where duty paid under protest, 4199; Mr. Knox, refund of excess duty collected prior to reduction, 4621, 4649
- Mr. Storrer, duty on chairs, 2564, 2688; Mr. Glynn, 2889
- Mr. D. Thomson, tartaric acid, cream of tartar and citric acid, collection of duty on, 11098
- Mr. J. Thomson, rebate on timber for butter boxes, and fruit cases, 2564; Mr. Palmer, 2567; Mr. W. H. Irvine, 6421, 6676, 7025; Mr. Fisher, on exported fruit cases, 7026; Sir J. Quick, 6420; Mr. McWilliams, 6421; on lead, Mr. Thomas, 6421; Mr. Fisher, 7026
- Mr. Watson, accuracy of comparative table, 2655; Mr. Tudor, 2791, 2889, 2891
- Mr. Watson, refunds of duties and effect on consumers, 1748; Mr. Johnson, refunds where duties reduced, 7300
- Mr. Wilks, exemption of hat leathers, 4748; Mr. B. Smith, history of exemption of hat-making machinery, 6676; Mr. Johnson, amount of duties rebated on hat-making machinery, 6729; failure to keep records of rebates, 6813
- Mr. Wilks, instructions to collectors regarding new duties and statement by Rockhampton *Bulletin*, 1864, 2122; preferential rates, when determined on, 2122
- Mr. Wilks, clearances of tobacco, 1868
- Mr. Willis, free entry of wire-netting by *Star of Scotland*, 3586
- Mr. Willis, effect of new duties on price of electric equipment, 2231-2
- Mr. Willis, despatching Tariff to Senate in divisions, 5131; Mr. Wilks, 6023
- Mr. Willis, suspension of fodder duties, 5230; recommendation of, Mr. B. Smith, 6355

TRADE AND CUSTOMS—continued.

TARIFF (NEW PROTECTION).

Senate:

Constitutionality of New Protection, *supply*, 6328-33-35; and procedure if held to be unconstitutional, *Tariff*, 7547-52

New protection, *Tariff*, 7562, 7586-7, 7591-5-9, 7608-12-13, 7619-20-22

Questions by—

Senator Dobson, introduction of new protection proposals before decision of High Court, 7796

Senator Sayers, early steps to bring policy into operation, 11382; Senator Findley, application to sugar industry, 11382; Senator St. Ledger, submission of policy to a referendum, 11382, 11473

Senator Symon, date of introduction of Bill relating to New Protection, 4036

House of Representatives:

New Protection, introduction of Bill before Christmas, *obs.*, 6417; early introduction of, *supply*, 5793; Government intentions, *obs.*, 8932

Operation of New Protection policy, *supply*, 5695-8-9

Protection of labour, *obs.*, 1744-5, 2842-44; *supply*, 1784; *Budget*, 2141-2-8, 2151, 2390-5, 2471-5, 2588-9, 2600-2, 2674-5, 2678-83, 2718, 2741, 2807-8, 2931, 2985, 2991-2, 3023-4, 3045, 3105-12, 3137-45, 3198; *supply*, 3319 (*p.o.*, 3319-20); "New Protection" scheme outlined by Sir W. Lyne, 3986, debated, 3989-4035, 4087-4135

Power of Government to refuse to stop imports if local labour conditions unreasonable, *supply*, 5697

Questions by—

Mr. Carr as to suspension of collection of increased duties if selling prices of goods are unfairly increased, 2890

Mr. Catts, Tariff reconsideration if new protection proposals unconstitutional, 8816; Mr. Frazer, 10132; Mr. McWilliams, will amendment of Constitution be necessary, 10132; Mr. Catts, delayed judgment of High Court, 11420

Mr. Catts, New Protection Policy, date of introduction, 10132, 10963, 11420; Mr. Reid, 11052

Mr. Crouch, provision in Tariff Bill to protect labour, 1281; inclusion of salt workers and all protected trades under New Protection scheme, 5802.

Mr. Fuller, presentation of list of industries to which New Protection will apply, 4200

Mr. Glynn, Excise duties to protect labour, 1715

Mr. Glynn, reason for abandoning method of protecting labour under Excise Tariff 1906, and consideration of Government proposals, 3268, 3302, 3421

Mr. W. H. Irvine, recommittal of schedule if New Protection held unconstitutional, 6231

Mr. Palmer, New Protection and Socialism, 7415

TRADE AND CUSTOMS—continued.

Tariff (New Protection)—continued.

Questions by—

Mr. Reid, constitutionality of proposed Excise exemptions, 4200; Mr. Hutchison, of New Protection legislation, 6095

Mr. Reid, intention of Government to stand by duties fixed, irrespective of adoption of New Protection, 6230

Mr. B. Smith, intentions of Government regarding Labour Party's scheme of "New Protection," 1974; and regarding Commission's recommendations for protection of workers and consumers, Mr. Carr, 3173

Mr. Tudor, omission of Excise duty on harvesters from revised proposals, 1748; limitation of apprentices under "New Protection," 7116

Mr. Webster, reduction of duty on woollens to assert principle of "New Protection," 3622

Mr. Wilks, date of introduction of Bill relating to New Protection, 5208; Mr. Tudor, 5328; Mr. Hall, drafting and distribution of Bill, 6095

Mr. Wilks, presentation of Memorandum on, 6095; Mr. Willis, 7300; press statements regarding Government proposals and criticism of Prime Minister, 7463

Mr. Willis, reported statement by Sir William Lyne, Excise duties mere matter of form, 5239

TARIFF (PREFERENTIAL TRADE).

Senate:

British preference, *tariff*, 7557-61, 7578-81-85-90-94, 7605-6-8, 7611-2, 7616-8; *supply*, 11487

Representations at Imperial Conference and policy of, *address*, 52, 58, 66-9, 148, 250-61, 293, 370-2, 377, 393, 473-6

Questions by—

Senator Stewart and Senator Sir J. Symon, speech by Senator Best, empire Tariff preference, 11468

Senator Walker, preferential treatment of British-grown imports from New Hebrides, 4245

House of Representatives:

Effect of general application of preferential proposals, *supply*, 3314-5

Preference to British imports, new Tariff, *Budget*, 1646-7, 2138, 2141-46-50, 2164-6-8, 2336-7, 2361-66, 2403-4, 2475-6, 2490-1, 2589, 2669-72-74, 2680-3, 2698, 2702, 2966-7, 3033, 3127, 3290; *Tariff*, 4504-51, 4557-8, 4561-3, 4874-85, 4888-90, 4928, 4938, 4959-5011, 5047-81

Representations at Imperial Conference and policy of, *address*, 94-5, 101, 109, 171-2, 190, 200-4, 209-11, 216, 221, 227, 234, 236, 324, 329, 345, 420-44, 455, 459

Report of Imperial Conference, printing and distribution of, *obs.*, 769-70

Statement by Australian correspondent of London Times, 4956

With Great Britain, New Guinea, the New Hebrides, and Canada, *supply*, 1646-7

TRADE AND CUSTOMS—*continued.*

Tariff (Preferential Trade)—*continued.*

Questions by—

Mr. Bowden, preferential trade with Pacific Islands, 829

Mr. J. Cook, abandonment of Government proposals, 2791

Mr. Crouch, statement by Captain Collins, 7111

Mr. Johnson, criticism in England of British preference proposals, 2235, 2311; statement by Senator Best, 11627

Mr. McWilliams, application of foreign rates to British goods, 1868

Mr. B. Smith, decision of House of Commons, 590; Mr. Glynn, 591, 694

Mr. B. Smith, statement by Australian correspondent of *London Times*, 4956

Mr. Wilks, date when new preferential duties were decided upon, 2122

Mr. Willis, Sir W. Lyne on Colonial preference and Labour Party, 1413

TARIFF (ROYAL COMMISSION'S REPORTS).

Senate:

Extent to which Tariff is based on reports of, *tariff*, 7555, 7581-6

Failure to distinguish between reports of two sections, *expl.*, 2513

Questions by Senator Clemons, supply of reports, 1684; form of binding, 2032, 2405, 2511

House of Representatives:

Comparison of Tariff Commission's proposals with former duties and increases to grant British preference, *Budget*, 2166-8

Duties in excess of those recommended by Commission on raw materials and parts of finished products, *Budget*, 2169

Failure to distinguish between reports of two sections, *expl.*, 2312, 2561-3

Increases in excess of Commission's proposals without granting British preference, *Budget*, 2168

Items recommended by protectionist section of Commission to be free on which free-trade section recommended duties, *Budget*, 2587

Permanent Tariff Commission, *Budget*, 3003

Preparation of comparative tables, *adj.*, 1682-4, 2026

Reports of Commission, distribution of, *Budget*, 1678

Questions by—

Mr. J. Cook, preparation of comparative tables, 1715, 1974; recommendations of "A" section, 3172; Mr. Mathews and Mr. Tudor, 1747; Sir J. Quick, 1748, 1868; Mr. Reid, 1865

Mr. Crouch, duty of Mr. Speaker to distinguish between free-traders and protectionist members of Commission, 1749; provision in Tariff Bill to protect labour, 1281

Mr. Poynton, Mr. Fuller, and Mr. Kelly, distribution of reports, 1716

Sir J. Quick, form of issuing Commission's reports, 1748; Mr. J. Cook, reports signed by chairman, 3172

TRADE AND CUSTOMS—*continued.*

Tariff (Royal Commission's Reports)—*continued.*

Questions by—

Sir J. Quick, sale of Reports and *Minutes of Evidence*, 6418; Mr. Hedges, supply of copies to libraries, &c., 6419

Mr. Tudor, preparation of index, 1714

TOBACCO INDUSTRY.

Senate:

Crusade against monopoly, *address*, 483

Motion for suspension of Standing Orders by Senator Neild to enable mover to move for appointment of select committee, 3049; debated, 3050; agreed to and motion for appointment of select committee moved, 3055; negatived, 3065

Motion by Senator Pearce for return as to tobacco, &c., taken out of bond and Excise duty paid during the four weeks prior to 9th August, 1907, 2227

Motion by Senator Pearce, return as to registered growers of cigar leaf and acreage, 5648

Tobacco Combine: Increase of prices following new duties, *adj.*, 2032-55, 2069-70, 2448

Questions by—

Senator Chataway, offer by British Australasian Company, 3149

Senator Findley, return as to employés, 564

Senator Pearce, sale of refuse leaf, 649, 830; stamping of cigar boxes, 5083

Senator Gray, result of inquiries regarding charges against manufacturers, 2068, 3684, 4706; Senator Neild, 2513, 2615, 3049; delay in making inquiries, 3899; failure of Government Officer to communicate with Trust, 4706

House of Representatives:

Questions by—

Mr. Fraser, nationalization of, experience of France, 10752

Mr. Salmon, effects of Kentucky riots on Australian manufacturers, 9191; Mr. O'Malley, relation of Australian and American monopolies, 9192

Mr. Wilks, duty paid on tobacco for month prior to 10th August, 1907, 1868

TRADE.

Senate:

Geraldton, refusal to take cargo from, *supply*, 10396-8

House of Representatives:

British, *address*, 216-7

Comparative Statistics, *Budget*, 1626

Geraldton, refusal of cargo from, *supply*, 9996-7

Improvements in Australian trade and causes of, *Budget*, 1626-7, 2125-9-74

Interchanges between States, *Budget*, 1629

Within the Empire, *address*, 94-5

[See TARIFF, "PREFERENTIAL TRADE"; also EXTERNAL AFFAIRS.]

TRADE AND CUSTOMS—*continued.*

WHEAT.

House of Representatives:

Question by Mr. McDougall, reimportation of wheat, 5600, 6099

WINES.

Senate:

Question by Senator Neild, as to admission of, into New Zealand, at reduced rates, 11472

WIRE NETTING.

Senate:

Questions by—

Senator Millen, hands employed in making, 1926

Senator W. Russell, number of manufacturers, 1926; Senator Millen, 2405

House of Representatives:

Questions by—

Mr. Chanter, number of wire-netting factories and annual requirement of rabbit-proof fencing, 2997; origin of imports, 3174; quantity, stated value, and country of origin of wire-netting imported by New South Wales Government, 4842, 5238

WIRE NETTING, SEIZURE OF. [See TARIFF, GENERAL.]

TREASURY.

ADMINISTRATION.

Senate:

Methods of, *supply*, 3903, 3909-12

Questions by Senator Millen, refusal of funds to Postmaster-General, 7795; Senator Neild, 7925

House of Representatives:

Conduct of business, *supply*, 6286-8

Devolution of functions to officers, *ways and means*, 6804-6

Failure to supply information, *ways and means*, 4117, 5236-7

Submission of information for members to Minister, *expl.*, 2651-3

Use of Departmental statement, *supply*, 3351-60

Question by Mr. B. Smith, provision of funds for Post and Telegraph Department, 12154-5

AUDITOR-GENERAL.

Senate:

Report presented, 7545

House of Representatives:

Auditing Accounts for Northern Territory, *supply*, 9970

Report of, presented, 7457

Questions by—

Mr. Johnson, report of, on Adelaide Customs frauds, 694

Mr. Hutchison non-supply of full Customs Audit Staff, South Australia, 8938

TREASURY—*continued.*

BANKING.

Senate:

Savings Bank claim, New South Wales, *supply*, 11620-1

House of Representatives:

Legislation relating to, *address*, 106; *Budget*, 2661

Savings Bank claim, New South Wales, *supply*, 5783-4

Savings Banks, increase in deposits, *Budget*, 1626

State Bank, *Budget*, 1642

Questions by—

Mr. Bamford as to establishment of Commonwealth Savings Banks, 407

Mr. Catts, national bank, 11019

Mr. Kelly, draft Bill and note issue, 501

BOOKKEEPING SYSTEM.

Senate:

Effect of, *supply*, 1842-4; 6300-3, 6306, 6313-4

House of Representatives:

Effect of *Budget*, 2464-5, 2502

BORROWING.

Senate:

Policy of, *supply*, 3817-19-23, 3845-8-9, 3902, 3915

House of Representatives:

Coercing States, to give up their powers of, *Budget*, 2356

Opposition to policy of loan expenditure on defence, *Budget*, 2372-4

Policy of, *Budget*, 2501, 2696, 2700-22, 2934, 3041, 3184-5

BRADDON SECTION.

Senate:

Disregard of in framing financial policy, *supply*, 1861

Obligations under, *supply*, 10268

Operation of and substitute for, *supply*, 3807-15-16-20-22, 3843, 3901-15

House of Representatives:

Decision of Conference, *Budget*, 1643-4, 2718-28, 2916-65; *supply*, 3316-8-41-3; *expl.*, 2654, 2741-2

Operation, continuation of and substitute for, *Budget*, 1640-3-4, 2127-44-5, 2170, 2580-2, 2660, 2718, 2721-8-30, 2820-1, 2906-7, 2916, 2978-0-80, 3007-15, 3037, 3185-9; *supply*, 3316-8, 3329-55

BUDGET.

Senate:

Obs. as to distribution of papers, 1714

Question by Senator Pearce, distribution of papers in Senate, 1684

TREASURY—continued.

Budget—continued.

House of Representatives:

Date of resuming debate on, *obs.*, 1743-4
 Papers ordered to be printed, 1678
 Budget delivered by Sir W. Lyne, 1625;
 debated 1678, 2124, 2262, 2314, 2348,
 2451, 2579, 2655, 2691, 2807, 2905,
 2965, 2999, 3105, 3175, 3269
 Question by Mr. J. Cook, date of deli-
 very of, 977; consideration of, 1716

CANDIDATES' (PARLIAMENTARY) EXPENSES OF.

Senate:

Refund of, where elections voided, *sup-
 ply*, 8988, 10304
 Questions by Senator St. Ledger, expenses
 of Mr. J. V. O'Loughlin and Senator
 Vardon, 8286; Senator McGregor, 9421,
 12101

House of Representatives:

Refund of, where elections voided, *sup-
 ply*, 1808, 8965, 9771, 9773, 9888, 11216,
 11365
 Questions by—
 Mr. J. T. Brown, payment of expenses
 where elections voided, 977
 Mr. Chanter, expenses of Mr. T. Ken-
 nedy, 10180, 11421
 Mr. Poynton, recognition of claim of
 widow of Mr. Crosby, 978

COINAGE.

Senate:

Questions by—

Senator Pearce, silver coinage, 8229;
 Commonwealth silver coinage and
 estimated profits, 8300; early estab-
 lishment of silver coinage mint, and
 making of "blanks" for cartridges
 therein, 9237; reports on feasibility
 of, 9796, 10255
 Senator Needham, decimal coinage, in-
 troduction of, 10369

House of Representatives:

Questions by—

Mr. Bamford, coinage of silver, Com-
 monwealth currency, 2235
 Mr. Bowden, minting, pending erection
 of Mint in Federal Capital, 10178-9
 Mr. Knox, minting of silver, copper,
 and bronze, 11424
 Mr. D. Thomson, decimal system, 11325;
 Mr. Knox, 11424

COMPENSATION, PAYMENT OF.

Senate:

To representatives of officers, *supply*,
 11620

House of Representatives:

To representatives of officers, *supply*,
 5790-1, 5797, 10153, 11390
 [See DEFENCE and POSTMASTER-GENERAL;
 also OFFICERS COMPENSATION BILL
 under BILLS.]

TREASURY—continued.

ESTIMATES OF REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE.

Senate:

Delay in dealing with, *supply*, 10269,
 10282, 10393

House of Representatives:

Delay in dealing with, *supply*, 6280-3,
 6286

Message from Governor-General transmit-
 ting estimates of revenue and expendi-
 ture, and estimates of expenditure for
 additions, new works, buildings, &c.,
 for the year ending 30th June, 1908,
 and recommending appropriation ac-
 cordingly, 1625

Message from Governor-General trans-
 mitting additional estimates of expendi-
 ture for additions, new works, and build-
 ings for year ending 30th June, 1908,
 3507, 10136; and for the years ended
 30th June, 1906 and 1907, and recom-
 mending appropriations accordingly,
 10177

Message from Governor-General trans-
 mitting Additional Estimates of Expen-
 diture for year ending 30th June, 1908,
 and recommending appropriations ac-
 cordingly, 10136; and for the years
 ended 30th June, 1906 and 1907, and
 recommending appropriations accord-
 ingly, 10177

Reduction of departmental estimates,
expl., 11625, 11704-7

Questions by—

Mr. Bamford, early consideration of
 New Works and Buildings Estimates,
 1866; Mr. Frazer, 2312

Mr. J. Cook, date of presentation of
 Additional Estimates, 10078

EXPENDITURE.

Senate:

Departmental, growth of, *supply*, 10273-4
 Details of increases, *supply*, 10264-6
 Effect of Federal on smaller States, *ad-
 dress*, 190

Increase of, *address*, 285; *supply*, 1833-6,
 3807-21, 3844, 3901, 3912-22, 11474

Motion by Senator Pearce for return as
 to States and Commonwealth loan and
 revenue expenditure, 3233

Provision for "Contingencies" in Supply
 Bill (No. 2), *supply*, 1947-55; in Supply
 Bill (No. 3), *supply*, 5784-7-9-90; in
 Supply Bill (No. 4), *supply*, 6288; in
 Supply Bill (No. 1) 1908-9, *supply*,
 12141

House of Representatives:

Departmental, increase of, *supply*, 9957-
 66-74, 11262-300, 11374

Effect of sugar bounty on, *supply*, 1779;
Budget, 2130, 2349-51, 2371, 2603, 2696;
supply, 3308

Estimate for current year, *Budget*, 1631
 Expenditure of which States have been
 relieved, *supply*, 1308-9

Expenditure on public works, *Budget*,
 1632, 1635-6, 2461, 2501, 11263, 11406

TREASURY—continued.

Expenditure—continued.

Growth of Commonwealth expenditure, *address*, 350; *supply*, 1778; *Budget*, 1638, 2349, 2370-1, 2396-7, 2458-9, 2915, 2971-7, 3112-17-19, 3199, 3304; *supply*, 3322-32-4-43

Increase in States expenditure, *Budget*, 1634, 2580, 3217-20; *supply*, 3304-9, 3322-4-9, 3330-1-5, 3357-60; *obs.*, 3361-2; *expl.*, 3411-19

Payment for public works, 'method of, *Budget*, 3041; *supply*, 3331-2, 3335-7; payment for out of Treasurer's Advance Account, *supply*, 12188-90; inadequacy of funds provided for, *supply*, 11281, 11293, 11295

Provision for "Contingencies," in Supply Bill (No. 2), *supply*, 1777-8, 1808

Per capita system of, *Budget*, 3331-2-7

Statement of certain Expenditure for Works and Buildings not provided for on Estimates, but urgently required, laid on table by Sir W. Lyne, 7502; *m.*, that paper be printed, moved and debated, 7504; agreed to, 7508

Motion by Mr. D. Thomson for return as to services transferred and to be transferred, expenditure on, agreed to, 11709

Question by—

Sir J. Forrest, preparation of statement showing Federal and State revenue and expenditure, and other new expenditure, 9099

FEDERATION, COST OF.

House of Representatives:

Per head of population, *Budget*, 1637, 2976

FINANCE: RELATIONS WITH STATES.

Senate:

Distribution of expenditure on public works, *supply*, 3803

Financial relations of Commonwealth and States, (including payments to States), *address*, 12, 51, 58, 60, 149, 291, 294, 398; *supply*, 3806-21, 3843, 3907, 10272-3-4, 11475-82-5-90-506-15-20, 11614-17

Payments to States during financial year, *supply*, 10262, 10272

Questions by—

Senator Clemons, statement contained in table XVIII. of Bulletin No. 11 issued by Government Statistician as to payment by and to the States, 7974-6; financial relations of Commonwealth and States, opportunity to discuss, 11381

Senator Croft, claim by Premier of Tasmania for refund of revenue, and reference to other States, 933; Senator Findley, 3462; Senator Pearce, 7752, 7850; Senator Stewart, 7753

Senator Givens, payments to States, 353; and Treasurer's forecast, Senator St. Ledger, 7976

Senator de Largie, refunds of revenue to Tasmania and Western Australia, 8365

Senator Dobson, distribution of paper on, by Tasmanian Statistician, 746

TREASURY—continued.

Finance: Relations with States—continued.

House of Representatives:

Distribution of expenditure on public works, *supply*, 3334

Effect of Federation on finances of Western Australia, 3220-1

Financial Proposals by Sir J. Forrest, when Treasurer, *expl.*, 10966-7

Financial relations of Commonwealth and States (including payments to States), *address*, 161, 222-5, 230-3, 331, 350, 1777; *Budget*, 1643, 2126-9-30, 2349, 2354-6, 2373, 2396-8, 2458-9-04, 2495-01, 2583, 2692-3-8, 2715, 2821-5, 2906-7, 2922, 2934-65, 2971-7, 3007-15, 3036-41, 3116, 3128, 3185-6-9, 3104, 3200; *supply*, 3303-12, 3325-31-8, 3339-60, 11264

Financial relations with States, submission of Government scheme before presentation to Conference, *obs.*, 10784

Inter-State Customs and Excise adjustments, *Budget*, 1630, 2974

Memorandum Government proposals re-adjustment financial relations laid on table and debated on *m.*, that papers be printed, 10808; *m.* agreed to, 10811

Monthly balances, payment to States, *obs.*, 11734-6; *adj.*, motion ruled out of order, 11744

Payments to Tasmania to obviate Inter-State certificates, *Budget*, 1629

Premiers' Conference, statement by Prime Minister as to Surplus Revenue Bill, *expl.*, 11787-8

Services and expenditure, *m.* by Mr. Crouch for return, 11526

Surplus revenue returned to States, *Budget*, 1627-39, 1643

Surplus revenue, payment of to States, *adj.*, 11734-6; *expl.*, 11787

Questions by—

Mr. J. Cook, deductions from monthly payments to States, 6420; States compelled to pay interest on transferred properties out of their three-fourths if Surplus Revenue Bill passed, 11786; statement by Prime Minister at Premiers' Conference, 10964; Mr. B. Smith, 10964

Mr. Crouch, Government's financial proposals, services to be taken over, 11420

Sir J. Forrest, financial relations with States, Government's proposals, 9099; submission to Parliament and opportunity to consider before presentation to Conference, 9846, 10524; Mr. W. H. Irvine, 9846, 11328; Mr. Willis, 11016; Sir J. Forrest, *amdt.* of Constitution to provide for proposed changes, 9390, 11016; payments in perpetuity, 11016

Sir J. Forrest, surplus revenue, monthly balance, payment to States, 11736-8, 11741-88; Mr. Thomas Brown, 11738; Mr. W. H. Irvine, 11738-40; Mr. Atkinson, 11788; Mr. Johnson, notice to States' Treasurers, 11739; Mr. Batchelor, 11785; Mr. Reid, statement by Prime Minister, 11788-9

TREASURY—continued.

Finance : Relations with States—continued.

Questions by—

Sir P. Fysh, surplus revenue, statement by Treasurer on Additional Estimates as to distribution of, 10462

Mr. Hutchison, return showing adjustment of revenue between Commonwealth and States in June of each year, 11784; Sir J. Forrest, amount returnable to States in June if Surplus Revenue Bill not passed, 11784; Mr. Poynton, surplus revenue paid to States, 11785; Mr. D. Thomson, proportion represented by interest on transferred properties, 11785; amount of interest that should have been paid, 11786; Mr. Poynton, transfer of debts to cover value of transferred properties, 11786; excess payments of revenue to States and payments out of revenue for public works, 11921

Mr. W. H. Irvine, decrease in balances paid to New South Wales and Victoria for April, 1908, 10751

Mr. Knox, transfer of debts, Treasurer's memorandum, 10875; Mr. J. Cook, Cabinet approval and Prime Minister's approval of Sir J. Forrest's scheme, 10875; Mr. B. Smith, *Argus* summary of Treasurer's memorandum, 10876

Mr. King O'Malley, monthly payments and loans to States, 12151

Mr. B. Smith, delay in printing Mr. O'Malley's scheme, 10524; Mr. Thomas, 10462

Mr. Storrer, amount paid to New South Wales since Federation, and Mr. W. H. Irvine, method of computation, 11742

Mr. Reid, further Conference of States Premiers to settle financial relations, 11787; supply of official reports of Conference, 12040

Mr. D. Thomson, debts of States and payments to Commonwealth, 11159

Mr. H. Willis, financial relations with States, Mr. Harper's scheme, 11016

[See "REVENUE"; also "STATE DEBTS."]

GUARANTEES, FIDELITY.

Senate:

Question by Senator Stewart, fidelity guarantee fund, 11471

House of Representatives:

Supply, 10412-5

INSURANCE.

House of Representatives:

Questions by—

Mr. Watkins, commission to inquire into business methods of companies, 12158

Mr. Maloney, Citizens Life Assurance Company, 12200

TREASURY—continued.

INCREMENTS, PAYMENT OF.

House of Representatives:

Supply, 1798; *Budget*, 2350, 2369, 2502-5, 2506, 2817; *supply*, 2651-2; *Budget*, 3042-4, 3120-2, 3199, 3270, 3296, 3298

Questions by Mr. Frazer, 2689; Mr. Mathews, 6812; Mr. Poynton, 7026, 7171, 9581; Mr. Catts, 7464

OLD-AGE PENSIONS.

Senate:

Motion by Senator Dobson that Bill providing for a compulsory scheme of life assurance, old-age pensions, and sick allowance be introduced as soon as convenient, moved, 4174; debated, 4196, 6006

Provision for, *address*, 14, 51, 78, 142, 251-3, 276-8, 285, 294-5, 478; *supply*, 1834, 1848, 3820-1

Questions by—

Senator Neild, speech by Mr. Mauger, inability to pay old-age pensions, 8507
Senator Pearce, cottage homes for pensioners, 12100

Senator W. Russell, date of introduction of Bill, 9422

House of Representatives:

Assistance of Opposition in expediting passing of Bill, *obs.*, 11982

Borrowing to provide for, *Budget*, 2375

Delay in introducing Federal system, *supply*, 1779-80

Estimated expenditure on, *m.*, by Mr. Crouch, for return, 11526

Federalization without altering Constitution, *obs.*, 8933-5

Intentions of Government, *adj.*, 1744

Motion by Mr. Maloney, pensions for reward of bravery, 694

Amdt. by Mr. Fisher on formal supply *m.*, that the passing of a measure to give effect to the expressed will of the people is an urgent public duty, moved, 9300; debated, 9306; *amdt.* by Mr. Wilks, that effect be given to such expressed will of the people this session, and further *amdt.* by Mr. McDonald that in the event of funds from Customs taxation being insufficient, the necessary funds be raised by taxation on unimproved value of land, 9350; *amdt.* by Mr. Watkins that Government should "take steps towards giving" effect to expressed will of people, 9351. Resolved, that the passing of a measure to give effect to the expressed will of the people is an urgent public necessity, and that the Government should take steps towards giving effect to such will of the people this session, 9352

Old-age Pensions and Braddon Section, *expl.*, 2654

Provision for, *address*, 87-8, 127-8, 161-6, 186-7, 205, 222, 224, 234, 325, 331, 338, 347; *Budget*, 1643, 2131, 2374-5, 2458, 2487-8, 2580-3, 2605, 2820-1, 2971, 3004, 3034-5, 3116, 3197, 3215

TREASURY—continued.

Old-age Pensions—continued.

Questions by—

Sir John Forrest, amendment of Bill, 12039

Mr. Mahon, distribution of New South Wales pension, 352

Mr. Maloney, imprisonment for non-compliance with orders under Victorian Act, 10482

Mr. Hutchison, priority of Federal system over uniform postage, 880

Mr. Sampson, funds available for, 11918

Mr. Wilson, notice of *m.*, by Mr. Fisher, 9298; allocation of £472,000 to old-age pension fund, if Surplus Revenue Bill is passed, 11785; transfer to fund of amount to be appropriated under Naval Defence Bill, 11790

Sir J. Forrest, old-age pensions and land taxation, 9389-90

Mr. Tudor, comparative statement as to old-age pensions, 12038

PAPER.

House of Representatives:

Printing paper, where purchased, *supply*, 10371

Question by Mr. D. Thomson, tenders for, 10081; Mr. Mathews, tenders for blotting paper, 11022

PAYMENT FOR SERVICES.

House of Representatives:

Question by Mr. Salmon, payment for services rendered to States, 7297

PRINTING.

Senate:

Government Printing Office: Unsatisfactory Arrangements for Commonwealth Printing, *supply*, 4051-9; Boy Labour and the Minimum Wage, *supply*, 8989-93

Motion by Senator Needham, that competent linotype operators with twelve months' service and over be placed on classified list of public servants, moved, 3829; debated, 3833, 5397; negatived, 5406

New linotype machines, *supply*, 11514

Plant owned by Commonwealth, *m.* by Senator Needham for return as to, 11865

Unclassified employes, *supply*, 10371

Vote of "Contingencies" for Government Printer, *supply*, 1947, 6352; and salaries, *supply*, 8988-9

Vote of £500 for salaries, *supply*, 6352; allowances for services by States officers, *supply*, 8989, 10370, 11514

Questions by—

Senator Croft, printing of *Year-Book*, 4707; establishment of Commonwealth office, 7793

TREASURY—continued.

Printing—continued.

Questions by—

Senator Findley, overtime, Government Printing Office, Victoria, 830; printing of Commonwealth Statistics, 1130; high class printing, 1131; boys as readers' assistants, 5858-9; employes receiving less than minimum wage, 8076, 8104-5

Senator Findley, strike of boys at Victorian Government Printing Office and employment of boys on night duty, 7792-3; Senator Neild, 7793

Senator Neild, printing of postage stamps, 7565

Senator Neild, sale of stationery by Government Printer, 2514, 2615; Senator Pearce, 2615

House of Representatives:

Leave to temporary employes, *obs.*, 7538-40

Printing of rolls for New South Wales in Melbourne, *supply*, 9970-1

Printing of *Seven Colonies*, *supply*, 3590

Printing of Postage Stamps, *supply*, 3591-6

Purchase of machinery and establishment of Commonwealth Printing Office, *supply*, 3589-98

Sale of Commonwealth Statutes, *supply*, 3596

Stamp printing, *supply*, 9970-4

Questions by—

Mr. Palmer, tenders for Government Printing and use of labour saving machinery, 4310, 4413

Mr. McDonald, tenders for printing *Year-Book*, 4412

Mr. Catts, sweating in Government Printing Office, Sydney, 6132, 6594-5, 6813; cost of printing reports of Imperial Conference and Mr. Beale's report, 6813

Mr. Maloney, wages of labourers, 11421

Mr. Maloney, leave to casual employes, 7415

Mr. Tudor, overtime for messengers, 6812

RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURE.

House of Representatives:

Presentation of Treasurer's statement of, 7457

REVENUE.

Senate:

Effect of Federation on revenue of Tasmania, *address*, 12, 372-3, 397-8

Effect of new Tariff on revenue, *Tariff*, 7576, 7594, 7601, 7608

Tariff, increased revenue from, *supply*, 10261

TREASURY—continued.

Revenue—continued.

Questions by—

Senator Croft, claim by Premier of Tasmania for refund of, and reference to other States, 933; Senator Findley, 3462; Senator Pearce, 7752; Senator Stewart, 7753
 Senator de Largie, refunds to Tasmania and Western Australia, 8365
 Senator Millen, preparation of return showing effect of new Tariff on revenue, 7791, 7926
 Senator Pulsford, revenue from ships' stores, 10251; from spirits, tobacco, cigars, and cigarettes, 10370

House of Representatives:

Details of, for 1906-7, *Budget*, 1627, 1630
 Distribution on *per capita* basis, *Budget*, 2603, 2974-5, 3040
 Effect of new Tariff on, *Budget*, 2396-8, 2499
 Effect of new Tariff on States' revenue, *Budget*, 1638, 2979
 Estimates for current year, *Budget*, 1628-9-30, 2398
 Principal causes of increase, *Budget*, 2129, 2451-4-8, 2659
 Receipts per head of population, *Budget*, 1631
 Return from sugar duties, *Budget*, 1628-9, 2607
 Services transferred and to be transferred, *m.*, for return as to revenue from, 11709
 Underestimates of, *address*, 87

Questions by—

Sir J. Forrest, preparation of statement showing Federal and State revenue and expenditure, and other new expenditure, 9099
 Mr. Reid, Senate's requests, effect on, 10751
 Mr. W. H. Irvine, decrease in returns for April, 10751; publication of quarterly returns, 10751
 [See "FINANCE"; also "BOUNTIES," and "SUGAR INDUSTRY."]

STATES DEBTS.

Senate:

Transfer of, *address*, 12, 58, 60, 140, 331; *supply*, 3808, 3817, 6313

House of Representatives:

Arrangements for transfer, *supply*, 1643-4
 Transfer of, *address*, 125, 161, 231-3, 462; *Budget*, 2355, 2497, 2584-6, 2697, 2737-40, 2821, 2821-5, 2916-8, 2977-80, 3002-4, 3195-6; *supply*, 3316-8, 3329, 3342-55

Questions by—

Mr. Willis, date of introduction of Bill for transfer of, 8816; Mr. McDonald, 9764; Mr. Willis, preparation and presentation of Government scheme, 10700
 Mr. Bruce Smith, power of Commonwealth to secure better terms, 9764
 Mr. Thomas, presentation and printing of paper by Mr. O'Malley, 10462

[See FINANCE.]

TREASURY—continued.

SUPPLY.

Senate:

Term of grant of, *supply*, 1833-61, 1930-47

House of Representatives:

Additional Estimates 1905-6, 1906-7, Additional Estimates for Additions, New Works, and Buildings, 1905-6 and 1906-7, 11418
 Additional Estimates, 11216, 11262, 11357, 11390
 Additions, New Works, and Buildings, 3302, 3423, 3509, 3589, 3622, 3735, 11403; *ad. rep.*, 11418
 Committee of, 84, 1775, 3302, 3423, 3509, 3589, 3622, 3735, 5783, 6279, 8820, 8964, 9393, 9482, 9597, 9686, 9768, 9875, 9957, 10082, 10136, 10181

Supply:

Attorney-General, 9725, 11364
 Defence, 3446, 3598, 3677, 3735, 9997, 10082, 11390, 11408
 External Affairs 3616, 3622, 8966, 9393, 9482, 9597, 9686, 11357
 Home Affairs, 3302, 3423, 9768, 9875, 11365, 11403
 Post and Telegraph, 3456, 3509, 10136, 10181, 11391, 11408
 The Parliament, 8964, 11216, 11262
 Trade and Customs, 3435, 9983, 11376
 Treasury, 3589, 9957, 11374
 Formal, 2891-05, 4843, 9300; (*amdt.*, as to Old-age Pensions, 9300-52), 10401; *m.*, to postpone consideration of order of the day, 10401; *amdt.*, providing for appointment of Royal Commission to inquire into Postmaster-General's Department, 10406-61, 10464; *m.*, to postpone consideration of order of the day, 10464-82, 11330; *amdt.*, as to Select Committee, Freeman and Wallace case, moved, 11330; debated, 11332-57
 Formal motion negatived, 989, 1977, 3854, 10703
 Senate's power to grant, *address*, 167
 Term of grant of, *supply*, 1775-1808, 5793

SURPLUS REVENUE BILL.

House of Representatives:

Question by Sir John Forrest, date of, 2R., 9479

Senate:

Question by Senator Millen, intention to proceed with, 11381

[See FINANCE; also BILLS.]

TAXATION.

Senate:

Direct Taxation, *supply*, 3813, 3817-20-3, 3848-9; Tariff as a lever to secure, *Tariff*, 7604-5
Obs. by Senator Best, as to motion by Senator McColl for return showing income tax paid and unpaid, 1233; *m.*, for return moved by Senator McColl, 1275; debated, 1276; negatived, 1279

TREASURY—continued.

Taxation—continued.

Present system of, *supply*, 11611
 Progressive land tax, *address*, 79, 142-6,
 156, 254, 261, 288-90, 369-70, 379, 394,
 476
 State taxation of Federal salaries, *ad-
 dress*, 12, 16, 61, 75-6, 284

House of Representatives:

Direct, *address*, 205, 232, 351; *Budget*,
 2375-6, 2456, 2501-2, 2676-7, 2691, 2814,
 2915, 2925-34, 2965-77-8, 3039-44-5, 3122,
 3137, 3190-7, 3215, 3327
 Progressive land tax, *address*, 127, 165,
 188, 319, 324; *Budget*, 2369, 2454-7,
 2491, 2501-2, 2581, 2676-7, 2716, 2719,
 2735-6, 2814-5, 2976, 3005, 3034, 3199,
 3203
 State taxation of Federal salaries, *ad-
 dress*, 191

Questions by—

Mr. Crouch, rates of States income
 tax, 1279
 Sir John Forrest, land taxation and
 Ministerial votes, 9389-90
 Mr. O'Malley, for defence purposes,
 11628

TRANSFERRED PROPERTIES.

Senate:

Payment for, *supply*, 3817, 3823; payment
 of interest on, *supply*, 3907

House of Representatives:

Payment for, *Budget*, 2373, 2740; payment
 of interest on, *Budget*, 2466, 2701

TREASURY—continued.

TREASURER'S ADVANCE ACCOUNT.

Senate:

Position of, *supply*, 138, 11689-91, 12141

House of Representatives:

Contingencies in No. 5 Supply Bill, *sup-
 ply*, 8843
 Position of, *supply*, 84-5, 1785, 1795, 1798,
 12182-96
 Works for which provision made in Sup-
 ply Bill No. 1 1908-9, *supply*, 12100-6
 Question by Mr. Maloney, paying officers'
 arrears out of, 988

TRUST FUNDS.

Senate:

Question by Senator Pulsford, where de-
 posited, and interest on, 10252

WAYS AND MEANS.

House of Representatives:

Formal motion, 4843-70, 5692-712
 Resumption of business after count-out,
m., 7251
 Resolution of Committee of, 85, 1809,
 10251, 11418
 Committee of (*Budget, and Customs and
 Excise Tariffs*), 1625, 1678, 2124, 2262,
 2314, 2348, 2451, 2579, 2655, 2691, 2807,
 2905, 2965, 2999, 3105, 3175, 3269;
 (*Tariff*), 3974, 4087, 4200, 4281, 4311,
 4413, 4519, 4623, 4650, 4749, 4870, 4928,
 4959, 5046, 5131, 5210, 5240, 5329, 5417,
 5497, 5601, 5712, 5736, 5804, 5914, 6033,
 6099, 6524, 6506, 6678, 6730, 6814,
 6835, 6806, 6968, 7028, 7118, 7171, 7251,
 7301, 7418

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN



3 9015 03041 8902

